Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 5 & 12 April 2016
The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 5 April 2016 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115). The meeting continued on Tuesday 12 April 2016 at 5 P.M., same location.

Agenda
1. Call to Order: 5:06 PM
2. The minutes for the March 2016 regular meeting were approved as posted.
3. Announcements and Information: none
4. Reports
   A. Speaker of the Faculty McNerney
      The Speaker forwent a report in order to allow as much time as possible for discussion and deliberation on the meeting’s reports and business. He emphasized the significance and value of full deliberations and discussion because these become part of our record of shared governance. He specified that, if needed, he will report or make announcements at the beginning of the next session of the meeting.
   B. President McConnell
      President McConnell delivered prepared remarks, a transcript of which, as delivered, is presented below.

Good afternoon.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak to you.

It’s been over 20 months since I became President of the College of Charleston. In what is approaching nearly two years, we’ve accomplished a lot together such as:

First, shutting the door on the idea of a merger with MUSC. Our future is now ours to control and shape, and does not rest with the authority of others outside of this institution.

Then, securing research status for our component institution, the University of Charleston, South Carolina.

Next, we received $2 million from the state to turn around and buy from the state the DEW Building on Lockwood Blvd., which will house administrative offices not needed physically on our core campus, thus opening up in the future new space at a minimum cost on our campus.

We launched our Top 10% Program and the first students into the program will be on our campus this fall.

Academically speaking, we secured additional state monies to expand our footprint in computer science and supply chain and information management.

We also passed and are implementing reforms to our Bachelor of Professional Studies program and working to grow our School of Professional Studies in North Charleston.

And recently, we have been more visible in Columbia, which has allowed us to champion our remarkable institution and call for an increased investment in higher
education from the State of South Carolina. And it appears that our message is being heard loud and clear because for the first time in many years, the College has received, over on the House side, an increase in state monies to our E&G budget. In the current version of the House budget, there is an appropriation for an additional recurring $2 million to the College.

Let me put that in context for you. If the College were to pull $2 million a year from our endowment in a sustainable way, we would approximately need about a $40 million unrestricted cash gift to earn the $2 million we would need in interest.

So you can see why the added investment from the state is terrific news. It will surely be a big step and help to the College as we work to implement a more sustainable budget.

Now, much change can occur by the time the budget is finalized in a couple of months, but we are cautiously optimistic that we will make it through to the final budget.

The progress we have made in the last 20 plus months are steps in the right direction for the College. We are now a stronger university, and we can move forward with confidence with our plans for the future.

We have put many critical pieces in place for our boundless future, and that includes adhering to the current College of Charleston Strategic Plan. The College continues to work from the aforementioned comprehensive document that is the result of a highly inclusive planning process.

I am extremely thankful to the members of our campus community who played a role in helping shape and lift up this plan, which was approved in 2009 and revised and approved again in 2013.

I have reviewed our Strategic Plan, and I support and I embrace it. I see no need to create a new one and be slowed down by perhaps another year or two of long planning. It’s time for action and implementation. And sure some updating will have to be done to this plan in the next 24 months with appropriate constituent input, but, overall, our Strategic Plan is directly in line with my vision and the vision of others for the College’s future of being an affordable, accessible, and inclusive institution.

That being said, the Strategic Plan was predicated on the idea that there would be substantial, consistent new monies for the implementation of the plan. As we all know, our current fiscal reality does not support that previous thinking. And efficiencies, internal reallocations, entrepreneurial initiatives, and fundraising are not enough by themselves.

So I’ve chosen to highlight five priorities that fit into the Plan, which the College will focus on as we approach our 250th anniversary in 2020.

These five priorities are deceptively simple, but, as we all know, can be complex in their execution.

1. Become a nationally preeminent undergraduate-centered, student-focused liberal arts and sciences university with outstanding professional programs in business and education;
2. Addressing ongoing enrollment trends and broaden recruitment;
3. Successfully pass our 10-year reaccreditation;
4. Increase diversity on the campus; and
5. Embrace sustainability in all forms on campus.

Within these priorities, we will we will retain our teacher-scholar model that has been the foundation of the College since we first began instruction in the late 1700s. At the same time, we will offer some advanced degrees in targeted areas for which there is student and market demand in our local, state, and regional communities. We will never be or want to be a full-fledged research university.

In regards to addressing ongoing national enrollment trends and broadening our recruitment strategies, the College will continue to admit and retain the best and brightest students from around South Carolina and the country and the world. We will continue to seek out and add nonresident students in a way that is smart and strategic and does not erode our ability to carry out our public mission of serving the needs of our community and state. In line with that, we also will seek to grow our graduate enrollment in our current programs, and others that may be added if the need arises.

Further, we will recruit more international students to campus and nontraditional students to our North Campus as well as potential satellite campuses East of the Cooper and by the Nexton Development.

These additions to our student demographics will help us adapt to the changing landscape of higher education today and in the future.

Of course, growing our enrollment will also mean expanding our campus outside of our historic core. We will continue to seek out properties that are a smart investment for future growth of the College, whether for classrooms, office spaces, or recreational activities.

As you know, we have under contract an inn, right down here on George St.: that is a 100-year purchase for the College of Charleston in terms of the strategic piece of property that is is.

To be attractive to all these different student groups we want to recruit, we would, of course, need to be reaccredited.

As we all know, we are currently in the midst of our 10-year SACS reaffirmation process. I know this is a large undertaking and a top priority not only for this administration, but for the entire campus. We can only achieve our reaccreditation by working together. And I greatly appreciate the additional time and attention that all of you are putting into our 10-year reaffirmation effort. It is not lost on me the amount of work that is being done by all of us and the toll it is taking on our entire campus community. And let me just say the work ends up, too, in my office, in meetings and everything else, as we all have to go through this reaffirmation process. So please know you have my most sincere and very appreciative thanks for any- and everything that you’re doing in that regard.

And in moments of frustration, and I know you’ve had a few, I ask that you remember that while the College has been accredited by SACS for exactly 100 years, there have been other instances when we were not as prepared for reaffirmation of accreditation as we should be, but we survived. We all know accreditation standards are becoming more and more rigorous in response to pressure from the federal government.

That is why this process is so important and why we must build at the College of Charleston a culture of assessment at moving forward. Accreditation ensures that an institution’s academic program meets acceptable levels of quality, in addition to
ensuring the value of a College of Charleston degree by other universities and by many public and private employers.

Honestly, much of the work being done is because we are behind the eight ball. But once we have the proper process and measurements in place, it should, and will, be easier moving forward.

Now, let me talk about another priority: diversity. As a diverse national university, we will foster a deeper appreciation for people of all races, ages, genders, religions, sexual affiliations and orientations, and levels of ability. We will increase the number of minority students and faculty and staff on campus. In line with that, we will offer the appropriate support services to ensure we are retaining these diverse groups of people. This can’t, and won’t, be just lip service. We will walk the walk, and we will talk the talk.

In addition, we will create and award more scholarships to diverse students and increase our diversity training efforts across campus.

It’s no secret that there is still much work to be done regarding diversity and inclusion at the College, but I am proud to say that we are headed in the right direction.

The last priority I want to discuss is sustainability. We must embrace sustainability. We talk about the triple bottom line, the everyday and institutional choices we make that have a social, financial, and environmental impact. By applying these tenets of sustainability, we will be a stronger university.

And you’ve heard me talk about sustainability in the sense of developing a more sustainable financial model. And yes, that means at times, we will have to make hard financial decisions. But these choices will ultimately strengthen our financial position with funds to invest in our faculty and staff and initiatives to make our College of Charleston stronger. Further, measures will be put in place that allows us to be a more affordable and accessible institution for ALL of our students.

Lastly, as we work through the implementation of our Strategic Plan, we will not decrease the quality of our academics. On the contrary, we will invest in the enhancement of renowned programs at the College and top-notch faculty and staff who are shaping the minds of tomorrow.

It’s all about implementation and execution...of new systems thinking...here at the College. Opportunities abound to change the way we think about the services we deliver; how those same services impact our bottom line, and how those same services enhance the academic achievement of the students we serve.

Focusing on these five priorities supports the goals and strategies outlined in our shared Strategic Plan. We are simply focusing on areas where we can take action now and have a lasting positive impact on the campus.

As I mentioned earlier, our Strategic Plan is quite broad, quite broad, and we need to have a more laser-like focus on a few key priorities, which we can target with the current resources we have.

Because our plan is a living document, we will review it as necessary and make revisions as circumstances and funding-- and unforeseen opportunities--may warrant. Along with that, we’ll also develop measurements to confirm we are effectively and efficiently achieving these priorities.

So much of what we do points to our bright and limitless future, including the very nature of our mission of education and service. We seek to prepare our students for
the careers of today and tomorrow. There is still more work to be done, but we are headed in the right direction.

Soon, we will hopefully announce a new collaborative institutional partnership that will improve our College by enabling us to enhance teaching, research, and service to our region and the world.

With these potential partnerships, our College will grow larger and more impactful, becoming the world-class institution our region and nation needs us to be and that we aspire to be.

Although we still have a lot to accomplish in the coming years, as we head toward our 250th anniversary, our momentum is strong. We have a great strategic plan, our BOUNDLESS campaign is the most successful campaign in our history, and we've started or completed construction of signature facilities to benefit our teaching and scholarly work.

What the College is and can be would not be possible without all of you. Because of our work together, we are stronger than we were 20-plus months ago. And this time next year, I hope we will be even stronger. In that, I am confident and committed.

I want to thank you for helping this college, what you do for the students. I talk to parents and hear what they say about their children's experience here at the College of Charleston is really something. I had a chance this weekend to sit with some of them, and they told me about the impact of their children being here, the great academic experience they're having at a great institution.

We are out trying not only to get students but to get additional funds and donations here to the College.

So, Mr. Speaker, [I close] with that: I said I would be brief, and that is brief to me.

---

**Questions / Discussion**

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), thanked the President for not pursuing a new strategic plan and for making diversity a priority. He asked if the President had in mind benchmarks for judging success or failure in diversity initiatives relating to students and faculty.

The President said he looks forward to a report to the Board of Trustees (BOT) of the diversity review committee, and that report may include benchmarks. He stated that his understanding is that some benchmarks were put in place with a prior diversity effort, but not fully adopted. He said that numbers, of course, will help us, and he pointed to encouraging numbers of the Top 10% program: 236 applications, 236 admissions, and 60 confirmations so far for fall enrollment.

We have made strides, he said, with diverse administrative hires. He added that we need to add diverse faculty, staff, and students: "the College of Charleston needs to look more like the society" in which it exists. He said this is "a good measurement for us," and he said that he hopes the diversity review committee will come back with good recommendations for matching resources to our desired results and measurements to help us see how we are doing, in addition to any recommendations they may have for changes in our organization itself to help us achieve our diversity goals.

**Irina Gigova**, Department of History, followed up on the President’s saying that we will not create a new strategic plan by pointing out that a positive outcome of our shared work on the current plan was to develop a common faculty idea of
institutional identity and mission. In the last couple of years, she suggested, our sense of identity and mission has "lost some focus," notably due to MUSC merger discussions, budget cuts, and expansion. She said that while she would not advocate for another two-year strategic planning process, she did encourage the President to think about initiating discussion with faculty and staff on institutional identity, what we want to accomplish, what students we hope to serve, what programs we want to offer, and "ultimately, what it means to be a liberal arts and sciences institution."

The President said Senator Gigova's suggestion was a good one. He added that he focuses on the liberal arts, wholistic education, and the value of training the whole mind when he speaks to various organizations about the College. He gave an example of the success of an alumnus whom he had lunch with recently and who is involved in a multi-million dollar organic cleansing agent company, a success the former student attributed to his College of Charleston education. The President said that "we need to be mindful of who we are," even as we make adjustments for unanticipated challenges.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, came back to the President's mention of the College's potential expansion east of the Cooper and at the Nexton development and the acquisition of additional properties. He urged more advanced discussion on how we make such decisions. He said that we should not be in a position in which we buy property and facilities and then after the fact have to build programs to make use of the acquisitions, which Senator Krasnoff asserted has happened with Dixie Plantation and, in a way, with the North Campus. He also stipulated that there need to be clear models for how faculty and academic programs are to be expanded in relation to acquired properties and facilities. We need to have plans in advance for who will teach where and why, whether they will be regular faculty or adjuncts, and so forth.

He argued that we need to have advanced planning, as opposed to making acquisitions based on the threat of another institution encroaching on our territory and our opportunities within it. If we respond in the latter fashion, we may be leaving unsettled the question of our own identity and mission. We have a particular model and are not in a general competition against all comers, and we should, he asserted, be expanding only in ways that support and extend our model. He pointed out that the President did not speak about how branch campuses will be evaluated and what will drive our acquisition of them, and he asked for the President's thoughts on these matters.

The President replied that location, need, and demand are key concerns relating to acquiring property and facilities, and he said any acquisition needs to make financial sense, or else it will be, he analogized, a "tick, drawing blood out of the core." He specified that he is concerned about competition for our typical students. He added here that, "without going into detail, a collaborative agreement [in the works] could open quite a few doors."

He also added that if the College is approached with opportunities for expansion and/or acquisitions that fit our needs and conform to our own prior discussions, then he will certainly look into their financial feasibility.

On the matter of Dixie Plantation, he said that the College has submitted a grant application and is trying to make that property "cash positive."

**There were no more questions.**
C. **Provost McGee** (Presentation Slides: [PPT](#) | [PDF](#))

Provost McGee thanked the Senate for its work and acknowledged that there is still a good deal of work left for faculty to complete the semester, and he thanked the faculty for their ongoing efforts. He also reinforced the President’s stated commitment to our goal of becoming a nationally preeminent institution, a "running theme," he said, in our discussions of our institutional identity and aspirations. He expressed gratitude for the President’s limited list of strategic plan-reinforcing priorities to work on within our current financial means. He also said he is looking forward to the College’s sesquicentennial celebration.

**Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review**

The Provost reviewed the numerical results for tenure, promotion, and third-year review and thanked the faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review and the faculty Post-Tenure Review Committee for their work. It is often onerous and challenging, he observed, but he added, for his part, it is also inspiring to read of the faculty’s achievements in the classroom and out.

Results for the year's cases were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Pos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third-Year Review</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure/Promotion to Assoc.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Professor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Sr. Instructor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention as Sr. Instructor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Librarian Tenure/Promotion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He explained that, due to our review cycle shift from five to seven years, there were this year no senior instructor cases.

**Policy Development and Implementation**

The Provost reminded the Senate of an email he sent to the Senate and to roster faculty two days prior to the meeting in which he attached copies of course numbering and faculty syllabi policies. These policies, now in their eighth versions and long in development with much faculty committee consultation, are nearly ready for the President's endorsement. He offered to address any questions or concerns about the policies in the question and discussion period.

[There were no questions at that time. JMD]

**Updating the Faculty/Administration Manual**

The Provost noted that we need to produce a final version of the *Faculty/Administration Manual* for next year much earlier than we usually do because of SACSCOC reaffirmation. And so we will be pushing for an early to mid-June release. He specified some of the changes that will be made in the new *F/AM*: title updates (to avoid confusion, for instance, with obsolete titles appearing in the current version) and minor editing, an updated adjunct faculty description, by-laws changes (if ratified by the full faculty), and changes in the administrative portion of the document.
Comments on the Senate Agenda

The Provost expressed support for two new program proposals (one undergraduate [Real Estate major] and one graduate [MA in Community Planning, Policy and Design]) to be taken up at the meeting. The proposals, he said, underwent very careful review.

The Provost singled out the Faculty Compensation Committee for their work on both roster and adjunct faculty compensation. He added that Professor Julia Eichelberger’s report on the status of adjunct faculty will provide important information on policies and practices regarding our adjunct colleagues. He also expressed gratitude for the Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness’s creation of a new undergraduate program review scheme for SACSCOC purposes and for improvement of undergraduate programs.

Questions / Discussion

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked the Provost a question which said he has already asked at a prior meeting and on which received an answer in the negative, but which he said was worth pursuing again after what he described as the President’s "largely optimistic" vision of the College’s prospects, even facing financial constraints. Senator Krasnoff said that faculty and deans should be able to expect a regular review of requests for faculty lines with the understanding that searches need to be conducted on particular timelines, even if the answer to the question of getting lines is "no."

Senator Krasnoff asked the Provost if he would commit to a timetable for review of all lines and approval of requests to hire by some reasonable date in the fall. He also asked if there can be a regular hiring process next year.

The Provost replied that next year we do not expect a budget reset like this year’s, and, he added, it is less likely that we will be in a "holding pattern" on faculty positions. He said that he has discussed many individual faculty positions with deans, and said that, generally speaking, he "is trying to get to 'yes'," but that he also has to consider the financial constraints for next year.

The goal, he said, is to get searches approved and up and running in an optimal timeline, but he observed that it is not preferable to say "no" by a preset date, when it is possible that there could be a "yes" six, eight, or ten weeks down the road, even if only for a visiting position. He agreed that the situation is a very frustrating one for faculty, deans, and Academic Affairs.

There were no further questions.

D. Faculty Compensation Committee (PowerPoint | PDF)

Chair, Cynthia May

Professor May gave a presentation covering three main topics.

1. progress on roster faculty salaries and current status in regard to a 2013 Senate resolution on faculty salaries

2. adjunct salaries

3. issues related to gender and salaries at CofC.

Roster Faculty Salaries

She reviewed the March 2013 resolution of the Faculty Senate that faculty salaries will meet or exceed the median salaries of our CUPA-HR salary peers, institutionally and at each rank and discipline, by September 2018 (slide 2), indicating that we are midway through the cycle set in the resolution.
She listed our CUPA-HR peers (slide 3), a list initially created in 2003 by a faculty committee and updated in 2008, and discussed the selection process, which included several factors (slide 4). She added that one could debate the appropriateness of the peers listed, but that would be a debate for another time.

She reported progress since 2013 (a move from 14th to 10th place among peers on overall mean salary); however, data for the current year was not available at the time of the presentation, and she warned, once the newest data is available, we may find that we are slipping (notably, with growing gaps at both the Associate and Professor ranks) (see slides 6 and 7). Professor May observed that the total cost of closing these gaps would be about $1.4 million.

The committee’s recommendations (slide 8) are that

- the College continue its effort to achieve the goal of meeting mean salaries of our CUPA-HR peers.
- the College target these issues of salary compression at the Associate and Professor levels with raises that are both market- and merit-based.
- the distribution of merit raise monies (that is, funds additional to any state-mandated raises) to schools be proportionate to the size of each school’s salary gap with respect to CUPA-HR peers.

Adjunct Salaries

Professor May pointed out that full-time adjunct annual salary (8 courses) is $27,400 with a PhD (slide 9). For comparison, she said that starting salaries for teachers in the Charleston County School District with a PhD and no experience are just over $44,000.

She explained the College’s current policy of differential rates of pay per course for adjuncts depending on how many courses they teach, as opposed to a single rate per course, no matter the number of courses taught (slide 9).

The committee has priced the cost of leveling adjunct salaries at about $547,000 (slide 10).

The committee’s recommendations (slide 11) are that

- the College strive to provide equal pay for equal work by paying adjuncts at the same rate per course, regardless of the number of courses taught per term.
- adjunct faculty be included in any state-mandated raises.

Gender Differences in Pay

The committee observed gender pay gaps across all faculty ranks (slide 12). Professor May noted that many factors drive faculty compensation, such as discipline, years in rank, and so forth. She said that because the data needed for a full study have not yet been released, the committee has not yet had a chance to fully study and understand the origin of the gender differences seen.

The committee’s recommendations (slide 13) are that

- the College closely examine salaries for male and female faculty members to understand the factors driving the global differences in mean salaries for men and women.
• the College consider discipline, years in rank, mid-rank raises, prior administrative appointments, and other objective factors that may affect base salaries for a full understanding of salaries across gender at each rank.

Questions / Discussion

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS, asked for a clarification of the committee's third recommendation for roster faculty salary: the distribution of merit raise monies (that is, funds additional to any state-mandated raises) to schools be proportionate to the size of each school's salary gap with respect to CUPA-HR peers. He asked if the gap is to be established by comparison of CoC schools to CUPA-HR schools within institutions: would we be comparing our SHSS to CUPA-HR SHSS averages?

Professor May said that one can drill down into the CUPA-HR data to get salary information by discipline. She acknowledged, however, that this can be tricky because, while there are some clear disciplinary comparisons that can be made (Psychology here to Psychology elsewhere), in some cases our peers do not have the exact same departments as we do. Some finesse would be required to set up the school comparisons.

She also observed, however, that not all our departments show roster faculty salary gaps at all ranks. She said that the committee hopes that we address the existing gaps, not adopt a blanket approach. The idea is to look precisely at where we fall short compared to our peers.

Senator Kelly expressed an interest in prioritizing departments that lag far behind the median salary for all professors at a particular rank, regardless of differences in the market with respect to discipline. Professor May replied that there might be some "push-back" on such a plan. Senator Kelly replied that this might help with gender pay gaps, to which Professor May agreed.

She added that this raises the question of how much market should influence our decisions and that a related issue is our hiring practices and the availability in personnel at the application stage.

Senator Kelly asked a second question. What is the nature of the committee’s recommendations and what happens next? Is the committee seeking the administration's commitment to accept, reject, or modify the recommendations? He said that he worries that the recommendations will end up in the dubious "file drawer of recommendations."

Professor May asked Provost McGee to reply.

The Provost said the committee's recommendations are read carefully in Randolph Hall and discussed, alongside a consideration of the resources that might be available to address recommendations. In the past, different pools of money have been available to address salary, including, at times, money for state-mandated across-the-board raises. Such mandates, he observed, are beneficial for overall compensation but can also aggravate disparities in pay. In some years, he said, we have been able to create merit and equity pools, which could be used to help smooth out disparities. This has not been the case in recent years, however.

He agreed with the compensation committee that we need to look closely into gender pay equity and said that with the help the Offices of Institutional Research, Planning, and Information Management and Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, he hopes we can make progress.

He added that the College has had success with a change in setting baselines for new Assistant Professors. It is much harder, however, to make progress on salaries
for faculty whose base salaries were set very low many years before we adopted the new practice.

Professor May followed up, saying that there is evidence that the Compensation Committee’s reports have made an impact because there were some targeted efforts following the 2013 resolution to move us closer to our peers.

**Janette Finch**, Senator - Library, inquired as to the apparent absence of library faculty in the report.

Professor May asked Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker to reply to Senator Finch.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker, noting that she works with and supports the committee, especially with gathering data, said that we have not had raise processes excluding the library faculty, but faculty librarians have not always been included in analyses of the sort conducted by the committee because the CUPA-HR data are not always good for including library faculty salary data in the study. She added that if the new data does not include useful information regarding library faculty salaries, she will seek another source to get it.

**Bill Olejniczak**, Department of History and former member of the committee, addressed Senator Kelly’s query about what becomes of the committee’s recommendations. He pointed out that the committee looked at the resolution as setting up a kind of assessment. In 2013, he said, the administration committed to the concept of the deadline. The committee’s annual report to the Senate offers a measure of how we are progressing and what remains to be done, in dollar figures. In 2013, he said, the feeling was that adjusting the salary per the resolution was felt to be "very doable." He agreed that financial conditions have changed since then, but he said that as an assessment the report of the committee continues to be relevant and useful.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker expressed appreciation for Professor Olejniczak’s statement and added that a source of difficulty in progressing toward the resolution’s goal is that we’re "aiming at a moving target": the numbers shift in relation to both the economy and the performance of individual institutions in the dataset. Thus the path is not steady or smooth, but jagged, she said. We should keep this in mind if the latest data shows us slipping in position, as Professor May observed it might in her report.

**Scott Peeples**, Department of English, inquired about the committee’s recommendation for adjunct pay. What, he asked, was the discussion that led to prioritizing evening out part-time and full-time adjunct pay per course, as opposed to increases across the board that would benefit full-time and part-time adjuncts alike.

Professor May said that the committee would advocate for an raise across the board, in addition to the leveling, if such raises are available.

She said, in relation to leveling, that "teaching a course is teaching a course," but she acknowledged that the back story of the current differential pay system involved mandated raises for full time temporary workers. She said that the recommended leveling is to ensure equal pay for equal work. Also, she said, in comparison with other institutions in the area and in the state, while we may rightly feel that adjunct pay is very low, the College’s adjunct pay is not substantially lower than our peers’ and, thus, it’s hard to argue that in a comparative sense, our adjuncts are underpaid.
Irina Gigova, Department of History, asked if cost of living is a factor in the committee's deliberations, especially considering the higher cost of living in Charleston compared to where some peer institutions are located.

Professor May replied that the committee did take cost of living into account, noting that Charleston is more expensive than some of the peer's locations and less expensive than others. She said that while she did not have cost of living data with her, that data has not always been helpful in the committee's work, in part because cost of living may be counterbalanced, to some extent, by benefits of living in a place like Charleston. She said that the committee might include cost of living in the future, but the committee's work did not this time around.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, came back to Professor Peeples’s query on adjunct salary, stipulating that there are different kinds of adjuncts and the role salary plays can be different in their lives. For instance, he said, for a professional who teaches a single class, it is mainly important that the pay not be insulting. Such a faculty member is not dependent on pay for teaching. But a full-time adjunct, presumably, is relying on her pay to make ends meet. The equal pay for equal work principle, he argued, is abstract and less compelling than a principle of making sure those who are working full time can earn a decent, living wage along with the benefits and protections they need.

Professor May said that it is not necessarily the case that faculty teaching one or two classes are not, therefore, vitally relying on their CofC wages because in many cases adjuncts only find out at the last minute how many courses they will be teaching, perhaps expecting more classes than they get to teach. The committee, she said, found it fundamentally unfair to pay one person more for teaching a course than another in the same rank and level.

Professor May invited Julia Eichelberger to comment, and Professor Eichelberger added that something to keep in mind in this discussion is that for full-time adjuncts who are eligible and choose to enroll, the College makes available health insurance. This was not available before about a year ago, and the College has to pay for it, and it can be seen as an investment on the part of the College and a important financial benefit for full-time adjuncts.

Lisa Covert, Senator - SHSS, came back to the cost of living discussion, pointing out that The Citadel is a peer in our CUPA-HR comparison but has a better rank (8th to our 14th). She suggested we investigate why this is the case.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, replied to Senator Covert by discussing the limitations of CUPA-HR data for some kinds of comparisons. While we can make rank/discipline comparisons (e.g., Assistant Professors in History) across groups, CUPA-HR affords a kind of protection to reporting institutions by not allowing access to any individual institution’s specific data. On the other hand, IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Center), which houses data from nationally-required reporting, provides institution-level data, but no individual rank/discipline data.

Stipulating that she was not claiming it as the sole reason for The Citadel’s higher ranking, she speculated that if their faculty is distributed differently by discipline, such that higher-paying disciplines have relatively more faculty than are represented in the same disciplines at the College and factoring in the presence of faculty in higher-paying disciplines at The Citadel, like Engineering, which we don't have, these could be factors affecting their higher ranking. We can't tell from CUPA-HR and IPEDS data.
Melissa Thomas, Senator - Adjunct, inquired if there is adjunct faculty representation on the Faculty Compensation Committee, and Professor May confirmed that there is.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked if the CUPA-HR rank by discipline data are available to department chairs.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker replied that they are.

Senator Shaver then asked about the IPEDS data, to which the Associate Provost replied that IPEDS data are public, and so, Academic Affairs could get these to deans and chairs.

Jolanda-Pieta van Arnheim, Library, reported that the CUPA-HR data for librarians is being re-evaluated by the ACRL (Association of College and Research Libraries), and she requested that a librarian be included in Compensation Committee meetings.

She also inquired if the College has considered setting a minimum starting salary for anyone considered faculty. She added that in librarianship, in particular, there are gender disparities. A minimum starting salary that accounts for cost of living might go some way toward addressing gender gaps in pay.

Professor May agreed that a minimum starting salary is something the Compensation Committee might consider.

Provost McGee added that, de facto, a minimum has been instituted on a discipline-by-discipline basis by benchmarking Assistant Professor starting pay by discipline. In a recent case, he said, in which both a woman and a man were hired in the same year, in the same discipline, and at the same rank, and in which the man bargained more aggressively, the College made sure each were paid the same, since a difference in pay (even minimally) would have made no sense. Salary floors are being set case-by-case within disciplines. But a universal floor, given the complexity of the organization, might not work out so well, he said: the floor might be too low or it might interfere with an effort to be responsive to the market.

Professor May said that the data shows that the administration has been sensitive to gender difference and the discipline-specific differences have been addressed to some degree by recent hires.

Kendall Deas, Senator - Adjunct, inquiring on behalf of constituents, asked if the committee discussed differential pay for adjuncts based on degree held, paying more for those with PhD’s, for instance, than those with Masters degrees.

Professor May noted that there is already, though a very small one, a difference in pay for adjuncts holding a terminal degree for those teaching one course. The increase per-course does not continue for those teaching two, three, or four courses.

There were no further questions.

E. Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness
Undergraduate Program Review Process (PDF)

Professor Jones reviewed his committee’s charge in relation to the need for undergraduate program review for compliance with SACSCOC reaffirmation (standard 3.4.12), replacing the long-defunct external reviews formerly conducted by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE), the desire to commend exemplary programs and identify programatic innovations that should be replicated elsewhere on campus, and to make suggestions for programatic improvements.
He reminded the Senate that the committee established a 14-point review rubric and articulated where chairs might find the information needed for the review, most of which is readily available through standard sources: departmental mission statements, annual departmental reports and assessment reports, information available in compliance assist, and institutional research.

He noted that the committee has now adjusted the plan to make the review cycle seven, rather than five years. He reported that reviews have begun of four departments (whom he thanked for agreeing to do so in a tight timeframe), the committee is reviewing these departments’ submitted materials (on Sharepoint), and that these reviews should be completed by the end of the semester for use in the fall SACSCOC reaffirmation submission.

Professor Jones pointed out that the review procedure is described in the document circulated with the agenda: "Undergraduate Program Review Process." He noted that the review process is subject to revision and modification if unexpected problems emerge, with the idea of creating a formal policy proposal afterwards based on the experience in the first round of reviews.

Professor Jones specified that November will likely be the time future reviews will be submitted, with notifications going out to programs in the previous year, affording the summer and most of the fall to prepare submissions.

Questions / Discussion

Andrew Shedlock, Senator - Biology, expressed his departmental constituents’ concerns about the potential burden imposed by program reviews, especially for those already heavily engaged in undergraduate program review work in departments. He read into the record one constituent's expression of such concerns:

"I am not saying that periodic assessment and revision of programs would not be useful, but that the current policy-driven approach does not help. in fact, in my opinion, it incentivizes keeping things as they are, rather than experimenting with new curricula and so forth. It removes flexibility in assessment approaches, [and] adds [a] substantial bureaucratic and reporting load, diminishing resources that could otherwise be focused on teaching and research."

Other departmental constituents said, he reported, that those already heavily engaged in assessment, program chairs, and department chairs may not do some of their existing duties if they become excessive. Granting that the spirit is good and the need to do such reviews has been forced on us by the state, he said there is growing concern and there will need to be very careful, elaborate dialogue before the policy gets written.

Professor Jones, beginning with "you're singing to the choir" and expressing his own frustration with and critical stance toward the College’s assessment efforts, replied that he hopes that the committee’s work will help the College get through the upcoming SACSCOC reaffirmation, but that at some point in the future he would like to see a full discussion of assessment itself, including an analysis of whether it, itself, is effective.

It is important, he added, that program assessment not be a "minimal checklist" that takes a lot of time but doesn’t look very deeply into the program, but also that it not be a very difficult review process. Program review needs to strike the right balance, and the committee puts that consideration in the forefront of its deliberations, Professor Jones said.
Senator Shedlock thanked Professor Jones for his reply and asked a second question gathered from his constituents. With the diversity of the College’s programs, can a single rubric be applied to all programs?

Professor Jones said that these reviews will not be to the depth where a disciplinary-specific approach is needed. The “gold standard” he said is external program review, which would be a more thorough review that yields deeper information in a disciplinarily specific way. These cost money, however; and that is a serious constraint.

Beatriz Maldonado, Senator - School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs (SLCWA), asked how program review will affect stand-alone programs that are not under another program, like International Studies. Will this end up doubling the work of program assessment already required?

Professor Jones said this is a tough question. The committee has been looking to what sort of documents and information department chairs ordinarily have to provide annually as the set of artifacts program review will use. He said that he cannot speak to the case of interdisciplinary programs like International Studies because he is not familiar with what the program ordinarily has to submit, but he said he hopes that there will not be too much extra work involved for such programs.

Dr. Divya Bhati, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, added here that programs like International Studies should be able to use assessment data to feed back into the program review, but the program review will cover all aspects of the program, including, for instance, faculty information.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked if the program review rubric includes departmental faculty compensation. Professor Jones replied that he couldn’t say off the top of his head and would need to check the rubric. Professor Shaver suggested that it be added if it is not already there.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS, asked how “program” is defined.

Professor Jones said that, since the committee was given a list of 80 or so programs that are to be reviewed, they have not considered a definition.

Senator Kelly asked AVP Bhati the same question, specifically asking if minors are included.

Dr, Bhati replied that there is an institutional definition of programs in Institutional Research, since we must report how many programs we have, how many certificates, how many stand-alone minors, and so on.

Provost McGee noted here that there has been an external review cycle for the graduate program for some time. When CHE’s undergraduate program review was eliminated in 2001, the College had no such reviews, aside from those programs who had a secondary accreditor, such as programs in the School of Business. Were we capable financially of conducting undergraduate reviews as we do graduate program reviews, we would, but we cannot.

The committee, he added, looked at a number of undergraduate review systems at schools similar to ours, and our committee’s scheme very much follows suit. The Provost expressed the desire to develop a review process that avoids extremes of deep-diving into the data and, on the other side, rudimentary box-checking. He added that he expects that there will be continuous improvement in the review process as it develops, and we will continue to weigh the costs of external reviews.
Irina Gigova, Department of History, inquired how item 9 from the rubric ("Produces alumni who use their degree to launch a successful career, to further their education, or to contribute to society") is to be assessed.

Professor Jones replied that departmental annual report information will provide alumni information that might speak to this item.

Dr. Bhati added here that institutional alumni survey can also provide useful data to this end.

There were no further questions or discussion.

F. Adjunct Policies and Practices, Julia Eichelberger
- Presentation (PowerPoint | PDF)
- Achieving Best Practices for Adjunct Faculty at the College of Charleston: Spring 2016 Progress Report and Recommendations (Handout - PDF | Full Report - PDF)

Professor Eichelberger explained that she served in Academic Affairs as a Faculty Administrative Fellow from 2013-15 (through the fall semester) specifically looking into adjunct faculty practices and policies.

Her report, she said, is based in part on internal research, with information gathered from department chairs and deans and a survey conducted by the Faculty Welfare Committee that she took as a starting point. She also studied other institutions and the work of adjunct and contingent faculty advocacy groups.

While we have made some progress, she said there is more work to be done, and that this work needs to part of our shared governance, advocating for the creation of an elected faculty committee that will keep track of adjunct policies and practices that could consult with Academic Affairs and report to the Senate.

She outlined and discussed 11 best practices for adjunct faculty policy and practices.

1. Adjuncts receive equitable pay and benefits, comparable to pay for comparable work by tenured and tenure-track faculty or other faculty with similar qualifications (slide 3)

   The adjunct faculty position, Professor Eichelberger said, is most comparable to that of Visiting Instructor (VI), although there is a key difference in how they are hired: VIs are always hired through a search, adjuncts, often not.

   She reported some progress in adjusting adjunct salaries, though she said there could be more progress made. The College has accorded health benefits to full time adjunct faculty, which is a significant.

   Noting that many feel that it would be best to convert all adjunct positions into full time positions, Professor Eichelberger offered cost figures for such a conversion (slide 4). The estimated cost to convert a full-time adjunct to a visiting instructor is about $13,000 plus benefits. To make the conversion across the board, she estimated, would require 124 new VI lines. Her rough guess of cost of 124 new VI lines to replace 124 full-time adjuncts was $1.57 million plus benefits.

   She agreed that it is not very likely the College would do this, but neither is it out of the question. In any case, the figures are good to have.

   Professor Eichelberger also pointed out more specifically the changes in adjunct salary since 2013 (slide 5), showing modest improvements, and
adding that the College pays better than many other institutions, though she
granted that "it is a low bar."

She also provided a bit more detail on health insurance for adjuncts who
teach 10 contact hours or more per semester. She added that this is
something to be proud of: the College of Charleston deliberately defined
adjunct work hours in a way that would allow them to qualify for healthcare
benefits.

2. When hired, adjuncts receive contracts, teaching information and support
comparable to that provided to other faculty. Appointments are made in time
to prepare to teach a course; supervisors clearly stipulate duties,
expectations, and process of evaluation. (slide 7)

Professor Eichelberger pointed out here that national news stories have
attended to the fact that it is not unusual for adjunct faculty to be hired to
teach so late that there is practically no time to prepare for classes before
they begin. Often there is very little support for such faculty. They may not
even have offices.

She said that her evidence is that the College is doing fairly well in this
respect, but that a future committee dedicated to adjunct faculty issues could
survey adjunct faculty to see how they feel in relation to this best practice.
She acknowledged that "just in time" hires are unavoidable at times,
however.

3. Evaluation practices for adjunct faculty are comparable to those used to hire
and evaluate tenure-track faculty: clearly defined criteria, peer review, and
adequate time to seek other employment if not reappointed (slide 8)

There is now, she said, a formal evaluation practice for adjunct faculty at the
College, but this was not the case across the board at the College in the
recent past.

4. Career ladder for adjunct faculty rewards excellent performance and makes
some form of job security possible. (slide 8)

Professor Eichelberger noted that this practice speaks to Senator Deas's
question about the potential of differential pay for adjuncts based on degrees
earned (above). She added that she thinks adjunct faculty ought to be eligible
for raises, just the same as other faculty, to reward performance.

We have titles for adjunct faculty, she noted, and added that there could be
more titles to make distinctions among adjuncts and the kinds of
qualifications they hold, along with different pay grades.

5. Support for adjunct faculty teaching parallels support for tenure-track
faculty: appropriate supplies, equipment, office space, and access to campus
resources, professional development, and mentoring. (slide 9)

She said that the College is doing well in relation to this practice. Many
adjuncts have access to office and equipment equivalent to other faculty, but
a future committee might also keep an eye on this, keeping in mind the limits
departments may have in terms of space and so forth.
Professor Eichelberger also reported that at the College now there are more opportunities for paid professional development than there ever have been.

6. Adjunct faculty are invited to participate in department meetings and may contribute to curriculum design. (slide 9)
   Some departments, she said, are doing this, and this could be monitored by a committee, with recognition and reward for departments who do this well.

7. Representation in faculty governance is available to all adjunct faculty. (slide 10)
   This practice and practices 8 and 9 below, Professor Eichelberger reported, we have achieved.

8. Respect for adjunct faculty is communicated by administration, chairs, and all faculty. (slide 10)
   Professor Eichelberger conceded that, speaking to this practice, she may not be perceiving things in quite the same way that an adjunct faculty member might. An adjunct oversight committee might want to pay attention to this.

9. Support is available for all adjunct faculty's professional development and scholarly research. (slide 10)
   She said that living up to this best practice is a "big milestone" for the College: adjuncts can now participate in professional development within departments and get paid for doing so (though, admittedly, not much). Programs including Biology, Hispanic Studies, and English piloted professional development programs. She said that there are not many institutions who are doing this.

10. Institution's staffing plan specifies a ratio of regular faculty/adjunct faculty that is desirable for institution to meet its academic goals (slide 11).
    We have not, at the College, achieved this, and Professor Eichelberger said that this could be something an adjunct issues committee could explore in coordination with the Provost and the President. The College, she argued, should have a specified target and when we go above it, we should be concerned about it.

11. Institution collects and publishes data tracking its achievement of best practices. (slide 11)
   Professor Eichelberger said there is strong consensus in the field regarding this practice, though in her role as a Faculty Administrative Fellow, she added, it has been hard to get this information. An adjunct oversight committee could make it an agenda item to seek out and collect such information through regular contact with Academic Affairs: how many adjuncts we have, number of adjunct-taught sections, salary levels, and so forth. The committee could provide a regular report on these and other matters to the Faculty Senate.

   Professor shared a chart with adjunct reliance figures since 2012-13, showing an average of around 30% of student credit hours taught by adjunct faculty (slide 12).

   She said that there is no reason we should be trying to get to 0%, since there
are many situations in which adjunct faculty do fine work for the College, but we could still aim to bring the number down.

Professor Eichelberger advocated for the formation of a standing committee composed of adjunct faculty, those who have supervised adjuncts, other faculty, and the Provost’s representative, is designed to monitor adjunct reliance, compensation, and working conditions and which would consult with Provost’s office and other College leaders and keep the Senate informed.

Questions / Discussion

Kendall Deas, Senator - Adjunct, expressing a concern of his constituents, asserted that student course and instructor evaluations are overly relied upon in adjunct faculty evaluations but that research has shown that there can be bias in these evaluations based on faculty’s race, ethnicity, and gender. Can we, he asked, move to an evaluation system for adjunct faculty that also accounts for service commitment, participation in professional activities and organizations, working in the community, and other such activities? This could bring adjunct faculty evaluation into closer alignment with evaluation of roster faculty.

Professor Eichelberger replied that student evaluations tell us only part of the story of faculty’s teaching and student learning.

Senator Deas added that not some adjuncts may have career aspirations toward becoming tenure-track faculty, and evaluations should include a broader spectrum of activities in order to help them on this path.

Professor Eichelberger said that evaluation processes for adjunct faculty should be just as transparent as they are for other faculty. She suggested that some kind of peer review might be added to the evaluation process, which is not mandated by Academic Affairs for adjunct faculty evaluation, but a department might choose to do. An oversight committee could take notice of departments that integrate transparent peer review practices. And the departments, she added, have an opportunity to further adjunct development for their work here and elsewhere if they choose to pursue full-time work at another institution. She said that in the Department of English, adjunct faculty have had the benefit of an evaluation process that helps those faculty develop a portfolio for use on the job market. She pointed out that professional development programs developed in some of the departments can be seen from links on the Academic Affairs website. She added that many departments also have wonderful collegiality between roster and adjunct faculty and that this is possible in other departments as well.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, added here that Academic Affairs, deans, department chairs believe student ratings are but one piece of evidence providing insight into teaching. Review of teaching should have substance and breadth beyond student course/instructor evaluations, but these do have some value within the larger context. She said that if there are reviews being conducted that do not put student ratings into the proper context, Academic Affairs would like to know. Academic Affairs conducts orientations of new chairs and program directors and this can be a good opportunity to reinforce the role of student course/instructor evaluations.

Addressing the question of evaluation of adjunct faculty on matters other than instruction, the Associate Provost said the Provost has been deliberate in treating adjunct faculty as instructional faculty and not setting expectations beyond that. We provide opportunities for professional development and service without setting those as expectations. It is, she agreed with Senator Deas, appropriate for adjunct faculty to pursue such opportunities for career advancement. She suggested that
evaluation on these activities could made available as an option requested by the adjunct faculty member, but not an expectation of all adjunct faculty, from whom these activities are not expected as part of their job description.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked if Professor Eichelberger had data on adjunct dependence by school.

Professor Eichelberger said that she did not have this information, but it would be useful.

Senator DeLaurell suggested that gathering such data and reporting it could be a function of an adjunct issues committee.

Provost McGee added here that Academic Affairs could provide this information and specified that more useful information might be gathered from the number of sections taught by adjuncts, rather than a head count of adjuncts, within schools.

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

**G. SACSCOC Reaffirmation Update** ([PowerPoint](#) | [PDF](#))

Divya Bhati, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning

Dr. Bhati reminded the Senate that the College will host a SACSCOC on-site team in spring ’17, and she broke down what the College will be evaluated on and the stages for the reaffirmation process (slide 2). The compliance certification report (off-site review) covering the standards listed on the slide will be submitted on September 12, 2016. The QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) will be submitted approximately four to six weeks before the spring on-site review.

The off-site review team consists of four to six colleagues from other institutions. If the team has questions, they will ask the College to respond in what is called a "focused report." The on-site team will review the focused report and use it to structure their work on campus. The chair of the on-site committee is Dr. Suzanne Ozment, formerly of The Citadel.

If the on-site team is happy with their review, then the review will proceed to the next stage, a CNR review, which is the review of the Commission’s Board of Trustees, and will be completed in December 2017.

A reaffirmation letter will come to the College in January 2018.

Dr. Bhati shared timelines for both reaffirmation and for the Quality Enhancement Plan, on which vertical arrows mark our current position in the process (slide 3). On the reaffirmation timeline, the next step is the advisory visit, May 24-25, of Dr. John Hardt. On the QEP timeline, the different subcommittees are at work on their respective parts of the proposal, and they will be establishing timelines for implementation in April and May.

She gave updates on the progress of the 16 working groups (slide 4) and listed significant dates (slide 5), including due dates. She asked for any faculty wishing to speak with Dr. John Hardt to contact her and asked that faculty put March 28-30, 2017 on their calendars for the on-site team visit.

**There were no questions.**
5. **Old Business**
   
   **A. Faculty Curriculum Committee**
   
   1. **Math: Course Renumbering** *(PDF)*
      
      The Speaker explained that this proposal carries over from the March meeting because, even though it was approved by the necessary committees prior to that meeting, the paperwork was, unintentionally, not provided to Senators with the meeting agenda.
      
      There were no questions.
      
      **The proposal was approved by a unanimous voice vote.**
      
   2. **Environmental Studies** *(PDF)*
      
      - Change the name of the minor.
      - Make a corresponding change to the name of ENVT 200, the minor's introductory course.
      
      Gibbs Knots, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, reminded the Senate that the proposal was approved by the committee and discussed in the Senate at the March meeting, discussion postponed until the present meeting (see March minutes, pp. 24-29).
      
      The Speaker recognized Todd LeVasseur, Environmental Studies Program Director, to speak on behalf of the proposal.
      
      Dr. LeVasseur provided a handout to address objections to the proposal voiced at the prior meeting. He summed up his response thusly:
      
      - the program under its current title no longer reflects what is taught in it and the classes that he said the program hopes to add in the future
      - the national trend over the past decade favors the new name and it might disadvantage students to stick with the current name
      - interdisciplinary faculty here involved in steering the program, after research, support the proposal
      - the name change covers one minor and its key course and will not impede developing other classes or programs at undergraduate and graduate levels in sustainability
      
      There were no questions or discussion.
      
      **The proposal was approved by a unanimous voice vote.**
      
   3. **BPS Healthcare** *(PDF)*
      
      - Create three new courses on healthcare
      - Create a healthcare minor within BPS.
      
      **See below**
      
   4. **BPS Program Changes** *(PDF)*
      
      - Add PRST 220 and PRST 230 as requirements in BPS.
      - Terminate the BPS Information Systems concentration.
      - Make numerous changes to the course lists for the other concentrations.
      
      **See below**
5. **BPS Project Management** *(PDF)*
   - Create six new courses on project management.
   - Create a new project management concentration within BPS

Professor Knotts introduced the three proposals above, noting that all the above proposals have now been vetted by the Faculty Budget Committee and have returned to the Senate for consideration (see *March minutes*, pp. 23-24).

**Questions / Discussion**

**The Speaker** asked Julia Eichelberger, Chair - Faculty Budget Committee, to give her committee’s opinion on the proposals.

She said that the committee supports all three proposals. She specified that the committee looked at the elimination of the BPS concentration in Information Systems in tandem with the creation of a Project Management concentration. The former did not have enough student interest, whereas the latter showed promise in that regard. The concentration, she added, could serve both our traditional students, current BPS students, and potential new students.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, asked for an explanation of project management: what it is, who teaches it, what their training is, and what disciplines/departments at the College are likely to provide faculty.

Dean Gibbison replied to the last part of Senator Krasnoff’s query first, noting, as an example, that Marvin Gonzalez from the School of Business will most likely be teaching a Quality Control course in the Project Management concentration. The discipline of Project Management, Dean Gibbison explained, has emerged in the past 25 years as a popular discipline initially associated with Engineering as an extension of Engineering into management. It tends to draw from Management and Engineering programs. The field is now very broad and includes construction (organizing the building of structures) and IT (launching IT initiatives with an eye toward maintaining quality, staying on task, communicating with clients along the way, staying on budget, and so forth). The three core aspects of Project Management, he said, are maintaining quality control, developing and working with timelines, and communication with teams and stakeholders.

He added that we have faculty members who have worked in Project Management or have training that is appropriate. No other departments at the College, he reported, have seemed interested in developing a Project Management program of any sort, a fact he has taken care to verify, he added.

Dean Gibbison noted that good adjunct faculty for the program are also fairly easy to come by, as well.

Senator Krasnoff noted that The Citadel has an MA in Project Management that appears to be tied to Engineering. Should we worry, he asked, about students lacking a technical background (Engineering, IT, for instance)?

Dean Gibbison said "not at all." While it is a discipline that can be tied to technical fields, it does not have to be. A more generic version might
actually be better and have a broader appeal. In the community, he added, some have already suggested particular specializations, such as healthcare project management. Yet, he asserted, the broader version gives graduates more open prospects.

**Marvin Gonzalez**, Senator - Supply Chain and Information Management, said that any project needs to be solvent and achieve its objectives. Project Management is the means of satisfying such needs. Project managers, in any business, have proficiency in the use of financial, quality control, and statistical tools.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked if we have a data-established understanding of the demand for the concentration.

Dean Gibbison replied that they looked at job openings in the area and state-wide, investigated data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics for skill sets, and he reported that he used a subscription-based tool called Earning Glass to drill down into job postings for desired skillsets.

Senator DeLaurell said that she asked the question since other departments have passed on the opportunity, which she said might suggest that they know of some negative in connection with offering such a program, perhaps a lack of demand. She asked Dean Gibbison why the other departments passed.

Dean Gibbison replied that he cannot speak for the other departments' decisions.

There were no further questions or discussion.

**The Speaker asked for a vote on all three proposals together and, without objection, called for a vote.**

The proposals passed by unanimous voice vote.

---

### B. Motion for a Faculty Representative in the Budget Process (PDF)

Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences

The Speaker asked for unanimous consent to postpone consideration of the motion until the next session of the April meeting (April 12) on account of the motion's author, Bill Olejniczak, Department of History and author of the motion, having to leave. With no objection discussion of the motion was postponed.

[see below]
C. **Motion to Increase the Number of Years Faculty May Serve on Committees** *(PDF)*

Dan Greenberg, Senator - Psychology

---

**MOTION**

**Current Policy:**

Members of committees (including alternates) serve for a term of one year and may be re-elected twice and then may serve again on the committee only after a lapse of three years.

**Proposed Change:**

Members of committees (including alternates) serve for a term of one year and may be re-elected up to four times and then may serve again on the committee only after a lapse of three years.

---

**Senator Greenberg** said that in our current practice, faculty may serve up to three years on a committee before having to rotate off, which leads to a significant amount of churn in committee membership. Committees may see a majority of members replaced annually or even a complete replacement. While adding new faculty can be good, too much turnover impedes faculty governance by diminishing institutional memory. This is a particular problem in heavy-workload committees like the Curriculum Committee and T&P.

A consequence of frequent turnover in committees, he asserted, is that the institutional memory then tends to reside with the administration, who serve longer, and while this is not necessarily a bad thing, it seems desirable to have institutional memory reside on the faculty side, too.

It also takes time to build expertise in committees, and this is a real problem for committee leadership because the three year limit often means that by the time some expertise has been developed, it is time to cycle off.

The proposal allows service beyond three years but it does not require it. There might be other solutions to the problems described, he said, but this fix is fairly simple and does not complicate the work of the Nominations and Elections committee. He added that he has discussed the motion with the current Nominations and Elections Committee chair, who is favorably disposed toward it.

**Questions / Discussion**

The Speaker explained that the motion could be discussed at the present meeting but cannot be voted on, as it will be sent to the Committee on the By-
Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual for further consideration, per the by-laws.

**Senator Krasnoff**, Philosophy, asked the Speaker if the earliest the motion could be voted on by the Senate would be the first meeting of next academic year (as opposed to the second session of the present meeting). The Speaker affirmed this, and said that any discussion of the motion will become part of the record and help inform the committee's work on it.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - SHSS, said he was in favor of the motion and thought it would begin to address one difficulty for faculty governance. But he inquired if Senator Greenberg had considered the bolder step of four-year appointments to committees (as opposed to re-election annually).

Senator Greenberg said that he discussed this very idea with Nominations and Elections when he served on the Curriculum Committee, and the feedback was that such a plan would introduce logistical difficulties. He added, nonetheless, that he thinks minimum terms would be a good thing, starting with at least two years, and stipulating in tenure and promotion guidelines that if service couldn't be completed, a faculty member could leave before the term's expiration.

He added that other modifications to faculty committee service could be considered as well, such as broader representation across schools. Setting the expectation of service, he asserted, would allow us to get representation from across schools and, hopefully, good representation. These modifications are probably not simple in execution, he said, but we should keep considering them.

The present motion, however, is simple to do, he said.

**Andrew Shedlock**, Senator - Biology, asked if it is worth our considering pre- and post-tenure realities for committee service. There is some incentive, he said, for junior faculty to serve on two committees to expand experience, but if a faculty member is on one committee for most of her pre-tenure time at the College, this might not be preferable.

Senator Greenberg agreed that this could be a problem but pointed out that the motion merely opens the possibility for longer service, and does not require it. He said that the Tenure and Promotion Committee will want to consider how much and what type of service they would like to see from junior faculty. In his own department, he said, typically junior faculty are not expected before third-year review to serve on college-level committees. He added that it would be nice to see more leadership from senior, tenured faculty.

**Jason Vance**, Senator - SHSS, on institutional memory, said that a serious problem emerges when an entire committee rotates off at once. He asked if Nominations and Elections considered the probability of this problem
occurring in the present system. Would the motion do anything to fix that particular problem?

Senator Greenberg replied that he has not surveyed faculty for how many would like to serve four or five years on T&P or Curriculum. In fact, it may not be very many people. But he said that on Curriculum, he lost all committee members, save one, in one year. Allowing for longer service, he expressed hope, would let at least some members stay longer, while still having a cap to prevent "curmudgeons" from serving beyond an appropriate time.

Irina Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, expressed support for the motion precisely for its permissive nature and that it does not require a certain term of service. This accords flexibility to faculty who may need to come out of committee service for any number of reasons (sabbaticals and so forth). She would not support an attempt, she said, to set a term of four years.

Senator Greenberg agreed that such a motion would require a much longer discussion, but he said that he would want some kind of loophole in any motion that sought to set a term length. After a brief back and forth with Senator Anguelova on this matter, Senator Greenberg said that term lengths are not under consideration at present, and especially given the lateness of the hour, it is a discussion for another time.

**The Provost** said he supports the motion: it’s permissive and gives more options for longevity of service. Some committees, he observed, do "vastly more complex work" than others, and there is a real advantage to having those who wish to serve longer be allowed to do so. He added that Nominations and Elections has shown good judgment over the years in creating turnover in some cases where colleagues may have wanted to continue serving. The motion gives Nominations and Elections an additional tool, and we should trust in their judgment. He added that, after discussion on the motion has concluded, he would like the Speaker to come back to him so that he could offer a motion to recess.

**Lynne Ford,** Associate Provost, offered the suggestion that, should the Senate consider terms in a future discussion, it would be advisable to consider a rotation of the bodies of committees by thirds, so that there is continuity.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, said that this is his sense of what Nominations and Elections tries to do informally: they don't want to see an entire committee rotate out at once. He added that we need to be realistic: some committees are such that people are unlikely to want to stay for four or five years, such as Curriculum and T&P.

He argued we should also take up question from other point of view: some faculty may stay on committees too long. Five years, Senator Krasnoff said, is a long time. Additionally, he said, there are some faculty who should probably not serve as long as they have as committee chairs. Our democratic oversight of committees, he added, is very weak. What if someone who is not a good
committee member wants to stay?: the motion might set up a presumption that such an individual can and will stay to the new limit.

Senator Greenberg replied that increasing the limit to five years would also allow others to serve serve longer, making it easier to elbow out people who have served too long. Any committee’s purview includes trying to manage their own affairs in relation to membership and positions of leadership. Perhaps committee chairs, he suggested, could communicate their wishes to Nominations and Elections in regard to poor committee colleagues.

**There was no further discussion.**

The Provost moved that the Senate recess until the scheduled meeting on April 17, the motion was seconded, and it carried with a unanimous voice vote.

The Senate recessed at 7:40 PM.

-----

The meeting continued on 12 April, coming to order at 5:05 PM.

The Speaker made a few brief remarks to open the meeting.

He encouraged Senators to, in turn, encourage faculty colleagues to, in turn again, encourage our first year and senior students to complete the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), a survey that provides incoming and outgoing student data on engagement, which is very useful to the College. The survey will remain open through the end of April. Students in the target group will find links directly to the survey in My Charleston.

The Speaker reported that a change has occurred in the nature and schedule of the upcoming Board of Trustees meetings (Thursday 4/21 and Friday 4/22). While typically Thursday is a committee meeting day, some committees will not meet at all but will just be submitting reports at the full board meeting on Friday. The Budget and Academic Affairs Committees will meet for shorter times and on a different schedule. The Speaker gave that schedule and encouraged faculty to attend.

Thursday afternoon will be occupied by half-hour presentations to the full Board of Trustees by all deans. They will speak on the current state of their schools, challenges, and opportunities. The Speaker said he will speak as well. The presentations were scheduled to begin at noon and last through 6 PM. The presentations are open to the public, and the Speaker encouraged attendance.

Finally the Speaker encouraged Senators to, in turn, encourage all faculty to attend the "Celebration of the Faculty" event scheduled for Friday, April 22, 3-5PM. This year, the Speaker said, his office is co-sponsoring the event and, in addition to recognizing faculty award winners, it will feature recognition of many who have contributed greatly to the work of shared governance.

-----

The business portion of the meeting continued at this point.
Old Business, Item B

**Motion for a Faculty Representative in the Budget Process** *(PDF)*
Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences

Be it so moved that the Faculty Senate supports the following proposal:

- The Faculty Speaker (or Speaker’s designee) will be inserted into the annual budgetary process. The Speaker (or Speaker’s designee) will have access to all information required to participate meaningfully in the budgetary process.

- As a participant in the annual budgetary process, the task of the Faculty Speaker will be to consider and make recommendations for budgetary decisions directly affecting the academic affairs of the College.

- The Faculty Speaker will participate in the annual budgetary process once in the fall semester (considering and recommending) and once in the spring semester (review).

- As a participant in the annual budget process, the Faculty Speaker will submit a written report to the Faculty Budget Committee on the progress of the annual budgetary process once in the fall semester and once in the spring semester.

---

**Senator Kelly** stated that he is making the motion on behalf of Bill Olejniczak, Department of History. He added to the published rationale for the motion that the Senate is charged by-laws, which are approved by the Board of Trustees, to advise the President on the entire college's budget. The motion helps us do that in a more meaningful way, he said.

The Speaker asked Professor Olejniczak to speak on the motion.

Professor Olejniczak thanked Senator Kelly. The proposal, he explained, has three main parts: to insert the Faculty Speaker into the annual College budgetary process at the senior leadership level, to allow the Speaker to participate in the process at that level once in the fall and once in the spring semesters, and to require the Speaker to submit a report in the fall and in the spring to the Faculty Budget Committee.

There are no specific calendar dates, he said, to allow flexibility. The point of the motion is not to set fixed dates but to have the Speaker present at major decision points in the year.

The motion is needed, Professor Olejniczak argued, because a direct faculty voice is needed at the table as we move through difficult fiscal times.
As it concerns the faculty, the current process allows for intermittent updates to the faculty by the Provost and the President. This communication is not formalized and the time at which it occurs can vary from one year to the next. Faculty committees and the Senate are currently notified of budgetary decisions affecting the faculty after the fact. The faculty committees serve as "information receiving bodies, rather than as participating bodies." In the current process, the Provost serves as Chief Academic Officer and has a very wide range of responsibilities and constituents. The deans in the current process represent the interests of their schools.

The motion, Professor Olejniczak stated, would make faculty representation formalized, regular, and certain. The Speaker, he argued, is the best person to represent the faculty because the Speaker is elected by the entire faculty, has key responsibilities, performs important functions, and represents the faculty at important institutional meetings throughout the year, and is well-positioned to provide a faculty perspective that is multi-year and "big picture" in a way that can provide insight. The Speaker also offers a direct channel of communication back and forth between faculty and administrators, all the more important in a time, he said, that the data show we have grown at the administrative level and become more layered.

The motion will increase transparency and mutual trust, he asserted, especially at a time at which we are being asked to make tough academic decisions and sacrifices. At better budgetary times, too, direct faculty representation will be essential to a good budgetary process.

He added that the motion would charge the Speaker only with making recommendations concerning the Academic Affairs budget.

The proposal is offered, he said, in the friendly, collaborative spirit of shared governance. Professor Olejniczak thanked the Senate for considering it.

The Speaker called for a second to the motion and received one.

**Questions / Discussion**

**Alex Kasman**, Senator - SSM, asked the Speaker if he felt that he would have time, given his other responsibilities, to fulfill the obligations the motion adds and asked if the Speaker is already involved in the budgetary process in some way without the motion.

The Speaker, noting that he cannot advocate one way or the other, replied in what he characterized as a factual way. While it's not entirely clear right how many meetings the motion would require the Speaker to participate in, he thought, yes, the Speaker could add the responsibility.
The Speaker pointed out that the Speaker attends Board of Trustees meetings regarding the budget, but at that point, things are largely already decided (though the Board could make changes). The Speaker does not, however, play any direct role in the processes Provost McGee has instituted for the Academic Affairs budget development. The Speaker regularly meets with the Provost and President, but conversations about the budget are not formalized.

The Speaker called on Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS and former Speaker of the Faculty, for his opinion.

Senator Kelly said that, while the Speaker has ready access to the President and Provost, the Speaker has not been privy to the budgetary decision making process. He added that he learned more about the budgetary process from the Budget Committee and its chair, Julia Eichelberger over the past two years, than he knew as Speaker.

Senator Kelly added that he very much supports the motion. While he said he might change a couple items, he said he will not bring those up, preferring not to bog down the process in favor of passing the resolution for its spirit, which will be clear to the President. It is vitally important, he said, that when budget decisions are made the faculty have a representative present, and it benefits not only the faculty, but the President, too, as the faculty now claim a greater responsibility in making difficult decisions and cannot simply complain about decisions after the fact. He added that there is no "hidden villain" that will be exposed as a result of the Speaker being involved in the process, but it will make the process more open and "improve the health of our shared governance," though it will take some time for this effect to set in.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, said that he supports the motion, and added, in reply to Senator Kasman's question, that the motion's provision for the Speaker to appoint a designee to attend meetings would help address any concerns of time/scheduling.

Senator Krasnoff also asked if we know enough or if we feel we know enough about the budget process to be able to be able to pinpoint the meetings in which we want the Speaker to participate. There is a danger that the Speaker might participate in meetings that are not exactly the "right" ones, which would violate the spirit of the motion. Senator Krasnoff noted that many in the room might be able to address this question.

The Speaker recognized Budget Committee Chair Eichelberger, who explained that the committee made a request of the President very similar to the motion not long ago, which he declined. The meetings that she said
would be significant are the meetings at which the budget is being drafted. While the Board can revise the budget in their May and June meetings, the budget has largely been built prior to that point and this may have happened in multiple meetings of the senior leadership. We have never had a faculty member present for any of those meetings with senior leadership at which they are looking at "the whole chessboard" and making decisions about allocations.

The Budget Committee last year was informed after those meetings that Academic Affairs's budgetary plans were to be significantly curtailed. Those decisions were made without a faculty representative present, and such a representative might have been able to at least understand and help communicate the context for the cuts, she argued.

The time of concern is when the budget is being put together. She added that the committee recently learned that in the late summer and fall that a list is composed for legislative special appropriations requests. Here, too, she said faculty representation could come into play.

Professor Olejniczak thanked Senator Eichelberger for her comments and observed that the Budget Committee's work has mapped out for us a "12-month world" in regard to the budget. He agreed that we need to identify and target "decision points" in the process. The motion, he observed, stipulates "one in the fall and once in the spring," and this might be revised as needed, he said.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, asked Senator Eichelberger if the President gave a rationale for rejecting the Budget Committee's proposal to have the Speaker present in senior leadership budget discussions. She added that if the President has a rationale that he still holds, the motion may not be acceptable to him. Also, would it be binding?

The Speaker replied that the Senate can vote whatever its will is. The part of the Faculty/Administration Manual we control, he added, is the by-laws, which already suggest we have a role. We could move that this motion go to the Committee on By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual for conversion into a by-laws amendment, but our by-laws, he pointed out, must be approved by the Board of Trustees.

The Senate, alternatively, can vote the motion up or down, he said, to express a will to the President. It will not bind him, however.

Senator Anguelova asked again about the President's rationale.

Senator Eichelberger reported that his rationale was that he already has in the Provost a representative of the faculty. He also pointed out, she said, that the Speaker attends the meetings of the Board of Trustees (these are
already, she added, public meetings). There is, according to the President, sufficient faculty representation. The committee disagreed, she said. A vote for this proposal by the Senate would affirm the committee's viewpoint.

Senator Eichelberger added that the motion asks for a faculty representative to be there as a witness and a voice with a healthy perspective. She said that it is not that the Provost lacks a faculty perspective but that he has a very different role as Provost, as opposed to an elected faculty representative.

Senator Anguelova said she agrees with the spirit of the motion, but she said that one could argue, as does the President, that the Speaker already in his current role has a place in the process and participates meaningfully.

Senator Kelly countered that attending Board of Trustees Budget Committee meetings is not meaningful.

Senator Anguelova returned that in the President's estimation it is.

Senator Kelly replied that the Speaker has no role in those meetings and is never invited to offer opinions, besides which, the decisions are already made at that point. The motion would insert the Speaker into the prior process, for instance, he added, when senior leadership discusses tuition increases. The key, he said, is "meaningfully," granting that the word is elastic. The intent of the Senate would be clear with the passage of the motion, he argued.

Senator Anguelova suggested that the motion could specifically mention the "decision making process," since "meaningful" is subject to interpretation.

Senator Eichelberger added here, having just consulted a memo from the President to the Budget Committee, that the President mentioned a number of meetings of the senior leadership, but, she said, the committee did not imagine that a faculty representative would attend all such meetings, only those discussions in which decisions get made, where the Provost would be in attendance. It's a hard position, she said, for the Provost, who has to come back and report to the faculty what transpired at these meetings: it would be more efficient for a faculty representative to serve that function.

Senator Eichelberger suggested that Senator Anguelova could move to modify the language of the motion to address her concerns and clarify, and she offered a few suggestions.

The Speaker asked if Senator Eichelberger was actually making a motion, to which she relied, "sure."

The motion to amend was as follows:
Strike the bullet reading

- The Faculty Speaker will participate in the annual budgetary process once in the fall semester (considering and recommending) and once in the spring semester (review).

and replace it with

- The Faculty Speaker will attend executive team meetings regarding the budget once in the fall semester (considering and recommending) and once in the spring semester (review).

The motion was seconded.

Discussion of Senator Eichelberger's motion to amend began with a request by Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, to offer a friendly amendment to Senator Eichelberger's, which she accepted.

The revised language (striking two occurrences of "once") would now read:

- The Faculty Speaker will attend executive team meetings regarding the budget in the fall semester (considering and recommending) and in the spring semester (review).

Senator Krasnoff pointed out that "once" implies it is satisfactory to only have the Speaker at one meeting each semester, whereas striking this adds flexibility.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS, recommended a swift vote of the motion to amend followed by a swift vote of the motion at large. "We're not writing law here. We're communicating to the President our desire." The intent will be clear, and the Speaker can explain to the President and the Board anything that needs explanation. In the meantime, there is a heavy agenda for the night still remaining, he observed.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, called the question on the motion to amend, it was seconded, and it passed by a unanimous voice vote.

**The motion to amend the motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.**

Discussion now turned to the main motion.

An unidentified Senator called the question on the motion, it was seconded, and it passed.

The motion (as amended) passed by a unanimous voice vote.

The approved version reads as follows:
Be it so moved that the Faculty Senate supports the following proposal:

• The Faculty Speaker (or Speaker’s designee) will be inserted into the annual budgetary process. The Speaker (or Speaker’s designee) will have access to all information required to participate meaningfully in the budgetary process.

• As a participant in the annual budgetary process, the task of the Faculty Speaker will be to consider and make recommendations for budgetary decisions directly affecting the academic affairs of the College.

• The Faculty Speaker will attend executive team meetings regarding the budget in the fall semester (considering and recommending) and in the spring semester (review).

• As a participant in the annual budget process, the Faculty Speaker will submit a written report to the Faculty Budget Committee on the progress of the annual budgetary process once in the fall semester and once in the spring semester.

6. New Business

A. Elections to Standing Senate Committees (Slates - PDF)
Committee on Nominations and Elections - Chair, Jen Kopfman

The committee, represented by Tom Kunkel, presented slates for slates for the three standing Senate committees: Academic Planning, Budget, and By-Laws and FAM. The Speaker asked for any additional nominations from the floor.

Seeing none and with no discussion offered, the Speaker took a vote.

The slates as published were accepted by unanimous voice vote.

The Speaker reminded the Senate at this point that at the March meeting he said that, in collaboration with the Provost, he would create ad hoc committee that would look at our grievance and hearing processes. After the March meeting, the Committee on Nominations and Elections discovered in the by-laws that ad hoc committees conducting Senate business and so does the Senate.

The Speaker offered committee slates for both ad hoc committees, on which he consulted with Nominations and Elections and the Provost. He said that he or the Provost’s office has communicated with the individuals listed. Those marked "TBD" on the lists are faculty who have been contacted but cannot yet give an answer.

Grievance

Dr. Amy Rogers, 2013-2014 & 2014-2015, Grievance Committee Chair
Dr. Jean Everett, 2012-2013, Grievance Committee Chair
Dr. Anthony Leclerc, 2006-2007, Grievance Committee Member
Dr. Lynn Cherry, former Speaker of the Faculty
TBD
Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker
Laura Penny, 2016-17 FAM/By-laws member

---

**Hearing**

Dr. John Huddlestun, 2014-2015, Hearing Committee Chair
Dr. Claire Curtis, 2013-2014, Hearing Committee Chair
TBD
Dr. Roger Daniels, 2010-2011, Hearing Committee Chair
Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker
Dr. Conrad Festa, Professor Emeritus, Former Provost
Angela Mulholland, General Council, non-voting ex officio

---

The Speaker asked and received unanimous consent for approval of the slates as presented and, also, for permission to continue working with the Nominations and Elections committee to fill any remaining open slots.

Finally, the Speaker asked the Senate for nominations to the Nominations and Elections Committee for next year. He added that he will also be seeking nominations from the campus at large.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator - SSM, nominated the following:
Richard Nunan, Philosophy
Terry Bowers, English
Jared Seay, Library
Jennifer Kopfman, Communication
Tom Kunkle, Mathematics

The Speaker noted that these individuals are all currently members of the committee (a body of seven) and have said they will serve again. If there were more nominations (from the floor or campus at large) than seven, he said, there will be an election.

The Speaker called for further nominations and there were none. He said he would solicit nominations from the campus at large and inform the faculty of the results and if there is to be an election.

---

**B. General Education Committee**

**Foreign Language Alternative Course Certification Proposals**
Shawn Morrison

Professor Morrison presented the proposals, expressing thanks to the faculty and departments who submitted the numerous proposals for approval as foreign language alternatives. The committee matched syllabus descriptions to program SLOs (Student Learning Outcomes) and have provided to the Senate the syllabi and materials they approved.
The Speaker asked for a clarification of the categories: do the students have to take one course from all or categories or is it a combination. Profess Morrison explained that students have to take one course from category one, one from category two, and two from category three.

She added that the structure of the program is, in this way, essentially the same as the current system, but there is now a commitment to program SLOs for each course a planned assessment.

Professor Morrison requested that the proposals be voted on in groups. The Speaker explained that if a Senator wishes to consider a single item separately, this can be done.

See below the list of proposals for discussion and actions taken.

1. Category 1: The Role of Language in Culture (PDF)
   a. ANTH 205: Language and Culture
   b. ENGL 309: English Language: Grammar and History
   c. ENGL 312: History of the English Language
   d. LING 101: Introduction to Language
2. Category 2: Global and Cultural Awareness (PDF)
   a. ANTH 201: Cultural Anthropology
   b. ARTH 101: History of Art: Prehistoric through Medieval
   c. ARTH 102: History of Western Art: Renaissance to Contemporary
   d. ARTH 105: Introduction to Architecture
   e. ENGL 233: Survey of Twentieth-Century Non-Western Masterpieces
   f. ENGL 234: Survey of Third World Masterpieces
   g. ENGL 358: Colonial and Postcolonial British Literature
   h. HIST 103: World History to 1500
   i. HIST 104: World History since 1500
   j. HIST 230: Ancient Egypt & Mesopotamia
   k. HIST 250: Special Topics in Comparative/Transnational History
   l. HIST 291: Disease, Medicine, & History
   m. HIST 350: Special Topics in Comparative/Transnational History
   n. HIST 359: Modern Jewish History: French Revolution to the Present
   o. HIST 366: Comparative Slavery in the Americas
   p. liAS 201: Introduction to Irish and Irish American Studies
   q. POLI 103: World Politics
   r. POLI 104: World Regional Geography
   s. POLI 240: Introduction to Comparative Politics
   t. POLI 260: International Relations Theory
   u. POLI 265: International Political Economy
   v. RELS 235: Introduction to Islam
3. Category 3: Regions of the World
   a. Africa (PDF)
      1. AFST 101: Introduction to Africa
      2. ARTH 210: African Art
      3. ENGL 352: Major African Authors
4. ENGL 353: African Women Writers
5. HIST 272: Pre-Colonial Africa
6. HIST 273: History of Modern Africa
7. POLI 342: Politics of Africa

b. Asia (PDF)
1. ARTH 103: History of Asian Art
2. ARTH 241: History of the Art of India
3. ARTH 242: History of the Art of China
4. ARTH 243: History of the Art of Japan
5. ASST 101: Introduction to Asian Studies
6. CHST 340: Special Topics in Chinese Studies
7. LTCH 250: Chinese Literature in Translation
8. LTJP 250: Japanese Literature in Translation
9. LTPJ 350: Japanese Literature in Translation
10. HIST 282: History of China to 1800
11. HIST 283: History of Modern China
12. HIST 286: Japan to 1800
13. HIST 287: History of Modern Japan
14. PHIL 234: Eastern Philosophy
15. POLI 343: Politics of East Asia
16. POLI 345: Politics of China
17. RELS 205: Sacred Texts of the East
18. RELS 240: The Buddhist Tradition
19. RELS 245: Religions of India
20. RELS 248: Religious Traditions of China and Japan

c. Europe (PDF)
1. ARTH 214: Art of Ancient Greece
2. ARTH 215: Art of Ancient Rome
3. ARTH 277: History of Renaissance Art
4. ARTH 278: Renaissance and Baroque Architecture
5. ARTH 280: Baroque Art
6. ARTH 303: Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art
7. ARTH 370: Early Italian Renaissance Art
8. ARTH 375: Italian High/ Late Renaissance Art
9. CLAS 101: Ancient Greek Civilization
10. CLAS 102: Roman Civilization
11. CLAS 103: Classical Mythology
12. CLAS 105: History of the Classical World
13. CLAS 223: Aegean Prehistory
14. CLAS 225. The Archaeology of Athens
15. CLAS 226: The Archaeology of Rome
16. CLAS 242: Images of Women in Classical Antiquity
17. CLAS 253: Epic
18. CLAS 254: Tragedy
19. CLAS 255: Comedy (Humor in Rome and Greece)
20. CLAS 256: Ancient Satire
21. HIST 231: Ancient Greece
22. HIST 232: Ancient Rome
23. HIST 234: Early Medieval Europe
24. HIST 235: High Middle Ages
25. HIST 241: Special Topics in Modern European History
26. HIST 242: History of Modern France
27. HIST 244: Modern Germany
28. HIST 247: Empire, Nation, Class in Eastern Europe
29. HIST 252: Women in Europe
30. HIST 336: Renaissance Europe
31. HIST 337: Age of Reformation
32. HIST 341: Age of Enlightenment & Revolution
33. HIST 343: Europe since 1939
34. HIST 344: Modern European Cultural History
35. HIST 345: German Cultural History
36. HIST 346: History of the Soviet Union
37. HIST 347: Special Topics in Modern European History
38. HIST 357: Victorian Britain
39. JWST 230: The Holocaust
40. JWST 330: Representations of the Holocaust
41. LTGR 250: Comedy in Contemporary German Culture
42. LTGR 270: Recent German Cinema
43. LTIT 250: Italian Literature in Translation
44. LTIT 270: Introduction to Italian Cinema
45. LTIT 350: Italian Literature in Translation
46. LTIT 370: Studies in Italian Cinema
47. LTRS 110: Russian Folktales in Translation
48. LTRS 120: A Window into Russia: The Major People, Events and Influences of Russia’s Cultural History
49. LTRS 210: Nineteenth Century Russian Literature
50. LTRS 220: Twentieth Century Russian Literature
51. LTRS 270: Studies in Russian Film
52. PHIL 201: History of Ancient Philosophy
53. PHIL 202: History of Modern Philosophy
54. PHIL 205: Existentialism
55. PHIL 252: Topics in Continental Philosophy
56. POLI 352: Geographies and Politics of the European Union

- Latin America (PDF)
  1. ANTH 328: Aztecs, Mayas, and Their Ancestors
  2. HIST 262: Colonial Latin America
3. HIST 263: Latin American since Independence
4. HIST 364: Sugar & Slaves in Colonial Brazil
5. HIST 365: Modern Brazil
6. LACS 101: Introduction to Latin American and Caribbean Studies
7. LACS 103: Introduction to Contemporary Cuba
8. LACS 104: Introduction to Contemporary Chile
9. LACS 106: Introduction to Contemporary Argentina
10. LACS 332: Latin American Society and Film
11. LTPO 150: Portuguese Literature in Translation
12. LTPO 270: Studies in Brazilian Film
13. LTPO 280: Studies in Brazilian Civilization and Culture through Literature
14. LTPO 350: Portuguese Literature in Translation: A Foreign Author
15. LTPO 450: Portuguese Literature in Translation: Comparative Literature
16. LTSP 252: Contemporary Latin American Literature in Translation
17. POLI 340: Politics of Latin America
18. POLI 351: Politics of Contemporary Brazil

e. Middle East (PDF)
1. ARTH 231: Islamic Art and Architecture
2. HIST 276: Islamic History & Civilization
3. HIST 277: History of the Modern Middle East
4. JWST 220: History of Israel
5. JWST 305: Israeli Cinema
6. ARST 100: Introduction to Arab and Islamic World Studies
7. LTAR 350: Arabic Literature in Translation
8. POLI 344: Politics of the Middle East

Questions / Discussion

Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, raised a general concern, first apologizing for not attending the General Education committee meeting at which the courses were discussed, the date and time of which he didn't know. He called attention to category two and asked the Faculty Secretariat to project the PDF file, specifically the defining characteristics statement on the course form (page 2 of the file):

"The primary focus of these courses is to introduce students to foundations, theories, and models (as used by the discipline) to understand culture around the world."

Senator Krasnoff said that he interpreted this line as bringing attention to "foundations, theories, and models," but reviewing the committee's approved course list, noted that it includes courses that are introductory or methodological in focus but it also includes specific topics, such as a "Modern Jewish History" and "Comparative Slavery in the Americas," which are not, he argued, methodological in focus. He questioned these courses' inclusion on the list.

He said that he proceeded with submitting Jewish Studies proposals with the thought that category two excluded topically-focused courses. He said, for instance, that he submitted a Jewish Studies course, JWST 215, Modern Jewish History
(essentially the same, he asserted, as the HIST course in Modern Jewish History that was approved in category two, not for this category but for category three (against the arguments of faculty who thought it would fit in category two). This course was rejected in category three, but Senator Krasnoff argued, it would fit category two, if more topically-focused courses are now allowed in that category.

He asked that we either exclude topical classes in category two or that JWST 210 and 215, surveys of Jewish History, be added to the category two foreign language alternatives. On the latter, he argued that if HIST 359 (Modern Jewish History: French Revolution to the Present) is to count in the list, so should JWST 210 and 215.

Lisa Covert, Senator - SHSS and General Education Committee member, said that category two was the category with which the committee had the most problems. At first, she said, the committee went with a narrow definition, but several committee members and departments made a case for a slightly broader interpretation of "foundations, theories, and models." Most of the courses were originally social science courses, and the committee adopted a broader interpretation of use of methodologies based on discipline and what the syllabus said. Some narrowly-defined topical courses included more methodology and analysis in major papers than other classes, which was one of the means of differentiating between courses. Descriptions of assignments became key.

Professor Morrison asked Senator Krasnoff if he also submitted the courses in question for consideration under category two.

Senator Krasnoff said they only submitted them in category three because of his understanding, at the time, of the definition of category two. And, though the courses were not solely centered in Europe (a defining feature of category 3), he said they were largely European in focus.

Professor Morrison clarified: the courses were not rejected in category two? Senator Krasnoff confirmed.

Senator Covert added that when the committee rejected courses in one category, they did not necessarily re-categorize them, mostly because of time. She suggested that Senator Krasnoff could resubmit the courses for category two with no problem.

The Speaker inquired at this point if the course list for foreign language alternatives was now frozen.

Professor Morrison initially replied that she would not have a problem adding courses at the moment, but on further consideration, said that the list was, in fact, closed.

Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience Lynne Ford addressed the "frozen" question: general education is not frozen, forever, she said.

Addressing Senator Krasnoff directly, she said that the courses could not be added at this point in the process. The committee, she explained, worked over spring break and over the course of two additional long, intensive meetings to evaluate all the proposals based on the criteria and with input from departments. If Jewish Studies chose to categorize the courses in category three, the committee, deferring to the program’s judgment, was bound to consider them within category three. When the committee rejected courses in a particular category, in some cases, she said, the committee did have a conversation with programs and departments about which category might be a better fit.
The matter before the Senate, she said, is the list resulting from the committee’s long and careful consideration. She urged the Senate not to recreate the list on the floor because this does not show proper respect for the committee.

Back to the question of freezing, she said that as general education opens back up again, the foreign language alternative program will go into the general education cycle. The possibility to add the JWST courses in category two will open up very soon in the cycle for foreign language.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, called the question on voting on the proposals in groups.

There was no second. Discussion continued.

Senator Krasnoff disagreed that the case he was outlining showed disrespect for the committee. He said that he understood the amount work done and the brevity of the timeline. He said that he submitted proposals but received no email indicating when he could discuss the proposals.

AVP Ford replied that the dates were in an email she sent inviting departments to submit proposals.

Senator Krasnoff apologized for missing the meeting and said that he did not intend to do that.

"What’s clear," he maintained, "is that the committee changed the understanding [and] the interpretation of the category at some point in the discussion." It would not be odd, he said, to approve the very same class taught in a different department. He argued that he is simply trying to apply the committee’s new understanding of the category. He said that he will ask to amend the motion to count the JWST courses in category two, and added that he would be willing to condition the motion to include the courses on the approval of the committee, which would not, he said, take very long.

The Speaker recognized Associate Provost Ford, who offered a clarification that the general education door opens again for the 2017 catalog. Senator Krasnoff could wait until next academic year to submit the courses under category two.

The Senator agreed that it would not be a "huge deal" to wait but that "neither would it be a huge deal" to approve the courses now.

Rick Heldrich, Senator - SSM, said that he was sympathetic to Senator Krasnoff’s situation and asked AVP Ford what the cycle is. He further asked if the cycle is published, and if it is permanent or specific to SACS reafirmation.

AVP Ford began to reply, but Senator Heldrich added that his reason for asking is that we represent the College’s curriculum as under faculty control, and he would wager that no one in the room except the Associate Provost knows what the general education cycle is.

Ford responded. Beginning in 2016-17, next academic year, any one who wishes to make changes to the general education list will be invited to do so, and the General Education Committee will consider all proposals for inclusion in the 2017-18 catalog year. The reason for the cycle, she said, has to do with the College’s having done no assessment of student learning in the general education program. It was necessary to establish a fixed list of courses with student learning outcomes attached and to assess that list over a period of time leading up to reaffirmation. Changes to general education in any year, in essence, create a new catalog every year, creating a potential problem in student planning. From that perspective, it is helpful to have a
mostly stable general education. Now that we have assessment data, she said, we can make decisions about what to change, if anything, based on the assessment.

Dr. Divya Bhati added that the College was in monitoring status with SACS twice for general education (not due to lack of effort, but due to a lack of assessment), hence the freezing of general education in order to effectively assess it longitudinally. Now that we have data, she said, we can open it back up again.

Senator Heldrich, SSM, observed that AVP Ford in an extensive faculty debate 20 years ago over general education was "an incredibly strong voice" arguing, he said, that the general education had been static far too long, "and it should change and it should change constantly." He called her present position "an unbelievable switch."

AVP Ford took issue with Senator Heldrich’s characterization that she "said it should change constantly."

Senator Heldrich followed up with a question: will the cycle end after the SACSCOC reaccreditation, or is the cycle permanent? Will there be, he specified, "a continuous three-year opening and closing of gen ed?"

AVP Ford said that the General Education Committee has proposed that we work in three-year cycles.

Senator Heldrich asked if the cycle plan is to be approved by the Senate.

Provost McGee entered the discussion here, saying that Senate minutes from the last several years, when Bob Mignone was chair of the committee speak to the freeze and intention to move toward a cycle. The charge of the General Education Committee gives discretion to decide on things as it wishes, and there is an appeals process, so if an individual Senator wants to appeal a decision to have a freeze, he or she may bring an appeal to the Senate. The Provost said that he suspects that there will be an ongoing discussion about how flexible we want the general education curriculum to be. He said that he agrees with Senator Heldrich that there are profound faculty governance issues to consider, but that the back and forth between the committee the Senate and Academic Affairs is ongoing, as ever.

He noted that before the Senate at the moment is an amendment to the General Education Committee’s motion that may or may not have been seconded.

The Speaker said that he did not hear a second. The Provost asked, however the amendment turns out, that the Senate please endorse the committee’s proposals so that the College can put into action a plan for foreign language alternatives that can be assessed and defended.

Senator Krasnoff restated his amendment:

The committee will include in the category two list JWST 210 and 215, subject to the approval of the committee.

He added that he is not doing this for himself but for his faculty who argued for those courses’ inclusion in the category, which he argued against, based on his understanding of the criteria for inclusion, which he pointed out, subsequently became more flexible.

The motion was seconded.

Discussion on Senator Krasnoff’s motion began at this point.

Registrar Mary Bergstrom asked Senator Krasnoff if JWST 210 and 215 count currently for the general education history requirement. With an affirmative reply from the Senator, she observed that courses cannot count twice in general
education. The courses would default as History and a student wishing to apply them to foreign language would have to have to get an manual exception take a different class for History credit. Senator Krasnoff said this would be no problem.

Iana Anguelova sought a clarification. Would the courses, if approved, have to come back to the Senate?

The Speaker and Senator Krasnoff both replied that the motion asks for consent to let the committee make the final decision on these two courses.

The Senator replied that the Senate loses nothing in the motion.

Steve Litvin, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism, responded at this point to a prior comment regarding respect for the committee. "If it is disrespectful for us to amend things, then why bring them to us for approval at all?" This is within the purview of the Senate: there is no disrespect.

Senator Krasnoff asserted here that he was not second guessing the committee's judgment, but rather, since the committee approved another Modern Jewish History course, he is actually trying to follow the committee's judgment.

AVP Ford noted that the comment about disrespect was hers, and she said that her meaning was that all departments and programs were invited to submit proposals; Jewish Studies made a decision about whether and to which category to submit courses; they submitted proposals in category three; the committee deliberated on the proposals' rationales, syllabus, SLOs, assignments--all the available evidence to judge fit. The Senate, she said, "sight unseen" would take the word of Senator Krasnoff, "a valued colleague, no doubt," that JWST 210 and 215 fit category two. The committee considered the entirety of the proposal, but the Senate will not be able to do that. Her comment on disrespect had to do, she said, specifically with these facts.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, said she shares Senator Krasnoff's concerns, having had Religious Studies proposals run afoul on the same ground of methodology. In the future, she said, there will be examples for comparison. She expressed support for the motion and called the question.

There was a second and on a voice vote (not unanimous) the question was called.

A voice vote on Senator Krasnoff's motion to amend was too close to count. By a subsequent raising of hands the amendment passed by a margin of 16 to 11.

The Speaker announced that, pending the committee's approval, JWST 210 and 215 will be added to the category two approved list for foreign language alternative courses.

There was no further discussion on the main motion.

On a unanimous voice vote, the courses proposed by the General Education Committee for foreign language alternative were approved as such.

**B. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs**

Jo Ann Ewalt, chair of the committee, asked to consider proposals 1-11 as a single passage, since these proposals amount to small adjustments and clean up. The Speaker sought and received unanimous consent to do so.

See below.
1. M.A.T. Middle Grades Education (PDF)
   a. EDFS 687 – Existing course added as prerequisite course
   b. EDEE 690 – Existing course added to core requirements
   c. EDFS 635 – Delete course
   d. EDEE 640 – Existing course added to core requirements
   e. EDEE 678 – Delete course from English emphasis requirements

2. M.Ed. Languages (PDF)
   a. SPAN 590 – Deleted course from Spanish emphasis requirements
   b. SPAN 671 – Delete course from Spanish emphasis requirements

3. M.S. Mathematics (PDF)
   Changing existing courses to comply with new cross-listing policy
   a. MATH 402/502 – Course description change
   b. MATH 415/515 – Course title change, course description change
   c. MATH 423/523 – Course title change, course description change
   d. MATH 430/530 – Course title change
   e. MATH 431/531 – Course description change
   f. MATH 440/540 – Course description change
   g. MATH 441/541 – Course description change
   h. MATH 445/545 – Course description change
   i. MATH 449/550 – Course description change
   j. MATH 451/551 – Course description change
   k. MATH 452/552 – Course description change
   l. MATH 455/555 – Course description change
   m. MATH 460/560 – Course number change, course description change
   n. MATH 461/561 – Course number change, course description change

4. MS Environmental Studies Proposal (PDF)
   a. Follow-up Cross-Listing Proposals: Re-numbering existing courses to comply with new cross-listing policy
      • EVSS 619 → EVSS 519
      • EVSS 628, EVSS 628L → EVSS 544, EVSS 544L
      • EVSS 629 → EVSS 506
      • EVSS 631, EVSS 631L → EVSS 541, EVSS 541L
      • EVSS 638, EVSS 638L → EVSS 538, EVSS 538L
      • EVSS 642, EVSS 642L → EVSS 52, EVSS 542L
      • EVSS 649, EVSS 649L → EVSS 549, EVSS 549L
      • EVSS 657 → EVSS 557
      • EVSS 669, EVSS 669L → EVSS 569, EVSS 569L
      • EVSS 695 → EVSS 595: ST: Applied Quantitative Methods
      • EVSS 695 → EVSS 595: ST: Ecopreneurship
   b. Affirm past practice: add existing courses to possible electives:
      • BIOL 618
      • BIOL 650

5. MA Communication Proposals (PDF)
   a. COMM 535: Delete Course
   b. Affirm past practice: Add existing courses (7) to requirements or electives: ENGL 558, ENGL 559, ENGL 560, ENGL 562, PUBA 640, PUBA 656, PUBA 650
6. **M.Ed. in Languages Proposals** ([PDF](#))
   a. **Change/Delete Graduate Program Proposal**
      Add existing course to requirements or electives, Interdisciplinary: EDFS 692 – add existing course to core requirement.
   b. **Affirm past practice**: add existing courses to possible electives from interdisciplinary programs: (see proposal)
      - Languages (1)
      - Spanish (6)
      - Teaching, Learning, and Advocacy (3)
      - Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education (15)
      - Elementary & Early Childhood Education (3)
      - Communication (1)

7. **MPA Proposals** ([PDF](#))
   a. **Change/Delete Graduate Program Proposals**: Add existing course to requirements or electives: PUBA 617: Add existing course to possible electives
   b. **Affirm past practice**: add existing courses to possible electives from interdisciplinary programs: EVSS 630, EVSS 605, EVSS 635, EVSAS 632, EVSS 633, EVSS 649, COMM 514, COMM 540

8. **MPA Urban and Regional Certificate Program Proposal** ([PDF](#))
   Same as above
   Change/Delete Graduate Program Proposals: Add existing course to requirements or electives: PUBA 617: Add existing course to possible electives

9. **MTLA Proposals** ([PDF](#))
   a. **Change/Delete Graduate Program Proposal**: add existing courses to possible electives for all MTLA concentrations:
      - EDFS 760
      - EDFS 761
      - EDFS 762
      - EDFS 763
      - EDFS 764
   b. Add to New Literacies concentration: EDFS 670

10. **MEd. Science & Math** ([PDF](#))
    Graduate Policy Change Proposal: Policy Change to Capstone Curriculum in catalog (See proposal)

11. **MS Marine Biology Proposals** ([PDF](#))
    a. **Affirm past practice**: add existing courses to possible electives:
       BIOL 502, BIOL 503, BIOL 506, BIOL 510, BIOL 514, BIOL 523, BIOL 544, BIOL 545, BIOL 549, BIOL 618, BIOL 627, BIOL 630, BIOL 632, BIOL 635, BIOL 641, BIOL 643, BIOL 644, BIOL 646, BIOL 649, BIOL 690, EVSS 649, EVSS 669
    b. BIOL 700 Research and Thesis (4) : Edit description to “repeatable: up to 4 credit hours”
    c. Add waive option to core course requirements
d. Renumber courses to conform to new numbering and cross-listing policies:

- BIOL 614 → BIOL 514
- BIOL 619 → BIOL 549
- BIOL 623 → BIOL 523
- BIOL 628 → BIOL 544
- BIOL 629 → BIOL 506
- BIOL 640 → BIOL 504
- BIOL 645 → BIOL 545

Proposals 1-11 above were approved by unanimous voice vote.

12. MS Child Life [PDF]

a. Graduate Program Change Proposal:
- Replace EDEE 655 with CHLI 602
- Replace EDFS 654 with CHLI 607
- Replace EDFS 635 or COMM 501/502 with CHLI 608
- Replace COMM 521, EDFS 670, MTLA 605, EDEE 620, EDEE 655 for CHLI 610

b. Graduate Course Proposals: New Courses (4):
- CHLI 602, Therapeutic Play for Child Life Specialists
- CHLI 607 Advanced Child Development
- CHLI 608 Research Methods
- CHLI 610, Infant Development and Child Life

**Professor Ewalt** explained that the program is preparing for national accreditation and the changes will help them align with standards. The proposals include new courses and replacement of current courses the program uses in Education with their own courses.

**Questions / Discussion**

The Provost asked MS Child Life Program Director Susan Simonian why the courses are 600-level.

Professor Simonian said the program used 600 numbers on the courses because many students come to the program with a good deal of prior work. Additionally, the idea was to make the courses more seminar-style and involve applied work as well.

The Provost asked if a 600-level research methods course is more advanced than a 500-level research methods course.

Professor Simonian replied in the negative and specified that the students are coming in with research methods already under their belt. She said that the program could use 500 numbers if this is the Provost's preference, but since the program was built with 600-level courses, the new course numbers were chosen to be consistent with the program as it is.
The Provost said that the numbering scheme "should receive some additional attention," since it is a goal of the soon-to-be finalized course numbering policy to have consistency in introductory graduate course numbering.

**The Provost** further inquired how CHLI 608 - Research Methods differs from the course it replaces.

Professor Simonian said that a key issue is the title, "Educational Research," which is an impediment to accreditation by the Child Life Council, who will not accredit the program with a course only in educational research. She added that the program is fortunate that those teaching the current course teach both qualitative and quantitative design and said that the program will be pursuing a "meets with" designation.

The Provost asked in what form the guidance from the council has come to her.

Professor Simonian replied that she has been on the accreditation pilot committee for the Child Life Council.

Is the guidance, he further asked, that we should have customized research methods classes that are tailored specifically to Child Life?

This is not exactly the case, she replied. Before the students can apply for an internship, which is competitive in a way similar to medical residencies, the courses taken have to be verified by the council. The courses in the proposal were flagged by the council as problematic for students who have already gone through the first cycle of internship accreditation. She explained that, in this case, she fixed the problem by adding descriptors to the courses, but this is not allowed in relation to SACS regulations.

The Provost came back to the idea he expressed about customization: does the council, he inquired, require customization to Child Life content even in teaching core social scientific research concepts?

Professor Simonian said that it is important to consider that the research is being conducted in pediatric psychiatry in pediatric hospital settings. It is also not always, necessarily, social science research, she said.

The Provost thanked Professor Simonian for her answers.

Steve Litvin, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism, asked if it is the preference of the Provost that there be a motion to renumber courses.

The Provost said that many of our programs have gone through a substantial clean-up in order to conform with the course numbering policy that is soon to be finalized. Child Life has not yet. He said he would ask the program to come back to the Senate at the earliest opportunity, having reconciled their numbering scheme with the course numbering policy in a comprehensive way.

Professor Ewalt added here that there are graduate 600-level research courses, and Child Life will not, she said, be seeking to
cross-list with undergraduate courses, so if they choose to remain at 600, no additional problems will be created.

The proposals were approved by unanimous voice vote.

13. MA English (PDF)
   a. Delete courses: ENGL 516, ENGL 530, ENGL 557, ENGL 563, ENGL 570, ENGL 571, ENGL 572, ENGL 650
   b. Terminate emphasis: African American Literature track

Professor Ewalt said that committee were troubled by the deletion of the African American Literature track in the English MA and wanted to be on the record as saying so. The program’s justification had to do with lack of student interest and concomitant inability to staff courses for it. In light of the College’s diversity goals, she reported that the committee “was saddened that we seem to be moving in the wrong direction.”

Discussion / Questions

Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, asked if there other concentrations in the English MA Professor Ewalt replied in the negative.

The proposals were approved by voice vote with one opposed.

14. MA Community Planning, Policy and Design: New Program Proposal (PDF)
   a. ARTH 565 – New course
   b. CPAD 605 – New course
   c. CPAD 615 – New course
   d. ARTH 535 – New course
   e. CPAD 619 – New course
   f. CPAD 790 – New course
   g. CPAD 830 – New course
   h. CPAD 631 – New course
   i. CPAD 895 – New course
   j. CPAD 690 – New course

Professor Ewalt pointed out that the program is a 56-hour interdisciplinary program including urban design, economics, transportation, planning, and public policy.

The Speaker at this point distributed hard copies of documents from the Academic Planning Committee provided after the Senate agenda deadline: the committee’s report (cover letter | report) and a minority report from the committee {link}. Committee Chair Agnes Southgate was on hand to address questions.

Questions / Discussion

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, asked Julia Eichelberger of the Budget Committee to comment on their deliberations on the proposal.

Professor Eichelberger reported that after detailed discussion of the program, the committee approved of it as a sound proposal

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, inquired about the minority report provided by the Academic Planning Committee.
Professor Ewalt noted that the majority and minority reports of Academic Planning did not come before to the Graduate Council.

Professor Eichelberger noted that Academic Planning’s position on the program is to support it, which the Speaker verified.

Both Senators Shaver and Anguelova asked to hear about the dissent in the committee, with the latter calling, in particular, for discussion of the new faculty line in the proposal.

Committee Chair of Academic Planning Agnes Southgate reported that the full discussion included the proposing faculty members and occurred after the Graduate Council had accepted the proposal and before the budget committee reviewed it. She reported that the committee’s overall discussion was focused on the program’s visibility and potential to recruit students to make the program viable, and the committee was enthusiastic about the program’s academic quality and its infusion of the liberal arts ideal of the College and blending of traditional and modern ideas of architecture and planning. The committee, she said, liked the program design, its leveraging of the advantages of the program, such as using the Riley Center.

Concerns of the committee included the logistics of the student cohort system (its disallowing staggered entrance into the program, for instance, or part-time students). The committee suggested to the proposers, she said, that after running the program for a while, they might consider these issues again. She said the committee did not think the concerns sufficient to withhold its support for the proposal.

There was, she said, a discussion about the budget and whether or not the program could support itself. The committee, however, had no discussion with the Provost on that matter; but, she said, the committee was reassured that the program’s economics would be vetted very carefully before it went up for approval.

Senator Anguelova, Mathematics, asked the provost to comment on the program’s economic footing.

The Provost replied that graduate programs should generate enrollments and tuition revenues that can be clearly measured against expense. He observed that the proposal before the Senate is not the original proposal, but a much revised one that went through revision primarily to address self-sustenance. Academic Affairs, he said, is satisfied that the program now makes financial sense without relying on any philanthropic commitments whatsoever and under realistic expectations for enrollment. His office, he said, was also clear with the school and graduate deans that if the program was not able to break even or do better financially, then further review would be needed and the program would be subject to cancelation, such as happened a few years back with an MA in Bilingual Legal Interpreting that was much loved but did not generate enough enrollment support to make financial sense. The Provost said that if the proposed MA does well with enrollment, then an additional faculty member will be considered, since enrollment would warrant it, and without this financial justification, we will not, he stated flatly, add a faculty member.

Senator Anguelova inquired about the review cycle for such a decision, and the Provost specified that "after three years or so" the program will have had time to demonstrate viability (or not).
Professor Eichelberger reported that, with regard to staffing, program proposer Grant Gilmore made the Budget Committee aware of the numerous qualified area people who would be eager to teach in the program as adjuncts. Some of the courses the students would take, she added, would meet with undergraduate courses already on the books. Graduate students would do different work, but there is ready capacity for a graduate student cohort in these classes. Professor Eichelberger added that a table in the proposal (PDF page 16) specifies that in academic year 2020-21, provided there were donor support, they could add a full-time faculty member, but not before such time. The proposers assured the committee, she said, that the program would be fully operational without added faculty, which was a central reason for the committee’s support. Finally, she said, as a graduate program, it will bring in students not already here, unlike an undergraduate program, which necessarily draws from a set population.

Senator Daniel Greenberg sought a clarification. In the Academic Planning Committee’s minority report, item 3 speaks, in part, specifically to instructional costs. Senator Greenberg asked if the "meets with" classes help allay that concern by not adding additional instructional costs.

Professor Eichelberger agreed: undergraduate faculty would not be pulled out of their classes and replaced by adjuncts in order to meet graduate staffing needs. Additionally, she said, local qualified professionals will be able to teach in the program, including the city’s former Mayor.

Professor Ewalt added that three things help address the concern: the ability to run "meets with" classes, the ability to use interdisciplinary courses already being taught, and ability to attract specialized adjuncts drawn to the program’s philosophy.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, pointed to the program proposal (PDF page 2), which speaks to the proposal supporting "a new financial model at the College." She wondered if the new model mentioned will be heavily adjunct based, drawing from the community, and not affording new faculty lines. What is the new model?, she asked.

Professor Ewalt suggested that Nathaniel Walker, one of the co-proposers, might address Senator DeLaurell’s query. But speaking to the question of adjuncts, she said that the program as proposed would intentionally seek adjuncts with specific training and experience when there is not a line or roster faculty with that expertise.

Professor Walker said that "new financial model" does not refer to hiring adjuncts but to correcting the flawed model that expected to cull revenue from an increased number of out-of-state students. Instead, we are thinking of new MA programs as a place of growth. The phrase comes from the strategic plan, he explained.

He reiterated what the Provost said about the program’s solvency and what others said about the particularity of the program’s plan for adjunct instruction. Having disciplinary practitioners, with their grounded knowledge, is a great benefit to the students. Historically, he said, architecture programs have relied on such expert adjuncts.

Senator DeLaurell inquired whether Professor Walker feels the program will have access to such high-level instructors who are willing to work for adjunct pay.
Professor Walker replied "yes," adding that he has "had to ask them to quit emailing [him]."

The Senator followed up: will the program be predominately relying on adjuncts?

Professor Walker said that adjuncts will not be in the majority since the program will be utilizing many classes already offered at the College.

Senator DeLaurell asked if "new financial model" is just another way of saying "revenue generating."

Professor Walker agreed: we cannot grow the numbers of undergraduates on the historic campus and cannot expect higher numbers of non-resident students, but we can add new MA programs.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Marketing, observed that the proposal references the School of Business and also that it refers to transportation as part of the course of study. In relation to transportation, he asked, does the program propose any connection to the School of Business on transportation?

Professor Walker said that that the reference to the School of Business is a reference to a Real Estate class that the Carter Real Estate Center has committed to helping the program find the right person to teach. The transportation course is one already taught in the Urban Studies program, and it also covers infrastructure and land-use planning.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, asked a question related to the Academic Planning Committee's minority report, item 5, addressing it to Professor Ewalt, not as committee chair but as Director of our Masters of Public Administration program. He observed that the program proposed in ways resembles an MPA program with another, add design and art component. Will that component, he asked, make graduates more attractive to employers who typically seek MPA graduates, or will that component, in effect, make graduates seem "watered down." Are there things, he added, that graduates of this program can do that MPA graduates cannot? He asked Professor Ewalt to speak to employment for graduates of the proposed program for her MPA directing perspective.

Professor Ewalt said that this was, indeed, her major concern when reading the first drafts of the proposal for the 56-hour degree: students could opt for less expensive degrees in roughly the same terrain. But, she said, she has been convinced that the MPA is fairly utilitarian, but the combination of policy and design, added to the rest of the curriculum, in the proposed MA is going to offer preparation for specific jobs in specific cities, and there are many such places globally that should find the combination of policy, planning, and aesthetic design very appealing. She added that a graduate of the program could very well be the kind of person former Mayor Joe Riley speaks of as who he looked to for thinking about design in this city.

Professor Walker added that the three different constituencies that he and Professor Gilmore conferred with in developing the program are urban design firms, development companies, and city governments. All three expressed a need for people versed in design but who also have good knowledge of planning and policy. There are many design programs to churn out designers who are very good at esoteric things but are incompetent in economics, planning, development, policy, gentrification, cultural heritage,
and practical planning. He said the proposal seeks to produce what a few have called "perfect generalists," able to act as ligaments connecting different organizations and efforts.

Professor Ewalt specified that students in the program who end up going on to study architecture will be few. Professor Walker agreed that, while some will go on to pursue an MA in Architecture, the program does not expect many will do so. It is also the case, he said that many architects holding MAs go on to pursue MAs in urban design and planning.

There were no further questions or discussion.

The proposal was approved by unanimous voice vote.

C. Faculty Curriculum Committee

Committee Chair Gibbs Knotts sought unanimous consent to consider, discuss, and vote on 1-20 in a block.

Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, asked if questions about a specific proposal can be asked.

The Speaker affirmed that they could, but added that to vote on an item separately would required separating it from the group.

See below for discussion and actions taken.

1. Archaeology (PDF)
   a. Create ARCH 499 (Bachelor’s Essay in Archaeology).
   b. Add ARTH 317 and CLAS 325 to the electives in the ARCH major and minor.

2. Arts Management (PDF)
   a. Create ARTM 255 (Fundamentals of Presenting the Performing Arts).
   b. Replace ARTM 360 with this new course in the ARTM Music Industry concentration.
   c. Add flexibility to the selection of electives.

3. Biology (PDF)
   Add lab courses that can accompany BIOL 250 and BIOL 453.

4. Business Language Minor in French (PDF)
   a. Deactivate FREN 382. Change the title and description of FREN 380 and FREN 381.
   b. Create FREN 383 (Summer Internship in a French Workplace).
   c. Make the corresponding changes to BLMF and add FREN 342 and FREN 363 to the electives.

5. Comparative Literature (PDF)
   a. Add four courses to the CPLT electives (two from the RUST proposal).
   b. Remove LTRS 150 and LTRS 450 from CPLT (deactivated in the RUST proposal).
   c. Change the role of LTSP 250 within CPLT.
6. **Data Science** ([PDF](#))
   In the DATA minor, change the 100-level math requirement from “MATH 111” to “MATH 105 or MATH 120.”

7. **European Studies** ([PDF](#))
   Add HIST 241, HIST 347, and JWST 330 to the EUST electives.

8. **French** ([PDF](#))
   a. Remove the 400-level course requirement for the French minor.
   c. Remove the requirement for INTB majors who minor in French to take FREN 380.
   d. Split FREN 361 study abroad into two courses, one specifically for France and another for other French-speaking countries.
   e. Make corresponding changes to the FRFS major and minor.

9. **Global Logistics and Transportation** ([PDF](#))
   Add TRAN 420 to the GLAT minor and concentration.

10. **History** ([PDF](#))
    Add HIST 498, HIST 499, and CLAS 401 to the list of courses satisfying the capstone.

11. **International Studies** ([PDF](#))
    Add four courses to the electives in the INTL Latin America concentration.

12. **Irish and Irish American Studies** ([PDF](#))
    a. Revisions to IIAS.
    b. Deactivate IIAS 301, IIAS 302, and IIAS 303.

13. **Latin American and Caribbean Studies** ([PDF](#))
    a. Create six new courses:
       - LACS 310 (Race, Gender, and Ethnicity in Latin American and the Caribbean)
       - LACS 320 (Human Rights and Social Movements in Latin American and the Caribbean)
       - LACS 330 (Colonial and Postcolonial Studies: Latin America and the Caribbean)
       - LACS 340 (Afro-Caribbean & Afro-Latin Studies)
       - LACS 350 (Globalization and Mass Media in Latin America and the Caribbean)
       - LACS 360 (Latina/o Identities: Constructions, Contestations, and Expressions).
    b. Add these courses to the LACS major and minor.
    c. Other modifications to the LACS major and minor.

14. **Math** ([PDF](#))
    Add MATH 105 (with a C-) as an option for satisfying MATH 350’s calculus prerequisite.

15. **Middle Eastern and Islamic World** ([PDF](#))
    Add ARTH 231 to the list of MEIW electives.
16. Philosophy (PDF)
   a. Add a requirement that PHIL majors take a course on Value Theory.
   b. Decrease the required number of elective courses.
   c. Correct a mistake in the PPLW concentration.

17. Russian Studies (PDF)
   a. Numerous changes to the RUST minor.
   b. Deactivate LTRS 150 and LTRS 450.
   c. Create RUST 250 (Vampires), RUST 300 (Gender and Sexuality in Russian Culture), and RUST 360 (Special Topics in Russian Studies).

The course creations and deactivations also affect the CPLT proposal.

18. Theater and Dance (PDF)
   a. Create DANC 380 (Dance Concert Production) and add it to the DANC major and its Performance and Choreography concentration.
   b. Create THTR 401 (Advanced Problems in Design) and THTR 411 (Main state Design and Production) and add them to the THTR major.
   c. Add FYSE 139 as an alternative to THTR 230 in the THTR major.

19. Women's and Gender Studies (PDF)
   a. Add ten courses to the list of electives for the WGST BA.
   b. Add those same ten courses, plus two more to the list of electives for the WGST minor.

20. Accounting-Business Administration (PDF)
    Prevent ACCT majors from double majoring in BADM.

Questions / Discussion, Proposals 1-20

Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, made a general inquiry based on proposal 19 in Women’s and Gender Studies. He pointed to a course proposed to be added to the WGST major: LACS 332: Latin American Politics and Society in Film. The class is topical and could, conceivably be taught with or without a significant emphasis on gender. There are different models, he said, for handling courses such as this one, and he asked for a clarification for how classes are handled as far as counting to an interdisciplinary degree or program like WGST or Jewish Studies.

Associate Provost Conseula Francis replied that in the case of the course Senator Krasnoff has pointed out, it will always count for WGST (if the proposal is approved).

A different system is in place, she explained, for special topics classes, the so-called asterisk model holds sway there. Special topics classes taught in particular semesters and sections are marked in such a way that they will could in particular programs.

Senator Krasnoff inquired about variable-topic courses. These, Associate Provost Francis pointed out, are a horse of a different color. For a number of reasons variable-topics classes are tricky to nail down as to applicability to degree programs. For now, the only way to handle them is to make exceptions case-by-case.
Senator Krasnoff thanked the Associate Provost for her explanation.

All proposals above (1-20) were approved by unanimous voice vote.

21. Bachelor of Professional Studies (PDF)

Create an undergraduate certificate in Project Management.

The Speaker pointed out that the budget committee vetted the proposal.

Questions / Discussion

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, opened a general discussion about what defines an undergraduate certificate at the College of Charleston. Graduate programs, he said, often offer certificates, and they tend to be in specific topic or content areas, such as an interdisciplinary field related to the major field of study. At the undergraduate level we have, also, concentrations and minors. In some ways, Senator Krasnoff said, the proposal resembles a minor because anyone can take it, and it has six courses and a capstone. What, he wondered, are the guidelines for a certificate? He said that his ultimate concern is that anything can be called a certificate.

Dean Godfrey Gibbison said that, at present, the College has no certificates at the undergraduate level. The certificate can be completed by students at the College and people from outside the College, as well, such as people who live in the area and wish to add the certificate as a credential for work purposes. Such a person could not complete a minor. The certificate has an expanded potential clientele, he said.

Senator Krasnoff asked if the main motivation for the proposal is to reach an outside audience.

The Provost, addressing Senator Krasnoff’s question, added to Dean Gibbison's definition of the category of "certificate": the undergraduate certificate is the counterpart of the graduate certificate, and both are well represented in academia. Certificates are not degrees, and a student entering a college just to complete a certificate is not a degree-seeking student. Undergraduate certificates, like graduate ones, are coherent collections of courses centered around and adding up to a sum of knowledge about a single subject. Undergraduate certificates are approved in the same ways that graduate certificates are. They tend to be around 12 credit hours, and they are regulated by SACSCOC in the same way as graduate certificates.

If approved, this proposal, the first undergraduate certificate at the College, will precipitate a need to develop procedures for admitting non-degree-seeking students who wish to complete the certificate. The procedure would be developed in consultation with the Academic Standards committee.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, congratulated Dean Gibbison on the development of the certificate proposal. She added that Mathematics might explore undergraduate certificates as well specifically to attract outside clientele, mentioning specifically cryptography and information security as possible programs. She said that undergraduate certificates are good for the College.

Jon Hakkila, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, expressed concern that if certificate programs generally make use of lower-division courses
(because they have no prerequisites), especially popular offerings, we may run into a capacity problems.

The Provost said that each new certificate would be approved on its own merits and with an understanding of enrollment demand for any existing courses the certificate employs. In majors, he added, there are often courses that do not have prerequisites and they often build on one another: the same model could be used for certificates.

Dean Gibbison asked if the Professor Hakkila was concerned about demand. Professor Hakkila replied that the issue is more a planning one: understanding that a certificate that draws on established courses needs to make sure seats will be available through consultation with programs that the certificate might affect.

The Provost agreed that poor enrollment planning will yield poor outcomes.

Dean Gibbison specified that the Certificate in Project Management does not create a demand on any existing courses.

Senator Anguelova, Mathematics, said that certificate programs do not always make use of lower-division classes. Some employ higher-level classes.

Daniel Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, said that future certificate programs are likely to be decided upon on a case-by-case basis.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, expressed concern about the word "certificate" itself in the proposal as possible source of confusion between this program and the national project certification exam. A person completing the certificate program will have earned a certification in project management, but this can be confused with earning certification through passing the national certification exam.

Dean Gibbison replied that anyone desiring the national certification knows that he or she has to take the national examination.

Senator Shaver inquired if the intent of the certificate program is to prepare those who earn it for the exam.

The Dean replied that the program covers a good part of the territory covered by the exam, but the program is not making any guarantees that students who earn their certificate will pass the exam.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, expressed concern that the discussion focus on the merits of the certificate proposal brought by the BPS program and steer away from conversation about certificates in general. We cannot regulate hypotheticals, he said.

Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, said he agrees that there are some very particular concerns we should attend to, but "on the other hand, this is a big moment." The proposal creates a new category at the College.

Senator Krasnoff then asked if people seeking a certificate are all non-degree seeking or can degree-seeking students as well complete the certificate?

Several people replied that anyone can earn a certificate.

The Provost said that if someone outside the College desires to complete the certificate, she would have to matriculate as a non-degree seeking student.
student already at the College would have to seek separate permission to pursue the certificate.

Senator Krasnoff asked if the Provost was saying that the primary audience is non degree-seeking students. The Provost said that this will depend on the certificate. In the proposal before the Senate, the primary audience will be degree-seeking students.

The Provost said that we will have to set up smart procedures for future proposals, and fortunately for us, he added, hundreds of universities have established undergraduate certificate programs, and we will look to them for models.

Senator Krasnoff asked Professor Knotts if there was any concern or discussion in the committee about the size of the certificate (18 hours) or any general feeling about what the right size is for certificate programs.

Professor Knotts replied that the committee didn't express a will on this matter but mainly thought of the current proposal as equivalent of a graduate certificate. He said that 18 hours seems high, but the committee did not discuss that.

Senator Krasnoff said he is interested in general what people think the proper size for a certificate is. He expressed a concern that along with approving the proposal, should the Senate do so, we may be setting a precedent on size.

Dean Gibbison noted that the number of courses in the Project Management Certificate was driven by the curriculum that needs to be covered.

Jon Hakkila, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, concurred with Senator Krasnoff that the proposal raises important concerns. He asked if the proposal should have gone to the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs. Is the certificate, he asked, a special program?

The Provost replied that the program is credit-bearing and thus could not be called "continuing education." "Special Programs," he said, has remained an undefined term for decades. The appropriate body to consider the proposal, he said, seemed to Academic Affairs to be the undergraduate Curriculum Committee. He added that it was also vetted by other Senate committees as well.

Senator Daniel Greenberg, Psychology, agreed that at some point it would be worth thinking about the size of certificate programs; however, it is also advisable to not chain things up a little too early. He argued that the proposal at hand does not implicitly argue that any new certificate needs to be 18 hours, but, rather, that a certificate can be 18 hours, if need be.

Alex Kasman, Senator - SSM, said that certificate programs are becoming popular at other universities, in part because the looseness of the term. It seems, he said, reasonable to begin experimenting with the idea of undergraduate certificates without the concern that we are setting some kind of dangerous precedent.

An unidentified Senator called the question; it was seconded, and on a unanimous voice vote, approved.

The proposal passed on a unanimous voice vote.
22. Real Estate– Create a new major in Real Estate (PDF)
   a. Create REAL 389 (Real Estate Valuation Analysis) and REAL 418 (Real Estate Feasibility Analysis) to be included in the major.
   b. Add REAL 310 to the prerequisites for REAL 376.

Professor Knotts explained that the proposal seeks to create a new major and creates some new classes to support it.

Questions / Discussion

Julia Eichelberger read into the record a prepared summary of the Budget Committee’s discussion on the proposal:

"We are forwarding the Real Estate proposal to the Senate with no recommendation.

We had concerns about the high cost of a new hire needed to support this program, because much less expensive positions are now being cut from other programs. The hire represents a very significant commitment of resources over potentially 30+ years, a commitment that the College is making in a very difficult financial climate. The high cost makes this seem an imprudent hire. On the other hand, we recognize that there are a large number of students taking Real Estate courses now, that additional students may pursue a major which is likely to be more appealing than a minor or concentration, and that a new hire will be able to teach in other areas besides Real Estate, helping relieve some of the demand within your School.

Some members of the committee felt that a program with such a high per-credit-hour cost should have program fees. This seems like a more prudent and fair way of paying for this hire—program fees would ask the students who receive this very expensive instruction to bear more of that higher cost, rather than requiring all C of C students in every major to absorb that cost. On the other hand, we recognize that this program’s per-credit-hour cost is not so far from the per-credit-hour cost of other SOBE instruction, all of which, one could argue, should have program fees added to them.

Given these factors and the unusual circumstances that prompted the Provost to decide to approve a new line in Real Estate, we were unable to make any recommendation on this motion. This was our committee’s unanimous decision."

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, said that he would like to know about votes in the various committees that vetted the proposal, and he said that he had heard there was a vote in the School of Business and he asked to hear about that as well.

Professor Knotts said that the Curriculum Committee sought several changes to the proposal as it developed, and the committee did vote unanimously to support it. As to the School of Business’s vote, he said he could not say.

Elaine Worzala, Senator - Finance, who worked on the proposal, said that she heard that Academic Planning also voted unanimously for the proposal as well. She added that there was a vote in the School of Business with a majority favoring the proposal.
Senator Krasnoff expressed the following concerns:

- The major has a very large number of hours, which he thought is a problem in a liberal arts environment in which elective hours allow for exploration.

- He thought that it might actually be better for real estate to stay as a concentration of the finance major rather than as a stand alone major. While he said that looking into the proposal himself revealed that the major has a very deep business grounding, there may be an appearance from the outside given the name "Real Estate" that the degree is more limited in focus that it actually is. It might be better for the students' prospects to not have a separate major but to keep Real Estate as a concentration.

- He asked if there is a connection in the proposal to a donor or a donation that is driving the idea of a separate Real Estate program. If that is part of the history of the proposal, he said, the Senate needs to hear it.

Senator Worzala, responding to Senator Krasnoff’s second question, replied that Real Estate is a wide-ranging topic. Students at the College have the option of going the standard route offered across the country, which is to earn a finance degree with a concentration in real estate. But students here can choose a number of other routes within the proposed Real Estate degree.

Her own informal survey of professionals in the field (emails sent to around 150 people) showed that only a very, very small number thought a real estate concentration would be superior to a full blown major.

She said that there is more specialization in the Real Estate major, but that the differences boil down to three additional required classes, which allow staging from introductory to advanced study. This is strong preparation for work after college and solid foundation for graduate school in Law, an MPA, etc.

Real estate, she added, is a important part of our economy: one out of every four jobs is related to real estate. It’s not just selling houses but involves asset management for large corporations, managing numerous property leases, and other such things.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, said that she would not comment on the proposal itself, but that she felt "the Faculty Senate is entitled to know the truth" about the School of Business's vote, which she reported was 27 for, 24 against, and 16 abstentions.

Joe Carson, Senator - SSM, struck by the budget committee’s unanimous statement that it offers no recommendation, but the Senate will be asked to vote up or down on it. He inquired if the proposal could go back to the committee to try to resolve the issues.

The Speaker replied that is is possible for a Senator to move that the proposal go back to a committee.

Senator Carson moved that the proposal be sent back to the Faculty Budget Committee, which was seconded by Senator Anguelova, Mathematics.

Discussion now began on Senator Carson's motion.
Julia Eichelberger, Senator - SHHS and Chair of the Budget Committee, observed that the faculty line needed to support the proposed major, a very expensive line, will go through regardless of whether or not the Senate approves the new major. The committee found itself "flummoxed," she said, by the situation because the committee is concerned about cost and this cost will be incurred, regardless.

Tom Ross, Senator - SHSS and member of the Budget Committee argued against the motion to remand: the committee will have the same information it has already reviewed, and the hire will be made, regardless. The committee’s inability to make a recommendation had nothing to do with the merits of the major itself. Remanding is not likely to yield an different recommendation.

Senator Anguelova, on hearing Senators Ross and Eichelberger, withdrew her support for the motion.

Jocelyn Evans, Department of Finance, said the new hire will teach in both Finance and Real Estate. There is growing demand for Finance classes (six classes in the summer are filled, for instance). She recognized the expense of the hire, but noted that the quantitative, finance orientation of the hire will allow for collaboration with other quantitative disciplines and specialities at the College. She added that alumni hired by firms such as Goldman Sachs have been asked to work in finance in the real estate sector without prior training and have expressed support for a full major in Real Estate. The new major, she said, is projecting 240-50 majors. Demand is high.

The Provost here suggested voting down the motion to remand, gathering information, and seeking answers to Senator Krasnoff’s questions, and giving the proposal an up or down vote.

The Provost called the question on the motion to remand. It was seconded and unanimously approved on a voice vote.

The motion to remand was defeated by a unanimous voice vote.

Jason Vance, Senator - SSM, expressed grave concern about the vote in the School of Business and further expressed concern about attendance in Senate. He called for quorum.

The Speaker and Parliamentarian counted Senators in attendance. With 27 Senators out of 51 present, there was a quorum.

The Speaker here said that, though the hour was growing late, important business remained to be conducted at the meeting.

Tom Baginski, Senator - German and Russian Studies, asked for a clarification: are students not allowed to double major in Real Estate and Business Administration, and if so, is that due to too much overlap?

Senator Worzala said that the school is pulling away from double majors with Business Administration, though the students can do concentrations. Finance, too, cannot be part of a double major.

Alan Shao, Dean of the School of Business, said that Real Estate is a very specific area, and the market is asking for specialists, not generalists. Combined with the liberal arts focus of the College, the student-centered approach, and our connections to the business community, he asserted, the Real Estate program will be unique and very strong. And he added that the business community is ready to hire our graduates (he characterized the
business community as "waiting by the phone" to hear the outcome of the night's vote on the major), and our graduates will be ready to work at commencement.

Weishen Wang, Chair of the Department of Finance, agreed that, on the expense side, a new hire in Finance is, in fact, expensive (he gave the figure of $125,000), but considered from the revenue side, the picture is different because 57% of Finance students pay out-of-state tuition, paying he said $28,900 annually for 30 credit hours, as opposed to the $10,900 paid by in-state students. He asserted that, in the Finance department, "each colleague ... contributes $2.4 million cash each year," because "every faculty member generates 283 credit hours per semester (over 560 each year), the majority from out-of-state." So, on the cost side, Finance professors are more expensive, but they "generate huge revenue."

He also argued that the Real Estate major provides a specialization in demand in the job market. He concluded that the numbers will bear out a strong case for the major, and he offered to provide them.

**Jason Vance**, Senator - SSM, agreed that Professor Weishen made a "strong business argument," but questioned why the vote in the School of Business does not indicate strong support in the school itself. He characterized the numbers provided by Senator DeLaurell as demonstrating divisiveness.

Professor Weishen replied that many faculty who talked to him in his office said that the new major is a natural extension of the finance program and the real estate concentration. He added, however, that at times there can a tense relationship between administrators and faculty members.

Senator Worzala added here that the Department of Finance voted unanimously in favor. She also said, as she understands it, in the most of the College, only the department, and not the school, conducts such votes. In the School of Business, however, there is a school-wide vote that derives from sharing so many courses across programs.

The Provost addressed Senator Vance’s question as well, cautioning that he cannot speak to individual’s votes in the school.

He said that this goes back to the third question from Senator Krasnoff. A major donor supported the Real Estate program at the College, with the idea of it becoming a major. Relations with the donor, however, were, in the Provost’s opinion, poorly handled (not, however, in Institutional Advancement, he specified). Reticent to speak in a public forum to the details, the Provost went on to speculate that School of Business faculty outside of Finance, hearing of the missteps, may have voted in the negative or abstained based on judgments perhaps independent of the academic and financial merits of the program.

On the approved faculty line, the Provost said that he committed to the line in light of the College’s original commitment to three Real Estate positions going back several years, prior to the recession, and his belief that there will be a good return on the line and the ability of that faculty member to teach both Finance and Real Estate courses. The commitment to the line is part of the College’s planned and ongoing support of the program, whether the major is approved or if the program remains in its current form for now.
The Provost said that he would be happy, as he imagined would Senator Worzala, the Dean of the School of Business, and other Business faculty present, to field any questions that can be answered in a public forum.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - SHSS, pointing out that the Budget Committee registered its objection to the process and the Provost had just responded, offered this as reason to hope that the President will support Professor Olejniczak's resolution, approved at the beginning of the present meeting.

He suggested that the question before the Senate now required that Senators set aside matters of process pertaining to the faculty line and consider the Real Estate major on its merits and whether or not we think it will serve College of Charleston students. Senator Kelly said he believes it will, and he intended to vote for it. He added that he hopes Senators vote for or against the proposal on its merits and not based on the baggage that is going along with it.

Dean Shao agreed with Senator Kelly's sentiment. He said that the proposal will serve CofC students very well. There is already demand in the minor and the concentration, and, he said, based on what he has heard from the community, enthusiasm for the new major is high. The timing is good, as well, in terms of the overall real estate market in the city.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, pointing out that resistance to the proposal is now being represented as having only to do with the process and an assumption that, had the process gone a better way, there would be no substantive objections to the proposal. Senator Krasnoff said that his concern is that because of this vexed process, the Senate may not be hearing the substantive objections of those who opposed it in the school. Many voted against it, and, he said, that he did not think they were all objecting to the process. Many of them had substantive objections, he thought. He said he would like to hear these objections and would feel better if the Senate could hear objections from faculty in the School of Business. Then the Senate could assess them.

He expressed deep concern that the reason we are not hearing objections is that there is something very wrong happening. There were 16 abstentions: "that strikes me as an environment," he asserted, "in which people are not willing to say what they think." This and the proposal's background, he added, is very disconcerting.

**Nathaniel Walker**, Department of Art and Architectural History, speaking to Dean Shao's earlier comments, expressed agreement. He said the Real Estate is a "perfect major for Charleston" and majors would dovetail very well into the MA program just approved.

**Senator Worzala**, replying to Senator Krasnoff's comments, said that there was a meeting with the entire School of Business faculty. The vote was conducted by secret ballot, electronically. At the meeting, no one, she said, spoke against the proposal. Professor Robert Pitts, not part of the Real Estate group, represented the proposal to the Academic Planning Committee. No one, she also said, approached her with dissent about the proposal. The proposal has been free of negatives, except for the resource issue, on which the Provost decided without the prompting of the Real Estate group. She mentioned in this connection that on her own hiring, she was told of plans to hire two additional Real Estate faculty as part of plan originating now ten years ago.
Steve Litvin, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism, specifying that he has been more of an observer of this process than a participant. He said that the abstentions may just be absences.

Senator Worzala pointed out that the vote was electronic. Senator Litvin countered that the meeting lacked full attendance. He said that abstentions are accounted for by either those people not "hitting the button" or not in attendance.

He also supported Senator Worzala's observation that pushback on the proposal was resource-based, not on the academic merit. There was no argument of whether it was academically meritorious.

Daniel Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, said that the emerging argument seemed to be that the Senate should vote on the merits of the major, but that the School of Business faculty did not, themselves, do that.

Senator Litvin and Worzala disagreed with Senator Greenberg's characterization.

Senator Litvin, prompted for more information by Senator Greenberg, characterized what dissent there was as amounting to, "I'm not going to approve your major, until you get me a line." He added that on the academic merits, certainly the positives were presented.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, suggested that, based on the numbers Senator DeLaurell provided, voter turn out was low.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, said that at the meeting in question, he heard arguments against the proposal on its merits. He said, therefore, that is not entirely accurate to say that only issue for faculty in the School of Business was a resource issue.

Tom Baginski, Senator - German and Russian Studies, inquired how many Real Estate minors are currently enrolled who might be said to be inline to take the new major?

Senator Worzala reported that in a survey of 230 students in an early Finance class, 226 said they would consider a major in Real Estate. She added that 93 students are declared in either the minor or concentration.

Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, suggested that, at this point, the Senate would be voting on whether it wants a major in particular, versus sticking with the traditional model of a concentration or minors. He said he is still persuaded that the latter might look better for students on the market. He discounted the idea that not being a major makes the program "not real." He expressed his intent to vote against the proposal.

The Provost said he believes in the academic merits of the proposal. He added that the donor business is unfortunate, but it should not drive voting decisions on the proposal. The ultimate question is whether students are better served by a major in Real Estate than they are with the current program.

The Provost called the question, which was seconded, and carried on a unanimous voice vote.

The proposal was approved on a non-unanimous voice vote.
D. Motion: Form a new standing Senate committee known as the Adjunct Oversight Committee (PDF)

Elizabeth Baker, Senator - English

The Speaker explained that the motion, like all motions that seek to change the faculty by-laws, if seconded, will have to go to the Committee on the By-laws and Faculty/Administration Manual for further review.

Senator Baker presented the motion, noting that it grew out of the work Senator Eichelberger did as a Faculty Administrative Fellow exploring adjunct faculty issues and policies, on which she reported (Best Practices for Adjunct Faculty) in the April 5 session of the present meeting.

Senator Baker specified that the committee would not replace the work on adjunct faculty of other committees, but make that work centralized, collected, and monitored.

Alex Kasman, Senator - SSM, seconded the motion.

Questions / Discussion

Jon Hakkila, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, asked if any problems might arise in seating the committee, considering the particular qualifications stated as they are in the motion.

The Speaker suggested the the by-laws committee could take up this concern.

There were no further questions.

E. Resolution from the Provost to Award Degrees (PDF)

The Provost asked unanimous consent to waive the reading of the motion and secured it. There was a second. The Provost then asked unanimous consent to call the question. There was a second and the question was called by unanimous voice vote.

The resolution passed by unanimous vote.

7. Constituent’s Concerns

The Speaker recognized Faculty Secretary Mike Duvall for three years of "dutifully and almost 'verbatimly' transcribing" the Senate's doings. Cheers and applause rained down on the unsuspecting scrivener, who humbly and deeply thanked the body.

Joe Carson, Senator - SSM, expressing a concern brought to him, noted that our syllabuses have been getting longer and longer over time, "partly motivated by our legal department or sometimes our disciplinary committees." The length, however, may be contributing to fewer students reading our syllabuses, which is not being taken into account, he relayed, by those who are requiring and motivating longer syllabuses.

Senator Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked that the Senate also recognize and thank the Speaker, Parliamentarian, and Secretariat for their work. Applause rang out.

A motion to adjourn was heard and unanimously approved.

8. Adjournment: 7:57 PM.
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 15 March 2016

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 15 March 2016 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order: 5:05 PM
2. Minutes were approved as posted.
   A. 26 January Special Meeting
   B. 9 February Regular Meeting
3. Announcements and Information
4. Reports
   A. Speaker of the Faculty McNerney

The Speaker thanked those who responded to the survey that he posted as a follow-up on January’s special meeting of the Senate. He said that, given the limited time left in the academic year, he has decided to share the results of the survey in a written form with the individuals and offices from whom the survey respondents would like to hear responses and to request responses directed to him, which he can then share and make part of the record at the regular April meeting of the Senate.

The Speaker announced the creation of two ad hoc committees related to and growing out of faculty concern about the charges and procedures of the Faculty Grievance Committee and the Faculty Hearing Committee. He noted that the Faculty Welfare Committee, for one, has been discussing concerns for the past few years about these committees and this year has endorsed a closer study of the committee charges and procedures. The speaker also explained the work of the two ad hoc committees is complicated by the fact that portions of these committees’ charges lie in the faculty by-laws and portions lie in the administrative section of the Faculty/ Administration Manual (F/AM), and both, at times, refer to an appendix which is no longer present in the F/AM. He reported that one of the ad hoc committees will look specifically at the grievance process and the charge of the Grievance Committee currently in the by-laws and the administrative sections of the F/AM; the other committee will focus on the same matters relating to the Hearing Committee. Letters of invitation to serve on these committees are forthcoming, and the committees are to begin preliminary work this semester and to complete their work in the fall.

The Speaker reported that the College is participating in National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE), a survey taken by first year students and graduating seniors. The first year the College participated in the survey was when current graduating seniors were freshmen. Students may participate through a portal in MyCharleston. The Speaker asked faculty to reinforce and support student participation in this nationally-normed survey since it provides a useful measure of student engagement at the beginning and end of their time at the College. As of now, he said, there appears to be only about 15% eligible student participation, but our goal is at 40% and the survey is set to close at the end of March.
The Speaker also reported that the results from our most recent participation in the Chronicle of Higher Education's "Great Places to Work Survey" will soon be shared. On a related note, the Speaker said that, given that Francis Marion University has scored higher on the "Great Places" survey, particularly in shared governance, he has been trying to arrange a meeting between himself and faculty governance leadership to hear what they might have to say about their success in that area.

The Speaker noted that six faculty/trustees pairs will be participating in the fall in the faculty/trustee shadowing program established by former Speaker Lynn Cherry. Over the seven semesters that the program has been in place, he said, 17 different trustees have shadowed 38 different faculty. He endorsed the program.

Finally, the Speaker offered an apology. He reported that he had been told that his reporting on the Staff Advisory Committee to the President's spirit day initiative was interpreted as indicating his lack of support. "Nothing," he said, "could be further from the truth, and I apologize," he added, "to anyone who left with such a perception." The campus and the auditorium in which the Senate was at that time meeting, he asserted, "are packed with people who care a great deal about their efforts and the portions of their lives that they give to this institution," even while our morale may slip from time to time. He closed by noting that on both spirit Fridays thus far he "proudly wore [his] maroon, and ... will like do so every [Spirit Day] moving forward." He suggested that all in the audience might consider doing the same.

B. Provost McGee (Topics - PDF)

Work of the Commission on Higher Education (CHE)

The Provost pointed out that, even though the Senate does not very often speak of the CHE, this body approves all new degree programs at the College and requires numerous reports be filed by the College. The CHE, he noted, has many new commissioners and is at present searching for a new director. They have, he reported, recently proposed new legislation that would give them expanded powers, including powers to unilaterally close academic programs that they believe are too small, not cost effective, or not in the best interest of the state. The Provost promised more information on this as it becomes available and on any other higher education legislation that may be brought before the state legislature.

Tenure, Promotion, Third-Year Review, Sabbatical, and Post-Tenure Review

The Provost reported that there were 36 tenure and promotion (T&P) cases and 24 third-year reviews, plus a number of post-tenure and sabbatical request reviews, all of which will be discussed, the Provost said, in his April Senate report. He expressed great appreciation of the work of all who are involved in the time consuming but critically important and valuable work of faculty evaluation and promotion.

Great Colleges Survey

The Provost noted that the survey was conducted last Spring. He reported that the results will be reviewed with the Staff Advisory Committee to the President on March 23 and the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President on April 6.
Academic Affairs Budget Development for 2016-2017

The Provost thanked the members of the Faculty Budget Committee for their significant investment of time working on developing next year's budget in a difficult time, as well as the Deans and unit heads for their help with materials used by the Budget Committee and himself. He said that the Budget Committee's report on the agenda for the meeting will be comprehensive and informative.

Policy Development and Implementation

The Provost pointed out that as part of our preparations for the reaffirmation of our accreditation, Academic Affairs has initiated a review of our memoranda of understanding governing our four joint MA programs with the Citadel, which have not been updated since their original signing (at least one is a quarter century old). These documents are being scrutinized to ensure that they are not inaccurate and far out of sync with practice.

He advised Senators that policy cleanup will be ongoing and that information on policies can be found at policy.cofc.edu.

More recent developments in policy include the development of the new comprehensive intellectual property policy, many years in the making and another policy that SACSCOC demands, on which the Provost offered to take questions in his Q&A following the report and promised responses to anyone who may have written him about them. He also said that he should soon be able to share with Senators (via email) advanced drafts of the new course numbering and syllabus policies.

Planned Review of Undergraduate and Graduate Grading Systems

The Provost pointed out a Post and Courier story published the very day of the Senate meeting on a proposal to change grading scales for public high schools in South Carolina from a seven-point to a ten-point scale, which would have favorable implications for SC student athletes applying for NCAA scholarship eligibility. He added that on March 2, he articulated to the CHE the College’s feedback on the proposal, opposing it on principled and practical grounds. He said that the College and South Carolina higher education more generally need to stay involved in the discussion.

On the College’s grade policy, the Provost pointed out that ten years ago the College moved from a grade system in which only letter and plus grades were awarded to a system in which minus grades could be awarded as well. The change followed much study of the issue by the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid and reported to the Senate on March 13, 2001. A concern expressed at the time was that the minus grades would lead to lower GPAs and have negative impacts on GPA-based scholarship recipients, which was countered by a viewpoint that the letter and plus-only system was imbalanced and provided insufficient specificity for end of course evaluation of student work. In 2006, after many years of discussion, the system we currently have was initiated. Over the summer, he said, he would like to lead an ad hoc committee to review the last decade of data on the performance of the undergraduate grading system, including comparison to systems used at other SC universities and at peer and aspirant institutions. The committee
will also investigate comparisons to our graduate grading system, which differs from our undergraduate grading system, which as he noted, "is a little weird."

**Comments on Today’s Agenda**

The Provost congratulated and thanked newly-named Interim Quality Enhancement Plan Director Todd LeVasseur for his service.

He also said that he is very grateful to several committees of the faculty and Faculty Senate for working on a revised major GPA policy, on which an interim report was soon to be offered at the meeting. He noted that there have been some challenges with the policy, and he stated that he has some reservations about our readiness to adopt a major GPA policy, and he said that he wanted to give fair warning that he will express those concerns. He added that it might be a good idea to delay the policy for a month while we have more conversation about it.

The Provost closed with saying that the campus is hosting accepted students weekend at the end of the week. He thanked those involved in developing and putting on the program and asked faculty who might be on campus to work during the weekend to be "extremely nice" to prospective students.

**Questions/Discussion**

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), inquired about the intellectual property policy. He read a sentence from the policy relating to distance education:

> For clarification purposes, the College/University shall retain rights to classes and course work developed at the College/University, including the syllabus, which are software, digital material in any media, videotaped or recorded using any other media or used for distance education, when the College/University has paid a stipend to the faculty member for such development or recording or it was developed with substantial use of College resources or facilities. [Policy 9.1.13, p. 5]

If a professor video-records lectures for a distance education class on his or her computer and posts them on OAKS, Senator Kelly asked, and subsequently leaves the College, does the college own the professor’s image and lectures, with the ability to use them in perpetuity?

The Provost said the College does not own such material. He added that, as concerns distance education, in the context of intellectual property, the College has not tried to "plow new ground."

He said that were an individual paid specifically to develop a new course in a work-for-hire arrangement and it was established up front that the College owned the course forever, that would be a different story. But in the typical case of developing a distance education course or developing course materials with electronic technology tools, the College is "not asserting a property interest in perpetuity."
However, there is a specific distance education proviso to consider: if one develops a distance education course and then leaves the College, the College has the right to use the material for a year (not permanently) in order to manage the instructional teach-out schedule to make sure students get the classes they need.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator — Management and Marketing, said that the appendix attached to the policy does not identify the name of the individual who is supposed to receive disclosures, and he asked who should receive them.

Provost McGee replied that, unless otherwise instructed by a supervisor, faculty should submit disclosure forms to the General Counsel.

**There were no further questions.**

C. **Faculty Budget Committee** - Chair, Julia Eichelberger

Report Forthcoming

Committee Documents Folder

Senator Eichelberger reported on behalf of the committee: Calvin Blackwell, Doug Friedman, herself, Courtney Murren, Tom Ross, Martha Stackel, William Veal

Senator Eichelberger summed up the current budget challenges (presentation slide 2), noting that much of this is familiar information to Senators. On how the makeup of next year’s student body will affect revenues, she added that this year’s graduating class has a higher percentage of out-of-state tuition-paying students. Thus their departure will not be offset by the incoming class.

On the public discussions (Feb 24 & Mar 2) of the Academic Affairs budget, Senator Eichelberger noted a change from last year’s process: unit heads, instead of asking for additions to the budget, were asked to discuss how they would reduce the budget if they had to do so.

The upshot of the discussions was a recognition, she pointed out, that considering the upcoming expenses, including the need to replenish our reserve, and the uncertain revenue picture, cuts to operating budgets in Academic Affairs will not suffice. (See graph on slide 4).

Comments heard in the hearing on cutting budgets in Academic Affairs (slide 5) include observations that little can be saved in the cutting; cutting operating budgets may affect the foreign instructional budget in one unit; professional development, faculty and student research can also take a hit with operational budget cuts; cutting instructional programs may not have an effect for some time; losing lines due to retirement can mean sacrifices in updating research and pedagogy in the department affected; and teaching is central but not the only work faculty do to fulfill our institutional mission. Some deans, additionally, asked if they could give up summer school revenues instead of making operational and instructional budget cuts. Note: Senator Eichelberger made a correction to the slide shown and handouts given at the meeting: in relation to an eliminated program, "Exercise Science" should have read "Athletic Training."

Student fees (slides 6 & 7) from 1998-99 through 2015-16 as a general trend have roughly tripled, with two areas rising at a faster rate: the fees for capital
improvement and athletics. The former is, she noted, paying for buildings students are using at present (not future buildings).

Senator Eichleberger also shared a graph on full- and part-time staff increases 2009-13 (slide 8) and the College’s recurring budget allocations from 2001-2 to present, breaking out allocations by unit. She thanked Sam Jones, Associate Vice President for Budgeting and Payroll Services, for providing the latter and other data and information for the committee.

The Athletics division’s allocations are featured in slide 10, the upper table showing showing allocations since 2007-08. The lower table, she explained, breaks down historic expenditures by the unit with information provided by Athletics in response to the committee’s request. Finally, she presented a slide (11) showing percentage budget increases by unit since 2006, noting that some have risen more steeply than others.

The Budget Committee’s recommendations (slides 12-14), she reported, are:

- Transparency and public accountability for units outside Academic Affairs.

  Academic Affairs, she noted, has worked transparently and is rigorously "soul searching" about instructional and operating budget cuts. The committee would like to see the same transparency from units across campus.

- Prioritize the academic mission instead of decreasing support for it.

  This, Senator Eichelberger said, is what we have to sell and is what students come for, and so should be prioritized.

- Consider reallocating funding to get more money to academic programs and avoid cuts being contemplated.

  Senator Eichelberger said the committee suggests that reallocations might be made from other parts of the budget and other parts of the universal student fee in order to get more money to academic programs so that we can avoid losing lines.

  She explained that relatively small short-term savings will come from cutting visiting positions that make very important contributions, and we should try to retain as many of these faculty as we can.

  Covering lost positions with "surplus labor" (available adjuncts) is also problematic, she said. Adjunct faculty, in most cases, are only expected to teach and not paid, in addition, to do other things critical to our mission (advising, service, research).

- Healthy academic departments need long-range planning.

  The committee, she said, would like to urge the Provost and the President to protect departments with current vacancies so that they are not forever
- We need publicly stated rationale for reallocations within Academic Affairs and across campus.

  The committee recognizes the need for reallocations but that the decision process and rationale for reallocations need to be shared and understood.

- Other forms of reallocation, including differential teaching loads, should be done carefully.

The committee reaffirms, she said, principles last year's committee expressed in memos sent to then Interim Provost McGee:

- Principles for prioritizing lines to protect, in the same way that the previous mode of budget development in the committee operated on a set of principles to determine lines to be added.

- Principles for school-based fees, which would provide a means of offsetting costs in schools with higher instructional costs.

She noted that these principles are laid out in the handout she circulated.

She closed by reporting that the Provost has promised to continue his consultations with the Faculty Budget Committee as he gets to the point of talking about cuts to positions and pointing out that, to date, the committee has not been involved in discussions of position cuts. She reported that schools and divisions were asked to "force rank" positions within schools and divisions and the committee expects that those rankings will guide the Provost's decisions. She promised that the Budget Committee will keep faculty informed on these matters.

She closed by adding that the College needs a "bigger buffer," retaining more funds to protect against tuition revenue fluctuations.

She called for discussion and invited all to join in: the Provost, Deans, Senators.

**Questions/Discussion**

**Andrew Bergstrom**, IT, in relation to the committee's call for increased budget transparency, pointed out that there is a "Transparency Spending" website (transparency.cofc.edu) that can provide insight in academic and nonacademic department spending, including P card reports. Bergstrom asked how many in the room have seen the site.

The Speaker replied that as a former department chair, he has never heard of it and thanked Mr. Bergstrom for pointing it out.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM), asked about the graph showing increases in expenditures in different divisions (slide 11). It does not include the President's office, he pointed out.
Senator Eichelberger noted that the data for allocations to the President’s office are available in slide 9. To consider those figures in the same way as the graph on slide 11 does, the President’s office was allocated about $2.8 million in 2006 and in 2015 about $3.5 million, an addition of about $700,000.

Senator Kasman noted that in comparison to budget increases in other units from 2006 to present, the increases in the Presidents office (by percentage) have been among the smallest.

**Tom Baginski**, Senator - German and Russian Studies, directed a question to either Provost McGee or Senator Eichelberger. He asked what, in slide 13, ”differential teaching loads” euphemizes.

”Not a euphemism at all,” Provost McGee replied. He explained that the phrase is a reference to a very old provision in the F/AM that sets the default faculty teaching load at 12 contact hours. Over time, we have moved to tenured and tenure-stream faculty teaching closer to nine contact hours. While many academic units have provisions for faculty who are not research productive or active in creative work to teach more, these provisions have not been employed. In conversations with Deans, he said, the need to revisit the assigning of research teaching releases to faculty who, for a variety of reasons and circumstances have not been able to be productive in research or creative activities.

[See Senator Iana Anguelova’s question below and following for further discussion of differential teaching loads.- JMD]

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked to go back to the graph on slide 11 (comparing percentage increases in budgets from 2006 to present, and asked why, with the exception of Physical Plant, the two units with the smallest increases over the period are the two units closest to the students: Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. He added a second question: why do units with greater percentages of increase than Academic Affairs not have to come to the Faculty Senate to report why this is?

Senator Eichelberger replied that these are good questions.

The Speaker said, to answer the second questions, we have not invited those units to do so, but there is no reason they cannot be invited to do so.

Senator Shaver followed up: ”where do these differential percentages come from? What have we done that is so much not having to do with students and faculty?” He added that there may be good reasons, but that he, for one, would like to hear them.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, speaking here, she said, as Associate Professor of Mathematics, said that it is important to look at relative size of each unit within the total budget, which is not to say that the graph does not provide important information, but that it should also be considered in that context.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - SHSS, offered two questions.
He asked the Provost if he had discussed with the Deans about adjusting evaluation criteria for annual evaluation and post-tenure review for faculty in the waning years of their careers and who are opting to focus on teaching and not research. Could evaluations for these faculty be focused more on teaching and leave out of consideration research?

The Provost replied that there have been many conversations along the lines Senator Kelly suggested, but there have been challenges in follow through. Conceptually, he said, he agrees with a more nuanced approach to differential teaching loads such as Senator Kelly suggested.

Separate questions from these relate to how faculty researchers are employed and how cost savings might be produced, the Provost said, and these and many other questions will need to be addressed if we are going to discuss differential teaching loads.

**Senator Kelly** also asked about two of the recurring budget requests that President McConnell lists in his 24 February Blog post ["Update on the State Budget"]:  

- Expansion of in-state mission: $2.2 million  
- Bachelor of Professional Studies: $750,000  
- Computer Science: $735,000  
- Mitigating Information Security Ranks: $652,000  

What do the first two figures cover?, Senator Kelly asked.

The Provost pointed out that budget requests to the state legislature often involve trying to divine what the priorities are of the legislators of any given year, and what appears to have been compelling over the past few years are programs that appeal to chambers of commerce and business groups in the state (such as Computer Science). He added that new money coming in one area may also free funds for use elsewhere. Thus, we do not turn down targeted funds, and if there seems to be a good chance of getting them, we ask for them.

On the $2.2 million, this would be more Educational and General (E&G) Budget money not tied to a specific purpose. We have not been successful in getting such unspecified funds in a meaningful way, the Provost said, in the 21st century. There may be some support for this ask of money without strings attached to help with our budget challenges.

**Lisa Covert**, Senator - SHSS, on the matter of unfunded state mandate for raises, asked if these raises are unfunded specifically at the College or across the board for employees at other state institutions as well.

Senator Eichelberger replied that it is across the board. We have a number of state-approved lines for which we furnish the entire salary and for these we are also responsible for generating the raises. For lines for which the salary comes from the state itself, the state provides the raise.
The Provost added that, in the short version of a more convoluted story, we will be responsible for 82% of the cost of any state-mandated raises. "Let me be clear," he asserted, "we want our employees to get raises." After not getting raises last year, adding in the rising cost of living here and the need to stay salary-competitive with other schools, "it is delightful to see salaries go up for our very hard working and dedicated employees." Yet it is big challenge to find the money with state only footing 18% of our raise bill.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, noting that we have heard much talk over the years about school-based fees asked if we are close to implementing these.

Senator Eichelberger said that the idea has support in the administration, who are hoping to secure the support of the Trustees, who would have to approve. Both the Schools of Sciences and Mathematics and Business have been developing plans, and according to the Provost, she said, the plans reflect some of the principles and caveats the committee developed last year. She reported that in a recent conversation with her, the President said that he thinks we are getting closer to implementing fees, but she said that she, herself, cannot report anything on it.

Senator Krasnoff followed up: is the any sense of how much revenue might be generated by fees?

Senator Eichelberger speculated that we would do something commensurate with Clemson and USC’s fee structures. We would not want to go above a benchmark set in relation to those schools’ fees. The fees would also be phased in.

The Provost added that models have been developed by SSM and SB that would use fees to support specific programs and return some fee income to the general ledger of the schools. If the fees based on current models were adopted, the Provost said, they could generate and return to the E&G budget about $400,000 in year one and $800,000 annually thereafter for "general support of the institution."

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked how much it cost us to get a raise.

Senator Eichelberger replied that this information is on the handout: $922,000 per each 1% raise.

Senator DeLaurell followed up: "are we saying we don't have that money? We can't get a raise?"

Senator Eichelberger: "It's not looking great." [Laughter]

The Provost added that if by law we are mandated to give raises, we have to. The money may come from a number of places (reductions, tuition and fee increases, other revenue streams), but it has to come from somewhere.

Senator Eichelberger added here that a report from Compensation Committee last year pointing out the pay gaps between ourselves and our peer institutions at Associate and full Professor ranks figured into the Budget Committee’s recommendations last year. The Provost observed at that time that a plan for raises might be implemented but not without cuts from elsewhere in the budget.
Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, asked as a follow-up if the SC legislature might be persuaded to have the state fund the entirety of the raise.

The Provost said that the President has been trying to educate the legislature on the differences between mandating a raise at an educational institution and mandating a raise, say, at the Department of Natural Resources. The $2.2 million mentioned in Senator Kelly’s query above, he said, if we managed to get it, could be swallowed up, every dime, by the mandated raise and we would still need more.

Senator Anguelova asked also how soon differential teaching loads might be implemented.

The Provost said that he “has suggested to the Deans that it is well within their authority, and they should consider doing so, in some targeted cases, as early as this fall.”

Senator Anguelova asked how much money it would save.

The Provost replied, “I have no idea, because it would depend on the rules adopted on a school-by-school basis.” He pointed out that Article Five of the F/AM specifies that the Provost delegates to the Deans workload management, and these decisions are made within the constraints of budget, disciplinary requirements, limits of accreditation, and other factors.

Hector Qirko, Senator - Sociology and Anthropology, observed that differential teaching loads were studied by an ad hoc committee a decade or so ago (before his time, he said). He asked if this report is still relevant.

The Provost replied in the affirmative and added that he has been thinking about the report a good deal in the current context. The work had much merit. It suggested that we need to consider student credit hour productivity and look at the unit of the department and the program, rather than use a one size fits all solution at the level of the individual faculty member. Yet, while there were many good ideas in the report, execution has been incomplete.

Senator Qirko followed up: should there be a new committee at this time?

The Provost said he would not disagree and, indeed, if we pursue questions raised by Senator Kelly, we will need to do so through our shared governance structures.

There were no further questions.

D. Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Update

Todd LeVasseur, QEP Interim Director

Professor LeVasseur said that as QEP Interim Director, he is building on work already done by Professor Brian Fisher, who laid the groundwork for the QEP with his original proposal.

He listed and discussed briefly the subcommittees for the QEP: Marketing, Budget, Student Advisory (graduate and undergraduate), Curricular and Co-curricular, Assessment, and Research, Literature Review, Best Practices, and Writing.
The Curricular and Co-curricular subcommittee, he reported, is at work on goal four of five. There is a meeting of this committee on March 17 and President McConnell will be in attendance. Once this committee is finished developing implementable actions, the Assessment committee can begin its work.

The Research, Literature Review, Best Practices, and Writing committee, Professor LeVasseur reported, will meet within two weeks to finalize definitions of sustainability and sustainability literacy.

A site visit, he said, is planned at Furman the Friday following the Senate meeting to examine their sustainability practices.

In time for the visit of a SACSCOC Vice President in May, the team will have developed some kind of document.

At this point, Professor LeVasseur called on Dr. Divya Bhati, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, for deadlines regarding the document. Dr. Bhati said that if we have in the fall a QEP document that can be shared with the Senate, she will happily do so. Currently there is not a specific timeline. An on-site SACSCOC team will evaluate the QEP in spring of 2017.

Anything needing to go through the curriculum committees will have to go through in the next academic year in order to have an implementable plan in spring ’17 to run in Fall 2017, with the first year of the QEP being 2017-18.

Professor LeVasseur also noted that he is trying to meet with Deans at present.

He reported that all the QEP meeting minutes are accessible through the QEP website. He added that he will be happy to visit departments and programs to field questions as requested.

There were no questions.

Speaker McNerney pointed out that links to the QEP materials are available through the OEP’s website off the College main page or on the Faculty Senate pages under “Important Links.”

E. **Faculty Educational Technology Committee** - Chair, David Desplaces

Classroom Upgrade Project (PDF) and Yammer Update

Professor Desplaces reported that the committee meets monthly to review issues associated with technology and education and IT concerns. Topics have included IT’s budget and the implications of budget cuts for teaching, classroom technology upgrades (shared in the linked report), and Yammer (matters of rollout, user adaptation). On the horizon for the committee are academic networking, Office 360, a review of distance education, and issues with Gmail raised by faculty.

The classroom upgrade report (linked to above) indicates the process for upgrades. A particular classroom referred to in the January special meeting in Q & A with Bob Cape, Professor Desplaces said, had a contractor issue and many classrooms simply have an awkward configuration that cannot be addressed by IT upgrades. Future discussions of the committee will also include the outfitting of the Technology Center.
Professor Desplaces stated that Bob Cape and his staff have worked very diligently to make classroom upgrades. While they fell short of the goal of upgrading 26 classrooms, there are also ongoing capital projects to consider that will bring 55 upgraded classrooms online.

Professor Desplaces also noted that many have posed questions about how we can best use Yammer. The committee, he says, feels Yammer has a functionality unrecognized by most faculty and has gone untapped.

**Questions / Discussion**

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, asked how, in practice, decisions are made on the rooms to be upgraded and how they should be upgraded. She asked if IT watches teachers in particular rooms, and she singled out as her "pet peeve" smart boards, which she said are expensive and take up too much room.

Zach Hartje, Teaching, Learning, Technology (TLT), responded that IT works with people they call "needs definers," and in this context, these are department chairs on whom IT rely to work with faculty on what should go into a classroom upgrade. All the classroom with smart boards (about 52% of those upgraded since the beginning of the upgrade project) were outfitted with smart boards based on feedback from department chairs. IT does not make the decision about what goes in the classroom.

Senator Anguelova asked for clarification: smart boards were requested by the chairs?

Mr. Hartje affirmed this.

Professor Desplaces at this time asked for a show of hands for how many faculty in the room remember getting an email in the last four months from their department chairs inquiring about technology needs in the classroom. Seeing few hands, he added that every chair was strongly encouraged to communicate with faculty on this matter.

Senator Anguelova stated that when smart boards came up in discussion in the Math department, they had to make a concerted campaign to keep their blackboards (and not adopt smart boards). The faculty's opinion, she said, not only was not solicited, and they had to fight.

She added another question: who decided on idea paint?

Desplaces clarified that the FETC in not involved in the upgrades. He added that the committee agreed that not everyone seems to have been solicited on classroom upgrades. Another complicating factor is that classrooms are "owned" by particular departments. For example, a Theater-owned classroom will be upgraded based on feedback from that department's chair, even though that classroom may also be used by languages faculty. A list of classrooms and their owners, he pointed out, is on the web. Professor Desplaces suggested that those in a situation similar to the one described above might try to open lines of communication with the chair of the classroom-owning department.
Senator Anguelova followed up by asking where initial ideas for upgrading classrooms are originating?

Zach Hartje, TLT, replied asked for clarification. Senator Anguelova said that she assumes IT proposes ideas to the need definers. She asked "do you ask the need definers to give you ideas on how they want the classroom to be upgraded?"

Mr. Hartje replied that IT asks the need definers to tell them about how the classroom is used in the department, and there are recommendations from IT (standard configurations) available, based on what need definers say.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, said that a problem is assuming that very busy chairs have time to think about the details of classroom configuration. Posing questions to faculty directly, she suggested, would yield more valuable information. In her own department, she said, her proactive chair and faculty went into classrooms together and discussed the options. Her department's classrooms, as a result, have no smart boards, though they were unable to resist whiteboards, even though they requested to keep chalkboards.

Senator Anguelova reiterated that Math faculty were not consulted. Senator Cormack replied that when there are changes that affect teachers across the College, the whole faculty need to be aware of the proposed changes and able to respond.

Senator Andy Shedlock (Biology) at this time suggested that the ongoing discussion could ported to Yammer in order that the meeting's business could move forward.

Jannette Finch, Senator - Library, on behalf of her constituents, asked for a clarification as to whether we are sticking with Yammer; to which the IT staff on hand said "yes" and after which she asked, provided that the idea is to offer more training in how to use Yammer well, what will the training/help look like?

Andrew Bergstrom, IT, explained that IT have met with the Staff Advisory Committee, the FETC, watched posities on Yammer, and gathered Helpdesk information, all of which revealed two trends.

1. People want to know how to do things.

To help with this, John Schroeder has developed a class that meets on Tuesdays from 2-3 (Bell 500). If this meeting time does not work, Mr. Bergstrom asked faculty to contact Helpdesk or Mr. Schroeder to schedule an alternate time, which they will be happy to do.

IT will also be building out an instructional site on Yammer itself.

2. People wanted to return to a listserv system.

There was a misconception among these users about how the faculty/staff listserv worked, Mr. Bergstrom said. The listserv never reached all faculty and staff because it was an opt-in list, which has, he pointed out, been said in the Senate at least a couple times, yet the misconception persists. There are mandatory lists at the College that reach all faculty and all staff, but these are moderated as to what can and cannot go out.
Mr. Bergstrom strongly recommended Yammer training, and said that once faculty see how it works they will see what can be gotten out of it.

Senator Cormack (Religious Studies), given Mr. Bergstrom’s stating that the old faculty/staff listserv did not reach all faculty and staff, asked how many people are not reached by Yammer.

Mr. Bergstrom said that the current number of people on Yammer is 1374.

Senator Cormack asked for a comparison to the numbers on/off the old listserv.

John Schroeder, IT, replied that the highest number of subscribers to the faculty/staff list was 1600, fairly evenly divided between faculty and staff. Mr. Bergstrom added that many of the subscribed addresses on faculty/staff were "debris," email addresses not longer used but still on the distribution list since listserv does not automatically decommission or purge unused addresses.

Senator Anguelova (Mathematics) stated that many people are technically on Yammer but do not really use it. She also claimed that, compared to the old open discussion listserv, Yammer's open discussion group is not as active.

She added that while a justification for moving from the listserv system was that it was wasting time. Yammer, she complained, also wastes time, evidence of which, she said, is the constant notifications on some of the lists and a large number of emails she does not want and which are not helpful. Yammer wastes more time, she argued, than listservs.

Professor Desplaces suggested the digest mode, which Senator Anguelova said comes the next day and may be too late to act on information contained therein.

John Schroeder, IT, observed that all this conversation suggests the value of training and a little more guidance. For Yammer to work best, he said, you need to go in and sign up for groups. The daily digest amounts to only a teaser for what is going on in groups. He added that IT does not recommend subscribing to "All Company" because that group cannot easily be subscribed to by email.

He added that IT recommends that everyone sign up for the faculty and staff announcements group as a default place to post and read announcements.

If you don't want to use the Yammer website, you can use Yammer to see email notifications when there are postings to a group.

Mr. Schroeder said that he is more than happy to work with everyone to help them get set up to use Yammer effectively. The whole point of Yammer, he added, is to allow users a choice in what they want to see.

An exchanged followed in which Senator Anguelova expressed concerns with her Yammer experience and Mr. Shroeder tried to answer these and to provide further information.

Senator Eichelberger (SHSS) asked that the Senate move to the next agenda item.

There was no further discussion.
F. **Academic Standards Committee** - Chair, Quinn Burke

Proposed Language for College-wide Major GPA Policy ([PDF](#))

The Speaker explained that the report is being offered by the Faculty Academic Standards Committee (FACS), but is really coming from an ad hoc committee.

Professor Burke said that the report is coming from a joint ad hoc committee of members from the FACS, Curriculum Committee, and the Academic Planning Committee. The process began in the fall.

He explained that some colleges have major GPA on transcripts; others do not. The College does not include major GPA on transcripts, though students do often include major GPA on resumes/CVs, particularly in applications to graduate school.

Across the College, he stated, there is high inconsistency in how departments are calculating major GPA. Some majors require courses that they exclude from calculating major GPA. The College's major GPA policy currently states that courses required for a major need to be included in major GPA calculations. A central issue is one of prerequisites, a term that needs to be well defined, which is the aim of the proposed policy.

In the proposed policy, prerequisites are broken into two categories for the purposes of calculating major GPA.

- Pre-Requisite Course Required for the Major: A prerequisite course for a required major course that is itself a required major course.
- Pre-Requisite Course Only: A prerequisite course for a required major course that is not itself a required major course.

Required major courses only would count in major GPA.

Nothing at this point is finalized, he said.

Professor Burke thanked the many who have worked on the policy and called for questions and discussion.

**Questions / Discussion**

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator - SSM, asked if the second of the above is not a "hidden prerequisite," which departments were asked to eliminate.

Professor Burke said that this issue did emerge in discussions and the committee may return to it, but at this point the committee is mainly trying to nail down distinctions between prerequisites.

The Provost added that before fairly recent changes, it was difficult to tell from the catalog what courses a student had to take to complete a major because the hour count displayed did not reflect prerequisite courses that were built into the short listings. In the current catalog, all the courses that have to be taken are listed.

"This is a serious and significant problem for us to address," he said; "happily, we don't have to fix that one, too."

The Provost deferred at this point to Registrar Mary Bergstrom to speak to ongoing challenges.
We are trying to get to a place, she said, in which the courses that are truly required for a major are all represented in the same way. She said that she could provide examples of five different ways in which major GPA is calculated across campus.

There will need to be agreement as to what is truly considered a prerequisite. Is it a course that prepares a student for the major? Is it a course within the major required to be taken before another course in the major?

On the matter of hidden prerequisites, she said, the Registrar's office's transparency project on the catalog unveiled many credit hours that were missing in the calculation. If you examine the catalog, she pointed out, you will often find a credit hour number with a plus added: this is because we cannot truly arrive at a finite number because there are disagreements as to what counts as a prerequisite in major GPA and what does not.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, said that, while he understands the point of the language, he felt it is not very well written and would not, in its current state be helpful to students. "Required course," he said, needs to be defined because one might argue that a course not listed in the major but is a prerequisite is, in fact, required. At present, "requirement" simply means "listed in the requirements." "Requirement" needs to be explicit.

**Andy Shedlock**, Senator - Biology, noting that Biology has over 1,000 majors, suggested that the policy may create unintended consequences for enrollment and tuition revenue. If the major GPA in Biology is calculated by including particularly challenging classes like Organic Chemistry, many students may go to Trident Tech, instead, in the summer. He offered this as a caution.

Professor Burke said he appreciated Senators Shedlock and Krasnoff’s observations and will take them back to the subcommittee.

There were no further questions or discussion.

5. **Old Business**: None

6. **New Business**
   A. **Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual** - Chair, Jason Vance

   Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Manual for Reapportionment of Faculty Senate (PDF)

Professor Vance pointed out the Senate was reduced in the number of Senators to 50 in 2010; however, over the past six years, over half of the time, we have failed to meet that prescribed number. A challenge is presented by changes in the composition of the College in the relative number of faculty in the different schools, which may change due to growth or contraction (should there be attrition or cuts in faculty lines, for instance). There is presently no F/AM language governing the regularly with which the Senate needs to be reapportioned.

The motion sets the reapportionment to occur under the supervision of the Faculty Nominations and Elections Committee every three years based on an assessment of the number of regular faculty in the College and establishes the method of
apportionment as Huntington-Hill. The language, he noted, sets the reapportionment cycle to begin in the fall of 2015 (reapportionment has already occurred for the current cycle). The language, he pointed out, also addresses the scenario in which seats might be lost and how apportionment operates in those cases.

Professor Vance noted that the way in which seats are distributed in the Senate is that if there are more seats allotted to a school than to the number of departments in the school, then each department gets a seat and the remaining seats are at-large seats. Conversely, if there are more departments in a school than the number of seats allotted to the school, then all the seats are at-large seats.

Professor Vance added that the committee sought the review and recommendations of the Faculty Nominations and Elections Committee and the Faculty Welfare Committee. He observed that the purpose of the motion is to address the reapportionment of the Senate only and not the composition of the Senate, which remains at 50 seats.

Speaker McNerney stipulated that as a motion brought by a Senate committee, it did not require a second.

There were questions or discussion.

The motion was approved on unanimous voice vote.

B. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

Jo Ann Ewalt, Chair

Professor Ewalt specified that the first two proposals (MAT Early Childhood and Elementary Education) make changes that bring the programs into compliance with the SC Read to Succeed Act, and she asked that they be considered for approval together.

1. MAT Early Childhood Education Proposals (PDF, pp. 1-36)
   - EDEE 617: change title, prerequisite change, edit description
   - EDEE 631: new course
   - EDEE 640: change title, edit description
   - EDEE 682: change title, edit description

2. MAT Elementary Education Proposals (PDF, pp. 37-61)
   - EDEE 633: new course
   - EDEE 695: change title, edit description

   There were no questions and no discussion.
The proposals were approved on unanimous voice vote.

3. MAT Special Education Proposal (PDF, pp. 62-65)

   EDFS 654: add existing course to requirements or electives.

   There were no questions and no discussion.
The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

4. MAT Performing Arts Proposal (PDF)
   - PUBA 664: replace with MTL 648
   - New Courses: MUSE 501 & 685
   - MUSE 704: change title, edit description
   - New Courses: THRE 704 & 690

Professor Ewalt specified that this proposal, among other things, also responds, in part, to the SC Read to Succeed Act.

There were no questions and no discussion.
The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

5. MS Environmental Studies Proposal (PDF)
   EVSS 695: change credits/contact hours, edit description

There were no questions and no discussion.
The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

6. MS Marine Biology Proposals (PDF)
    Delete courses: BIOL 510 & 631

There were no questions and no discussion.
The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

7. MS Accountancy Proposals (PDF)
    - New courses: ACCT 550, 538, and 589
    - ACCT 531: edit course description
    - Delete courses: ACCT 542, 543, and 545

There were no questions and no discussion.
The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

C. Faculty Curriculum Committee
   Gibbs Knotts, Chair

Speaker McNerney pointed out the item number 10 (course renumbering in MATH and EVSS) below needed to be stricken from consideration at the meeting. The Math renumbering proposal has already been approved by both the graduate and undergraduate curriculum committees; however, the PDF distributed with the agenda does not include the materials. The PDF provided only has the EVSS materials, and those course re-numberings will not be discussed by the graduate curriculum committee until March 16. Thus, the item should be pulled, and will be on the agenda in April.

The Speaker also specified that item number 13 (on the Environmental Studies minor), in particular the name change proposed, will be singled out for separate discussion at the request of a Senator.
Professor Knotts then opened the floor for discussion of and questions about the remaining proposals, 1-9, 11, 12, and 14-23 below.

Senator (SHSS) and Faculty Budget Committee Chair Julia Eichelberger noted that item 7 (BPS Healthcare) has not been received but not yet reviewed by her committee. She requested that the item be pulled from consideration pending the budget committee’s review.

Senator Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) suggested that deliberation on all the BPS proposals (items 7, 8, and 9 below) be discussed separately from the others. The Speaker then called for any other proposals that should be discussed separately. Seeing none, he asked for discussion and questions on the remaining proposals: 1-6, 11, 12, and 14-23 below.

There were no questions or discussion on these items.

All passed on a unanimous voice vote.

See beneath the proposal listing below for the discussion of BPS proposals (items 7-9) and the Environmental Studies minor proposal (item 13).

1. African Studies (PDF)
   Add HIST 272 and 273 to the electives in the AFST minor. Students are currently required to take one of those two courses, but aren’t allowed to count the other as an elective. This was an oversight.

   This proposal was approved.

2. Art History (PDF)
   - Create six new courses and add them as options in the ARTH B.A.
   - Deactivate four courses and title changes for 14 courses.

   This proposal was approved.

3. Asian Languages (PDF)
   Creation of 0-credit discussion courses as co-requisites for Asian language courses.

   This proposal was approved.

4. Biology (PDF)
   Updating the various Biology programs to reflect the changes to the Honors Chemistry courses.

   This proposal was approved.

5. Geology (PDF)
   Change to some of the prerequisites for GEOL 291.

   This proposal was approved.

6. Honors Chemistry (PDF)
   - Deactivate HONS 191/L and 294/L and replace with a new 5-credit hour course.
   - Update the various Chemistry programs to reflect this change.
   - This will also affect the Biology proposal and the Geology 291 proposal.

   This proposal was approved.
7. **BPS Healthcare** ([PDF](#))
   - Create three new courses on healthcare
   - Create a healthcare minor within BPS.

   **This proposal was discussed separately (see below).**

8. **BPS Program Changes** ([PDF](#))
   - Add PRST 220 and PRST 230 as requirements in BPS.
   - Terminate the BPS Information Systems concentration.
   - Make numerous changes to the course lists for the other concentrations.

   **This proposal was discussed separately (see below).**

9. **BPS Project Management** ([PDF](#))
   - Create six new courses on project management.
   - Create a new project management concentration within BPS.

   **This proposal was discussed separately (see below).**

10. **Course Renumbering** ([PDF](#))
    The College has a new course-numbering policy, which is forcing programs to renumber some of their courses. Requirements for cross-listed courses are now stricter. Both EVSS and MATH are making changes because of this.

    (Stricken from consideration at this meeting. See the Speaker's remarks above).

11. **Data Science** ([PDF](#))
    - Replace current system of 14 different cognates (basically a discipline-based system) with a system of 4 different emphases (basically a school-based system).
    - Add 6 hours of CSCI/MATH courses to the requirements.

    **This proposal was approved.**

12. **Elementary Education** ([PDF](#))
    Remove EDEE 327 from the EDEL degree requirements.

    **This proposal was approved.**

13. **Environmental Studies** ([PDF](#))
    - Change the name of the minor.
    - Make a corresponding change to the name of ENVT 200, the minor’s introductory course.

    **This proposal was discussed separately (see below).**

14. **Foreign Language Education** ([PDF](#))
    - Add EDFS 455 to the EDFL degree requirements.
    - Add TEDU 436 as an alternative to EDFS 326.

    **This proposal was approved.**
15. **History** ([PDF](#))
   Create three new courses and add them to the HIST B.A.

   **This proposal was approved.**

16. **History 321** ([PDF](#))
   - Create the HIST version of AAST 340.
   - Add this course to the HIST B.A.

   **This proposal was approved.**

17. **International Studies** ([PDF](#))
   - Add INTL 100 as a prerequisite for INTL 350.
   - Change the wording of the INTL study-abroad requirement to better reflect the original intent.
   - Add flexibility to the language requirement in the INTL Asia concentration.
   - Add LTHI 250 to the INTL Comparative Literature concentration.

   **This proposal was approved.**

18. **International Studies Concentration** ([PDF](#))
   - Add HIST 272 and 273 to the INTL Africa concentration.
   - Change the Europe and Latin America concentrations so SPAN 333 counts only when the content is relevant.
   - Add SPAN 494 to the Latin America concentration.
   - Add a restriction that most courses can't be double counted between LACS and the INTL Latin America concentration.

   **This proposal was approved.**

19. **Linguistics** ([PDF](#))
   - Create a new course.
   - Add it and ANTH 387 to the LING minor.
   - Change the title of LING 125.
   - Change the role of LING 101 in the minor.

   **This proposal was approved.**

20. **Physical Education Activities** ([PDF](#))
   - Create two new courses.
   - Add PEAC 102 as a prerequisite for PEAC 132.
   - Update degree requirements.

   **This proposal was approved.**

21. **Physical Education Teacher Education (A)** ([PDF](#))
   - Delete HEAL 216, PEAC 105, PEAC 117, EXSC 340+L from PE/TE major.
   - Add EXSC 210, PEHD 222L, PEHD 223L, EDFS 455, BIOL 201+L, BIOL 202+L to PE/TE major.
   - Add 1-credit lab (PEHD 222L) to PEHD 222. Add 1-credit lab (PEHD 223L) to PEHD 223.

   **This proposal was approved.**

22. **Physical Education Teacher Education (B)** ([PDF](#))
   - Change the GPA requirement.
This proposal was approved.

23. Theater (PDF)
   - Create a new course. Add some courses to the THTR electives.
   - Change all dance-related THTR courses to the DANC prefix.

This proposal was approved.

Discussion turned to the proposals not yet voted on, beginning with the Bachelor of Professional Studies proposals.

7. BPS Healthcare (PDF)
   - Create three new courses on healthcare
   - Create a healthcare minor within BPS.

8. BPS Program Changes (PDF)
   - Add PRST 220 and PRST 230 as requirements in BPS.
   - Terminate the BPS Information Systems concentration.
   - Make numerous changes to the course lists for the other concentrations.

9. BPS Project Management (PDF)
   - Create six new courses on project management.
   - Create a new project management concentration within BPS.

Speaker McNerney asked Senator Eichelberger if she thought only the BPS Healthcare proposal needed to be reviewed by the Budget Committee or if they might also need to review the Project Management proposal. Senator Eichelberger replied that the committee typically reviews only new program proposals, but not proposals for changes within programs.

Associate Provost Conseula Frances added that her understanding is that the Senate Budget Committee reviews new majors, does not review concentrations in majors, and has not typically reviewed new minors, though the committee did request to review the BPS Healthcare minor proposal.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, suggested that in the BPS, a concentration is functionally a major and, thus, might be reviewed in the same way the new majors outside the BPS are reviewed.

The Speaker suggested that each proposal might be discussed and acted on in turn.

Senator Krasnoff, instead, moved that all three proposals (items 7, 8, and 9) be remanded to the Budget Committee for review, after which the proposals might return to the Senate in the April meeting. The motion was seconded.

Dan Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, argued that item 8 (BPS Program Changes) proposes actions not ordinarily reviewed by the committee: adding requirements, terminating a concentration, and making other changes.
Senator Krasnoff replied that, presumably the termination of the concentration has to do with underperforming enrollment, while the new concentration proposal would seem to argue that it will do better in enrollment. They are both budgetary arguments, he said, and, thus, within the committee’s domain.

The Speaker added here as a point of information that the Budget Committee is charged with reviewing deletions of majors, which fact might be considered if there is an analogy being made between BPS concentrations and majors outside the BPS.

There was no further discussion of Senator Krasnoff’s motion.

The motion passed on unanimous voice vote: Items 7, 8, and 9 were remanded to the Budget Committee for further review.

Discussion now turned to the Environmental Studies minor proposal:

13. Environmental Studies (PDF)
   - Change the name of the minor.
   - Make a corresponding change to the name of ENVT 200, the minor’s introductory course.

Professor Knotts specified that the change in the name is from "Environmental Studies" to "Environmental and Sustainability Studies." He noted that in the Faculty Curriculum Committee there was lengthy discussion about the proposal related to whether or not the title change was advisable in relation to the still-formulating QEP. Ultimately, the proposal passed unanimously.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, said that, as a Senator, he was asked by a colleague to represent concerns about the title change. His colleague, he said, is on the QEP committee and has two objections to the proposal. He feels that it might be wise to wait on the proposed name change in the minor until it is known, as a consequence of the developing QEP, whether or not there might be a separate major in Sustainability. The minor change, in this regard, is premature.

The second objection is to the yoking of sustainability and environment in the proposed title: "Environmental and Sustainability Studies." In his colleague’s view, Senator Shaver said, the title confines sustainability's applicability to the environment. The Senator pointed out that the American Association for Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE), a secondary accreditation organization for Sustainability Studies, sets standards for "sustainability-related" and "sustainability-focused" courses. Colorado State University, which Senator Shaver said is a "star" according to the ASSHE, offers a wide range of sustainability-focused courses, some in expected areas, others in less obvious territory: Agriculture, Animal Sciences, Construction Sciences, Environmental Sciences, but also Business, Economics, English, History, Math, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology. This, he argued on behalf of his colleague, suggests the national
accrediting body's recognition that sustainability involves the environment, but also much more. The effect of tying Environmental Studies and sustainability together may be, he cautioned, to encourage the idea that sustainability is irrelevant outside that context.

Todd LeVasseur, QEP Interim Director, replied that each campus gets to decide what sustainability means. The courses in the minor include Natural Sciences (9 hrs.) and Humanities and Social Sciences (6 hrs.), the latter including courses in Anthropology, Economics, Entrepreneurship, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, and Religious Studies. The program is interdisciplinary, and the learning outcomes include sustainability literacy. He listed numerous (30+) colleges with minors or majors in "Environmental Sustainability Studies" or "Sustainability and Environmental Studies," offering the list as evidence in support of the name change in the proposal.

Senator Shaver replied that his colleague would recommend that "and" be deleted, so that the new title would read "Environmental Sustainability Studies," opening the possibility for other kinds of sustainability studies as well.

Senator Shaver moved that the proposal be changed, replacing "Environmental and Sustainability Studies" as the new name with "Environmental Sustainability Studies." The motion was seconded.

Discussion of the motion now began.

Brian Fisher, Senator - SHSS and Sustainability Director, Business Affairs, added as a point of information that the College is a subscriber to AASHE and, thus, we are part of AASHE. He said that he is currently doing a sustainability assessment for the College so that we can be rated as an institution.

He pointed out that over the last fifteen years AASHE has evolved in how sustainability is understood and practiced. Renewable energy, building efficiency, etc. were the main concerns initially and AASHE assessed schools along these lines. However, at present, he said, those measures (environmental indicators) only account for about 30% of the total assessment. Many of the indicators are social or curricular. He asserted that there is "a clear evolution of what sustainability is."

Senator Fisher argued that the title change as proposed would introduce an interpretation problem for students, who will already naturally associate sustainability with the environment. Students may assume that to learn about sustainability to is go to a particular place, "as opposed to the Business School or the Physical Sciences or even the Arts."

Senator Fisher argued that sustainability needs to be seen not only as interdisciplinary but as "integrative." It can serve as a "platform to bring all the disciplines together as a wholistic framework," allowing problem solving from a system-wide perspective.
Alex Kasman, Senator - SSM, stated that with or without the coordinating conjunction in minor's title, to his mind, there is not necessarily an implication that sustainability only exists in the context of Environmental Studies, just as, he analogized, a Math teaching track does not assume all teaching is Mathematics.

He asked for a clarification: will the minor address sustainability only in the context of the environment? If so, he said, he might agree with Senator Shaver's motion to drop the "and."

Professor LeVasseur reiterated that the minor is interdisciplinary. In order for a class to count for credit in the minor, it must have at least one-third of its content related to sustainability or Environmental Studies. The introductory course also has a name change in the proposal to reflect the new emphasis on sustainability, and it has a final unit called "What is Sustainability?" He added that Senator Fisher's Political Science course in Sustainability fits the minor. The minor's name, Professor LeVasseur asserted, captures the focus on sustainability in contexts other than Environmental Science, but the minor is built on the core strength of the nine hours of Natural Sciences. Other courses that students might take include Ecoreneurship; Environmental Economics; Nature, Technology, and Society; Environmental Ethics; Sustainability; Environmental Policy; even a special topics course in the relationship between the psychology of social change in relation to sustainability, such as Jen Wright is teaching.

The emphasis on sustainability as such, he also noted, is reflected in the minor's student learning outcomes.

The Speaker, at this point, reminded the Senate that the motion on the floor was to remove "and" from the proposed new title for the minor and called for further discussion.

Hector Qirko, Senator - Sociology and Anthropology, asked Professor LeVasseur, asked how many of the numerous schools he listed earlier had an "and" in their program titles.

Within the 45 schools he found, Professor LeVasseur said, titles are either Environmental Sustainability Studies or Sustainability and Environmental Studies.

"So," Senator Qirko followed, "you wouldn't worry about taking 'and' out?"

Professor LeVasseur replied that the proposal was discussed by a steering committee of six faculty, including persons in Psychology, Sociology, Political Science, Geology, Biology, and Chemistry. There was discussion also with Deans. No one in those discussions, he said, had a problem with the name.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, said that to remove the "and" would imply that there's no Environmental Studies in the minor. "Are there," he asked, "Environmental
Studies going on in the minor, apart from sustainability?" If the answer is "yes," then the word "and" should be there, he observed.

Professor Levasseur said that there is a focus, from a Natural Sciences point of view, on Environmental Science separate from sustainability.

Provost McGee at this point asked if there was still a quorum.

The Speaker asked that the conversation continue while he ascertained whether or not there is a quorum.

Senator Fisher (SHSS) observed that courses alone do not lend a sustainability focus to a program. There is a methodology to sustainability that relies on holistic thinking, and simply adding courses, even if they represent perspectives outside of the Natural Sciences, does not get at the methodological focus. There is more to it, he said, than course lists and whether or not an "and" is in the title. He said the real question is whether the program is going to be built with these methodological questions in mind, and "if it is, are you then ignoring the Environmental Science side of things?" Will the minor "evolve toward a holistic, integrated, assessment, problem-solving framework, or is it going to attempt to do that along with the study of environment, which is what the name implies?"

Professor Levasseur replied that he does not think the name implies that Environmental Studies and sustainability are separate but, rather, "what we've been doing, our strengths, where we see ourselves moving towards," and, he asserted, given budget realities there is uncertainty regarding how much the program can be built moving forward.

Senator Fisher asked Professor LeVasseur what his vision for the program is.

The Speaker interjected, indicating that he needs to ensure there is a quorum, and he asked Senators to show hands in order to verify his count.

Beth Meyer-Bernstein, Senator - SSM, asked Professor LeVasseur if there was discussion of having a separate minor in Sustainability, instead of putting it together with Environmental Studies. She agreed that the name as proposed may produce a lack of clarity. A separate, interdisciplinary minor in Sustainability would address this.

"It's not on me," Professor Levasseur replied, "what to develop and what our ability to develop new programs is." He added that the name was discussed in the committee, and some in the discussion felt that calling the program "Sustainability Studies" did not capture what the program does and were not comfortable with it.

Senator Meyer-Bernstein asked why there can't be two separate programs. Sustainability Studies as a minor could have some of the Environmental Studies courses but would also have other interdisciplinary courses. She added that she is
worried that the change to the minor might preclude other programs that might be developed in sustainability, such as a Sustainability major.

Professor LeVasseur replied that the courses in the proposal do offer multiple perspectives.

Senator Shaver (Management and Marketing) asked, on behalf of his colleague, if any new courses were added to the minor prior to the name change. Or is this, he asked, adding that the phrase is his, not his colleague's "putting old wine in a new bottle"?

Professor LeVasseur replied that courses in urban sustainability will be added.

Senator Shaver: "but they haven't been yet."

Professor LeVasseur noted that currently all the minor can do is to work with faculty whose courses offer a third of their content in the area of the minor. There are plenty of Math and Science faculty who can do this, but currently there is a limit as far as Humanities and Social Science faculty who can. Right now, he said, there is a special topics course being offered on women, gender, and the environment, which could become part of the program should it become a permanent course.

Senator Shaver added, "the answer is still no."

Professor LeVasseur countered, "because there's not faculty to generate the classes."

Shaver: "but it's still no."

LeVasseur: "yes."

Adem Ali, Senator - Geology, asked if there is flexibility in the requirements because, he said, the program is heavy in the Earth Sciences.

Professor LeVasseur said this reflects the history of the program, but he said, they would like to grow the program through faculty that can teach the courses. He said that the program is very flexible and invites contributions from anybody from any department to teach courses meeting the student learning outcomes of the program.

Beth Meyer-Bernstein, Senator - SSM, asked for a clarification. Each course has to have a third of its content in the area of the minor. Given that the title proposed is "Environmental and Sustainability Studies," does the third of the content need to be either of those things or both?

Provost McGee at this point expressed concern about the Senate's potential modification of a name change that is the product of work in a steering committee.
While the Senate may wish to reject the proposal, he said that the modification of the name, given the situation, is discomforting, and he urged caution.

He noted that the discussion has disclosed hesitation about setting a frame for both Environmental Studies and Sustainability Studies. There could be long term consequences that might need a fuller exploration and debate.

He counseled defeating Senator Shaver’s motion and postponing the discussion of the proposal until the April meeting to allow the steering committee to digest the discussion and return in order to discuss the framework for the proposed change to the minor name, which does need a "tidy answer" to questions of how the two sides of the proposed title fit together.

The Speaker reminded the Senate Senator Shaver's motion is still on the floor.

**Provost McGee called the question;** this was seconded, and it carried on a voice vote.

**Senator Shaver’s motion to drop the "and" from the proposed title in the motion of "Environmental and Sustainability Studies" was defeated on voice vote (not unanimous).**

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, said that he intended to offer the postponement motion that Provost McGee suggested, but stated that he had concerns about bringing the motion back immediately in the April meeting. He expressed agreement with Senator Meyer-Bernstein's idea of a separate Sustainability Studies minor and echoed her concern that the minor might preclude program development emerging from the QEP. He said that the proposal is on the right track, but the question of what will come out of the QEP is still an open one and may suggest the need to slow the proposal down somewhat.

**Senator Krasnoff moved that the proposal be postponed.** The motion was seconded. The Parliamentarian suggested that the postponement be until the next meeting. Senator Krasnoff left it open-ended, leaving it up to the steering committee to decide when to bring it back.

**There was no discussion of Senator Krasnoff’s motion, which carried on a voice vote (not unanimous).**

The Speaker moved on to Constituents’ Concerns, postponing the following two motions until the April meeting.

C. **Motion for a Faculty Representative in the Budget Process** (PDF)
Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences

D. **Motion to Increase the Number of Years Faculty May Serve on Committees** (PDF)
7. **Constituent’s Concerns**

Simon Lewis, Professor of English, expressed concern about sanctions levied on Professor Robert Dillon (being shifted from his lab and reassigned to other, non-teaching duties) for his alleged insubordination. He pointed out that Professor Dillon’s case "escalated very rapidly," to the point of a possible suspension this coming August. Professor Lewis stated that at no point before the assignment of other duties was Professor Dillon given a hearing. While an investigative hearing is now underway, this has only come after the reassignment. Nor was an ombudsperson called in, nor does there appear, Professor Lewis said, to have been efforts made at mediation. Professor Lewis read into the record the AAUP’s response to the case:

“In general, the AAUP views ‘alternative assignments in lieu of teaching’ to be a suspension and, further, suspensions to be a major sanction that can only be imposed after an adjudicative hearing before an elected faculty body in which the administration has the burden of proof to establish that cause for the sanction exists. As such, the treatment of your colleague appears to fall short of AAUP-supported procedural standards.”

Professor Lewis connected Professor Dillon’s case with the Speaker’s discussion early in the meeting about the need to look into the grievance and hearing systems, and he added that, to his mind, the ombudsperson system at the College is broken. The hearing system, he asserted, is stacked against faculty and is ineffective.

8. **Adjournment:** 7:45PM
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 9 February 2016

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 9 February 2016 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order: 5:04 PM
2. Approval of the Minutes of the 12 January Regular Meeting Minutes
3. Announcements and Information
4. Reports
   A. Speaker of the Faculty McNerney

   The Speaker thanked Senators for their participation in the recent special meeting and reported that he will soon be distributing to Senators another survey instrument, similar to the one he distributed prior to the special meeting. The survey will determine if there are additional questions Senators and faculty colleagues wish to pursue. He said he will also ask in the survey if there are additional issues around which we should call another special meeting. Regular meeting agendas toward the end of the year, he pointed out, can be quite packed with business and so some may find a special meeting desirable for discussing other issues.

   The Speaker reported that he attended recent Board of Trustees (BOT) committee meetings (January 28-29): Athletics, Academic Affairs, Budget and Finance, Governmental Affairs and External Relations, and Information Technology. Actions taken by the BOT included approval of the new Meteorology program; a resolution recognizing and thanking the city of Trujillo, Spain for their 20 year relationship with the College; approval of housing and food service fees for 2016-17; the announcement of the intended purchase of King George Inn on George St.; and the approval of a second round of budget reductions. At this point, the Speaker distributed hard copies of a document on the latter.

   The Speaker also reported on the College’s recent annual budget request presentation to the State House Ways and Means Committee. The requests for increases this year included nearly $4.1 million in recurring monies, with $2.2 million being general operations money that is not targeted to any specific programs. The Speaker added that it has been quite some time since the college has requested increases in unrestricted general operations funding. The College also requested around $2.4 million in non-recurring funding and another approximately $125 million in capital projects funding. The Speaker added that we have made requests for a significant amount of funding for next year.

   The Provost and the Faculty Budget Committee, the Speaker reported, have announced tentative dates for budget hearings: February 24 and, if needed, March 2. More information is forthcoming on this, he said.

   The BOT, the Speaker reported, has amended and approved their bylaws, the most notable change to which is an addition of term limits for board officers, now set at three terms. Chair Greg Padgett’s current term will expire in October 2017. In
addition, two board members, Lee Mikell and Renee Goldfinch, it was announced, will not be seeking re-election.

The Speaker announced that on Friday, February 12 there will be an announcement regarding the Boundless campaign, which may include a final tally. The Speaker encourage all to attend.

The Speaker said that Senators should be on the lookout for information coming in email regarding various matters of faculty governance, such as notices of elections (including for Adjunct Senators) and requests for desired committee assignments. He said that an election is currently running for Speaker of the Faculty, Faculty Secretary, and school at-large Senators, and he asked that Senators remind their constituents to vote.

Recalling the conversation in constituents’ concerns at the January meeting regarding Yammer, the speaker reported that the Faculty Educational Technology Committee (FETC), as directed, is looking at ways to improve Yammer and/or its use and promises to report at the March regular meeting. The Speaker reported that the Staff Advisory Committee to the President has also been looking into concerns about Yammer. Chair of the Committee, Karen Hauschild, shared with the Speaker minutes of a meeting between the committee and IT on Yammer, which the Speaker said he will share with the chair of the FETC.

The Speaker also reported that the Staff Advisory Committee to the President is also instituting a CoFC Spirit Day program to occur on the first Friday of every month. On the first Friday of March there will be special kickoff for the program.

The Speaker closed by asking Senators and faculty colleagues to share their ideas for future Commencement speakers via email to the Speaker or Elizabeth Kassebaum (Executive Secretary to the Board of Trustees and Vice President for College Projects) or via an online form available on the Office of the President’s website <http://president.cofc.edu/administration/committee/index.php>.

Questions / Discussion

Alex Kasman, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM), asked the Speaker if he knows what the plans are for the George Street Inn.

The Speaker said that there are a few ideas for it. The property sits between a parking lot—what used to be a Chinese restaurant—and our arena. At present, it is a fully operational bed and breakfast, and one idea would be to move current guest accommodations operations located on Glebe Street to that location, opening up the spaces on Glebe Street for academic and other central campus office needs.

The Speaker added that a second building behind the King George Inn is not an historical property, and this affords us a future building site if needed.

B. Provost McGee (Topics: PDF | Presentation Slides: PPT) {FIX THIS LINK, MAN}

The Provost thanked all who participated in recent homecoming events, which were well attended by students and alumni, and at which enthusiasm for the College ran high.
**Academic Affairs Budget Development**

The Provost thanked all the Senators who participated in the recent special meeting focusing on budget matters and also those who made presentations and answered questions.

A number of budgetary matters have been under discussion in the Senate, the Faculty Budget Committee, the Academic Forum, and the Academic Council, and the Provost expressed his appreciation for the work of all involved.

Picking up on the Speaker's comments on budget requests to the state government, the Provost said the President has requested unrestricted funding ($2.2 million) that can be applied to our education and general budget. This is the first time, to his knowledge, he said, that the College has requested an increase in unrestricted funding in the last ten years. The Ways and Means Committee had tough questions on this request, he noted, but it is important, he added, to indicate to the state that if we are to maintain academic quality and at the same time hold down tuition, the state will have to allot more funding.

The Provost said that at upcoming meetings (scheduled tentatively for February 24 and March 2), the Faculty Budget Committee will work with Academic Affairs and senior leadership in hearings to review our priorities in the upcoming fiscal year's budget. The "twin goal," the Provost specified, is to articulate how the budget is tied to the strategic plan and how we will manage in an environment of limited resources. He reiterated that the process will be transparent, with meetings open to everyone.

**Peer and Aspirant Institutions**

Here the Provost referred to a presentation projected on screen (see slide 2, "Proposed and Peer Aspirant List").

The list of peer and aspirant institutions the Provost provided, he said, is pursuant to the desire of our regional accreditors to know the names of the institutions to which we compare ourselves and, importantly, also how we decide who the institutions are. These are hard questions at the College, he said, pointing out that we have used a series of peer and aspirant lists over the years. Our rapid growth over the last 25 years, our unusual nature as a Masters/comprehensive institution that skews toward undergraduate programming, our broad recruiting territory and other factors have made it difficult for us to identify peers. We have had some long standing peer lists, for instance, for the purposes of salary studies, and we have used other lists for other purposes: we have used athletic conferences to generate peer lists, for example. We cannot, however, tell SACSCOC that we use different lists for different purposes. We should, therefore, try to develop a master list of comparators for which we can articulate the rationale, while also recognizing that we will likely continue to find targeted peer and aspirant lists useful for specific purposes. For instance, he said, we might use different lists for looking at honors colleges or particular schools than we might when we are comparing something like purchasing programs, for which we would probably confined to South Carolina schools.

Jim Posey in Institutional Research, the Provost reported, compiled all our peer and aspirant comparison lists for the last 15+ years and subjected the list of institutions (both public and private) to Euclidean distance analysis in order to develop for the
executive team a ranked list of institutions that includes their relative distance from the College on several variables. The executive team then took the initial listing thus ranked and investigated them qualitatively on several factors: fit, cross-application status, regional presence in the Southeast, research match, admissions selectivity, urban location, history of use at the College as a comparator, and media rankings (college rankings in magazines). No institution compared well to us on all those dimensions, and many that seemed comparable are not among our most common comparators. The executive team decided to engage a qualitative process, looking at the list and distance ranking in order to compile a short master list of peer and aspirant institutions that can be agreed upon, published, and made available to SACSCOC on demand.

The lists, as represented in slide, are as follows:

**Proposed Peer List**
- Appalachian State University* (Public)
- Elon University* (Private)
- James Madison University* (Public)
- University of Mary Washington (Public)
- University of North Carolina Wilmington* (Public)
- University of Tampa (Private)

*Those marked with * above also list the College of Charleston as a their peer.*

**Proposed Aspirant List**
- Boston College (Private)
- College of William and Mary (Public)
- Miami University of Ohio (Public)
- University of New Hampshire (Public)

Many of the institutions on the list will be recognizable to those who have done service work involving use of peer and aspirant institution lists, he noted.

University of Mary Washington (Public) and University of Tampa (Private) come up a little less often in the lists ranked by Euclidean distance analysis, but the latter comes up in the analysis as the private institution most like us. Elon University has been our top private cross-applicant peer. James Madison, Appalachian State, Mary Washington, and UNC Wilmington are common public cross-application institutions. Proposed aspirants have tended in the past to be public institutions or, occasionally, private institutions of about the same size as us in undergraduate population, sometimes smaller.

Developing these lists has been challenging, but the Provost said that he did not feel it useful to get into the details. The plan is to settle on a master comparator list and make it public very soon but to still use targeted lists for targeted purposes. He offered the list at hand for the consideration of the Senate and offered to discuss the list during Q&A, if anyone has questions. The list, he said, has no impact on our identity.
December Commencement

The Provost reminded the Senate that he sent the campus an email a year ago in which he explained that a December 2015 commencement would be held and a study would follow that would indicate the viability of a 2016 December commencement (there having been a decline in the numbers of students who participate). The question was, he said, whether or not the resources and effort to put on a December commencement is worth the value it may bring to a relatively few students. The Provost said he thought we had reached a "tipping point" that would mean there would be no 2016 December commencement and was in favor of putting our efforts behind the unique spring ceremony.

175 students participated in the December 2015 ceremony, and students and families enjoyed the experience. Many students could not, for a variety of reasons, participate in the spring ceremony. The President decided to continue December commencements for another two years (2016 & 2017), providing that there will be a reconsideration on the December commencement's future in early 2018.

SACSCOC Accreditation Update

The Provost expressed his gratitude for the ongoing faculty work on the SACSCOC reaffirmation.

He announced that he will request a change to the late spring assessment planning calendar. Also, later this spring, he said, John Hardt, SACSCOC Regional Vice President, will make a campus visit to give advice and counsel on our preparations for reaffirmation.

Undergraduate Program Review

The Provost reported that deans and chairs received an email the Friday prior from Professor Brenton LeMesurier requesting assistance in completing a select number of undergraduate program reviews this academic year. The Provost thanked the Committee on Institutional Effectiveness for their work in developing a review plan. He asked for cooperation in undergraduate program reviews this year and moving forward, since this is, he said, to "employ a somewhat overused phrase,... an expected and a necessary component of our quality assurance work" at the College.

Curricular Alignment

The Provost said that the phrase, "curricular alignment," attempts to capture some issues that pertain to strategic planning, mission statements, and learning outcomes from course to program level. When the current strategic plan was developed in 2009, divisions, schools, departments, and offices also developed strategic plans aligned with the College’s plan. However, we have not insisted on those plans being updated and judged at to how they align with the institutional strategic plan.

A similar case is our institutional mission statement, with which the mission statements of all units are supposed to align, yet it is not clear that such alignment exists. Mission statements may have been devised and revised in an ad hoc fashion without approval by unit heads or, in the case of departments, without approval of departmental faculty. If a department has a mission statement, there needs to be evidence that the statement was approved.
Program learning outcomes provide yet another set of similar issues. While some new programs had learning outcomes approved in their development and approval phase, for older programs there may be no record of approved learning outcomes in Senate documents, yet there has been for some time an expectation that there will be approved learning outcomes that are "owned" by program directors or department chairs and by the faculty, since faculty are expected to adhere to the outcomes.

At the level of course learning outcomes, the issue, again, is the same. Recently approved courses have learning outcomes, and there is an expectation that these outcomes are owned and approved by program/department faculty, not developed and revised in an ad hoc way by individual faculty: "Learning outcomes at the course level belong to the faculty of the College, not to the individual faculty, just as the catalogue description for a course belongs to the institution, not the individual faculty member."

The Provost said that this group of issues is important because "in a mature system,... institutional strategic plans, divisional and other unit strategic plans, program strategic plans, mission statements at all levels, and learning outcomes align, at least at the level of not conflicting with one another and also in the sense that any conversant faculty member after examining them could explain in a straightforward way why there is consistency and, in fact, there is synergy among those different documents." The goal should be, he argued, that "what we actually deliver in a class is consistent with what people expect we're delivering at the level of the course and the program and, ultimately, the entire degree program."

Over the course of the spring semester, the Provost said, he will be asking for the faculty and the deans' assistance in building such alignment in academic units where it does not exist and documenting alignment where it does exist. He cautioned that for units without strategic plans or mission statements, or in units who have never discussed program learning objectives at all or in a number of years, there may be work to be done. For other units, due to work with secondary accreditors or work on program redevelopment, there will be no surprise in the request for work on curricular alignment. This work will help create what the Provost characterized as "the kind of maturity in our systems and processes that is now increasingly expected across accredited institutions of all shapes and sizes."

**New and Revised Academic Policies**

The time conflict form discussed at the January meeting, the Provost reported, no longer appears on the Registrar's website, and he is now formally withdrawing it. He added that those who may have a problem with the form being withdrawn should work with directors and deans to reach solutions for particular situations. The Provost expressed appreciation for those who worked on this issue.

A few more policies, he reported, remain under sustained review but approval is imminent: course numbering and syllabus policies.

**Comments on the Senate's Agenda**

The Provost expressed thanks to the members of the Honors College Committee and the Honors College Dean who worked to bring revisions back to the Senate.
On the General Education Committee's proposals, the Provost said there has been some confusion about the addition of new courses to the approved general education curriculum. In February 2013, the Provost noted, Associate Provost Lynne Ford passed on to the Senate at their regular meeting important information regarding recertification of general education courses and general education assessment. In the April regular meeting, then General Education Committee Chair Bob Mignone conveyed to the Senate that the committee was likely to recommend that, effective fall 2015 [here the Provost quoted directly from minutes], "the general education curriculum will remain fixed for a period of years that will represent one fall assessment cycle." This freeze, he reported, was administratively approved to last until fall 2017.

An announcement in the February 2015 Senate minutes, however, indicated that the freeze was to last until fall 2016. This announcement was incorrect. An announcement on the OAKS opening page in September 2015 confirmed the correct end-of-freeze date as fall 2017.

The Senate has approved some courses for the general education curriculum that will take effect at the end of the freeze. General education proposals to be considered at the present Senate meeting, the Provost said, if approved are subject to the freeze in the same way.

The Provost added that the effective date for changes in the curriculum is complicated somewhat by the college's needs in relation to SACSCOC reaffirmation. Therefore, the conversation is ongoing about the fall 2017 start date for those approved general education courses that are currently on hold. The Provost said that he has "great gratitude" for all the work relating to general education over the past few years, from developing general education learning outcomes to the reapproval of general education courses to the ARG (Assessment Reading Group) assessment.

The Provost said that as a result of this work, "some folks have been re-excited by our current general education curriculum and what it can do, while others who remember what some people call the 'general education wars' of previous decades have a bit of post traumatic stress disorder every time they hear 'general education' said aloud."

Given the passing of several years and the reinvention of general education at the level of learning outcomes and assessment, it is a good time to begin a preliminary conversation about "next steps" on general education, using what we have learned from the ARGs through this year. Periodically we need to have, he said, a serious consideration of general education to judge whether or not it still makes sense. He pointed out that our current general education's core dates back to spring 1971, when faculty at the College approved it, and though amended since then, it is still discernible as the 1971 curriculum. We need to scrutinize our general education, he said, no matter what the outcomes of our assessment of it may be.

The Provost specified that he has a particular interest in the integration of general education and our major and minor programs and how this bears out and reinforces our unique identity as a Liberal Arts and Sciences university. After the spring semester ends and before May 15, the Provost said he plans to meet with the current Speaker, previous Speakers, current and previous chairs of the General Education
and Curriculum committees for a conversation about how we might during, but especially after, the current reaffirmation "explore and assess" whether our current approach to general education is the right one or whether we might consider other options. He assured the Senate that general education will be "carefully and transparently discussed."

On a different note, the Provost said that there will be a brown bag lunch on March 29 in Craig 108 to continue a productive discussion about our institutional mission and our Liberal Arts and Sciences identity begun at recent brown bag discussion. The Provost closed by reminding Senators and guests that a 40-foot Tyrannosaurus Rex skeleton now graces the School of Sciences and Mathematics building and is well worth seeing. He thanked new faculty colleagues Professors Manning and Egerton for the inspiring display

Questions/Discussion

Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), asked about an item on the Provost’s PDF list of topics for the night, to which the Provost did not speak: "Trujillo Program Anniversary."

The Provost replied that he would concur with what the Speaker already said on the BOT resolution on Trujillo. He added that the College remains committed to the Trujillo program, and he pointed out that there have been conversations in some of the schools about how the program might be revitalized with new ways to create offerings there.

Senator Kelly asked what the status is of those conversations.

The Provost said this question might be best asked of representatives of the School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs, the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, or other schools involved. He asked if any Deans present could speak to these efforts, and getting no reply, told Senator Kelly that he will get a report from the committee and share it with him but added that he doesn't think the committee has completed its work.

Senator Kelly asked a second question. Regarding the proposed master peer and aspirant institutions list, has there been any investigation of CofC salary in relation to this newly proposed group.

The Provost noted that current Faculty Compensation Committee Chair Cyndi May was not present to speak to this, but he observed that almost all the institutions on the peer list and some on the aspirant list have been for some time part of the list for salary comparison. He added that he would not recommend using as small asset as represented by the list on the slide for salary comparisons, as, among other things, some institutions do not report salaries annually. The Provost said that Senator Kelly made a good point: we need to know on what basis of comparison we consider other institutions our peers or aspirant peers. He said that we dropped Western Washington from the list on the slide after consultations, since there is no geographic comparison to be made, even though they are on our salary comparison list.

Senator Kelly speculated that in relation to James Madison (JMU), an institution that compares themselves to us (signified by the asterisk), the College probably makes
their salaries look very good. The Provost replied that in different years we have been better or worse in comparison with JMU. Within a comparison set of 20 institutions, we have been as high as 12 and as low as 18, the Provost said.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, said that she sits with the Compensation Committee and there has been no salary comparison yet, she said, with the list on the slide. She specified two factors to keep in mind in this query. We employ CUPA-HR (College and University Professional Association for Human Resources) data for comparisons, and we are limited in how the list can be adjusted, due to their agreements with their reporting institutions.

We also use IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) data, which was used to produce the Euclidean distance analysis the Provost mentioned. We have this data for 2014-15 (we won't have 2015-16 data for some time), and we will have CUPA-HR data for 2015-16 in a few weeks, at which point we will be a position to make some decisions about the nature of our future salary studies.

There were no further questions.

5. Old Business

A. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual (Jason Vance, Chair) and The Honors College Committee (Phyllis Jestice, Chair)

Motion to Change Faculty and Administrative Manual for Composition and Duties of Honors College Committee (PDF)

The Speaker noted that this proposed by-laws change was brought before the Senate in the December regular meeting, discussed at some length, and returned to the committee for further revision [see December minutes, pp. 16-20].

Chair of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual (By-Laws) Jason Vance thanked the Senate for its comments on the prior version of the motion and thanked colleagues on the Honors College Committee and the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration for their subsequent work on the proposal. He projected a document summing up the motion and recent changes to it and providing rationale and supporting charts.

As laid out in the document, Professor Vance noted that the proposed change to increase the size of committee from 5 to 7 faculty members, representing each of the schools seeks to make it easier to achieve a quorum, reduce the individual burden of reviewing large number of student applications/essays, and to provide broader representation/expertise. With the proposal, SHSS would have two representatives, one for Humanities, and one for Social Sciences. Additionally, four of the committee members will have taught
“recently” in the Honors College (rather than in a set number of years) to ensure sufficient candidates for membership in the committee.

A friendly amendment from December Senate meeting was incorporated, so that "Honors faculty fellow" was stricken in favor of "other Honors faculty and staff" in section 3.b.13.a.

For Article V, Section 3.B.13.b, "Duties," Professor Vance outlined the following proposed changes to existing by-laws language:

1. The same as presented in December: HCC does not make the final decision for selecting students for admission to the Honors College

3-4. The same as presented in December: revised to clarify duties, and reduce redundancy between sections 3 and 4.

3. Friendly amendment from December meeting incorporated: "To review and make policy decisions" stricken in favor of "To review and apply policy."

4. Friendly amendment from December meeting incorporated: "To review and rule upon" stricken in favor of "To review and make recommendations on." Professor Vance added that this change was in response to Interim Registrar Mary Bergstrom’s concerns expressed in December.

5. The same as presented in December: the HCC serves as an advisory committee to the Honors Dean, and therefore may be requested to advise on a diverse range of topics pertaining to the Honors College.

Professor Vance reported that Senator Rick Heldrich (SSM) expressed concerns in the December meeting [see December minutes, pp. 17-18] about the school representation scheme proposed in the motion, alleging bias in the Honors College against SSM and that SSM has been underrepresented in the Honors College. Senator Heldrich felt that the motion’s allowing two representatives from SHHS (one Humanities and one for Social Sciences) reinforces the bias, Professor Vance said.

In response to Senator Heldrich’s concerns, Professor Vance reported, Jannette Finch gathered data for the committee on the trends in school representation on the committee over the past few years in order to see if the proposal might bear these concerns about representation. The findings are presented in a chart on page 2 of the document, reflecting committee representation from 2010-16 and revealing that out of the 30 total committee members serving in the time period, about 17 were from SHSS; one was from School of Business (SB); four were the School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs (SLCWA); and four were from SSM. Over the last six years, 57%
of the committee was composed of SHHS faculty. The current proposal, with its provision for fixed representation and SHHS guaranteed two members, would half the SHHS representation (bringing it down to 26 or 27%). The current proposal, furthermore, would ensure that 1/7 of the committee would be represented by each of the the other remaining schools, and there will always be a representative from each of the remaining schools. Professor Vance conceded that such representation may not get at what Senator Heldrich might consider the root of his concern, but it will reduce the representation of SHHS relative to the other schools.

Professor Vance noted that more striking figures on school representation on the committee can be seen in a year by year account of the past six years. In any given year, some schools have no representation at all on the committee. In the last two years, for instance, SSM has had no representation, and SB has had only one representative in the last six years. The proposal, he said, would ensure representation from all schools.

Professor Vance at this time called for questions and discussion.

Questions / Discussion

Andy Shedlock, Senator - Biology, thanked Professor Vance and asked how the numbers he just discussed line up against the students in the Honors College parsed by school.

Professor Vance replied that he does not know the figures for graduates by school or how this lines up with school faculty representation on the committee. The Honors College Committee’s justification for the motion, in part, has to do with the technical nature of reviewing applications and the expertise of the reviewers, correcting a problem that has occurred in years when they have lacked representation from particular schools, such as reviewing a science student’s application without an SSM representative. In such situations, the committee has had to rely on outside evaluation. Professor Vance agreed that Senator Shedlock’s question might be useful to pursue.

Rick Heldrich, Senator - SSM, offered a clarification of his position. He said that his concern is not just with SHHS representation but also with SLCWA representation as proposed in the motion. SHHS representation, added to SLACWA representation would make for 43% representation “by that cohort of faculty,” which he asserted “is still too high if your goal is to have the Honors College be representative of the entire faculty.” He added that he does not see the argument for having Humanities, Social Science, and Foreign Language represented but only one person to represent Physical Science, Life Science, and Mathematics.
Tom Ross, Senator - SHHS, said he was curious about the long-standing dynamics contributing to the disparities of school representation on the committee. While he said he supports diversity of representation on the committee, he also wonders if it will create problems. Does the historical disparity arise from light volunteering for the committee? Does that disparity reflect the proportion of courses that are typically offered in the Honors College, perhaps explaining why faculty from some schools are more invested in the program? Have faculty from other schools been turned away from the committee in favor of SHHS faculty?

Professor Vance replied that Senator Ross posed important questions. How members are selected for the committee, he said, was discussed in the last meeting of By-Laws. He said that future consideration might be given to whether or not it would be worthwhile to consider school appointments of faculty to the committee, rather than relying on volunteers assigned by the Nominations and Elections committee. This might ensure that schools select faculty that are strong representatives of their interests.

Professor Vance invited Phills Jestice, Chair of the Honors College Committee (HCC), to respond as well. She said that one of the important issues was the expectation that there is a significant number of members on the committee that have experience in the Honors College. In its current configuration, that faculty is disproportionately from SHHS, in large part because of the first-year English composition requirement of all students and the sophomore year-long Western Civilization course, which draws for the most part, on SHHS faculty. It has been at times difficult, she said, to find faculty to volunteer from some of the underrepresented schools.

Senator Ross (SHHS) followed up by saying that his question was mainly pitched toward ascertaining whether or not we have an understanding of the causes of disparate representation in the first place, since knowing these causes would be important to the success of the committee. And he mentioned in particular the potential problem of finding faculty to participate.

Professor Vance asked Professor Jestice if she had a response to Senator Ross, and she replied that she hopes the Nominations and Elections committee will be proactive in getting the word out about the committee's new representative structure and will actively solicit new members.

Professor Vance, turning to the duties of the committee to review applications, said is that currently, for a number of reasons, Honors College Dean Folds-Bennett ends up reviewing a number of applications on her own. The new representative committee structure would mean that this reviewing
will be distributed across school representatives and to a larger number of individuals.

**Provost McGee** asked Professor Vance if the intent, with the exception of the split of SHHS into Humanities and Social Science representation, is to represent the other schools as discrete entities. Professor Vance agreed. Provost McGee then asked if the reference in the proposal to “Education” is, in fact, to be the “School of Education, Health, and Human Performance” (SEHHP). Professor Vance agreed.

The Provost asked for and received unanimous consent that the document be corrected so that it uses the exact names of the schools, with the exception of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, attending to commas and word placement.

**Senator Heldrich** (SSM) asserted that adding two more members to the committee, given that a major role of the committee is to review applications, would be a helpful addition. He added that he does not understand what is so particular about the work of the committee that it requires representation of the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Languages.

In addition, he asserted that the Western Civilization course could benefit a great deal from greater participation of the Sciences in the program. He also asserted that this course impedes the progress of Pre-med, Chemistry, and Biology majors in the Honors College.

Professor Jestice replied that she hopes that a major revision of the course will happen.

Senator Heldrich riposted that the need for such a revision would have been obvious much sooner with stronger representation of the Sciences and Mathematics on the committee.

**The Speaker**, at this point, noted that, since the motion was previously brought to the Senate, the motion at hand is essentially an amendment or series of amendments to the original motion, some friendly, some added through further consultation of the bylaws committee. The Senate, he said, if it so chooses, will need to vote on these amendments, after which it should approach the matter as it does all bylaws changes being submitted from a committee.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, queried a point of order: the Senate will have to agree to amend the previous motion to include this new language? The Speaker agreed.
The Speaker asked for a second and received it. The Speaker asked for further discussion. Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS, called the question, which was seconded, and agreed to on unanimous voice vote.

The amended version of the motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

The motion now stood as presented by Professor Vance with the unanimously consented edits asked for by the Provost above:

**Motion to Change Faculty and Administrative Manual for Composition and Duties of Honors College Committee**

*With specific changes to the FAM Bylaws: Article V, Section 3.B.13.a-b.*

13. Honors College Committee

   a. Composition: Seven faculty members (one representative each from Humanities; Social Sciences; Science and Mathematics; Business; Arts; Languages, Cultures and World Affairs; and Education, Health, and Human Performance; four of whom shall have taught recently in the Honors College), and two student representatives, one junior and one senior, chosen by the Honors Committee from students nominated by the Honors student body. The expectation is that faculty committee members will serve a two-year term; student member terms are one year and they are eligible for re-election. The Dean of the Honors College (or the Dean's designee) is an *ex-officio* non-voting member of this committee; the dean may also invite other Honors faculty and staff to participate as an *ex-officio* non-voting members.

   b. Duties:

   (1) To review student applications for admission into the Honors College.

   (2) To review faculty course proposals and select Honors College courses.

   (3) To review and apply policy concerning the Honors College curriculum, admission and retention standards, and course selection procedures.

   (4) To review and make recommendations on written requests from students, faculty members, schools, or departments for exceptions from Honors College regulations and requirements.

   (5) To review information from the Dean of the Honors College concerning Honors College admissions, retention,
curriculum, and other matters pertaining to the Honors College.

(Rev. Pending)

The Speaker noted that the motion does not require a second since it has been brought by a committee, but it requires a two-thirds majority vote to pass because it is a change to the bylaws. The Speaker then asked for further discussion.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked if the Provost’s unanimously approved edits (see above) would appear on screen before the Senate votes. Professor Vance replied that since the document projected was in PDF format the changes could not be made but they will be part of the record.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, asserted that the crucial point to consider is the number of Honors College graduates from each school. "Word of mouth," he said, is that the Honors College is more suited for students in SHHS than in SSM. He added that, looking at the offerings this semester in the Honors College, the majority are in Humanities and Social Sciences. He said that he would like some reassurance from the Honors College that the program is owned by the entirety of the College of Charleston.

Senator Krasnoff (Philosophy) added that without numbers, we are relying on anecdotal evidence. He asserted that "the general anecdotal sense is that there are way more Science and Math students among the honors students than Humanities students." He pointed out that the discussion underway is about the committee, not all aspects of the program, and a primary duty of the committee is admissions. The committee, composed as it has been, has clearly been admitting a large number of Science and Math students. Thus, he argued, the claim of bias is somewhat strange.

In the Western Civilization program, Senator Krasnoff added, his Philosophy colleague Richard Nunan has offered History of Science content, "and the students hate that more than anything else." The courses need to be interdisciplinary, and the faculty participating have sought interdisciplinarity. In his estimation, he said, the Honors College would be very happy to receive course proposals from the Sciences and Mathematics.

Senator Kunkle followed up. He argued that one reason why there might be fewer proposals from Science and Math is that there is less flexibility in Science and Math majors then there is in Humanities majors. There is less room for special topics courses in the former. The perception is that it is harder to be an Honors student as a Science or Math major.
Bill Manaris (Computer Science), said that he taught an Honors College course with a faculty member from Music, and they sought students to do research with them, but were met with students’ saying that they have no time for additional work. Professor Manaris said that the curriculum is so tight that there is no space for the kind of research students do in the sciences.

Senator Shedlock (Biology) agreed with Professor Manaris, adding that one of the unique features and draws of the College of Charleston is the ability for undergraduates to do research in the Sciences and Mathematics. Some of our best students are in the Honors College, yet, he asserted, there is an irony in the fact that due to "gridlock," talented Science and Math students in the Honors College have less of an opportunity to position themselves to deliver high quality research then do those less talented or motivated students who are not in the Honors College, "especially due to courses like Western Civ." He said, based on his experience, this is a real phenomenon.

Daniel Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, said that there are data available on graduates of the Honors College broken down by school. He reported that in 2015, there were six graduates from SEHHP, 12 from the School of the Arts, 14 from SB, 15 from SLCWA, 44 from SHHS, and, the plurality, 55 from SSM. Thus, he said, there are a high number of SSM students able to complete their programs in the Honors College. We cannot say, from these numbers, he added, whether there might be others who have been precluded from getting through their programs in the Honors College, however.

Senator Shedlock replied that "getting through" is not the issue, but rather students’ competitive footing if they are not able to deliver very high quality bachelors essays. This is due, he asserted, to a great deal of extra work required in the Honors College and the timing of the courses they take. The timing of coursework, he specified, is critical in helping students build the flexibility they need to get into position to become investigators in their senior year.

Beth Meyer-Bernstein, Senator - SSM and Associate Dean - Honors College, offered several replies to the discussion. The required courses in the Honors College map well onto general education requirements at the College, she said. Students should not have to take extra coursework, except in order to fulfill the research requirement. Honors students get started in their first year with work in research labs, much sooner than do non-Honors students, she observed. She added that the Honors College realizes that the Western Civilization course is difficult and is a "roadblock" for many of the Honors College’s strong science students but said that a careful examination of the
curriculum is underway. The proposed new makeup of the committee will help with that work by providing the expertise of a faculty member from SSM, as well as from the other schools.

Honors College Dean Trisha Folds-Bennett added to the conversation on the school distribution of Honors College students. About 40% of entering students are from SSM, which is a consistent proportion from first year to graduation. Our Honors College reflects national norms in honors colleges, she reported: only about 50% of students complete the Honors College requirements, due to a number of reasons. She observed that students are just as likely to exit the Honors College due to the Calculus requirement as they are due to other factors, and this is the requirement they dislike the most. Exit surveys of students leaving the Honors College and focus groups of graduating seniors bear this out: they are just as likely to leave due to a requirement in SSM as to requirements in the Honors College.

Dean Folds-Bennett added that the Honors College understands that the 6-hour Western Civilization requirement in the fall and spring is challenging, but not just for students in SSM. This curriculum, she said, is under careful review, for which the Honors College has sought feedback from SSM faculty. She added that her own background is not in the Humanities, but in the Social Sciences, which she said is a discipline also not well represented in the Honors College. She stated flatly that she does not bring a Humanities bias to the operations and decisions of the Honors College.

Dean Folds-Bennett also said that the Honors College considers undergraduate research central to their mission, and to that end offers an entire first-year class devoted to getting students from all disciplines started in research. Students are devoted to research throughout their programs and this comes through in the results, in their successful applications to graduate school and in their national awards.

**Professor Vance**, speaking as an SSM at large Senator, said he supports the added representation of SSM in the proposal. Continuing with the current by-laws arrangement (not adopting the amendment to the by-laws, in other words), would probably mean trends of weak representation of SSM and schools other that SHHS will likely continue. If, he argued, there is any bias in the current arrangement, that, too, would perhaps continue. Guarantees of school representation are needed. Senator Vance suggested that an amendment might be offered to apportion seats on the committee in relation to Honors students’ schools.
The Speaker at this point noted that any number of actions might be taken, such as amendments proposed or returning the motion again to the committee for further work.

Elaine Worzala, Senator - Finance, suggested that the Senate vote to pass the motion, with the understanding that the representation scheme could be changed as needed as future experience made more obvious what the needs are. Representation is the issue, she said, but there should be a minimum of one member from each school. She suggested approval in order to "move this along."

Senator Rick Heldrich (SSM) asserted that there are two solutions to his problem with the motion. One is to reduce SHHS representation to one member (not two), but this would make the committee have an even number, which is undesirable. Another option would be, he said, to increase SSM representation to three seats, which would maintain an odd number.

Responding to Senator Worzala's idea that additional seats could be added at a later time, he said he would rather add seats now and reduce them later if needed, particularly at a time in which the program is contemplating many changes for which added SSM representation could be very helpful.

Senator Heldrich then moved that the motion be amended to split SSM representation into three seats, one each to represent the following areas: Physical Science (Physics and Chemistry), Life Sciences (Geology and Biology), and Computer Science/Mathematics. The motion was seconded.

Discussion now began on Senator Heldrich's motion.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked why it is absolutely critical to have an odd number on a committee. Are there not other ways of addressing, he asked, what are likely very few disagreements resulting in tied votes?

The Speaker asked HCC Chair Phylis Jestice to respond, and she replied that it is traditional to have an odd number of committee members in case of a close vote. This was the committee's logic.

Senator Shaver labeled this reply a "this is how it has always been done argument" and said a full consideration might also include a reconsideration of the traditional odd number requirement.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHHS, said he did not see logic of three seats for SSM and said he would, therefore, vote against the amendment, and should the amendment fail, he would, if one was offered, vote for an amendment for two seats for SSM. He added that he does not see the logic of the implication that
seats for SHSS and SLCWA amount to a single block. He agreed with Senator Shaver that the odd number should not be a requirement.

Senator Heldrich followed up. SHSS and SLCWA, he observed, used to be together in a single school, hence, his lumping them together.

**Senator Krasnoff** (Philosophy) asked for a clarification. Senator Heldrich’s motion put Geology in with Biology under "Life Sciences," but could it not also fit under "Physical Sciences"? Senator Heldrich expressed ambivalence as to where it should be categorized, and Senator Krasnoff used this ambivalence to point out that the methodological distinction doesn’t seem to be very important, after all.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asserted that, if we are making finer distinctions within schools, the School of Business (SB) is also woefully underrepresented, considering the large number of SB students in the Honors College.

**Annette Watson**, Senator - Political Science, pointed out that it would be very difficult to schedule full meetings with nine different committee members.

**Bill Manaris**, Computer Science, argued that school representation on the HCC should be proportional to the number of Honors College students in each school.

Professor Vance added here that the numbers for Honors College students discussed so far are only graduation numbers.

**Senator Kunkle** (SSM) noted, based on his experience serving on Nominations and Elections, stated that, apart from whether or not the number of committee members in the amendment is desirable, it may be difficult to seat the committee.

Professor Vance observed, again, school appointment of seats on the committee might be a better arrangement, though this is not on the table at present.

Senator Kunkle said that his point was not a criticism of the proposal per se, but a caution about the feasibility of implementing the proposal. The more seats there are and the more restrictions there are about who can be seated, the harder it is to seat the committee.

**Alem Teklu**, Senator - Physics/Astronomy, asserted that he did not like the way in which Senator Heldrich’s amendment breaks down representation within SSM. He asserted that three seats for SSM makes sense, but they should not be specified as to area: the three seats should be expected to represent the school, not different areas with it.
The Speaker inquired if this was being offered as a friendly amendment to the amendment on the floor.

**Senator Teklu said it was and Senator Heldrich accepted it as such. The amendment to Senator Heldrich’s motion to amend specified that SSM would have three at-large representatives on the committee.**

Idee Winfield, Senator- SHHS, asked of the Senator Teklu’s amendment, why there would need to be three representatives, since the logic of Heldrich’s motion to amend the motion brought by By-Laws is that SSM breaks into three distinct areas that need separate representation.

She asserted that two at large seats from SSM might be better.

Professor Vance said that the three seats might still stand if they are thought of as representing Honors College students in SSM.

**The Provost interjected here.** The Senate had, to his mind, "gone down a rabbit hole." The College has not, for purposes such as the one at hand, ever divided schools by disciplines or orientations, he asserted. Rather, there has always been a preference for the simpler approach of not splitting up school units. The present amendment, he said, creates problems in seating the committee, problems of size and scale, and the Senate had been sidetracked from the original goal of creating cross-college representation on the committee. There can be no tidy solution to representation. He counseled that the Senate reject the amendment and amend the original motion to seat one committee member per school.

Alex Kasman, Senator - SSM, argued that part of the problem in the discussion originates in the original motion’s splitting up of disciplines in SHHS. We could specify, he suggested, one member per school with an additional member (to bring the committee to seven) that could rotate in line with some other dimension, like number of students, number of courses, etc.

Daniel Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, said he agrees with bringing the representation on the committee down to one per school. He reported that, looking over the data for the past three years, SSM predominated in Honors College graduates for two years, SHHS for one. If we go with a proportional representation scheme, he asserted, the Honors College committee will be returning to this issue, potentially, year after year. He suggested that the Senate vote the present amendment (specifying three at-large representative from SSM) down, and then amend the original motion to one representative per school.
Honors College Committee Chair Philis Jestice added here that such a move to bring the representation down to one member per school, is not far out of line with the desires of the committee.

**The Provost called the question, it was seconded, and secured a unanimous voice vote.**

**The amendment to the By-Laws- sponsored motion brought by Senator Heldrich and subsequently amended by Senator Teklu was defeated by a unanimous voice vote.**

The discussion turned again to the original motion as represented above, featuring representation of one member from all schools, save SHHS, which was split into two seats, one for Humanities, one for Social Sciences.

**Joe Kelly,** Senator - SHSS, moved that the motion be amended: SHHS should not have two seats, but one. The motion was seconded.

Discussion was now opened on Senator Kelly’s amendment.

**Philis Jestice** suggested a friendly amendment to Senator Kelly’s of adding one member to the committee (for a total of seven) at-large from the College. Senator Kelly accepted the amendment.

The pertinent section of the motion with Senator Kelly’s amendment would now read:

a. Composition: Seven faculty members [one representative each from: Humanities and Social Sciences; Science and Mathematics; Business; Arts; Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs; and Education, Health, and Human Performance; plus one member at-large (four of whom shall have taught recently in the Honors College)], two student representatives (one junior and one senior) chosen by the Honors Committee from students nominated by the Honors student body.

**The Provost called the question, and it was seconded.**

Senator Krasnoff (Philosophy), raised a point of order. Is the Provost a member of the body, and does he have a right to make a motion such as calling the question?

The Provost affirmed that he is a member of the body, and though non-voting, he has privileges to make motions.

Senator Krasnoff queried if guest in general have the ability to make motions. The Speaker verified with the Parliamentarian that guests cannot make motions.
The calling of the question was approved on voice vote (not unanimous).

The amendment by Senator Kelly (one representative to the committee from each academic school, plus an additional member at large) was approved by unanimous voice vote.

There was no further discussion.

The Speaker pointed out that as a change in the by-laws, to be approved, the motion would requires 2/3 majority vote.

**The motion as amended by Senator Kelly was approved on unanimous voice vote.**

The Speaker noted that the change just approved will have to be ratified by the full faculty before it goes into effect.

The full text of the approved by-laws amendment is as follows:

**Motion to Change Faculty and Administrative Manual for Composition and Duties of Honors College Committee**

*With specific changes to the FAM Bylaws: Article V, Section 3.B.13.a-b.*

13. Honors College Committee

   a. Composition: Seven faculty members [one representative each from: Humanities and Social Sciences; Science and Mathematics; Business; Arts; Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs; and Education, Health, and Human Performance; plus one member at-large (four of whom shall have taught recently in the Honors College)], two student representatives (one junior and one senior) chosen by the Honors Committee from students nominated by the Honors student body. The expectation is that faculty committee members will serve a two-year term; student member terms are one year and they are eligible for re-election. The Dean of the Honors College (or the Dean’s designee) is an ex-officio non-voting member of this committee; the dean may also invite other Honors faculty and staff to participate as an ex-officio non-voting member.

   b. Duties:

      (1) To review student applications for admission into the Honors College.
(2) To review faculty course proposals and select Honors College courses.

(3) To review and apply policy concerning the Honors College curriculum, admission and retention standards, and course selection procedures.

(4) To review and make recommendations on written requests from students, faculty members, schools, or departments for exceptions from Honors College regulations and requirements.

(5) To review information from the Dean of the Honors College concerning Honors College admissions, retention, curriculum, and other matters pertaining to the Honors College.

(Rev. Pending)

6. New Business

A. General Education Committee
   1. Requests for Humanities General Education Certification
      a. ARTH 230 - Islamic Art and Architecture (PDF)
      b. ARTH 278 - Renaissance and Baroque Architecture (PDF)
      c. ARTH 294 - City and Cinema (PDF)
      d. JWST 220 - History of Israel (PDF)
      e. JWST 305 - Israeli Cinema (PDF)
      f. PHIL 105 - Contemporary Moral Issues (PDF)
      g. PHIL 252 - Topics in Continental Philosophy (PDF)

Questions/Discussion

Jannette Finch, Senator - Libraries and Paul Collins, Senator - Theater and Dance, both asked about the effective date of these courses if they are approved.

The Speaker noted that these courses, if approved, will join a group of other courses that the Senate has approved for general education credit but have not entered the catalog yet.

Provost McGhee said that, as previously approved by Provost Hynd, the courses would go into effect in fall 2017. But, as he noted in his remarks, an optimal starting date in terms of SACSCOC reaffirmation is under investigation.

The proposals were approved on unanimous voice vote.

B. Foreign Language Alternative Program Proposal
   - Proposal distributed February 2: PDF
The Speaker noted that the latest version of the motion was distributed via email to Senators earlier in the day. He also handed out hard copies of the same. The latest version included friendly amendments not present in the version of the proposal distributed with the Senate agenda on February 2.

**Associate Dean Morrison** explained that the foreign language alternative program has been in place for many years. It has only recently become apparent, however, that the College should have been assessing the program all along but has not been. The present proposal represents an attempt, through faculty committees and through the Senate, to add transparency and make it clear to students what courses they can take. If the proposal is approved, we will be able to produce assessment data from students who have completed the program, which will then allow appropriate changes to be made to the program based on data.

The basic way in which the program works has not been changed in the proposal before the Senate, she added. What has been added is a mechanism for assessment, including student learning outcomes, which had not been in place before. The Senate has already approved one list of courses for the requirement, and, should the proposal be approved, departments and programs will be able to recertify courses, in a similar way to the recent recertification for general education. Departments and programs will submit courses to be certified only if they desire that those courses be added to the list.

**Questions / Discussion**

**Alex Kasman**, Senator - SSM, characterized the foreign language alternative program as “a way around” Senate-approved general education requirements. He asked if the existence of the program is subject to Senate approval or required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Associate Dean Morrison explained that the program is for students who have a documented foreign language learning disability and who are approved through the Students Needing Access Parity (SNAP) office to take foreign language alternative courses.

Senator Kasman countered that there are no alternatives to all of the other general education requirements.

Associate Provost Lynne Ford, self-styled "Keeper of Gen Ed, Currently," replied that the ADA requires us to provide students with an accommodation based on documented disability. The nature of the accommodation is in the purview of the Senate, however. The proposal under consideration is a curricular proposal for a particular mode of accommodation that is in line with the most prevalent accommodations at other schools: course substitution for required courses in foreign language. While the Senate can decide on the form of accommodation, it cannot forgo accommodation.

The Provost added that there was a lengthy faculty discussion of this accommodation in the Faculty Assembly in 1988, which, he pointed out, occurred prior to the ADA. The faculty and the College, he said, desired to accommodate
students for whom second language acquisition at college age is extremely difficult to the point of being practically impossible.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - SHHS, asked about departments that have classes that might fit the bill but whose classes are not on the list. Will these programs be asked to provide courses to be certified?

Associate Dean Morrison explained that if the proposal before the body is approved, there is a form that can be filled out by departments and programs that wish to have courses certified as foreign language alternatives. The process is similar to the general education recertification but with a simpler form. The General Education committee will evaluate the requests and bring approved courses to the Senate for approval and addition to the catalog.

**Senator Kelly** also noted that in the document, in section III “Regions of the World,” item C., ”Europe” is followed by a parenthetical ”(e.g. UK, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Spain, Ancient Greece, Ancient Rome).” The other regions identified in the list do not carry similar parenthetical examples, and he asked if this parenthetical could be removed.

Associate Dean Morrison said the committee will take it as a friendly amendment to strike the parenthetical following ”Europe.”

Associate Provost Ford said that the footnote following the parenthetical does provide important information, however, since it explains what former categories in the current system of course substitution are now encapsulated by the word ”Europe.”

**Senator Kelly** asked, on another tack, if there might be a bias against English language speaking countries in the policy.

Associate Dean Morrison said that this will be up to the Senate. It is, she said, a "deep question." We will have to see, she said, what course proposal requests come through and take it from there.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, asked what the timeline for recertification will be, if the proposal is approved.

Associate Dean Morrison replied that she hopes courses can be re-certified in time for the fall catalog.

Senator Krasnoff asked if this would violate the general education moratorium.

Provost McGee replied that the general education freeze currently in place is there to facilitate developing good assessment practices. Since the current foreign language alternative program is ”the antithesis of effective program assessment,” the moratorium will not apply in this case, so that we have time to gather baseline data on the foreign language alternative program.

Dr. Divya Bhati, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, reinforced Provost McGee’s reply. ”Zero assessment” on this program, she said, is unacceptable going into reaffirmation.

**Senator Krasnoff** followed up, pursuing a different question: have we identified a post test that clearly matches the proposed learning outcomes? He said that if he were designing a course to be added to the list of foreign language alternatives, he
might want to see the post test. Or, he asked, will the outcomes themselves be sufficient for course design purposes?

Associate Dean Morrison replied that if a course is designed to meet the learning outcomes, it will also match up with the post test.

Senator Krasnoff then cited a particular sentence from the assessment section of the document: "The scale is designed to measure intercultural attitudes, skills, and knowledge."

He questioned whether measuring intercultural attitudes, skills, and knowledge fits with the idea of "the role that language plays in culture" [student learning outcome 1]. He suggested that these two are not exactly aligned.

Associate Provost Ford replied that assessing this program is different from assessing general education courses because students making use of the program are not all in the same courses. When we assess foreign language in general education, she said, we assess 202 (whatever the language is) and we use the same signature assignment across sections as the assessment artefact. With the foreign language alternative program, since students can choose a variety of courses, we are assessing the totality of the program's outcomes, not individual course outcomes. We will be employing, she said, a scale developed at Purdue (which we still have to finish customizing). The assessment will be a student self-assessment of their knowledge, attitudes, and skills, on pre and post tests.

Senator Krasnoff said he assumes we are not legislating this particular instrument if the proposal is approved by the Senate.

Associate Provost Ford agreed. What the Senate is considering and approving in proposal will be, she specified, the learning outcomes, the structure of the requirement, and permission to start the certification process. This will allow us to have something that we can assess in relatively short order, she hopes.

An exchange followed between Senator Rick Heldrich (SSM) and the Provost regarding the policy at hand but also, more broadly, faculty governance.

Senator Heldrich said that he is not sure how he feels about "waiving the general requirements for one thing and holding everybody else at the College of Charleston hostage to a decision made by somebody who is no longer here."

The Provost replied that Senator Heldrich's was "an extremely fair question," but added that former Provost George Hynd did not enact the foreign language alternative proposal unilaterally. Rather, it was a product of faculty discussion in the General Education Committee at the time, which was chaired by Bob Mignone (who was not present at the meeting and could not contribute, therefore, to this discussion). The point, the Provost said, was to get us through a complete assessment cycle in order to develop a baseline for future assessment of this particular program. While our general education assessment has now had a few cycles, we are starting from scratch, he said, with the foreign language alternative program. Coming into reaffirmation with as much data and as mature a process as possible is important for the College's success in reaffirmation. "But I get your point," he said.
Senator Heldrich replied, “maybe...” He asserted that what passes as "approved by the faculty" may actually be more accurately characterized as faculty acquiescence. Some decisions have been made by a single committee, he charged, or an Associate Provost, but not the Senate. When the college represents the curriculum as controlled by the faculty, "that should mean that it is voted on by this body, and I don’t believe that has happened in this case.”

Associate Dean Morrison added here that the Senate will be voting on this proposal at the present meeting.

Senator Heldrich countered by saying the Senate "will be voting on a binding that we never voted to accept” in the first place.

The Provost said that he is a little confused by the question and asked Senator Heldrich if he is referring to the foreign language alternative program, to which the latter replied, “no; I’m referring to the statement that often is made that 'this is now the rule because the faculty has decided it,' when it might just be one committee that decided it, or it might be one Associate Provost who decided it.”

The Provost replied that in this particular case, he agreed with Senator Heldrich that there was a committee recommendation to the Provost, who then made a final decision.

As part of our shared governance, faculty control the curriculum, he agreed, ”but some time, place, and manner decisions very much belong to the administration.” "In this particular case," he continued, "no one’s saying that a faculty decision is not going to go into the catalog. There was a decision made administratively in consultation with the faculty that said we were going to restrict when we would do this.” The Provost said that an objection might be made to the Provost’s having that kind of administrative power, or one might say the Provost made a bad decision. Either way, he said," you have heard the best argument I can articulate for it.”

There was no further discussion.

The proposal was approved on voice vote (not unanimous).

C. Faculty Curriculum Committee

Daniel Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, moved, given the lateness of the hour, that the Senate vote on all the proposals below, except number 19 (Southern Studies Minor) as a single package. The proposal for the new minor would be considered separately. The motion was seconded.

There was no discussion of Senator Greenberg’s motion, and it was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

There was no discussion offered of the proposals below (1-18).

By a single unanimous voice vote, proposals 1-18 were approved.

1. Jewish Studies (PDF)
   a. Deactivate JWST 450 (Research Seminar in Jewish Studies)
   b. Add JWST 305 (Israeli Cinema) as an elective and replace current JWST 450 requirement with JWST 400 (Independent Study) or JWST 499 (Bachelor’s Essay) to the JWST major
c. Add JWST 305 and delete JWST 450 to the JWST minor
d. Change description of JWST 400 so that it requires independent research
e. Create new course: JWST 399 (Directed Reading)

2. **Athletic Training**: Terminate Athletic Training major ([PDF](#))


4. **Asian Languages** – Change prerequisite (202) for ARBC 390 (Special Topics in Arabic), ARBC 496 (Independent Study), JPNS 390 (Special Topics), JPNS 496 (Independent Study), CHNS 330 (Collateral Study), and CHNS 496 (Independent Study) ([PDF](#))

5. **Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs** – Prerequisite changes (202 or 205) to FREN 330, 496, 498, 499, GREK 390, 490, 496, 498, GRMN 213, 325, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 341, 365, 490, 496, 499, HBRW 330, ITAL 328, 329, LATN 490, 496, 498, PORT 330, 498, RUSS 313, 330, 398, and SPAN 390 ([PDF](#))

6. **French Francophone and Italian Studies** ([PDF](#))
   a. Deactivate LTIT 150 (Italian Literature in (English) Translation), ITAL 330 (Collateral Study), and ITAL 370 (Studies in Italian Cinema)
   b. Change prerequisite for ITAL 390 (Special Topics in Italian)

7. **Classics** ([PDF](#))
   a. Create new course: CLAS 325 (Ancient Houses and Households)
   b. Add this course to the major and the minor
   c. Deactivate LATN 301 (Introduction to Latin Literature)
   d. Changes some prerequisites

8. **Atmospheric Physics**: Delete PHYS 301 (Classical Mechanics) and add PHYS 272 (Methods of Applied Physics) to list of possible prerequisites for fluid mechanics ([PDF](#))

9. **Physics**: Create new course: PHYS 481 (Physics Problem Solving) and add as an elective in the BA and BS in Physics degrees ([PDF](#))

10. **Communication**: Change of restrictions for COMM 310 (Message Design and Influence) and COMM 481 (Capstone in Communication) ([PDF](#))

11. **African American Studies** ([PDF](#))
    a. Add four courses to list of pre-approved electives in both the major and the minor
    b. Create two new courses: AAST 340 (Remembering and Forgetting: Race, Violence, and Memory in American History) and AAST 345 (Race and Sports in American Society)
    c. Add seven courses to the minor

12. **Computing in the Arts** ([PDF](#))
    a. Create new concentration in Digital Media
    b. Create new course CITA/CSCI 140 (Graphic Design and Digital Media)
c. Change description of CITA/CSCI 180 (Computers, Music, and Art)
d. Add CSCI 380 (User Interface Development) and CSCI 392 (Seminar in Computing and Society) to the list of required courses for the major
e. Add MUSC 349 (Jazz Arranging) to the list of music electives in the music concentration

13. **Exercise Science** ([PDF](#))
   a. Change prerequisites for EXSC 433 (Research Design and Analysis)
   b. Change credit hours for EXSC 439 (Advanced Topics in Exercise Physiology)

14. **Health and Human Performance** ([PDF](#))
   a. Change course number of HEAL 395 to HEAL 456
   b. Change prerequisites
   c. Deactivate HEAL 395

15. **Hospitality and Tourism Management** ([PDF](#))
   a. Change prerequisites for HTMT 444 (Hospitality Management Internship)
   b. Change HTMT concentration, eliminating one of the required HTMT electives and making HTMT 444 mandatory
   c. Create new course: HTMT 244 (Internship)

16. **Mathematics**: Modify the course catalog description for MATH 229 (Vector Calculus with Chemical Applications) ([PDF](#))

17. **Religious Studies** ([PDF](#))
   a. Create three new courses RELS 215 (Religion and Globalization), RELS 370 (Advanced Topics in American Religion), and RELS 382 (Teaching Apprenticeship)
   b. Add new courses to the Religious Studies major and minor

18. **Theater and Dance** ([PDF](#))
   a. Remove prerequisite for THTR 230 (Fundamentals of Theatrical Design)
   b. Change prerequisite for THTR 316 (African American Theatre)
   c. Create new course: THTR 314 (Dramaturgy)
   d. Add THTR 314 to the list of major electives

---

19. **Create new minor in Southern Studies** ([PDF](#)), including creation of two new course SOST 200 (Introduction to Southern Studies) and SOST 400 (Southern Studies Capstone Project)

   **Senator Greenberg** (Psychology) stated that he wanted to separate this proposal for consideration from the others because a new minor deserves separate deliberation. He endorsed the proposal enthusiastically.
Senator Krasnoff (Philosophy) agreed that the proposal is strong and said he intended to vote in favor, but had a couple questions.

How many interdisciplinary minors, he asked, have both an introductory course and a capstone?

Several people replied (no one identified her- or himself) that a couple such minors do have both introductory courses and capstones but most don't have both.

Senator Krasnoff said there might be capstone enrollment concerns with the new minor and asked Professor Julia Eichelberger (co-sponsor of the minor) if she feels good about offering the capstone without knowing at present how many minors there will be to take it in the minor's first few years.

Professor Eichelberger replied that the capstone is only a one-hour course and will be supervised by the director as part of that position's duties, so enrollment will not likely be an issue.

The proposal was approved by unanimous voice vote.

7. Constituent’s Concerns

Hector Qirko, Senator - Sociology and Anthropology, raised two constituent concerns.

He read the following two items into the record.

"The Housing Authority of the City of Charleston has income limits developed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The HUD fiscal year 2015 income limits documentation system categorizes a one-person family in Charleston County making less than $35,250 annually as low income. If I teach five classes in both the spring and fall semesters of the same year, I make $34,250 dollars for that year."

This 5/5 Adjunct Professor, Senator Qirko said, is categorized as being low income. Given our reliance on adjuncts at the College and that adjunct pay is "adjustable and negotiable in many instances," Senator Qirko said "this is, at best, embarrassing and [is] something to pursue."

His second item relates, he said, to the process—not the outcomes—of both the recent budget and the appointment of the Provost.

"Hypothetically speaking, according to the F/AM, the Senate serves as an elected body that represents the faculty. The Senate, in turn, elects committees to serve certain functions, including the Budget Committee and the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. If neither the Senate nor the committees were consulted as representatives of the faculty with respect to the budget and with respect to the appointment of the Provost, it is worth asking whether these bodies continue to serve any function and if they should not disband. If these bodies no longer serve an advisory function, they represent not only a tremendous waste of faculty time but also serve to perpetuate the illusion of shared governance. Or perhaps shared governance no longer exists. (If we have no power, why let others pretend that we do?)"

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked if there is any way the Senate can consider these statements of concern at a future Senate meeting.
The Speaker replied by saying that, as he said in his report, he will be distributing another survey instrument that would allow for those particular topics to be captured, and we then might consider setting aside specific times to discuss them.

**Kendall Deas**, Senator - Adjunct, inquired if there is a faculty welfare committee to which adjuncts can bring their concerns. He specified that he has heard concerns similar to those raised by Senator Qirko.

The Speaker pointed Senator Deas to the chair of the standing Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC), Emily Skinner, and he added out that the committee has an adjunct representative. Professor Skinner replied that there is an FWC subcommittee working on adjunct issues. She wondered, however, how much power the committee has in relation to salary.

Senator Qirko replied that adjunct salaries are adjustable and negotiable above the minimum, and different adjuncts have different salaries across the College. He reasoned that there may, therefore, be some room to discuss raising the floor.

Deana Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, noted that she sits with the faculty compensation committee, one of three faculty committees that have adjunct representatives. The committee is finalizing its recommendations for the year. She said that anyone who would like to speak or meet with the committee is welcome to attend upcoming meetings.

**There were no further constituent concerns raised.**

8. **Adjournment: 7:14**

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Duvall
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Special Meeting on 26 January 2016

The Faculty Senate met for a special meeting on Tuesday 26 January 2016 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. **Call to Order:** 5:06 PM

2. **Speaker of the Faculty's Opening Remarks**
   (Invitations to Panelists, Including Questions - PDF)

   The Speaker welcomed guests and thanked the panelists for coming and participating in the discussion.

   The Speaker explained that on the day when he and the Secretary of the Faculty were finalizing the agenda, the President was in Columbia and unable to confirm that he would like to be on the agenda in time for its release on 1/19. The Speaker moved without objection that the President be added to the agenda following his (the Speaker's) opening remarks.

   The Speaker explained that in December he circulated a Google form questionnaire to Senators, asking them to submit questions that would help build an agenda for the special meeting. The questions distributed to the panelists, he pointed out, can be accessed in the PDF linked to above.

   The Speaker laid out the plan for the meeting: following the President's remarks, panelists were to make brief remarks, responses, and comments on the questions, and after this, the floor would be open for questions.

   The Speaker reminded Senators and guests of the standing rules pertaining to the meeting. All guests are welcome, and all present have floor privileges to ask questions and speak. All who speak, he specified, should wait to be formally recognized by him and, once given the floor, identify themselves and state their roles at the College. The Speaker also emphasized the need for civil discourse.

   The Speaker distributed 50 copies of a document showing the first round of budget cuts that were approved by the Board of Trustees (BOT) in October, a publicly available document, he said. He suggested that the document might serve, for those interested, as a spur to questions for panelists.

   The Speaker here concluded his remarks. There were no questions for the Speaker.

3. **President McConnell's Remarks**

   President McConnell read from prepared remarks. Below is a transcript of his remarks as delivered.

   ---

   First of all, I want to thank you for the opportunity to be here to address you. I appreciate the opportunity to listen and learn about what is on the faculty's mind, particularly related to the College's budget. I have tried to communicate with the Faculty Advisory Committee [to the President] and Deans and others along the way.
I hope that tonight can be an informative and positive experience for all of us. As I previously said, we are at our best here at the College when we learn from each other, engage with each other, and work with each other. I believe that the best of our human spirit is our capacity to grow and to change and be life-long learners because that intellectual growth informs not only our minds, but it shapes our empathy and it creates our connections to one another. I hope we can all keep that thought in mind throughout tonight's meeting. While we may disagree from time to time on College issues, it's our shared love and passion for this institution that binds all of us so closely together. No matter the issue, no matter the time period in our history, this school has always worked together to support each other and to advance our university. I see no reason why this cannot be true tonight and every day moving forward. Together we, the College of Charleston, can be the nationally preeminent liberal arts and sciences university we aspire to and know that we can be.

One great example of what we can achieve when we work together relates to the BPS [Bachelor of Professional Studies] program and the reforms passed by this body last semester. Our process of shared governance is clearly defined in the F/AM [Faculty/Administration Manual], worked wonderfully, and we were able to make inroads to a crucial program for the College’s future. I want to thank all of you, the Faculty Senate, for your diligent work in committee and in your general body, for meeting, for giving these ideas a chance, and approving these reforms, which I believe will have a positive impact on our budget in the years to come. And that leads us to tonight’s conversation: the budget. Let me be clear, the College is not in financial jeopardy. We are making these adjustments to remain fiscally sound going forward.

As I previously said, we do not have an enrollment problem. We have a strong admissions team doing a great job in attracting the best and brightest to our campus. By looking at our admissions data, it is clear that students want to come to the College of Charleston. Our applications numbers are holding steady because our prospective students and their families know that our value proposition is strong compared with other universities up and down the East Coast and around the country. They understand we are well on our way to becoming a nationally preeminent liberal arts and sciences university and that a College of Charleston degree can take you to any job, any career, and any place you want to go in the world. Your options are boundless when you graduate from here, and I try to reiterate that as an alumnus to the graduates when they are leaving at graduation.

As I have said before, we can all disagree on how we address these challenges, and I firmly believe that debates on this campus can be very healthy. However, I think we begin to head down a potentially divisive road when we dissect others' department and division budgets in order to save our own interests. We are a campus of professionals, both on the faculty side and staff side, and we should trust each other to do our jobs efficiently and effectively. Our goal as an institution should always be to collaborate with each other and to complement each other’s work while retaining our individual freedoms. We should not operate in silos, nor should we infringe on each other’s abilities to do the jobs we were hired to do. We do this by being as transparent as possible.
Transparency is the key to remain a strong College of Charleston. And that is why it has been a priority of my administration since I took office in July of 2014. Many of you saw first hand the way the Provost's office communicated to the Deans, Faculty Budget Committee, and the Academic Affairs personnel throughout last year’s budget planning process and our mid-year adjustments. I hope you’ll agree that we don't just talk about transparency at the College, but that we practice it.

In closing, I want all of you to know that I believe in building a consensus with the faculty, the staff, and the Faculty Senate. I always appreciate your sharing your thoughts and your ideas as together we work to accomplish the goals of our beloved College. It is a privilege to serve with you. I continue to be excited about trying to move this college forward and to shape a bright and balanced future. Together, in shared governance, we will continue to make decisions that strengthen the institution, our academic mission, and student experience. I want to thank you and the Speaker for giving me the opportunity to address you. We have folks here that are experts in their respective areas, and I hope that we can answer your questions and all of us together learn more about the budget process, the decisions that we’re making. The Board [of Trustees] will be meeting this week, and I welcome your input. And I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for the job you do for the College and all of you who care about this great institution and moving it forward.

----

4. Brief Presentations/Remarks of Panelists
The Speaker introduced all the panelists and they made remarks in the order below.

A. Steve Osborne - Executive Vice President for Business Affairs (Budget Documents - PDF)

Mr. Osborne offered what he described as a "primer" on the budget and referred frequently throughout to the documents circulated with the agenda, which are taken, he said, directly from the Board of Trustees (BOT)-approved budget from June 2015 for FY 15-16.

On the data sheet (page 1), he highlighted section IV, “Fees 2015-016.” He pointed out that the total figure reported for in-state undergraduate fees listed as $10,900, is now $10,950, reflecting an added security fee of $50 annually.

He explained that the "ECollective Fee" ($20) is one the students requested to support sustainability initiatives.

The $70 fee listed in the same section and labeled "Tuition Fee," Mr. Osborne reported, is actually a debt-service fee for a state institution bond that was issued for the School of Business a few years ago.

The "Capital Improvement Fund" fee ($1,608) supports capital construction and bond issues, and a significant portion of this fee (over $960), he said, is pledged as securities for debt service for our bond issues. The difference is used to support capital projects that are fee-funded and not bond-funded. These are primarily smaller capital projects.

The total of the fees listed in section IV of the document is the sum total for tuition and fees, with out-of-state students paying the same in fees as in-state students. Mr.
Osborne said that the total for tuition and fees makes up the income side of what is called the E&G (Educational and General) budget, the "heart of our operating budget."

In the same section of document are included auxiliaries (housing and food services). He said that it is important to note that auxiliaries are "separate and apart from our operating budget." Auxiliaries are self-supporting operations as dictated by state law. He listed the bookstore and Athletics as other auxiliaries. Funds from E&G cannot be carried over to auxiliaries, and the opposite is true, as well: funds from auxiliaries cannot be carried over into the E&G budget.

The BOT sets the fees, and the way in which the fees are set (up or down, relatively) affects the number of dollars going into the E&G budget.

The document's second page shows the College's annual debt payments. Mr. Osborne called attention to the next to last column, which shows the total principle amount owed by the College as around $259 million in bond issuances and bond debt. He pointed out that the first item on the list in the left-hand column is a state institution bond for the School of Business. This type of bond, he said, is different from a revenue bond. Revenue bonds, he said, cover the rest of the debt.

Page three of the document, Mr. Osborne said, gives additions made to this year's budget, broken down by revenue source and the uses to which the revenue has been put. The top line ($4,614,580) indicates revenue generated by tuition. As this page points out, $3,158,536 came into the E&G budget as additional funds this year over the previous year, and this represents "new money" to be distributed to different areas.

Uses are broken down into different areas. "Mandated New Spending" is just like it sounds: new spending that is not optional. The two items here (employee contributions to health insurance and retirement benefits) must be paid for because we participate in these plans.

Another category, "Inflationary Required Spending / Annualizations" (approximately $1.9 million) accounts for budget items that go up in cost, such as indexed financial aid for abatements as tuition goes up. There are a number of such costs that have to be met. Mr. Osborne said that the total figure for this category is about what we see every year.

"Strategic Action Items" breaks down into "Programatic Items" and "Critical Faculty & Staff Positions (Includes Fringe Benefits)." The list of items under former, he said, was somewhat smaller this year, owing to the offset enrollment number. Around $250,000 of the approximately $407,000 in programatic items was in financial aid; $100,000 was put into the SPECTRA program.

The total outlay in uses matches the additional revenue.

The next four pages break down revenue and expenditures. Mr. Osborne illustrated the degree to which we are tuition-dependent in our budget by pointing out that out of a total operating budget of roughly $180 million, $149,789,029 comes in through tuition. Another nearly $9 million comes from summer school, and another $1.4 million or so in fees.
The budget was presented in June, before the legislative process closed, and state appropriation ($20,573,373) actually went up slightly in the legislative budgetary process (to around $22 million, Mr. Osborne reported).

Page five of the PDF document lists some of the revenue for auxiliary services (stores, vending, housing, parking, etc.) totaling some $55,000,000.

Page six shows how the expenses break down. The total budget, he reported, is roughly $264 million.

Mr. Osborne said that he hope the information he has provided is helpful and gives some perspective on the budget.

**B. Jimmie Foster, Jr. - Assistant Vice President for Admissions & Financial Aid (16 Year Trends - PDF)**

Mr. Foster said that Mr. Osborne’s presentation pointed out how important enrollments are for the College’s budget, and he thanked the President for his remarks, especially regarding enrollment. He also thanked the Admissions and Financial Aid staff, praising their collaborative work with offices across campus.

He discussed and explained the graphs he provided, “Applications and Enrollment, Completion Admit and Yield Rates” for both resident and non-residents (PDF). He pointed out that the column of five row items on the lower left corner of each graph presents five key information areas, and he defined each:

- **Submitted Applications** - applications sent to the Office of Admissions, but this does not mean applications that include all the documents needed for a complete application.
- **Admitted Students** - students offered an acceptance, not including provisionally-admitted students
- **Enrolled Students** - students who decided to enroll, beyond the census date, and who were with us at the beginning of the fall semester
- **Yield Rate** - the number of students who took us up on our offer of acceptance, a percentage of the students who applied (for instance, he said, if we invited five to apply and one enrolled, the yield rate would be 20%).
- **Tuition** - only tuition, not the total cost for students

The charts represent trends over the last 16 years. Mr. Foster said emphatically that in the last 16 years, the College has had "an amazing, amazing run," and added that in comparison to our competitors we are in "one of the strongest, most stable places an institution could be.” The economy, of course, affects how we do, as does, Mr. Foster specified, the population of students (resident versus non-resident).

On the first page (in-state students), the vertical white bars beginning at the 0% line and projecting upward indicate, he pointed out, an upward trend over the years in submitted resident student applications, peaking last year at 5,300 submitted in-state applications, a record number. We are doing very well in this regard. He said that this indicates high brand strength, great interest in our programs, and that potential students see the value of a CofC education.
Yet, for resident students, yield rate (represented by a blue line tracking from left to right across the middle of the graph) over the same time in which applications have been going up, he pointed out, has "trickled down some," from around 41% in 2000 to 36.1% in 2015. Over the last four years, though, he said that there has been relative stability in yield with numbers in the high 30s.

Looking at the "enrolled students" figures, Mr. Foster pointed out that it is very difficult to maintain enrollment at a specific number, particularly within a plus or minus 25-student range. He observed that his office has been able to enroll students within their projected figures consistently with only a few exceptions. He pointed out, for example, that in 2011 we had a higher number of enrollments than expected.

Turning to the non-resident chart on the next page, Mr. Foster said that in this group as well, applications have been going up since 2000. As with the resident numbers, here, too, enrollments show a consistency. Since 2009, he reported, the average non-resident enrollment per class has been 977. The last three years' enrollments, 946, 944, 947, respectively, show great consistency.

The challenge for revenue in enrolling the freshman class, Mr. Foster said, is that when projecting a specific number, 25 students one way or another can make a big revenue impact, which, he noted, we have seen in the past two years. Yet the numbers have, in general, been strong, he said.

C. Robert Cape - Senior Vice President and Chief Information Officer (Memo - PDF)

Mr. Cape said that in his 19-page response to the questions conveyed to him by the Speaker, he took care to be substantive in his responses. He gave summaries of his responses [please see the slides for details].

1. What have been the priorities of your division over the past 10 years?

   Mr. Cape said that he and his department have built an IT organization that provides needed services, support, and infrastructure for faculty, staff, and students. Nine departments have been added to IT in his ten years of service to the College.

2. What do you regard as the 3 or 4 most important specific milestones you achieved, and how much did each of these cost?

   Mr. Cape specified governance as the first milestone, characterizing current governance as "a complete bottom-to-top governance structure." He cited here work with the Faculty Educational Technology Committee; the creation of ITSAC (IT Strategic Advisory Committee), on which he elaborated at length (see the document), the creation of the Executive Steering Committee (ESC), and the creation of the Board of Trustees Committee on Information Technology.

   Mr. Cape also specified the evolution of Teaching, Learning and Technology (TLT) as another milestone reached, as well as the implementation of OAKS
as a replacement for WebCT, and the implementation of the BATTERY project.

3. Why are we required to purchase equipment from vendors who charge much more than market rates? How can you work to get these costs back in line?

Mr. Cape said that our outlay for equipment is considerably less than commercial costs due to the use of state contracts, which offer a negotiation starting point. He reported a savings of 49% off manufacturer’s suggested list price and 38% relative to state contract price, the latter of which he said is due to very good negotiators on his staff.

He called attention to an email exchange he provided in his response between himself and Trustee G. Lee Mikell, who had made some budget inquiries to Mr. Cape.

4. What would you do if you had to cut your budget by 2% or by 4%?

Mr. Cape reported that this year there has been a reduction in the number of classrooms that can be upgraded with classroom technology because Physical Plant cannot do necessary preparatory work for the upgrades. Mr. Cape said if he had to have a 2-4% budget reduction, classroom upgrades would be affected negatively, which he said is explained fully in his document.

5. How were software licenses paid for before this year? Did you get non-recurring funds transferred to your budget year after year, or did you pay for them out of operating funds?

Mr. Cape noted that this question may be referring to new monies IT received for the current fiscal year, which he said he would not go into in his remarks but could address in Q&A if asked.

Some costs, Mr. Cape said, are not generated by IT, but all the costs relate to contractual obligations.

F. Joe Hull - Director of Athletics (Special Faculty Senate Meeting) (Responses to Questions - PDF)

Mr. Hull thanked the audience for their support of Athletics at the College and thanked, in particular, Faculty Athletics Representative Vince Benigni.

Mr. Hull said that one of the primary goals of our programs is to bring positive recognition to the College of Charleston. Through traditional and social media exposure, athletic programs serve as a constant source of publicity for the College. The programs also bring alumni in the community to campus. Student athletes, he said, can serve as role models for youth in the community. Athletics, he added, can bring a sense of esprit de corps to the campus, uniting all the different units of the
campus in celebrating the College of Charleston. In addition, Athletics is a site of diversity at the College of Charleston, with our most visible teams being our most diverse, and it is a benefit to the College to be depicted in this way, he said. Mr. Hull added that Athletics brings an international presence, as well.

Our teams, he said, are visible in major East Coast media markets, which may aid in attracting high-quality out-of-state students to apply. Our changing of conferences also brings us into competition and collaboration with many public schools of note (such as William and Mary, University of Delaware, James Madison University).

Mr. Hull reported that our athletes major in a broad array of areas (not in a small group of majors). Average athletes’ GPA over the past five and a half years has been above 3.0. In 2012, ’13, and ’14 a student athlete graduated through the Honors College with a perfect 4.0 GPA. He added that a current basketball player is carrying a 4.0 and is likely to be nominated as a Rhodes Scholar, the first at the College since 1915.

Turning to the budget, Mr. Hull said that $5 million of the Athletics fee revenue ($14,722,603 on Mr. Osborne’s documents) goes to scholarships, and, thus, that money moves directly back to the College. We also, he said, attract many non-scholarship athletes who, in tuition and fees alone, pay back, he said, another $6 million. He said that these considerations are important and add complexity to the budget picture: if we eliminated athletics, he said, it would not mean a savings of the total amount cited above.

We have 365 student athletes, 115 on full scholarships, and about 250 paying their own way. Mr. Hull pointed out a mistake in his written response to the question about how many student athletes are non-resident. He reported 85%, which is an historical figure, he explained, but the current academic year’s figure is 75%.

5. Questions / Discussion

Betsy Baker, Senator - English, asked Mr. Osborne for clarification on precisely how auxiliary services fees factor into the budget and what effect, if any, they may have on the E&G budget.

Mr. Osborne replied that there are two subsets of auxiliaries. Some services (for example, Food Services, Residential, Bookstore) are totally dependent on fees paid directly by the student. Other services (Health Services, Athletics) are supported by a portion of the tuition base paid by the student. Increasing these fees would take away dollars that can go to E&G; likewise, decreasing the fees would increase the dollars that go to E&G.

Julia Eichelberger, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), followed up, offering another way of saying what Mr. Osborne said: “it would be possible for the Trustees to vote to decrease the tuition fee and to increase the athletics fee, for example,” with the total fee still remaining flat.

Mr. Osborne said Senator Eichelberger was correct. The Board of Trustees (BOT), he said, approves the fees and change the structure of the fees within the total or, put another way, how the fees are apportioned.

Tom Carroll, Health and Human Performance, asked Mr. Hull for confirmation on the dollar figure for tuition brought in by non-scholarship students: $6 million.
Mr. Hull confirmed the figure he gave, but added that there is some complication in arriving at a figure, since not all scholarship recipients are on a full scholarship, but he said the number is accurate in a broad sense.

Mr. Carroll followed up by asking if Mr. Hull’s figures for non-scholarship student athlete tuition factor in the athletes from the now-eliminated swimming and diving teams. These were especially large teams, he said, with a large number of non-scholarship student athletes.

Mr. Hull said this year’s figures do not include those students.

Claire Curtis, Political Science, asked Mr. Osborne about the ratio of state support to student tuition fees. How do we compare to other schools, in-state and out? She also asked what ideas are being considered to change the ratio.

Mr. Osborne said that most public comprehensive universities who lack an R1 research portfolio and a large endowment, are heavily dependent on tuition. We are in a similar position to other institutions like us in the state.

Drivers of our revenue, Mr. Osborne enumerated, are total enrollment, in-state/out-of-state enrollment mix, some grants, some private funds, and state appropriations. State appropriations are not going to change dramatically, he noted, and because we are not R1, we cannot rely on research grants. We will have to depend on tuition.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHHS, thanked the panel, and said that in his 24 years at the College he has not seen, as far as transparency goes, an event such as this one. He did say, however, that the meeting is somewhat "cumbersome" and may not be something we wish to repeat annually. Senator Kelly recommended that the chair of the Faculty Budget Committee be able to sit in on meetings in which these budget decisions are made or that we build into our shared-governance structure a way in which communication and transparency can be insured in a less cumbersome way.

Senator Kelly then asked, since he could not tell from Mr. Hull’s documents or his remarks, if the Athletics budget has taken any cuts. He added that Mr. Hull’s remarks seemed to suggest that upon our joining the Colonial Athletics Association (CAA), Athletics has seen modest increases annually. He asked if the increases have continued or if Athletics has taken any cuts.

Mr. Hull replied that travel expenses went up on our joining the CAA, running in the $500,000-$600,000 range. He explained that the move to the CAA was a campus-decision, not Athletics’ alone. To offset the new travel costs, about $50 was added to the Athletics fee a couple years ago. With that in mind, Mr. Hull said, per student, the cost of competing is about $50 annually or $25 per semester.

Mr. Osborne added some context to the discussion. When we raise tuition, say 3.5%, the Athletics fee may go up about 3%, which, he said is close to the index rate. In the current fiscal year, the BOT allowed a 3% increase to the Athletics budget, but then took a portion of that increase back. They indexed the amount that was required to fund the increase in scholarship costs, which left roughly $153,000. They froze that amount and put it in a restricted reserve fund.

Also, Mr. Osborne said, we should be aware that a fee-dependent program such as Athletics is also, thus, dependent on enrollment and is affected by any fluctuations in it.

Senator Kelly asked about how the Athletics fee has changed over the past five years: has it been around 3.5% as approved by the BOT?

Mr. Osborne said yes, roughly. In the year the College joined the CAA there was a jump.
Tom Baginski, Senator - German and Russian Studies, thanked the panelists and then pointed out that in previous Faculty Senate meetings, two annual shortfalls in Athletics were brought to the faculty's attention: for 2012-13, $1,432,000 and for 2013-14, $547,000. He asked Mr. Hull if the numbers are correct, and if so, if Mr. Hull could shed light on them, and if he expected any further shortfalls.

Mr. Hull replied that while these numbers looks like deficits, they are not, in fact. In the year of moving from the Southern Conference (SC) to the CAA, there was, Mr. Hull said, a $600,000 SC exit fee, and cash from previously generate revenues paid for this fee. But in the accounting report, it shows as a deficit in a particular line item. In addition, that year, Athletics did about $670,000 worth of pre-approved smaller projects that, again, were paid for with funds on hand but show up, inaccurately, he said, as a deficit in the annual report.

Mr. Hull said that it pains him to see the reported deficits because they seem to indicate an improper management of funds, when there has been nothing of the sort.

Mr. Osborne offered at this point further information. Athletics, as an auxiliary service, is allowed to carry a balance from year to year. Athletics carries a positive fund balance. For instance, he said that receiving $600,000 in a naming rights contract in one year allowed the athletics program to spend that $600,000 in the following year.

Julia Eichelberger, Senator - SHSS, raised two points in reaction to this discussion.

In academic departments, she pointed out, any fund balance remaining at year's end is swept for use elsewhere in the E&G budget, wherever it is need most critically. Unlike Athletics, academic units are not allowed to generate and carry forward a fund balance.

She also noted that the Athletics fee is moving up to 12% of total general in-state student fees, which she said, seems like a lot of money for every single student to pay. While she said she accepts all of what Mr. Hull said about the value of our teams, it is a legitimate question to ask how much in an Athletics fee is too much. She said that her own questions and the questions of the Faculty Budget Committee (which she chairs) are not meant as an attack, but to raise genuine concerns about what students have to pay in order for all the teams to exist.

Mr. Hull replied that Athletics is doing all it can, through such means as ticket sales, philanthropy, selling sponsorships, etc., to augment the budget. He said that they are able to generate about $3 million annually through these means. Schools such as the University of South Carolina, with large stadiums and TV contracts, he observed, can fund programs without too much campus support. But within the CAA, compared to the other public schools, our fee falls into the bottom half in terms of percentage. Compared to the other state institutions, he said, we are in the "smaller tier." So, he said, while our numbers are "significant," compared to other schools in our state, our fee is smaller.

Mr. Hull said that Athletics is well aware of the issues and is doing its best to keep costs down and carefully manage the budget in the context of its immediate and long-term plans.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked Mr. Foster about the rate of enrolled non-residential students. The number of non-resident enrollments over the past three years has, he said, been stable, as Mr. Foster pointed out. Yet, we have been told over and over that our financial troubles are related in part to a shortfall in non-
resident enrollments. There is a drop from 2011 and 2012’s numbers: is this where the shortfall originates? More generally, what is the nature of the shortfall?

Mr. Foster said that there is a combination of issues at the heart of the problem. Recent graduating classes had a larger percentage of non-resident students than current classes. Projections for the number of non-resident (and resident) students we expect to enroll are made, and this is used to build the budget. Last year, we projected 1,000 non-resident enrollments and fell short of that number.

Senator Krasnoff asked Mr. Foster if the projections two years earlier had been the same, 1,000. Mr. Foster said that, while he can’t recall the specific number, it was around 975 and 955 for the year after that.

Mr. Foster specified that in addition to freshman enrollments, transfer students make a difference. Each fall, he said, we enroll around 750 transfer students. Each spring semester, we enroll approximately 300, he said.

Senator Krasnoff followed up with a different observation. Referring to the chart for non-residents, he observed that accounting for the ratio between submitted applications and admitted students we "get a lot lot less selective" over time. Why, he asked, "did we get so much less selective?"

Mr. Foster countered Senator Krasnoff’s assertion by saying that the quality of student has actually improved as measured by average GPA, which he said is the number one predictor of student success in the classroom. He reported an incremental climb in in-state and out-of-state incoming student GPA over the past three years.

He added that yield is important to consider. We had a 22.4% yield in 2008, and last year it was down to 17.3% We have had to take more non-residents in order to meet our projections. National trends and conditions in states we depend upon for non-resident enrollments must be considered here. Florida and Georgia, for instance, are competing with us via strong state scholarships that are keeping students at home, forcing us to recruit more energetically in other places.

Senator Krasnoff noted that Mr. Foster focused on GPA as a success predictor and asked what our trends are relating to incoming first year students’ standardized test scores. He added that we used to hear much about standardized test scores in the early 2000s, but we don't anymore.

Mr. Foster replied that the average SAT score has gone down over the last five years or so. However, he added, nationally, attention on the SAT has gone down as well. More students are taking the ACT; and ACT submitters to the College have gone up (to almost half).

Andy Shedlock - Senator - Biology, asked Mr. Foster if the challenge in addressing our shortage in out-of-state enrollments is to adjust the demographics of who is applying to the College or if it is more of an intramural policy adjustment that is needed.

Mr. Foster replied that there is a national trend at work. Yield rates are down everywhere (except in the top 25 R1s and the very top liberal arts institutions). In the mid 1990s, the average student was applying to two or three schools. That number has now doubled. At the same time, there are fewer high school students graduating, so there are fewer students applying to more places and getting into more places (keeping in mind that yield rates are declining across the board). Mr. Foster said that "we have to be smart about this: we don't want to turn away students that we may need to enroll."
Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, said that it might be useful in the future for faculty to have a picture of overall enrollment, including transfers. She suggested that this might be reported to the Senate on a regular basis.

**Returning to Athletics**, Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker, stated that from the faculty’s side of things, we are feeling the cuts but are not convinced that Athletics has been feeling the burden of budget cuts in the same way, but more significant, she said, is that faculty want to be involved in discussions about budget priorities, such as how much of tuition is dedicated to Athletics.

On the one hand, she said, as Mr. Hull pointed out, our Athletics fee is on the low end in our conference, but as she put it, “there are a lot of other places where we are low within that conference and low within groups that we selectively compare ourselves against, for example in faculty salaries.” While we are also near the bottom in state funding, we are, she said, probably near the top in student credit hour production and near the bottom in instructional cost per student credit hour. Keeping such things in mind, she asserted that, as to the Athletics fee, the best comparison is not necessarily to other schools in the CAA, but within our own school, how is Athletics doing in comparison to academics?

What might help in this connection is to know more about Athletics’ fund balance. She asked Mr. Hull if it has been accumulating (suggesting that there’s more money there than needs to be), is it stable at a reasonable number, or is it going down? She added that a single point-in-time figure will not help as much as an over-time figure.

Mr. Hull replied that in the last eight years there has never been a deficit. He added that the balance is about the same now as it was eight years ago. There has been some fluctuation, plus and minus, but, he said, it has been basically stable over time over eight years.

**Todd Grantham**, Philosophy, asked Mr. Foster about tuition, represented on both charts by the green line moving left to right and steadily upward. Professor Grantham pointed out that tuition is rather high and speculated that perhaps lowering tuition a bit might improve our yield. Is the tuition line important in the choices students are making not to come to the College? Could moving it down even a little make a positive impact on yield?

Mr. Foster addressed the question from two angles. He said that enrollment has become a numbers-driven world, which is why we have a data analyst on staff. He added that, in addition to being numbers-driven, enrollment requires a sociological and psychological approach. The Admitted Student Questionnaire (ASQ) from College Board, to which we subscribe, reveals that the reasons students do not come to the College are “a mixed bag,” but cost is certainly one key concern.

Can we go down on tuition? Mr. Foster replied, though it may be counter-intuitive, he would not advocate for lowering non-resident tuition. Using financial aid and discounting is the best way to offset the cost, he argued, instead of taking a institutional risk with an across-the-board tuition cut. For students who are near-misses, a discount or reduction via scholarship of a few thousand dollars may do the trick. We need, he said, better ways to increase our discount rate.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked if our yield figures on non-resident students are comparable to our aspirational peers.

Mr. Foster replied that it depends on who we identify as aspirational peers, of which, over time, we have not had a consistent list. He said he has, however; looked at closest competitors. Yield rates are defined to a great extent by a school’s discount rate. We compete, he said, not only with state schools, but also, due to our brand and
academics, with private schools as well. Competition is fierce with privates, though, because they can offer higher discount rates.

**Jim Newhart**, Classics, asked about student retention. Where are students who leave the College going and why?

The Provost offered to come back as early as the February regular meeting of the Senate to discuss retention in more depth or to give a "wave-top" rundown at the present meeting. Professor Newhart agreed that the former would be better.

Mr. Foster replied that Professor Newhart and Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker both make good points about the multifarious nature of enrollment: there are many factors we have to consider beyond admissions.

**David Desplaces**, Management and Marketing, expressed concern that in March faculty might be asked again to make phone calls to prospective non-resident students. He said that he is "still not hearing a true plan," and that we are relying on an "over-taxed" non-resident pool of prospective students. What are we doing, he asked, to raise money for endowed scholarships from donors? He asked how the foundation is contributing to this effort, and he queried why we are adding scholarships when we do not have the resources to do so (while we are also thinking about building new buildings and such). He emphasized what he sees as a lack of strategic planning in these areas.

The Provost replied that we have been working out of an established plan for recruitment and retention for several years, adjusting as needed, in line with the core goal of being a nationally preeminent liberal arts and sciences university. This is a consistent message, he said, but the competitive environment has changed and our approach and materials for recruitment have been refined to better meet the needs of our audience. The Provost said that he agrees with Professor Desplaces on the importance of philanthropy to fund scholarships, and we have had our most successful campaign to date and an enormous amount of money has been raised for scholarships. Some time will pass, however, before the bulk of it will be available. Plans are in place and being continuously refined.

Mr. Osborne added that the Boundless campaign has recently surpassed its goal of raising $125 million, with scholarships as its highest priority. He added that there has been a good deal of work this year with Admissions and Financial Aid to figure out ways to use partial abatements to a greater extent. Partial abatements, he explained, require an analysis of how much money in incoming revenue can be given up in favor of retaining students. There was partial success with abatements this year; especially for students in particular categories.

Mr. Foster replied to Professor Desplaces's assertions by saying that the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid has "a very solid plan," with numerous strategies featuring a multiple-pronged approach with communication and recruitment travel. The plan is data-driven and augmented by a top-notch marketing strategy, he added.

On the matter of faculty phone calls, Mr. Foster thanked the faculty who have participated. It was effective, he said. Based on the data available right now, he said, we have enrolled almost 3% more students than we would have without the calls. A personal touch, whether in the context of a campus visit of a phone conversation, makes a difference, helping especially with recruiting students of color (our numbers in this area have gone up each of the last five years). Having everyone participate in the recruitment process is key.

President McConnell added that there will be an announcement next month on the status of comprehensive campaign, which he said promises to be an exciting one. About 50% of the money will go toward scholarships, he said. He echoed Provost
McGee’s remark that most of the money raised so far is not immediately available since, he pointed out, it is tied up in estates and such.

President McConnell also reported that the planned Learning Technology Center, due to its expense, will be endowed in order for it to support itself, renovate itself, and grow. He asked for faculty involvement and feedback on how the center should be constructed, equipped, and implemented, particularly for how its technology can be used for teaching. This center will be a draw for prospective students who visit the campus.

President McConnell stressed that the College does have plans for recruitment. He noted that we are combining some recruitment and institutional advancement trips, so that as we meet with alumni, we also are reaching out to prospective students.

**Dan Greenberg**, Senator - Psychology, raised a question for Mr. Foster: We think we know what we do well and what is great about the College of Charleston, he said, but what we are less aware of is whether or not these things are what the parents and prospective students want to hear. When faculty involve themselves in recruiting, what should faculty be “pushing,” and what are prospective students and parents looking for?

Mr. Foster responded that we should "go beyond the statistics" and try to tell the distinctive story of the College of Charleston. He also said that faculty can emphasize direct outcomes, faculty relationships with students, research opportunities, and networking. Students and parents, he said, are interested in seeing what the experience at the College is "going to do in the real world." The consumer-based decision of choosing a school involves considering it as an investment, so a sense of outcomes will be key. He suggested that faculty emphasize the unique ways in an education at the College connects to the world and give examples of what our students and alumni have done.

Senator Greenberg agreed with Mr. Foster’s characterization of the consumer-decision parents and prospective students are making and the strategies that emerge from that understanding. He added that he can easily make a positive comparison of class size here with Clemson, but a small liberal arts school can beat that pitch, raising the question of what our niche is and how to sell it. He posed two questions: "why hasn’t our recruitment been as effective as we need it to be so far?,” and "how does our pitch differ from our competitors’ pitches?"

Mr. Foster replied that he thinks our recruitment has been very successful, based on how we do against competitors with a better discount rate and the fact that many students are willing to pay full price for a CofC education. Charleston, as recently reported in *USA Today*, is also a top post-college boom town, where graduates are joining the area community and adding their skills and talents in a variety of ways to the culture. We are, he said, in an enviable position among our competitors.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator - Mathematics, directed a question to Mr. Cape. Many classrooms recently updated and outfitted with new classroom technology, she asserted, are now "close to unusable." For example, a classroom in Maybank Hall features a projector oriented toward the front of the room, a white board on the opposite wall, and the chairs bolted to the floor facing the front of the room. She said we need smart classroom upgrades (smart in the sense of common sense). She asked Mr. Cape what he thinks can be done to avoid spending ineffectively and, thus, wastefully, in classroom upgrades.

Mr. Cape replied that his office has been making classroom upgrades for around three years, a program urged and supported by the BOT and strongly supported by faculty as a way to improve the environment and tools for teaching and student
learning. His unit, he said, takes into account the problems that may emerge in previous designs as new designs are made. When classrooms are chosen for upgrade, he said, IT starts with the department chairs to identify which classrooms to upgrade and routinely works, he said, with faculty who teach in the classroom to get their input, translating into "a great deal of faculty involvement in the design of the classroom." He added that Senator Anguelova has given a good example of a classroom that does not work for her.

Senator Anguelova replied by saying that she cannot imagine a faculty member who would advocate for that particular classroom design.

Mr. Cape asked Senator Anguelova to let him know at another time which classroom she is referring to and it can be investigated to determine "what the surround was" for that classroom's design. Mr. Cape at this point asked for a show of hands among faculty who, first, do not want upgrades to classrooms and, second, who want to have upgrades with their involvement. No hands were raised for the first, several for the second.

Senator Anguelova countered that the issue is not whether or not faculty want upgrades. The issue is that several classrooms that were updated at great expense are "unusable after the upgrade." She said this is true on the North Campus and downtown, and it is wasteful.

Mr. Cape replied that, like Mr. Foster, he is data-driven and asked for the data on the classrooms in question.

Glenn Lesses, Philosophy, asked Mr. Osborne and President McConnell if there are any more budget cuts coming this year, noting that already in this academic year we have had two rounds of unexpected cuts.

Mr. Osborne said they foresee no further cuts this fiscal year. Enrollment will determine the extent of any cuts next year.

Elaine Worzala, Senator - School of Business, directed a question to Mr. Foster. She said she made several phone calls for recruiting out-of-state students last year, yet did not know where to send potential students and parents on their questions about abatements, discounts, and such. Could guidance on these matters be offered to those faculty who make calls?

Also, she wondered about whether or not we are going back to targeted students with offers of discounts or abatements when they seem to be leaning against the College.

Mr. Foster said there is no negotiation with prospective students, per se, but we do offer a financial aid package based on certain criteria, particularly their FAFSA form, which could lead to need-based funding or loans. On the FAFSA-related aid, there's no flexibility. We use scholarship dollars for partial abatements, which is a fixed amount, and we rarely have additional resources left over that we could use to attract students.

Senator Worzala added that she wonders what we can do in terms of additional discounting or abatement for out-of-state students who continue to express interest but are also getting, as they report, compelling offers from elsewhere.

Mr. Foster replied that in some years, when there has been additional resources, we have gone back out to a group of students, but, he said, late in the game, there is very little yield from doing so. Late offers are not typically successful.

He did say, however, that the faculty calling campaign is very helpful, and he pledged support with the right resources for faculty who participate.
**Vince Benigni**, Communication, said that, in addition to studying student retention at the College, we should also consider examining faculty and staff retention. The literature, he said, shows that there are very high financial and psychological costs to turnover and replacement. He asked Mr. Osborne if we have any data on staff and faculty turnover.

Mr. Osborne said that he does not have data with him, but he agreed that turnover is very costly.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, thanked the panelists and praised the transparency the evening has demonstrated. She then asked if there is any way we can get individual schools to have same kind of conversation and transparency about school operations. She suggested that this might be a question for the Provost and Deans.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - SHHS and Faculty Budget Committee Chair, echoed the appreciation others had expressed for the panelists’ participation, and noted specifically how nice it was to hear from Mr. Foster on how significant the faculty’s contribution is to our success.

She directed a question to Mr. Osborne: would be helpful and appropriate to have a faculty member present at some of the senior leadership’s meetings at which budgetary decisions are made? The Speaker of the Faculty could serve as such a representative. She reported that the Faculty Budget Committee sent a memo to President McConnell suggesting this, but he replied that he did not think it was necessary. She said that she thinks faculty do need such representation since we are part of the labor that creates the revenue. She asked Mr. Osborne if he can help the faculty understand why this might not be a good idea, given his knowledge of the nature of the meetings.

Mr. Osborne replied that he thinks that there are certainly decision points in the budgetary process which should be transparent. Each year there is a process involving the BOT and having faculty involved as the budget is worked out seems like a good idea.

Senator Eichelberger replied that faculty do attend those meetings, through the Budget Committee. She specified that she is inquiring about meetings in which the budget is being drafted, in the initial stages of the process.

Mr. Osborne replied that he thinks he would need to consult with the President and the other Executive Vice Presidents on this, and that, ultimately, the decision would be the President’s.

Senator Eichelberger noted Mr. Osborne’s service to a number of Presidents and said that she was looking for his unique perspective.

Mr. Osborne replied that he knows the senior leadership wants to be transparent. There are, he said, however, decision points that the executive management team has to engage on its own. There are moments for faculty involvement, he said, just as there are moments for the Deans to be involved.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, noted that a nice feature of the auxiliary services is that they have separate budgets and their budget-related performance can be observed on a year-to-year basis. Academic programs, however, cannot be easily tracked in the same way. Of particular concern, said Senator Krasnoff, are some graduate programs and the BPS program, which were begun on the promise of making a positive difference in revenue, yet for which we do not get a report of how they are doing in this regard. He asked if there are things we are doing right now or
that we can do better to track these programs to see if they are living up to the initial claims that they will be revenue positive.

Mr. Osborne replied that we can always do better. We are currently, he said, trying to establish more benchmarks for return on investment. The BPS program is a good example. He said that he was told there would be a certain number of students for the BPS and this projection factored into the pitch he made in Columbia. The BPS has made a "slower return on investment" than initially expected. We are, he said, seeking more and more data to judge return on investment and this will be data that can be shared, he said.

Senator Krasnoff followed up by asking if this can be applied to graduate programs as well.

Provost McGee entered the discussion here to add that a few years ago, under Provost Hynd and Associate Provost Diamond, Academic Affairs ran a custom comprehensive cost study for undergraduate and graduate programs on a per credit hour basis. The study was not perfect, but the result was that we could cost out what revenue, if any, programs were generating. We need to develop ongoing tools for measuring how we are doing without having to build custom studies each time. Our ability to predict how large our programs will be has, thus far, not been very successful, he said. We have missed the mark in making projections, one way or another, exceeding or coming in below projections. Finally, he said, as we see enrollment rise in some programs and decline for in others, we need to be candid about such shifts and find ways to shift resources to support the programs that are growing and withdraw resources from those that are getting smaller over time.

Steve Litvin, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, addressed Mr. Osborne, "accountant to accountant," observing that in light of the complexity of the organization, to have a budget come out less than 1% off ($2 million out a budget of over $200 million) is actually impressive and a compliment to Mr. Osborne. "Why all the angst?," he asked. "Why is it not just a casual, relatively easy fix?," he added. He said that he is not criticizing the faculty's worries in characterizing it thusly, but he adduced Post and Courier stories about the College's budget as examples of what he sees as overstatement of the problem.

Mr. Osborne said he appreciated the compliment and agreed with Senator Litvin that the situation has been overstated, and he pointed out that the gap is being addressed by vacancies and operating cost cuts. Yet, any time you take away funding, it does cause some anxiety.

There were no further questions or comments.

The Speaker thanked panelists and guests. Applause followed.

6. **Adjournment:** 7:18 PM
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 12 January 2016

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

Agenda

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- open forum on Information Technology (Thursday 1/14, 3-4 PM, Alumni Center), at which IT leadership and members of the IT Strategic Advisory Committee (ITSAC) will share information about their goal-setting for FY 2017 and ’19 and ask for input from those attending.

- Martin Luther King, Jr. Program and Candle Light Vigil (Thursday 1/14, 6 PM, Sten Center Ballroom & Garden), featuring keynote speaker Senator Marlon Kimpson.

- Teaching, Learning, Technology (TLT) Conference (replacing the Faculty Technology Institute), for which registration is now open, and which will run during Spring Break (Tuesday, March 8 through Thursday, March 10).

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

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

B. Provost McGee (PDF)

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

Budget Update - Academic Affairs (AA)

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

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

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

**December Commencement**

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

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

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

**Course-Instructor Evaluations for Fall 2015**

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

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

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

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

**SACSCOC Accreditation**

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

**New and Revised Academic Policies**

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

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

**IRS Audit of the College**

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

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

**Questions / Discussion**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As to next year's lines, the Provost said that he is not sure it would be "financially prudent" to give a September 15 guarantee, since the financial indicators are not strong that early, as we have learned, he said, from our recent experiences. There are
positions, however, he said, that will be essential to allow students to graduate in a timely fashion and positions critical to a secondary accreditation in one or more of our departments. These are critical replacements. The goal, he said, is always to give a full year for faculty searches, if possible, but this has to be balanced with our financial situation.

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

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

**Slide 3**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Slide 4**

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

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

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

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

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

**Slide 6**

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

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

**Slide 7**

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

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

**Slide 8**

The Compliance Certification Report, which covers past and present practices, must, Dr. Bhati stressed, be submitted in September of 2016, no matter what. This is submitted to the off-site committee, and upon their review, should they have questions, we will have an opportunity to file a response report in two to three months. We cannot build policies and procedures in that period, she said, so it is very important that we build these and improve our existing policies and procedures ahead of time.
The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is submitted six weeks prior to the on-site visit. Our on-site visit is set for March 2017, so the QEP will be submitted in January or February 2017. The QEP committee will present the plan to the on-site committee, and the evaluation occurs at that time.

**Slide 9**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Slide 10**

The College’s Committee Structure includes the following (from the “top” down):

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

Slide 11

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

Slide 12

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

Slide 13

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

Slide 14 lists QEP subcommittees and chairs.

Questions / Discussion

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

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

Senator DeLaurell asked how the last reaffirmation turned out.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. The institution is doing a bad job of managing credentials and documenting them (this is not our situation, she said)

2. There is a lack of precision (uncrossed t’s, undotted i’s, etc.). She said our credential audit will help keep that from happening, as well our policy, which will guide practice, ensuring everyone knows what to do, our objectives, and so forth.

3. There is a failure in communication, a faulty presentation of the institution’s credentialing decisions in particular cases. This could happen in our case, she said, if we are not careful.

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

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

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

Dr. Bhati replied that the latter is the case and that SACS has increased its rigor in recent years. She said that if one bad case crops up in the off-site review and it can be addressed in follow-up, then the on-site review will pass us.
Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker explained that aiding in the review teams work of examining credentials is a required faculty roster (a 3-4,000 row table that lists every faculty member, every course they have taught in 2015-16, and their credentials). The reviewers examine the rows to see if they can catch problems, and if they spot problems, they are likely to dig deeper.

There were no further questions or discussion.

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

Robert Mignone, Co-Chair

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

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

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

Questions / Discussion

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

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

Dr. Bhati added at this point that the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning is in the process of analyzing the results of the survey Senator Krasnoff referred to, which results have been forwarded to the Deans, will be disseminated to the subcommittees, and will be posted on the web. She invited questions regarding the survey, addressed to her or the chairs of the subcommittee.
There were no further questions/discussion.

E. Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness

Professor Martin Jones (Mathematics) reported for the committee.

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

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

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

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

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

Questions / Discussions

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

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

Idée Winfield, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, asked about the degree to which these program reviews would incorporate disciplinary best practices. She explained that in her experience serving as an outside reviewer in her
own discipline, programs are often reviewed in anticipation of accreditation reviews and the outside review includes a judgement of how programs are doing in terms of best practices in their discipline. She also added that in the past, program reviews were conducted by the Commission on Higher Education (CHE).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. **Old Business**

   None

6. **New Business**

   None
7. Constituent’s Concerns

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Speaker, at this point, echoed his invitation to the upcoming IT forum. Senator Thomas added here that the meeting was announced on Yammer with only a week’s lead time (she, for one, had already scheduled student appointments at that time, she said). The Speaker said he would be present and would convey the concerns being raised.
Roxane DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, said that she submitted an email to the Faculty Technology Committee to voice concerns about Yammer and to ask for instruction. She noted that after eight months she has not had a reply.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Robert Mignone, Chair - Department of Mathematics, added that he finds email, which he uses most frequently, a fine medium for calling information to his attention. For him, going to Yammer for information amounts to an additional step he is not likely to take. He said,
however, that if no one sent emails anymore and, instead, communicated exclusively via Yammer, he would do so as well.

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

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

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

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

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

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

-----

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

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

For years, the plan for enrollments was to incrementally raise non-in-state enrollments to around 37%, having been at the 34-35% range for a few years. 37%, as the Provost said he has pointed out on other occasions, is not a sustainable target. Next year's incoming Freshman class, he noted, will likely look much like this year's, with an out-of-state number of around 34-35%. Relative to current sophomore and junior classes, the senior class has more non-residents. Next year, all classes considered, we expect, he reported, to have fewer non-resident students after the current senior class graduates.
We are, he added, recruiting differently, having less success in Florida and Georgia, who have excellent scholarships for in-state students. Consequently, more of the strong students in those states seem to be staying home. We are, however, still doing well in New Jersey, New York, New England, and Pennsylvania, traditionally strong markets for us. In some cases, we don't need any more presence in the market than we have had in the past, while in some states, he said, more visits and time spent in the market is needed for the same outcome as before. Additionally, more discounting is needed in some markets than in others: for instance, more discounting is required to recruit from North Carolina than from New Jersey. There are many metrics at work, and the Provost added that all these are bound up with our goal and expectation to have more diverse classes of freshman than we had several years ago (a goal on which we are making progress, he said).

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

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

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

8. Adjournment: 6:27 PM
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 8 December 2015

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 8 December 2015 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. **Call to Order:** 5:08
2. Minutes of the [3 November 2015 regular meeting](#) were approved.
3. **Announcements and Information**
   Speaker McNerney reminded Senators to sign the meeting roll and noted that hard copies of a report ([PDF](#)) by the Faculty Budget Committee have been distributed and that he will make this hardcopy report part of his Speaker’s report and, thus, it will be included in the meeting record.

4. **Reports**

   **A. Speaker of the Faculty McNerney**

   The Speaker announced that, as indicated in an email he distributed to the faculty, there will be a special meeting of the Faculty Senate on January 19, 2016, the intent of which is to allow focused time and attention on budget matters and their impact on strategic priorities. Also, more broadly, he said, shared governance will be a subject of discussion. Senators and other interested faculty will set the specifics of the agenda via responses collected in an online survey the Speaker will send out shortly. He added that he will invite representatives from campus offices to give responses to questions and participate in discussion. As specified by Senate by-laws, the agenda for this meeting will be distributed one week ahead of the meeting. The meeting, he added, by virtue of being set off from regular Senate business, will allow for focused discussion.

   The Speaker also reported that he had just returned from the SACSCOC meeting in Houston, at which he attended sessions and spent a significant amount of time in a resource room researching other institutions’ responses to SACSCOC reviews, including their responses that did not, ultimately, meet SACSCOC standards.

   He described the meeting as “quite illuminating.” He thanked those from the College who attended and all the faculty and staff who are hard at work on our own reaffirmation efforts in numerous ways and offered praise for how much has been accomplished in a short amount of time.

   On the timeline for SACS reaffirmation, he noted that the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning has created websites with detailed calendar information and these have been linked to from the Faculty Senate webpage [see the link on “SACSCOC Reaffirmation Information”](#).

   He also reported that a particular focus of reaffirmation efforts has been in cleaning up, revising, and developing new policies. On the latter, he said these will be vetted by our standing faculty and Senate committees.
The Speaker noted that an enormous amount of work has been done and is being done to meet our challenges, both those of reaffirmation and of our financial realities. In the face of these challenges, “our commitment to our students and their education,” he said, “is as strong as it ever has been.” He added that “[he is] confident that by working together and always keeping that commitment in the forefront of our minds we can meet these challenges.”

The Speaker closed by mentioning the printed Faculty Budget Committee report (PDF) that he distributed and said that this report will be officially part of the record of the meeting. While he said he will not directly address the report, it will be available via link on the Senate website and in the meeting minutes.

Questions / Discussion

Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Science (SHSS), asked the Speaker if there will be an opportunity to discuss the Faculty Budget Committee report.

The Speaker said that it could be discussed, but that such discussion might be better following the Provost’s report, since he would likely raise the budget in his remarks.

B. Provost McGee

The Provost thanked Senators and guests present at the meeting for taking the time at the end of the semester to attend to the needs of the College.

The Provost opened his remarks by saying that he felt obligated to respond to a recent event in our community. Replying to the proposal offered by a leading presidential candidate in Mount Pleasant on December 7 that the federal government should totally ban travel by Muslims into the US, the Provost said it would violate Constitutional principles and international treaties, characterized the candidate’s words as "risible and offensive," and expressed deep embarrassment that the candidate's proposal was met with applause in our community. The Provost, stipulating that the College takes no position on political candidates, said that we should "recognize this candidate's words for what they were: religious bigotry of the rankest sort." He added that "[the] suggestion that a religious test should be used to determine entry into the United States or access to an education at an institution like the College of Charleston is inimical to the values of this great university," and reaffirmed that "all students, all faculty, all staff, without regard to their religious beliefs, are welcome in this academic community."

Applause followed.

Undergraduate Catalogs

The Provost reminded the Senate that at the November meeting (PDF), he took the position that it would be in the College’s best interest to combine the College's two separate undergraduate catalogs (one for the AB, BA, and BS degrees, the other for the BPS [Bachelor of Professional Studies] degree, and only that degree, consistent with the description of that degree to the Senate in 2012).
He argued at that time, he noted, that it would be both financially advantageous and advantageous on the grounds of principle to combine the two catalogs. This discussion continued on Yammer for another couple of weeks, with several members of the Senate and the faculty contributing.

He extracted from these discussions some key ideas:

- our catalogs have been exclusively online for several years, with very few hard copies printed for internal use only
- catalogs provide complete lists of degree requirements and cross-referencing to other catalogs is quite uncommon, he said, as was a subject of recent discussion at the SACSCOC meeting
- the costs of maintaining separate catalogs is primarily a labor cost added to the initial software set up costs
- websites for the School of Professional Studies and the BPS could be better aligned with the rest of the College's academic program websites, particularly if we adopt a one-College attitude with the catalog and an explanation of why all the programs are consolidated in a single catalog

The Yammer discussion, he added, spoke as well to the nature of the BPS, the relationship between all four undergraduate degrees, and to the College's liberal arts commitment.

The Provost said that, while he respects all the questions raised in the discussion, particularly those related to a shared identity of undergraduates at the College, he still finds the financial and principled grounds he offered for combining the catalogs compelling. He added that if Senators feel otherwise, a Senator could consider offering a motion to that effect in order for the Senate to make their position known definitively. There have been opportunities for dialogue, he said, but the Registrar's office at this point needs a final decision for production purposes.

Policy Development and the Time-Conflict Registration Form

The Provost mentioned several policies under development and review, and he expressed thanks for faculty efforts on these: course numbering, syllabi, undergraduate program review. Significant work is underway as well, he said, on a faculty credentials policy, materials on which will be circulated very soon, beginning with academic administrators.

He then turned to a policy that he said "has never existed" governing time-conflict registration. For around 20 years there has been a form available from the Registrar's office that, when signed by appropriate authorities, allowed students to register for classes that conflict in a way that makes it impossible for the student to attend the full sessions and/or semester duration of both classes. The form and implied policy is puzzling. Aside from the obvious question of how it is reasonable for a student to be enrolled in two classes that conflict in such a way, there is another question of how this situation does not violate credit-hour policies necessary for regional accreditation and that assume students spend a
certain amount of time present in face-to-face classes. Additionally, the policy
would allow students to miss critical content at the beginning and end of classes
(even safety instructions). These forms are very rarely used, according to Interim
Registrar Bergstrom. Finally, there is no evidence, the Provost said, that any prior
Provost approved the form or that the Faculty Senate did so or any faculty
committee did so; it appears to have emerged as a "customer service"
accommodation.

For these reasons, he reported, he has withdrawn the form. However, should
there be a faculty member who wishes to use the form due to a prior discussion
with a student and a department chair, then this can be handled on a case-by-
case basis in Academic Affairs.

He said that very soon, subsequent to review by the Academic Standards
Committee, Financial Aid, and other units over the next few weeks, he hopes the
form will be discontinued indefinitely due to the potential harm it may cause to
accreditation efforts and because it is not in the spirit of providing the best
education for our students. He thanked the Interim Registrar for raising concern
about the form.

The Budget

The Provost asserted that the College's financial fundamentals are "as strong as
they have ever been," yet, he said, faculty concern about their own courses and
programs and concerns for the future of the institution are understandable and
we can have productive discussions about these concerns. In the past decade, the
College has not increased enrollments, but state dollars have essentially
decreased, added to which in the past five years, we have not been able to
increase tuition above the rate of inflation. Additionally, our attempt to slightly
increase our non-resident student population has failed.

The Provost reminded the Senate of the President’s report at the September
meeting (PDF), in which he discussed the need to offset budget shortfalls and in
which he asked the Senate to endorse changes to assist our outreach to
nontraditional students, a public mission that the Provost said has notable
antecedents in evening extension classes the College offered in the 1940s and
"aggressive" non-traditional enrollment efforts in the 1970s and 80s. The efforts
at recruiting non-traditional students, however, have fallen off more recently.

The Provost said that Academic Affairs, the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Budget
Committee, and others have responded to the President’s call in both the areas of
budget and expanding outreach to non-traditional students, and he expects
continued consultation on the budget in the next few weeks. He congratulated
the Senate, in particular, for approving changes in the BPS program to support
non-traditional students, which aids the College financial, and more importantly,
he said, demonstrates our commitment to our public mission.

Our early efforts to offset budgetary shortfalls, the Provost said, relied on
incomplete data and underestimated the shortfall. He noted that in many
meetings with the Faculty Budget committee, he has discussed the methodology
employed and what has been learned about how projections are made. He welcomed questions from the Senate and faculty both to himself and to any other member of the administration about the budget process.

He said that in the numerous discussions about the budget, concerns of the values our budget reflects have been raised in the context of an institution in which the faculty have done excellent work with very limited resources, where budgets have been stretched to the limit to invest in additional quality, and where progress on meeting goals in our strategic plan has been slower than we would like. We have had good success in fundraising by College standards, he said, but the effect of this fund raising will not really be felt for a few years.

He specified the priorities he will keep front and center as he participates in efforts to address the additional budget shortfall: meeting our general education obligations and protecting the ability of students to graduate with their majors and minors on time. He added that budget discussions will be guided by the strategic plan (with its emphasis on academic excellence, student focus, and importance of place) and the recently revised mission statement (with the added long-term capacity to develop targeted research and graduate programs in a setting of continued emphasis on undergraduate programs and professional programs in Business and Education). The College will remain a public liberal arts and sciences institution with targeted graduate and professional programs, and "our future," he said, "will be secured by our ability to articulate and defend our liberal arts focus, reimagined for the 21st century and beyond, in a public university that is responsive to community and state needs." Thus, the College is likely to evolve over time, as it has in the past, and "the process of shared governance will shape our future."

Of the budget, he said, we can anticipate more cuts and more adjustments over the coming year. Cuts will be distributed through such offices as the President’s, Student Affairs, Business Affairs, Marketing and Communications, Institutional Advancement, but Academic Affairs will also be subject to adjustments, which, he said, is to be expected in a large institution with significant fixed costs. He said that he has been consulting with and will continue consultations with the Faculty Budget Committee, the Academic Counsel, and the Counsel of Deans. He added that Academic Affairs is soliciting ideas from the Budget Committee and academic leaders across campus, and he invited faculty to share their creative and prudent ideas on the Academic Affairs budget through their various representatives or via direct communication. The budgeting process will begin in January, with a movement from ideas to actions to finalize reductions for the year and then to transition into a transparent and open budgetary planning process for next year.

He closed by noting the significant challenges ahead, both in resetting the budget and financial footing of the College and what he expects to be a very rigorous SACSCOC reaffirmation process. He asked on behalf of the President and himself for the faculty’s help in these matters and in recruiting an excellent class of new students for the 2016-17 year. He closed by expressing confidence in the bright
future of the College, noted that we are "maturing as a modern mid-sized university," and that "we have exciting opportunities in the future for the preservation of all that we hold dear and for our great traditions, but also for the continuing reinvention, revitalization, and reimagining of our undergraduate and graduate programs, consistent with President McConnell’s vision for access, affordability, and inclusiveness at a nationally-preeminent, public liberal arts and sciences university."

He thanked the faculty and asked for questions.

**Questions / Discussion**

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), pointed to a number of unanswered questions in the Budget Committee’s report and particularly to the offices that have yet to provide information requested by the Budget Committee, specifically Athletics. He said that it would be very helpful to the committee if they could get the information requested in order to discuss matters such as the amount of the Athletics fee and in order to provide this information to the Senate in advance of the special meeting in January.

The Provost replied that he has spoken to the President about the need for this information, and the President agrees that there should be no reason why it cannot be provided.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM), raised the issue of the merging of two undergraduate catalogs, saying that the particular issue has raised deeper concerns. He pointed out that a faculty survey about 10 years back demonstrated that faculty find that the common general education requirement for AB, BA, and BS students is central to the identity of the College. While the BPS, as approved by the Senate after that initial survey, has a different general education requirement, a recent, though small, survey that he conducted on Yammer still indicated that a common general education requirement is a key component of the College’s identity. He argued that this suggests that the faculty see the BPS as a separate program from the AB, BA, and BS degrees. This sense of separateness, Senator Kasman said, was reflected in the original charge that the BPS’s catalog be separate, not only for our own purposes but also to communicate the difference to students and parents.

Senator Kasman likened our situation to that of a business that has two separate brands, such as Holiday inn and Holiday Inn Express, in which the parent company spends some money in keeping the two brands separate for potential customers. He asserted that unless a unified catalog can make clear the distinction between the BPS and the other undergraduate degrees, the Senate ought to consider the expense of maintaining separate catalogs worthwhile (although we should try to minimize it), a necessary cost to keep the distinction clear.

The Provost replied with what he characterized as "raising one bit of trouble": before 1971, he said, the College had separate general education requirements for its AB, BA, and BS degrees. Thus, the single general education requirement is
a feature of the modern College of Charleston and should not be seen as a feature of the College's identity going back further than 1971.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - SHHS, agreed with Kasman that there is great value in the common general education requirements for the AB, BS, and BA degrees, but given that the Senate has already approved the BPS with its differing general education requirements, she said she is less concerned with keeping the catalogs separate. She asked the Provost for further information, perhaps to be brought to a future meeting, about the great expense of maintaining two separate catalogs.

The Provost in his reply deferred to Interim Registrar Mary Bergstrom.

Bergstrom said the College will be using DigArc software (Acalog) to build and maintain its catalog. A second element provided by DigArc is a curriculum development software package called Curriculog, which provides a streamlined electronic workflow for curriculum changes. She explained that the catalog and curriculum processes use a common database. If required to maintain a separate catalog for the BPS, we will have to maintain two separate databases because BPS students can have a minor, and so all of the undergraduate courses offered for non-BPS students are available to BPS students as well and need to be included in their catalog.

Another concern, she said, is that there is automation in the Acalog software such that a curriculum change will automatically update the catalog. With two separate catalogs, the BPS catalog will have to updated manually (an additional operation).

Bergstrom also noted that people may be thinking about the issue of the two catalogs through the lens of printed materials, yet we moved away from a printed catalog two years ago. The situation we are in is more like a website. Endorsing Senator Kasman's comparison of the two catalogs to Holiday Inn and Holiday Inn Express, Bergstrom pointed out that from those hotels' parent company website (ihg.com), you can follow links out to the separate brand hotel chains. The College’s catalog will have links taking students out to the requirements of the BPS and to the other degrees. The lens of the printed catalog does not well represent our current catalog reality.

To have the second database built, she added, have to pay an extra cost. It would also increase the workload for the catalog manager and require additional support due the increased data management needed. The immediate cost she said, when prompted by the Provost for specific numbers, would be $3,000 to add the second undergraduate database with an added recurring cost of $20,000 for the support staff required to update the separate database.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, expressed concern that including the BPS alongside the other degrees even in a list on a website may increase the likelihood of confusion between the BPS, which as she said, is a "completely different animal" (different admission standards, different requirements) and the other degrees. The confusion might occur on the part of an interested 18 year old or a parent, but it could also occur with the general
public or potential employers. She added that $20,000 might not be too high a price to pay to eliminate the potential confusion.

The Provost responded that the BPS’s minimum age requirements are posted in the materials repeatedly.

**Elaine Worzala**, Senator - Finance, sought clarification: it’s not a matter a one or two catalogs but of perhaps two different websites built from a single database?

Bergstrom agreed with this characterization and assured the Senate that whatever the front end of the catalog is, the Registrar’s office will take great care in differentiating the BPS from the other degree programs to ensure that the kind of confusion Senator DeLaurell is concerned about does not occur. She said that the only potential confusion would be at the point of choosing a link to click, but once a link is followed all will be clear.

**Rick Heldrich**, Senator - SSM, said that he understands Senator Kasman’s concerns and agrees with them but that his concerns are misplaced. When one goes to the websites of schools that have systems such as this, like Johns Hopkins, Georgetown, and so on, you cannot find a catalog in the sense of a single document. Instead, he said, there is "a bunch of data" from which is delivered specific and limited information on the click of a link. Clicking on a link on a BA in a particular program will deliver information specifically limited to that program. Senator Heldrich reported that he spent about an hour and a half online trying to find a catalog and came up empty: there are just databases that deliver limited information on clicks.

He added that the entire CofC issue might be resolved if we could see what we are talking about.

**Dan Greenberg**, Senator - Psychology, added that what the Interim Registrar is speaking to is how the catalog operates "under the hood," and what is involved in trying to maintain two separate databases in order to keep the BPS absolutely separate from the other programs, with attendant costs and possibilities for error. He said that paying for a separate database and maintenance appears to not be required in order to reach the goal of differentiating the BPS. That could be done on the front end.

He added that he served on the committee that selected the software, and the software is streamlined and will offer a significant boost for the work of the curriculum committee.

**Senator Kasman** asserted that he would not be satisfied if "BPS" is just another choice along with "BA," "BS," and "AB," because a clear distinction between the BPS and the other three is what he would like to see. That said, he agreed that such a separation could be achieved on the front end in how the information is presented. He added that his desire has been to see how it will be presented before we agree to combine the catalogs. The distinction must be clear and the the BPS not be presented as merely one more choice, no different in kind from the rest.
The Provost said that draft mock-ups could be easily supplied to the Senate. Bergstrom agreed, adding that currently DigArc has our catalogs and is coding. We should have it in late January.

She raised a separate point as well: many DigArc customers have completely eliminated PDFs. She added that Charleston Southern’s faculty found this unacceptable when they went with DigArc and after a year went back to providing access to PDFs. We have a choice to provide a PDF export of our catalog. She added that currently, with the information we have, our printout would be about 800 pages.

-----

Questions about the catalog during Q & A for the Provost’s report ended at this point. Provost McGee added that if there is no motion forthcoming at this meeting regarding the catalog, the process will be to announce a time when people can come to look at a mock-up on the catalog ascribed when it becomes available.

Discussion of the catalogs returned in the Constituents’ Concerns section of the meeting (below) and closed with a motion.

-----

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, returning to the issue of the time-conflict registration form, asked if the use of the time-conflict registration form has become more popular since the move of Computer Science to Harborwalk and a ten minute offset added in the schedule of their classes.

The Provost deferred to SSM Dean Auerbach, who said that offset is more than ten minutes.

Associate Provost Conseula Francis added that this change has not affected the frequency of the use of the form.

Dean Auerbach added that he has not had a single complaint about schedules related to the move.

Note: Senator Krasnoff’s queries and comments below came slightly later, after the question about the budget posed by Senator Greenberg below, but as they speak to the time-conflict form, I included them at this point in the record. - JMD

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked who approves the time-conflict form.

The Provost replied that there have been different iterations of the form, but in its most recent iteration, it had to be printed by a chair and signed off by that chair and any other chair or program director who might be involved. It would be then seen by the Registrar but only flagged for further review by the Associate Provost for curriculum in the case of a form being deemed suspicious for some reason.

Senator Krasnoff said that a student might have a need for the time-conflict form when she is trying to complete a program or minor and there is only one section
of a needed class and there is a conflict with another. He asked if, in such a scenario, there might be an exception offered if the student took an equivalent independent study.

The Provost agreed that in such a case a student and chair might make avail of the exception management policy. This concern also calls to mind, the Provost said, the advantages of longer cycles of planning in majors, particularly those with many lab or studio requirements, which he said was a discussion also raised in the recent Academic Council meeting.

-----

**Dan Greenberg**, Senator - Psychology, inquired about the **budget**, asking the Provost to speak to why we heard about the additional $600,000 shortfall in the budget at the time we heard about it.

The Provost explained that never before has the College made a mid-year adjustment prior to having all the official fall semester financial numbers (after all deadlines for withdrawal and pulling cash out of the system have passed, and so on), but we did this year because we knew we had a higher-than-anticipated melt in the incoming freshman class and that we would not, as a consequence, make the numbers. The Board of Trustees adopted a proactive stance because cutting earlier in the year is better than cutting later in the year. The idea, he said, was to create from partial data, unofficial data, and projection a model for fall and spring revenues, which had never been done before. The model did not work, and we ended up being off substantially.

The Provost added that what we learned from the experience was to be reluctant to build such a model again because having two rounds of mid-year budget reduction is "agonizing" and "distracting." The College did its "level best," with people working hard to create a model they thought would work, but it didn't.

Greenberg followed up by inquiring "when does the next shoe drop?" When would another correction be needed?

The Provost said that he cannot speak with absolute confidence but that he believes the adjustment that Senator Greenberg asked about will be the last for the year. Even if we prove to be off in projections for the rest of the year, he added, there should be enough in cash reserve to cover it, and it would be sensible to use the cash reserve for this.

**Kendall Deas**, Senator - Adjunct, inquired if the need for cuts are endemic to the College or if other state institutions like USC or Clemson are experiencing these problems as well.

The Provost said that nationally it's a "mixed bag," but he said he does not know if other four-year institutions in the state are going through similar adjustments to ours, given that they all use different budgeting models. There are only a couple that have a high presence of non-resident students. Clemson, who have a similar non-resident discounting model to ours, does not seem to be having problems meeting their non-resident student needs. USC and Coastal Carolina,
on the other hand, have aggressive non-resident discounting that brings those students somewhere close to resident tuition. There are not many in-state comparisons, he said, that we can make. But universities that are trying to hold down tuition costs are having a difficult time making ends meet.

-----

There were no further questions or discussion.

C. **Lowcountry Graduate Center** (PDF)

Nancy Muller, Director and Associate Dean

Muller said that she hoped her presentation would show some pathways that the College might explore for increasing enrollment of part-time, older graduates living and working in the Lowcountry.

*Please see the presentation slides (PDF).*

Muller explained (slide 1) that the Lowcountry Graduate Center (LGC) was created by local politicians to draw on the resources of the College of Charleston, the Citadel, and MUSC to provide graduate education to meet the needs of the local workforce and to build the talent pool in the area in order to attract more businesses. The LGC is a state-funded entity, governed by representatives of the boards of trustees of the three schools. Muller added that as Director she reports to the Provosts of the three institutions, but that she also works on behalf of the local workforce and employers.

Access is a central focus of the LGC in terms of location and class times. The LGC shares a North Charleston facility, replete with state of the art technology, with the College's School of Professional Studies (SPS). The LGC and the SPS share costs of some personnel—library, reception, IT. The LGC, she said, tries to offer a "high touch, high tech" environment for its students, some of whom may be a hundred or more miles away from their home campuses (slide 2).

She explained that the LGC has no programs or faculty of its own and is not responsible for student learning outcomes. Rather, it is a facilitator, a portal for programs and serves by design as a bridging agent between academia and local employers.

She reported that nearly 800 students have graduated from the LGC in the last five years (slide 4), and she shared a list of current program offerings at the LGC (slide 5), noting that new additions to the list have come from Clemson (MS in Mechanical Engineering) and the University of South Carolina (Master of Social Work and MS in Engineering Management).

She explained that the LGC supports different class meeting times (including Saturday) and formats (slide 6). The Clemson Engineering program's classes offers live, synchronous streaming classes in which the faculty travel back and forth from the main campus to the LGC, conducting sessions from both locations in the course of a semester. Up to fifty students at Clemson meet simultaneously with around ten at the LGC, and they can see and talk to each other live. Lectures given at both locations are recorded on site and archived for student use later.
There are several new programs set to launch at the LGC soon (slide 7), and these new programs reflect, Muller noted, three "major target sectors" for new programs: advanced manufacturing, engineering services, software development, and IT; health services management and community wellness; and pre-K through 12 teacher education and administration.

This targeting is based on research and feedback from employers, chambers of commerce, and the Charleston Regional Development Alliance (CRDA) (slide 8). The graph in slide 8 derives from the work of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce and the CRDA, with help of two consulting groups. The medical area of employment is very strong. The study concluded that the medical area is the single largest employer filling advertised jobs in the area. K-12 is a target section (though not strongly represented on the chart) because education is central to developing the region's workforce.

The LGC has several advisory counsels comprised largely of hiring managers (slide 9). In addition, the LGC is undertaking some consumer research on its own, gathering data from prospective graduate students living in the area.

Muller pointed out that students at the LGC are not the LGC's students, per se, but enroll in the institution that offers the program they are pursuing. The only role LGC has in recruiting students is through public awareness campaigns. Tuition dollars (slide 10) are paid directly to the programs' institutions and never pass through the LGC itself. For engineering and high tech programs, she added, at least half of the tuition is paid by or reimbursed by employers, bolstering the security of those enrollments.

Engineering programs at the LGC compete with online offerings from UCLA and NC State. Billboard advertising gets the message out (slide 11). Advertising focuses on easy access (location, hours, parking, in-state tuition) to high quality education from accredited universities. She pointed out, however, that there is no longer state funding to advertise individual programs.

Slides 14-16 focus on outreach. The LGC helped secure the Governor's proclamation of "Manufacturing Week" in South Carolina (14) and used that as a springboard for outreach to high school students via mentoring toward careers in manufacturing (15). This event helps build awareness of the LGC and, indirectly, helps build a pipeline for future students. To kindle literacy education, the LGC sponsored in October "Begin with Books," an organization affiliated with Dolly Parton's Imagination Library (slide 16). In January, the LGC will host an open house for teachers and others interested in teaching, focusing attention on programs offered by the Citadel and the College of Charleston at the LGC.

95% of the LGC's budget (slide 17) comes from the state, Muller pointed out, and the LGC is enjoined from seeking foundation funding or soliciting funding in other ways. Reflected in the expense lines at the top of the slide, the LGC pays about a third of the College of Charleston's total occupancy expenses on the North Campus (lease, utilities, maintenance, and other costs) and pays a fee to the College for services such as procurement and HR. About a third of the
personnel costs (including benefits and related expenses) are for the shared staff. All totaled, about three-quarters of the LGC's annual state appropriation, she pointed out, goes directly to the College of Charleston. The remainder the LGC can spend on dedicated staff, marketing, and communications.

The LGC’s challenge, she said, is to build the talent pool in the Lowcountry, rather than leaving employers no choice but to recruit talent from out of state to fill some of their highest paid jobs. To do so, the LGC, she pointed out, has to rely on faculty willing to take on the challenge of hybrid course design, travel, and weekend teaching.

Questions / Discussion

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, inquired about the decreasing pattern of tuition earned from College of Charleston graduate programs from 2011-15 (slide 10), asking why that is the case.

Muller replied that the College had a program in Communication that launched at the LGC but was subsequently pulled downtown. The figures point only to graduate program tuition income from the LGC. She added that there have also not been any new programs from the College added at the LGC. The two most successful and continuously growing programs at the LGC have been the Project Management program (Citadel) and the MS in Social Work (USC), and these institutions’ tuition incomes have increased in the same period.

5. Old Business

A. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs
   Chair, Jo Ann Ewalt
   1. Environmental Studies
      New Course Proposal: EVSS 606 – Wildlife Law (PDF)
      
      There were no questions or discussion.
      The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).

   2. Teaching, Learning & Advocacy (MTLA): Program Changes (PDF)
      - 4 new course proposals (MTLA 668, 671, 672, and 674)
      - 1 program change (adding a new concentration)
      
      There were no questions or discussion.
      The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).

6. New Business

A. Resolution to Award Degrees, December 2015 (PDF)
   Provost McGee
   
   The motion was seconded and approved unanimously on a voice vote.
B. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs  
Chair, Jo Ann Ewalt

1. English

   a. ENGL 650, Course Changes (PDF)

      Ewalt explained that the course’s number is 511, not 650. There were no questions or discussion.  
      The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).

   b. Changes to MA Program (PDF)

      Ewalt noted that all references in the document to ENGL 650 should be changed to ENGL 511. There were no questions or discussion.  
      The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).

2. Mathematics

      Program Changes (PDF)  
      There were no questions or discussion. The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).

C. Curriculum Committee

   Gibbs Knotts, Chair

1. Historic Preservation and Community Planning

      Creation of HPCP 222 (Old & Green: Where Heritage Preservation and Environmental Conservation Overlap) (PDF)  
      There were no questions or discussion. The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).

2. Management and Marking

      Removal of prerequisites from ENTR 200 (PDF)  
      There were no questions or discussion. The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).

3. Environmental Studies Minor

   a. Add HPCP 222 to the ENVT minor (PDF)  
   b. Add GEOL 441 to the ENVT minor (PDF)  

      There were no questions or discussion. The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).

4. Marketing

      Delete the Marketing concentration from BADM (PDF)  
      There were no questions or discussion. The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).
5. **Computer Science**  
Add CSCI 115 as a prerequisite for CSCI 215; several changes to the prerequisites for CSCI 220, change the prerequisite for CSCI 362 from CSCI 221 (with a C-) to CSCI 230 (with a C-); change the INFS major to add more flexibility to the required business coursework ([PDF](#)).

There were no questions or discussion.  
**The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).**

6. **Teacher Education**

a. **(Read to Success Compliance)** – Delete EDEE 374 to EDEL programs; add TEDU/EDFS 436 as an option and require ANTH 101 ([PDF](#)).

Bob Perkins, Teacher Education, clarified that a class is not being deleted from the inventory in this proposal, just being deleted from a particular degree. Also, he said there is no such course as EDFS 436 ("a gremlin" that he said keeps returning in the paperwork).

There were no questions or discussion.  
**The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).**

b. **(Modify Secondary Education Cognates)** – Modify secondary education cognates to include TEDU 325 as a requirement and to allow TEDU 436 as an alternative to EDFS 326 ([PDF](#)).

There were no questions or discussion.  
**The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).**

c. **(Other Changes)** – Delete EDEE 327 from the EDEC major; move EDEE 363 within the program (and change its prerequisites); add EDEE/TEDU 436 as an alternative to EDFS 326; change entry requirements; add a prerequisite to EDEE 455, requiring a student to get at least a C- in EDEE 415 ([PDF](#)).

Bob Perkins, Teacher Education, explained that there is no such course as EDEE 436.

There were no questions or discussion.  
**The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).**

7. **Supply Chain and Information Management**  
Create new minor in Information Management, create four new courses INFM 330 (Enterprise Data Management), INFM 350 (Business Analytics), INFM 360 (Special Topics in Information Management), and INFM 390 (Enterprise Resource Planning); add DATA 101 to the prerequisites for INFM 350; change the SCIM 366 prerequisite; and add DSCI 323 to the SCIM electives ([PDF](#)).

There were no questions or discussion.  
**The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).**
8. **New Degree in Meteorology (Physics and Astronomy)**

Create a new degree in Meteorology and several new courses ([PDF](#)).

**Questions/Discussion**

**Dan Greenberg**, Senator - Psychology, asked why the degree is a BA and not a BS.

Lee Linder, Physics and Astronomy, replied that the BA is attuned to the liberal arts population. He added that there is a concentration in the works for Astronomy and Physics students and if that is successful, then a BS could be designed, added to which, there was concern that CHE might object to a BS at this particular time.

**The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).**

D. **Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual** (Jason Vance, Chair) and **The Honors College Committee** (Phyllis Jestice, Chair)

Motion to Change Faculty and Administrative Manual for Composition and Duties of Honors College Committee ([PDF](#))

The motion, the Speaker explained, is a "co-motion" of the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual (By-laws) and the Honors College Committee (HCC).

Vance reported that HCC sent By-laws the proposal in October, By-laws reviewed it and sent comments and criticisms back to HCC, who addressed the criticisms and sent a revised motion back to By-Laws, who agreed that the criticisms were sufficiently addressed to bring the motion to the Senate for consideration.

Vance summarized the changes that the motion would make to the Faculty By-laws as specified in the document ([PDF](#)).

**Questions/Discussion**

**Provost McGee** asked how a distinction will be made between the humanities and social sciences faculty, given that some faculty may represent both of these disciplines.

Vance pointed out that the Chair of the committee, Phyllis Jestice, was not present to address concerns and asked if another member of the HCC was present and could answer questions. Dean of the Honors College, Trisha Folds-Bennett agreed to answer questions.

Dean Folds-Bennett said that faculty would be identified as humanities or social science according to how their home departments identifies themselves.

**Provost McGee** also commented on the language, as revised, of section 13 b. (3):

"To review and make policy decisions concerning the Honors College curriculum, admission and retention standards, and course selection procedures."
He said that he does not interpret this language as overriding the ability or cancelling the authority of other Faculty Senate or college committees relating to academic standards or other curriculum matters that may touch on Honors. If the Senate agrees with his interpretation, the Provost said, it would be helpful that the Senate makes this clear in order to guide various future proposals through the vetting process.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - SHHS, asked if Dean Folds-Bennett would respond to the Provost’s comment. Is it the intent of the motion, Kelly asked, that the HCC makes final decisions or that it makes recommendations to the Senate to changes in the curriculum, policy, and so forth?

Dean Folds-Bennett replied that in the case of anything requiring the input of other committees and, ultimately, the Faculty Senate, the HCC's decisions are not final but advisory.

Senator Kelly followed up by asking if "policy decisions" regarding the "curriculum" is to the same as "changes to the curriculum"?

Dean Folds-Bennett agreed with Senator Kelly's reading, but further specified that it would also include appeals by students about course requirements and similar matters, not all of which would go to other committees. She said that "'recommendations' would be a change that the HCC would accept, not 'decisions,' but 'recommendations'."

The Speaker asked if the Dean was making a friendly amendment. There was no reply before Senator Krasnoff (Philosophy) spoke.

Senator Krasnoff offered the following suggestion for an amendment: adding "To review and apply policy" in the place of "to review and make policy," and striking "decisions."

Senator Krasnoff asked Dean Folds-Bennett if she would accept this on behalf of the committee as a friendly amendment, to which she agreed. He then asked Chair of By-laws Vance the same, to which he agreed.

With the amendment, section 13 b. (3), now read:

"To review and apply policy concerning the Honors College curriculum, admission and retention standards, and course selection procedures."

Dean Folds-Bennett stipulated that there are, however, cases in which the committee has to recommend policy changes, and she said that she wanted to make sure this is reflected in the motion as well.

Senator Krasnoff said that "review" would include recommendation. He said he is fine with adding "recommend" but that it is not necessary.

The Speaker verified that the amendment as rendered above was accepted by Vance and Folds-Bennett.

**Rick Heldrich**, Senator - SSM, said that he objects to the proposal, "primarily because it continues the bias of the Honors College against Science and Math." He
observed that in the revised language, there will be three representatives, he said, from what he sees as the humanities (a humanities representative, one from Social Science, and one from Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs) and only one from Science and Math. He asserted that "the Honors College program has advised against Science and Math since [he has] been at the College, not intentionally," but perhaps, he said, due to the larger presence of humanities faculty involved in the program. The motion offers an opportunity, he said, to get a wider faculty involvement. He pointed out that the rationale in the motion for a wider disciplinary representation and splitting SHHS representation into humanities and social science representation on the committee actually included an example from science. He closed by saying that we have an opportunity to be more inclusive of the sciences in the HCC, and that it is inappropriate to be debating the motion at 7PM in the last fall meeting. It deserves a debate by the whole faculty.

Melissa Thomas, Senator - Adjunct, called for a quorum. The count of Senators was 31, a quorum.

Senator Krasnoff (Philosophy) argued that the motion adds representation for SSM, which does not necessarily exist in the current state of things.

Senator Krasnoff offered another amendment to the motion, which he hoped would be accepted as friendly, pertaining to the last sentence of section 13 a. as revised:

"The Dean of the Honors College (or the Dean’s designee) is an ex-officio non-voting member of this committee; the dean may also invite an Honors faculty fellow to participate as an ex-officio non-voting member."

He said that "Honors faculty fellow" is not a position defined in the by-laws and asked the Provost to confirm this, to which the Provost replied that there is no such position defined in the by-laws or in the administrative portion of the F/AM. The Provost noted in this connection that there are also a number of position titles referenced in the F/AM that no longer exist, and the only way to edit these out of the portion controlled by the faculty is via Senate vote and faculty ratification, the same process we use for any by-laws changes. The position of "Honors faculty fellow" was approved by the office of the Provost, he said.

Senator Krasnoff observed, then, that the title is "living," but may not always be so. He said he agreed with the principle of this sentence in the motion, however, and offered the following amendment of the final phrase in the last sentence in 13 a., which he hoped would be accepted as friendly:

"the dean may also invite other Honors faculty and staff to participate as an ex-officio non-voting members."

Senator Krasnoff specified that the Dean need not invite more than one such person but may. He also suggested that there is sense in inviting a staff member to serve on the committee. Also, the amendment, he said, would avoid using titles.
Dean Folds-Bennett and Vance accepted the amendment as friendly.

**The Speaker** invited further discussion of the main motion or friendly amendments thereto.

**Joe Carson**, Senator - SSM, sought and received clarification of what is meant by “friendly.” In this case, the Speaker said, it is friendly if accepted by both the chair of by-laws and Dean Folds-Bennett for the HCC. Their acceptance changes the main motion’s language to reflect the amendments.

**Mary Bergstrom**, Interim Registrar, called attention to 13. b. (4), as revised:

"To review and rule on written requests from students, faculty members, schools, or departments for exceptions from Honors College regulations and requirements."

She said that it is important, in reference to this item, to be clear that in the exception management process there is already a set group of guidelines used to handle exceptions and anyone wishing to go beyond those guidelines or ask for further exceptions, those would have to go through Academic Affairs and that these policies cannot be ruled on by any other body.

Vance argued that with the motion’s striking out "act upon" and replacing it with "rule on," "review" then covers recommendation by which any further policy applies. The revised language, he said, suggests that there are some things the committee cannot act upon, but they can, rather, make a ruling in support of or against, which could then be bound by the exception management policies. Vance asked Dean Folds-Bennett if this is correct.

Dean Folds-Bennett replied that there are different kinds of regulations and requirements. Some require input from other committees or units. Others, such as applying guidelines on retention, are subject to the committee's consultation with the Dean, case by case. Matters such as graduation requirements would clearly require consultation beyond the HCC.

Dean Folds-Bennett asked Interim Registrar Bergstrom if the different cases need to be distinguished. Bergstrom replied "yes, if that is at all possible, particularly the exceptions from Honors College regulations and requirements," since those are specifically in the purview of the Honor College.

Vance suggested an analogy. While a faculty member might sign off on (and thereby approve) a student request (such as an override or, up until now, a time-conflict form), but that request will still go through other approvers. The same is true of the HCC’s rulings.

The Provost asked if it would be helpful to distinguish in the motion between catalog requirements and what are other requirements of the Honors College. Is this the distinction?

Dean Folds-Bennett agreed that it would be helpful, though she said she is not sure how to represent the non-catalog requirement side of the distinction.
The Provost posed a hypothetical example. If a student, for some good reason, failed to attend a required number of colloquia (per Honors College internal policy), the HCC could rule on the exception, the policy not being a catalog policy.

Dean Folds-Bennett agreed: these are the kinds of exceptions the HCC would be involved in ruling on.

Vance asked at this point if there is an intent to propose a friendly amendment to the motion or if the discussion record will be sufficient to illuminate the differences between what the HCC can rule on and what it cannot.

At this point, Melissa Thomas, Senator- Adjunct, after consulting with the Speaker and Parliamentarian on the best option, moved that the motion be referred back to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. She explained that numerous issues have arisen, the Senate's quorum may be evaporating, and it seems that the motion needs more work.

The motion was seconded.

Senator Krasnoff (Philosophy) inquired if the motion is debated and was answered to the contrary.

On a voice vote (not unanimous), the motion passed.

7. Constituent’s Concerns

Jannette Flinch, Senator - Library, said that she would like to raise a concern but would defer doing so until the January meeting, when there may be more time for its discussion.

Elaine Worzala, Senator - Finance, expressed concern that the Senate vote on the matter of the catalog, since the Registrar's office needs to move forward on it.

Melissa Thomas, Senator - Adjunct, pointed out that if the Senate does nothing, the Registrar office will move forward.

Alex Kasman, Senator - SSM, observed that in discussion it became apparent that the term "catalog" may not even apply any more. He suggested that the Senate consider making a statement of some sort that, whatever software is used, there should be an attempt to "conform to the intent" of the requirement that the BPS have a separate catalog, so that a distinction is clear, as it has been with separate, paper catalogs.

Two or three Senators (unidentified) or audience members (unidentified) expressed doubt that this could be done.

Senator Kasman suggested one way of doing so: just as at the top level of the catalog website, we will be given a selection of graduate or undergraduate programs, could a third selection be added for the BPS?

Again, two or three Senators (unidentified) or audience members (unidentified) expressed doubt.
Kasman said that it seems very plausible that such an arrangement could be deployed with a single database.

Associate Provost Conseula Francis asserted that Senator Kasman’s solution would require a separate database, and this is what Academic Affairs and the Registrar’s office is trying to avoid as both expensive and duplicative of effort.

Julia Eichelberger, Senator - SHSS, asked for a clarification of the Senate’s role in the decision. Is this a matter of consultative courtesy or does the Senate have control over the College's catalog? "It sounds like you're saying," she said, "'we've made the decision and unless you talk us out of it, we're going ahead with it.' Is that correct?"

"That is correct," the Provost replied; however, he also stipulated that if the majority of the Senate said they want two separate databases with the additional expense, "I will honor that decision."

Jason Vance, Senator - SSM, followed up Senator Kasman’s suggestion. Can't HTML hyperlinks be deployed in such a way as to make the program distinction clear at the top page of the website?

Associate Provost Francis replied that this is what will happen.

Senator Vance asked if the website will have top-level, separate links to the undergraduate catalog, graduate catalog, and Professional Studies catalog.

Associate Provost Francis said that the catalog will have all the schools in which we offer undergraduate degrees. One of those schools will be the School of Professional Studies, where we offer the BPS, and on clicking that link, the user will be taken to all the BPS information.

Hector Qirko, Senator - Sociology and Anthropology, said that the process for deliberation on this matter seems to be out of sorts. He asked if the discussion should be occurring in a relevant committee, which could then advise the Senate as a whole, rather than the Senate’s spending a great deal of time as a body trying to figure out the nuts and bolts of an issue that may turn out to be trivial in the end.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, suggested that one solution to the problem would be to let the administration go forward with their plan for a year, after which the Senate could review it and vote accordingly to keep things as they currently are or revert to the prior mode.

Kunkle specified that we make a new catalog every year. Interim Registrar Bergstrom said that this is true, though the current software being used to do so is to be decommissioned and must be replaced with new software. She said that they had hoped to avoid duplication of the undergraduate database, but if the Senate is willing to accord a year to work with the new system and to revisit it at that time, she supported that.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHHS, inquired if at this point in the meeting (Constituent’s Concerns) a motion can be made. The Speaker said a motion could be made.

Senator Kelly moved that the Senate adopt the plan to combine undergraduate catalogs as specified by the Provost and Interim Registrar for two years in order for
any problems to be ironed out, if any are encountered. Additionally, while the interface is mocked up, the Senate will be given opportunity to provide feedback on it. Finally, the Senate would have to act in two years time to do away with the combined catalog as such.

The motion was seconded.

Discussion of Senator Kelly’s motion

Provost McGee cautioned that, while he accepts the motion, he cannot make promises for future Provosts.

Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, pointed out that Faculty Technology Committee reviewed the software, and he said that the decision on the catalogs is essentially being driven by a software purchase. He asked Senator Greenberg (Psychology), who had been on the committee, if the committee discussed the issue of combining the two catalogs.

Senator Greenberg replied that this particular question did not come up since the focus was on whether or not the software would be an improvement and if it would provide a good user interface for the catalog (a “yes” on both counts). The committee, he said, reviewed four different proposals and the one chosen came out the best for price and functionality.

He added that while it is important to make a distinction between the BPS and the other undergraduate programs, he said that he would prefer not to get into the details of locating hyperlinks on certain webpages, since the Senate does not have those pages to consult. He said that the flexibility of the software should give us many ways of making the distinction between the BPS and other undergraduate programs.

The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

Several nearly simultaneous motions were made to adjourn and seconded, and on a unanimous voice vote the motion to adjourn was approved at 7:18PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Duvall
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 3 November 2015

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday 3 November 2015 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. **Call to Order**: 5:05 PM
2. **6 October Regular Meeting Minutes** were approved as posted.

3. **Announcements and Information**
   Speaker of the Faculty Todd McNerney sought and received unanimous consent from the body to alter the distributed agenda to
   - add a report by the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review (T&P) on “Motion on Administrators’ Roles in Faculty Evaluation” introduced by Senator Larry Krasnoff, Philosophy, at the September Senate meeting, T&P's report to follow that of the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC). The Speaker explained that prior to the Senate agenda deadline for this meeting (10/22), T&P had not had a chance to discuss the motion, but met shortly afterward and have a report they can offer alongside FWC’s.
   - include in curriculum proposals under consideration in New Business (Middle Grades Education) the new course proposal for EDFS 436 already distributed to Senators in PDF form with the agenda but not listed on the agenda document.
   - remove from consideration a deactivation of an International Studies course included in the PDF curriculum proposals in Latin American and Caribbean Studies distributed with the agenda.
   The Speaker also announced that after the meeting agenda was distributed, the President announced that Brian McGee has been named Provost, so the title "Interim Provost" is no longer applicable and he said would introduce Brian McGee at the meeting as Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Applause followed the announcement.

4. **Reports**
   A. **Speaker of the Faculty McNerney**
      The Speaker reported that he attended the Board of Trustees meeting on October 22 and 23. He attended several committee meetings, and he mentioned that what transpired at each will be recorded in their minutes, which will be available when Board of Trustees meeting minutes are posted. The meeting agendas and binders are stored in the Faculty Senate's office space in ECTR, and Senators and others are welcome to view these.
      At the Athletics committee meeting, the Speaker said, renderings of the planned Patriots Point facility were shared (the Speaker shared these with the Senators and audience in the form of a single handout). Presentations were also made by the men's and women's soccer coaches, and, of particular note, men's coach, Ralph Lundy, was congratulated on his 300th victory.
      At the Audit committee, the Speaker learned that we have been under an IRS audit, specifically in the Budgeting and Payroll unit, but that nothing amiss has turned up. Quite the contrary, the Speaker said, "they keep noting how super Everett [McInnis, Payroll Manager] is."
      The Speaker reported that at the Academic Affairs committee, he learned that we are making modest progress in faculty diversity. The numbers will be available in that
committee’s minutes, but the Speaker did note numbers relating to gender: the female to male faculty ratio stands at around 44% to 56%, respectively.

The Speaker also reminded Senators at this point of the upcoming visit from College Reads author Bruce Watson (11/9 and 11/10) and the associated events, and he asked Senators to remind their constituents of these.

At the Budget committee, the Speaker heard reports on the College’s financial picture. He distributed to the body in the form of a handout (PDF) of college-wide cuts approved by the committee and then the full board. He also reported that he learned at the meeting of the Board’s institution of a new per-semester student fee ($50) for security, effective next semester.

At the Institutional Advancement committee, he learned of a change to the committee’s title to the Development Committee, with a modestly expanded charge of reviewing the policies of and monitoring the activities, goals, and outcomes of both the Development and Economic Development offices. He noted that the committee also heard a report on farms-to-school projects on campus.

He said that he also attended the Alumni Relations Committee meeting. With apologies to the Board and the Senate, he also noted that while he was present for the first hour and a half of the Board meeting on the 23rd, he had to leave early for teaching obligations, the need of which was made all the more acute by the recent weather-related closures.

Finally, the Speaker noted that the newly-announced QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) on sustainability, a comprehensive initiative designed to benefit a large portion of our students, still needs much fleshing out, and this will require strong faculty participation. He noted that some faculty in the room may be asked to serve on a committee related to developing the QEP. Additionally, a survey on the QEP that can be filled out by all faculty will open on 11/10 and close on 11/18, and the Speaker asked that Senators, as faculty leaders, both participate and encourage their constituents to do so as well.

There were no questions.

B. Provost McGee (Topics - PDF)

The Provost thanked faculty who sent him congratulatory notes on his being named to the position. He noted that he is the first internally-appointed chief academic officer since 1968, and said he hopes that his own experience and institutional knowledge as a member of the Senate will be an asset to the College. He said that he is trying to schedule a meeting with former Provosts and Interim Provosts still living in the region in order to learn from them. He also announced plans for three open sessions for exchanges between himself and faculty and staff, to replicate, in part, the kind of frank exchanges such as occur during a national search process, the first session to be on Wednesday 11/11, 12:30-1:30.

Provost McGee preliminarily outlined some of his “institutional commitments and beliefs” as he assumes the position, speaking to three main topics: the liberal arts-infused curriculum, the public university, and the teacher-scholar model. Of the liberal arts in our curriculum, he asserted that the College has displayed over its long history a commitment to the liberal arts, but also, since the Harrison Randolph administration, the College has demonstrated a “spirit of experimentation with professional programs” desired by students and the community. Asserting that he does not view the twin mission of liberal arts and professional education as “a source of tension” or a “distraction,” the Provost cited former Provost Conrad Festa’s words from the 1988 undergraduate bulletin: “the College as a liberal arts
institution insures that the ideals of a liberal education inform, support, and enhance every aspect of its curriculum.” These words can be taken as a guiding principle, he asserted: the liberal arts infuses “every school, every department, every program, and every course.” The professional programs are not separate from the liberal arts but infused by them.

At the same time, the College is, he also said, a public institution and, as such, owes the state a “debt of service,” incurred 45 years ago, when the state’s taxpayers “rescued us from bankruptcy and oblivion.”

Finally, he added that he believes that we have not devoted enough time to discussion about the teacher-scholar model in recent years, yet it is a distinguishing feature of the College. He said he “would like us to spend more time thinking about the challenges of that model, whether it’s mentoring and developing faculty as teachers, as researchers, as mentors to students, as well as leaders in the service life of the institution.”

He closed these comments by saying that there is much more to say about these topics in the upcoming open sessions and in future conversations in the Senate.

On the budget for 2015-2016, the Provost reiterated some of the the causes of our budgetary shortfall discussed in prior Senate meetings this fall. He noted that the budget information Speaker McNerney distributed (PDF) at the beginning of the meeting reflects permanent adjustments to the annual budget, and presumably going forward, as approved by the Board of Trustees. He said that unit budget cuts were apportioned in way that accounted for personnel expenses in the general and educational budget and does not include auxiliary spending. It does, however, include “all of the core services of the institution that are provided by Student Affairs, Business Affairs, Institutional Advancement, Marketing and Communications, and, of course most centrally, Academic Affairs.” The Provost noted that while on the percentages, the cuts in Academic Affairs, are not “an enormous part of the budget,” if your academic unit has had operating funds and faculty cut, then it “seems real and personal to you because those are fewer services you have to meet the needs of your students.”

He added that, as previously reported, Academic Affairs will have to locate another $250,000 in recurring budget cuts next year (that amount was to be cut this year but was deferred). Also, the Provost said that since he used $19,000 in nonrecurring funds to help balance the books this year, he will have to make $19,000 in recurring budget cuts next year as well. Additionally, a large proportion of the very large senior class are non-resident students and when they leave, unless there is an offset in recruiting, this will likely eventuate additional recurring budget cuts.

The Provost reported that the Deans and he have already been discussing options and are paying close attention to the first projections in enrollment from the Office of Undergraduate Admissions. Next year’s process for budget planning, he said he hopes “will not be the smash-and-grab of having to make cuts quickly in a few weeks,” but will be more deliberate, several weeks-long process that tries to do the least harm possible to our programming. That said, after next year, we may be able to stabilize at a lower total number of out-of-state students and break the cycle we are currently in, even as we continue with adjusted recruiting efforts to bring students who will pay higher tuition.

On adjunct faculty compensation and employment agreements, the Provost noted recent Yammer discussions on these matters, including new F/AM language on adjunct faculty titles (to be reported on by the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual). For their work on these provisions, the Provost
thanked the Senate and the faculty committees that were involved in vetting the language.

Noting a Yammer discussion on adjunct faculty compensation and contracts, the Provost suggested that the Faculty Welfare and Faculty Compensation committees, as they have done on compensation for roster faculty, might find ways to look at our multiyear trends for adjunct faculty compensation and, also, explore agreements to hire adjunct faculty for more than single semesters. We should try, he said, to find out where we are and where we are in relation to competitors on these matters as a step toward making headway on these matters ourselves.

**On the undergraduate catalog.** an item he pointed out that was not on his distributed list of topics, the Provost reported that we currently publish two separate undergraduate catalogs, one for the BPS and another for our AB, BA, and BS degrees. The two documents share information, since the BPS catalog has to reproduce much of what is in the other catalog. There are only 12 unique pages in the BPS catalog.

The reason there is a separate catalog for this program, the Provost said, has to do with the original proposal for the program, which specified that there would be two separate catalogs. The Provost stated that this commitment has been honored, but given the time and energy needed to produce two separate catalogs, he asked that Senators and faculty let the Speaker know within the next two weeks if there are any concerns about combining these two catalogs. Should be concerns expressed, the Provost said, then we can commit to a review of the issues, but if not, he expressed a desire to move ahead with combining the catalogs.

**On SACSCOC reaffirmation,** the Provost noted some strides in policy redevelopment, pointed to the announcement of the QEP, and thanked especially the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (Pam Riggs-Gelasco, Chair) for their development of a plan for a undergraduate program review that will be essential for meeting SACSCOC expectations.

**Questions/Discussion**

**Joe Carson,** Senator - School of Sciences and Mathematics (SSM), in connection to the Provost’s remark about continuing efforts to recruit higher-paying students, asked if the Provost was referring solely to non-resident students or also to full-paying in-state students.

The Provost replied that he was referring to two separate groups of non-resident students. The efforts include refining strategies for recruiting out-of-state students based out what has been learned over the past year, but the efforts also include targeting international students. He pointed out that we have 120-150 international students at any given time at the College, most of whom are exchange students, not degree-seeking ones. The students add diversity to the school and pay at a rate about the same as US non-resident students. He added that a modest rise in our international students would provide faculty with even stronger students to teach and help offset loses in US non-resident student numbers due to competition.

**Alex Kasman,** Senator - SSM, asked if the combining of undergraduate catalogs might be extended from the two week time frame stipulated by the Provost until the next meeting of the Senate in December, when it might be discussed.

The Provost deferred to Interim Registrar Mary Bergstrom on the timing, who explained that two weeks was optimal in relation to the vendor they are working with, but she said the Registrar’s Office will comply with what ever directive they get.
Kasman specified that his question was not to ask for more time to, himself, look over the catalogs but to ask for a fuller consideration by his Senate and faculty colleagues.

The Provost said that he could also approach a committee on the matter, which would likely be Academic Planning.

Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), noting that the Budget Committee's report in October had questions about shortfalls two years running in the Athletics Budget, asked if their budget is connected to Academic Affairs. Specifically, he wanted to know if their shortfalls had implications for cuts in Academic Affairs's budget and how the shortfall in the former unit's budget has been made up.

The Provost replied that there is a "high, thick wall" that keeps the Athletics budget separate. Athletics is funded through many sources, primarily through the student athletics fee, but also from ticket sales and other revenue streams. In past years, Athletics has actually had a budget surplus that they rolled forward as a cushion, he said, while in recent years there has been a deficit. The Provost noted that, while he claims no expertise in the Athletics budget, he can assure the Senate that there is no back and forth between their budget and ours.

One benefit we derive from their budget, however, comes in the form of the scholarships they grant to academically-strong students.

The program is connected to us financially in one way, however, the Provost said, noting that this was also mentioned in the October meetings's Budget Committee Report. The Athletics fee is a universal fee and thus is implicated in any effort to raise tuition: the total Athletics fee puts a limit on how much tuition can grow.

However, as the Speaker noted at the last meeting, the Provost said, the Athletic fee increase this last year was reduced slightly to allow more of the total increase to go to other budgets.

Kelly followed up by asking about the new facility at Patriots Point: will the Provost be involved in discussions about paying for facilities like that one through the Athletics budget and what implications that may have on our ability to raise tuition?

The Provost replied that he has had a seat at all such discussions. The new facility at Patriots Point, he added, is supposed to be philanthropically supported.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, inquired what the Athletics fee is this year.

The Provost deferred to Julia Eichelberger, Senator - SHSS and Faculty Budget Committee Chair, who said that the fee is around $1200 annually. The Provost added that the fee accounts for about three quarters of the Athletics budget, not unusual for a school of our size.

Jon Hakkila, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, asked why Athletics-related information is not appearing in Yammer.

The Provost said he did not know but that he will inquire about it.

—

There were no further questions.

C. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual

Jason Vance, Chair

1. Change in Faculty/Administration Manual for Adjunct Titles (PDF)
Vance noted at the outset that he was not aware of the Yammer discussion to which the Provost referred in his report and that his own report will only reflect discussion in the committee.

The Notice of Intent was forwarded to the Senate last April over email, Vance reported. At that time, there was some concern that time was not allotted for discussion in a Senate meeting. The Provost in the September meeting brought the matter up, but there was no discussion. He also sought feedback and received some from the Deans.

Vance summarized the changes: adjunct faculty will will have the title of Adjunct Lecturer. The rank of Adjunct Senior Lecturer may be conferred on adjunct faculty having taught 30 or more course sections, taught at least eight separate semesters/summer terms, and been responsible for 500 student enrollments. These changes to the F/AM also provide for Deans conferring professor titles on adjunct faculty: Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. This is a common convention at other schools.

In a memo sent on October 17, the Provost said that at this time, Deans may begin assigning the Adjunct Lecturer rank to adjunct faculty, but directed Deans to delay assigning the title of Adjunct Senior Lecturer until the publication of the next edition of the F/AM. In that memo he further noted that there is nothing in the current F/AM that would prevent Deans from assigning adjunct professor titles at this time.

Questions / Discussion

Jennifer Mantini, Senator - Adjunct, sought clarification for her colleagues on what is meant by “half-time” on the second page of the document in terms of number of courses taught.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost for Faulty Affairs, explained that “half-time” is “old language” that needs to be changed in another edition of the F/AM. There are different notions of what is meant by full time and part time for different purposes. Generally, full time for adjuncts means 12 credit/contact hours per semester. With the Affordable Care Act (ACA), the mandate is that any employee who works an average of 30 hours a week is considered full time for purposes of qualifying for healthcare. For adjunct eligibility under the ACA, she explained, the College is using a multiplier of 3 to turn contact/credit hours into “average weekly hours worked.” Thus, 10 credit/contact hours equals 30 hours. Ten credit/contact hours, in the ACA context, is full time.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, expressed concern about one of the changes: “Adjunct appointments are for a specified period of one year or less for a single semester.”

He asked for the rationale for the change, his concern being that the single semester appointment doubles the work for the administrative staff and means other administrative duplication, such as an adjunct having to be put back on email in January, say, after losing her account in December at the end of fall term, even if it was known in August that the adjunct would be serving the entire year.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker replied that the modification to the language was made to align with current practice, even as we are seeking means of providing more than single semester contracts. Adjunct pay, she noted, in our current system works one semester at a time on one-semester appointment forms. This has been the practice at the College and gives chairs scheduling flexibility.
Adjunct’s email accounts do not, she said, get turned off in between sessions. If, however, adjuncts have not taught for a specified number of semesters, they are deactivated, provided that their department does not intend to employ them in the coming semester. While there have been glitches—people being activated and deactivated—this is not, she said, due to semester-to-semester contracting.

The Provost added that this particular language change is not to substantively change policy but to bring the F/AM into alignment with practice.

Hector Qirko, Senator - Sociology and Anthropology, inquired that when it is said of an Adjunct Lecturer who has taught 30 sections and had 500 enrollment, that this person is “eligible” for the rank of Adjunct Senior Lecturer, does it suggest that there may be other requirements? Also, he asked what the thinking was behind the delay in conferring such ranks until after the latest F/AM has been released.

The Provost replied that the language is permissive, giving Deans an option to confer the rank but it does not require it, even if an Adjunct Lecturer has met the objective requirements. This is consistent with the permissive policy allowing Deans to assign an adjunct professorial rank, if they wish.

On the second question, the Provost said that he felt that the F/AM language needed be fully in place before we move forward with the Deans’ elective appointments.

At this point, the Speaker called for a voice vote to indicate the Senate’s relative support of the language change as specified in the notice of intent. The voice vote was unanimous.

2. Report (PDF) on Motion to Reduce Redundancies in Standing Committee (PDF), introduced by Heath Hoffmann, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, at October Senate Meeting

Vance relayed the report of the committee (PDF), explaining that the first few bullet points are technical and might be answered by changes to the motion, but the remaining concerns require discussion.

The Speaker clarified that this motion would change the by-laws, the section of the F/AM over which the faculty has control. The Speaker explained that at this point, having been reported on by the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, it is up to the Senate to decide what to do with the motion.

Questions / Discussion

Rick Heldrich, Senator - SSM, complimented the committee on the report and said that he thinks the Senate should dismiss the motion.

Elaine Worzala, Senator - Finance, expressed agreement with Heldrich.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, thanked the committee for its work and expressed agreement with Heldrich and Worzala, adding that we need good communication between the Speaker, the Provost, and committee chairs about what is properly remanded to which committees, but the motion would raise too many complications.

At this point, the Speaker conferred with Parliamentarian George Pothering.

The Provost offered a point of information: the motion was made, seconded, referred to the committee, and now has returned and it is before the Senate.
The Provost then, in his capacity as an ex-officio member of the Senate, moved to table (postpone) the motion indefinitely. He explained that a later motion might be made to take it off the table. This would be courteous to Heath Hoffmann, who brought the motion to the Senate.

The motion was seconded.

Senator Krasnoff inquired if the motion is debatable. The Parliamentarian confirmed that it is.

Questions / Discussion of the motion to postpone indefinitely.

An unidentified Senator said that he would prefer a yea or nay vote on the original motion to the postponement.

Jason Vance, Senator - SSM, spoke in favor of the motion, since it would give Hoffmann the opportunity to address the concerns, and he might reintroduce the motion with revisions.

Senator Krasnoff suggested that if Hoffmann wanted to come back with a revised version of the motion, it might make more sense just to defeat the original motion. To change the tabled motion, it would require reviving it and then making amendments to it. If it is Hoffmann's intention to revise the motion, it might be more a courtesy to defeat the original motion.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS, called the question on the motion to postpone. This was seconded.

The Parliamentarian offered a point of order. The motion is not to “table” but to postpone indefinitely, which “essentially kills the main motion. It would have to be reintroduced, but you can't take this one off the table. It's putting a dagger through its heart.”

Rick Heldrich, Senator - SSM, said that he made a motion to dismiss the original motion and it was seconded, and he asked if the Senate cannot simply vote on the motion to dismiss the original motion.

The Speaker replied that he did not hear an actual motion. Worzala added that she agreed with Heldrich, but did not offer a second, per se.

The Senate voted on calling the question, and this passed on a voice vote.

On a voice vote (not unanimous) the Senate approved the motion to postpone indefinitely Motion to Reduce Redundancies in Standing Committees.

D. Faculty Welfare Committee

Chair, Emily Skinner

Report (PDF) on Motion on Administrators’ Roles in Faculty Evaluation (PDF), introduced by Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, at September Senate Meeting

Skinner summarized Senator Krasnoff’s motion. If a Dean holds an academic appointment in the department of a candidate for review, the Dean must select an Associate Dean outside the candidate’s department or another Dean to conduct the review. The case is similar regarding a Provost in the same department as the candidate under review. An Associate Provost with an academic appointment outside the candidate’s department would need to be appointed.
She explained that Faculty Welfare (FWC) discussed the motion over three separate meetings and sought feedback from committee members’ departments and other faculty, and includes in their report a letter representing the Deans’ position on the motion.

The committee, she said, does not support the motion for the reasons provided in the report (PDF), which she read. Notably, while the committee does not support the motion, they agreed with its spirit and raised some concerns that might be discussed and addressed apart from the motion.

The Speaker suggested that, unless there were questions directly for FWC, that the next report on the motion be given. There were no such questions.

**Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review**

Chair, Irina Gigova

Report (PDF) on Motion on Administrators’ Roles in Faculty Evaluation (PDF), introduced by Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, at September Senate Meeting

Gigova read the report (PDF), which agrees with reservations about the sweeping coverage of the motion, but also agrees with the intent of the motion and suggests an alternate means of eliminating the appearance of conflict of interest by preemptive discussions between department chair, Dean, and Provost in the rare cases covered in the motion, during which alternate reviewers could be located.

At this point, the Speaker reminded the body that this motion is to change a portion of the F/AM over which the faculty do not have direct control. He called for discussion and questions to the committees.

**Questions / Discussion**

**Roxane DeLaurel**, Senator - Accounting/Legal Studies, asked if the motion presumes that a Dean or Provost’s being in the same discipline as the candidate will automatically lead to a conflict of interest.

The Speaker asked Senator Krasnoff if he would like to reply, but, noting that the Speaker asked for questions to the committees, he declined until after the committees had a chance to answer. Senator DeLaurel redirected the question to the committees.

Gigova replied that it is not a concern about bias so much as one of level of review. At the level of the college-wide committee, she said, as an historian, if she reads a case in the sciences, she is relying a great deal on the departmental, disciplinary review. But the review at that level would be qualitatively different were she reading a case in her own discipline, even if she did not intend it to be different.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator - SSM, suggested that the ideal would be to have a reviewer with broad enough knowledge to carefully judge candidates in all disciplines. “It seems strange to say,” he added, “they’re giving good scrutiny in one case, so we need to eliminate them so they’re equally bad in all cases."

Gigova replied that the Advisory Committee is purposefully composed of faculty from different disciplines.

Kasman clarified: he meant at the Dean or Provost level.

**Larry Krasnoff** responded at this point to raise a concern that he said did not emerge in discussion at the September meeting. The point has been raised, he said, that it does not make sense to take a Dean with expertise in the candidate’s field out of the review because that expertise can be helpful. However, Senator Krasnoff...
argued, the nature of the Dean’s and Provost’s review is procedural, to provide checks on the department and college-wide committee’s reviews.

If a dean does a *de novo* review of a candidate’s materials, this is a misunderstanding of the dean’s role in the process, and tying into Gigova’s comments, Krasnoff added that it would be difficult for a Dean in the same discipline as the candidate to not do a disciplinary review.

He asked the Senate to imagine a case in which a departmental review committee and the college-wide T&P committee voted strongly in the same direction, but are reversed due to a Dean or the Provost’s disagreement. This can happen, but it doesn’t very often because if the faculty committees do good work, their verdicts stand.

He added that he agrees with the FWC’s objection that the motion covers too many cases, but a rule of some sort is needed. There may be other means of writing language into the *F/AM* or adopting a policy such as described in T&P’s report if a more narrow target is desired, he said. The motion as is, though, provides an easy way “to make the cut,” he said. Additionally, he said the policy articulated in the motion would not be too costly, given that the number of controversial cases is low and the procedural review done by an outside Dean or an Associate Provost would not be terribly time-consuming. Even so, he said he would welcome any amendment that might lead to better targeting.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator - SSM, said that one thing not mentioned in the committee reports or in the prior Senate meeting at which this motion was discussed is that the Dean has a supervisory role. When a Dean is replaced in the process with an Associate Dean, you may be replacing the Dean with someone who is in the position for reasons other than those for which a Dean has the position. You would be raising the Associate Dean into a supervisory position, which seems unfair to the Associate Dean and, also, inconsistent. The level of scrutiny a Dean can supply may be far different from that an Associate Dean can.

Senator Krasnoff replied that the motion allows that option of using another Dean.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator - Mathematics, objected to the idea that the Deans have largely a procedural role in tenure and promotion. She asserted that the Dean’s role is to conduct an independent, rigorous evaluation, including of the candidate’s research. She also asserted there’s consistency to consider.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Marketing, asserted that the motion seems to be saying that what the Deans do is unimportant.

Krasnoff objected to the characterization, arguing that to say that their role is procedural is not to say it is unimportant. To make sure the departments have paid due diligence to the evaluation procedure is a very significant job.

Shaver asked in reply that if the Dean's role is completely or largely procedural, then why should their discipline matter?

Krasnoff said that this is his point, and explains why other Deans serving in cases where it is needed is not a terribly costly endeavor.

Senator Anguelova reiterated her point in the form of a question: “is the Dean’s role procedural?”

**Fran Welch**, Dean of the School of Education, Health, and Human Performance, replied that her role is not solely procedural. Her *F/AM*-sanctioned role, she said, is to conduct an independent review, separate from the departmental review.
Elaine Worzala, Senator - Finance, suggested that the Dean's role is critical in evaluations in part because the schools are so different. She added that she would not like to be reviewed by a Dean outside of the School of Business.

Jason Vance, Senator - SSM, asked if there could be a kind of “William Tell rule” as part of the motion that would allow the candidate to decide. According to the motion a Dean in the same department as a candidate would automatically have to recuse: a “William Tell rule” would allow the candidate to choose to be reviewed by a Dean in the same discipline.

Krasnoff said he likes this option better than one in which the candidate has to ask for a recusal: in the case Vance describes, recusal is presumed, but the candidate can waive it.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, added to the discussion of the Deans' role by reading from the F/AM: “The Dean will provide the candidate and the chair of the departmental evaluation panel a copy of his/her assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the Provost” (emphasis added). She also said, according to the F/AM, the Dean can ask for “information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation.” The Dean, then, she argued, is not just doing a procedural check but is looking at the merits of the case.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker also asked if the committees vetting the motion had checked into how other schools handle the situations the motion hopes to address.

Gigova reported that members of T&P did their own research on this and found that there are no consistent approaches across other colleges and universities. T&P did not take these other schools’ experiences into account, focusing instead on our internal situation.

Skinner reported that FWC, similarly, focused on the internal situation at the College.

Rick Heldrich, Senator - SSM, said that he doesn't understand the motion and its intent. It strikes him, he said, as lack of trust for Deans and the Provost specifically. If this were not the case, chairs would be suspect, too. One could argue that chairs have been involved in annual reviews and so should not be able to vote in evaluations. Similarly, you might ask why a President who happens to be a biologist, for instance, should be able to vote on whether or not a biologist be granted tenure. The motion is not consistent at all levels.

Senator Krasnoff replied that, for him, consistency at all levels, means that the disciplinary review is conducted at the disciplinary level. The other levels, he asserted, are not doing disciplinary review. The principle that attains is of one disciplinary review. As to what Heldrich said about the department chair, Krasnoff said that he thinks the chair should have an equal vote and should be sharing annual evaluations all along.

As to lack of trust, he said that things happened last where he expected recusals and they did not happen. He added that what the motion does seems natural. Were he appointed Dean, he would never participate in a review of a Philosophy faculty member. He reiterated that the basic principle is a simple one: one disciplinary review at the departmental level.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, observed that there appear to be two justifications for the motion. One is that with a Dean in the discipline, there can be an over-scrutiny of a candidate. The other justification seems to be that simply being in the same discipline creates conflict of interest. He said "I don't buy either one of those."
Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker argued that there seems to be a simplification afoot in the idea that a review is disciplinary or it is not. In a review, you are given much qualitative information that does not require disciplinary expertise to understand, such as external reviews of research, information about journals, review process information, and we develop an expertise in using that information. There is no easy dividing line between what is a disciplinary review and what is not.

Roxane Delaurel, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, said that Senator Krasnoff is struggling with the very important issue of trust, and often, she asserted, there is no trust. A faculty member that lacks trust in a reviewer should have some means of asking for a different reviewer. But she said she disagrees with the implication of the motion that a reviewer’s being in the same discipline as the candidate results in an automatic conflict of interest, which almost trivializes, she said, departmental colleagues’ work.

While she did not support the motion, she said that we should have some kind of mechanism of petition for cases in which a candidate can ask for an alternate reviewer:

Julia Eichelberger, Senator - SHSS, called the question and it was seconded, and carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Speaker McNerney pointed out that the motion about to be voted upon seeks changes in a section of the F/AM over which the Senate and faculty have no control. The vote, thus, will merely express the Senate’s relative support or lack of support for the motion.

**On voice vote (not unanimous) the Senate voted against supporting the motion.**

5. **Old Business** (none)

6. **New Business**

   A. **Curriculum Committee**  
      Gibbs Knotts, Chair

      The discussion and voting on the proposals below was conducted by group under arabic numeral headings, unless a Senator requested that the proposals be split and considered separately.

      1. **French and Francophone Studies**  
         Allow FREN 496 and FREN 499 as alternatives to the capstone course FREN 495  
         ([Proposal PDF](#))

         **There were no questions or discussion.**  
         **The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.**

      2. **Middle Grades Education**  
         Creation of two new courses (TEDU 325: Foundations of Language and Literacies Development Grades 5-12 and EDMG 335: Teaching Writing/Design with Adolescent Literature and Multimodal Texts 5-8), adding them to the degree requirements, replacing EDEE 325, and replacing the current entrance requirements with the College's Gen Ed requirement ([Proposal PDF](#))

      **Questions / Discussion**  
      Bob Perkins, Interim Chair - Teacher Education, explained that in the documentation provided the same course appears under two different acronyms
(but the same number), EDFS 436 and TEDU 436. He said that the course should appear only as TEDU 436.

Curriculum Committee Chair, Gibbs Knotts made corrections to the hardcopies of the proposals.

**The proposals were approved on unanimous voice vote.**

3. **Political Science**
   Change the titles of POLI 294 and POLI 395 ([Proposal PDF](#)).

   **There were no questions or discussion.**
   The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

4. **Studio Art**
   Proposal for three new courses (ARTS 295: Photography in Context: History, Theory, and Practice; ARTS 316: Digital Photography I: Portrait and Documentary Photography; and ARTS 349: Digital Photography II: Landscape Photography) and also changes to the titles of ARTS 215, ARTS 315, and ARTS 327 ([Proposal PDF](#)).

   **There were no questions or discussion.**
   The proposals were approved on unanimous voice vote.

5. **Urban Studies**
   a. Junior Student Ambassador Proposal ([Proposal PDF](#))
   b. Senior Student Ambassador Proposal ([Proposal PDF](#))
   c. Proposal to add a new concentration in Sustainable Urbanism ([Proposal PDF](#))

**Questions / Discussion**

**Brian Fisher,** Senator - SHSS, said that as Director of the Office of Sustainability and a member of the Department of Political Science, he would like to raise some concerns about the proposal to add a new concentration in Sustainable Urbanism. In reply, Speaker McNerney suggested that the concentration be considered separately.

The Speaker then called for questions about the Junior and Senior Ambassador proposals.

**Larry Krasnoff,** Senator - Philosophy, inquired of Kevin Keenan, Director of the Urban Studies program, how the pipeline for students in the ambassador program works.

Keenan said that students will start in their sophomore year, taking URST 250 & 251, and would continue, with the approval of these proposals, through their junior year, taking URST 350 & 351, and compete the program in their senior year, taking URST 450. The program is designed to provide foundational knowledge in urban policy and Lowcountry issues, experiential learning, and, ultimately, an internship.

Krasnoff asked what the target number of sophomores is. Keenan replied ten.

There were no further questions or discussion on the junior and senior ambassador proposals.
The proposals were approved on unanimous voice vote.

Questions / Discussion on the proposal to add a new concentration in Sustainable Urbanism

Brian Fisher, Senator - SHSS, raised concerns about the proposal related to the sustainability QEP, which he worked on. A central principle of the proposal is the infusion of sustainability principles through a wide range of courses and to encourage departments to take ownership of this. Fisher said that his concern about the proposal relates to the timing of it. He would like to see the QEP be allowed time to develop and the community time to develop their ideas about sustainability and what it is going to look like, how it is going to operate in departments, what kind of new courses are developed and interdisciplinary pathways established.

He added that many courses in the proposal are environmental courses, whereas sustainability is broader than that, encompassing economics and the social dimension as well.

Keenan expressed disagreement with Fisher’s concerns. He noted that there are economics and sociology courses in the concentration. He also argued that the concentration does not preclude action on defining the QEP.

Fisher further specified that he hopes the QEP will bring sustainability thinking into every department. Keenan agreed with this goal and said that the concentration could feed into that effort.

Daniel Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, said the proposal already demonstrates the infusion of work in other departments, a process which can continue. Additionally, he said approving the proposal will not negatively affect the work of developing the QEP.

Elaine Worzala, Senator - Finance, agreed that the proposal will not preclude other work on sustainability, developing classes, and so forth. Given issues like 1,000 year floods, she said, the sooner we get programs like this on the books, the better.

Senator Krasnoff asked a general question about concentrations (both to Keenan and Knots). This is a third concentration in the major: could it dilute the others? Also, this concentration is more of an individual student experience, and thus it may work against one idea of a concentration, that it groups students together. He stipulated that this is not necessarily a problem, but it does raise a question of what a concentration is.

Keenan replied that there is in the Urban Studies major a core. Also, in this and the other two concentrations there is a core of a small number of courses and students are likely to encounter each other there.

Conseula Francis, Associate Provost for Curriculum, observed that there is only one definition for a concentration: 18 or more hours of focused coursework inside a major.

The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

6. Latin American and Caribbean Studies (LACS)
Reduction in the number of required credit hours by reducing the number of
electives required and by eliminating the required course INTL 300 (Proposal PDF)

FCC Chair Knotts specified that the deactivation of INTL 300 included in the proposal paperwork was specifically off the table, per the Speaker’s unanimously-approved request at the beginning of the meeting that it be removed from consideration since LACS does not have jurisdiction over the course. The vote on the proposal, therefore, did not include a vote to deactivate INTL 300.

There were no questions or discussion.
The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

7. Professional Studies
Changes to admission requirements, specifically: lowering the age requirement, adding flexibility to the required course content, and decreasing the number of required credit hours (Proposal PDF)

Questions / Discussion

Roxane DeLaurel, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked if the Faculty Curriculum Committee (FCC) has approved the proposal. Knotts replied in the affirmative. Senator DeLaurel asked if the committee was comfortable with the lowered age requirement.

Knotts replied that there was considerable discussion on that issue, but the committee arrived at consensus after discussing it. He added that some, however, felt that the change represented a turning away from the original proposal. Knotts asked Dean of the School of Professional Studies (SPS) Godfrey Gibbison if he would like to comment.

Dean Gibbison thanked the FCC for their work on the initial proposal, but said having now been implemented the program for about three years, we have, he said, more information and experience. We also, he added, now have data from around the country relating to degree completion programs and the body of students that would be candidates for programs like ours.

On the practical side of things, Dean Gibbison pointed out, current BPS admissions criteria eliminate some 98% of prospective students.

Many potential students under the age of 24 have some college, are not living with their parents, are functioning independently, like older students, and on the whole, have a higher level of maturity than the typical 21 year old student at the downtown campus. Furthermore, these students are not seeking BA and BS degrees and as such do not represent a population over which the downtown and North Campus might compete.

Senator DeLaurel stated that one her concerns on the age requirement stems from the original proposal’s citing 38 as the average age of the students the BPS is seeking, but the new proposal asks for the 24 year minimum to be dropped to 21, which seems inconsistent.

A second concern about the lowered age, she said, is difficulty we will have in maintaining a separation between the BPS and other degrees.

Additionally, she said that she feels that the BPS was represented initially in a different way, and now there’s an attempt to lower the admission age and
combine the undergraduate catalogs: the BPS is finding its way into the College. She expressed concern that this will water down the education on the downtown campus with the different admission requirements and the impression that the BPS is a business degree. She fears that this will harm existing students and alumni, as the firewall between the BPS and downtown seems to be melting.

She added that she will vote against the proposals, which she characterized as marginally deceptive since they depart from what the faculty agreed to in the original proposal.

Dean Gibbison replied and reiterated strongly that the BPS is never represented as a business degree. In fact, there is, he pointed out, a BS in Business Administration offered in its entirety at the North Campus for students who have an interest in that.

He added that the downtown undergraduate and BPS catalogs only differ slightly.

On the charge of misrepresentation, Dean Gibbison asserted the process for proposing the changes has been a transparent one. He said that he is asking for the Senate to make the changes. Nothing is cloaked in secrecy.

It was the intent of the faculty to serve a certain population of students, but we cannot, Dean Gibbison said, under the current rules. If you want to serve these students, he said, vote yes on the proposal.

Idee Winfield, Senator - SHSS, asked if a student on the downtown campus, meeting the age and other BPS requirements, could shift over to the BPS program.

Dean Gibbison replied that this could happen right now, since about 1,000 students on the downtown campus are 24. But it doesn't happen. Students who come to the College to pursue a BA or BS come for a specific major, not the BPS.

Elaine Worzala, Senator - Finance, expressed concern that if we lower the age requirement to 21, some of our out of state students could stop going for a while, establish residency for in-state tuition, and go back and finish the degree.

Dean Gibbison replied that, as he said above, nothing is stopping students from doing that now. Worzala replied that now they have to wait until they're 24. Gibbison replied that he considers it an extremely unlikely scenario, since students who come to the downtown campus come for specific reasons, and earning a BPS is not among them.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, noted that the discussion so far has concentrated on age requirements, yet the proposal calls for more than that. He inquired if the FCC considered splitting up the proposal to consider age as a separate concern.

Gibbs Knotts replied that they did not.

**Shaver moved to divide the proposal, and this motion was seconded.**

Associate Provost Francis noted at this point that the proposals were in fact presented to Academic Affairs as separate.

The Parliamentarian inquired of Shaver how he would like to split the proposal. Shaver replied that he would divide it into age and everything else. The Parliamentarian specified that the motion to divide could be amended to adjust how the proposal is to be broken up.
Senator Krasnoff moved to amend the motion to split age, minimum hours, and core admission requirements. Shaver accepted the amendment.

On a voice vote (not unanimous) the motion to divide passed.

**Discussion of the age requirement proposal**

**Mark Witte**, Senator - Accounting, addressed Senator Worzala's question. Any non-resident student over the age of 18, he said, could take a year off from school, secure a driver's license and register to vote, become a citizen of South Carolina, and get in-state tuition.

Additionally, he speculated that it may not even be legal to have an age requirement for entrance into the BPS program.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - SHSS, spoke in favor of lowering the age requirement. It meets the market. Many of these potential students are working full time and do not have the access they need to complete a degree in our traditional program. She said she sees no reason to deny access to 21 year olds. Nor does it not dilute the quality of education downtown, she said.

**Daniel Greenberg**, Senator - Psychology, agreed, adding that some of the language being used to describe these students seems peculiar; “they might become part of the school” or “they were part of the College of Charleston, and then they went to the BPS program.” All these students, he stressed, are at the College. They are all our students.

**Tom Baginski**, Senator - German and Russian Studies, asked Dean Gibbison to clarify what he meant by “we cannot serve these students.”

Dean Gibbison explained that the admission requirements for age and number of credit hours, eliminate about 95% of potential applicants for the BPS. We cannot serve this population if they cannot gain admission.

**Brian Fisher**, Senator - SHSS, asked Dean Gibbison what the age requirements are for our competitors.

Dean Gibbison replied that our competitors have no age requirements. In many cases, they are taking transfers from technical colleges.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator - Mathematics, said that he is uncomfortable with an age requirement that would keep out people who might benefit from the program, provided the program is a good one. But he said that he is also having trouble seeing the BPS as just another part of the College. Mentioning the Provost’s comment that the College is unified in its liberal arts infusion, he said he doesn’t see that extending into the BPS. So “is it part of the college or isn’t it?,” he asked.

The Provost said that the committee that designed the BPS deserves full credit. They designed a unique degree-completion program notable for its integration of the liberal arts experience. The Provost said it is a good program and one to be proud of, yet there is a core problem of access, as Dean Gibbison has laid out. On the age issue, the Provost, referring to his own experience teaching in a degree completion program, noted that such students have a different set of life experiences than those of our continuously enrolled students. He also said that the experience of other programs is that they often started with age restrictions and then rolled them back. Most have an age requirement of 21 or 22, some with no age requirement at all. “24 is simply too high,” he said, given our experience and programs elsewhere.
Senator DeLaurel said that her comments should not be construed as meaning she is “trying to keep people away from the body.” Rather, she called attention to assurances at the program’s development that the reasons the BPS did not have the same requirements and liberal arts experiences as the AB, BA, and BS programs is due to a special educational circumstance, meeting a special market, the non-traditional, older student returning to school. Given the market and the students’ circumstances, many faculty at the time, she said, were not as stringent as they were in vetting other programs.

Now, she said, the BPS has not been successful with that targeted market, and, she said, we are asked to make changes for which “age is just a proxy to reintroduce these students” in a way that might threaten the integrity of our liberal arts public institution. We are not, she stressed, “a for-profit institution designed to compete with Strayer;” which competition was noted, she pointed out, in the BPS proposal. Far from it, she asserted, we should not be competing with Strayer. We should serve non-traditional students, but maybe, she asserted, the age issue is “a proxy for a certain philosophy,” and “our goal should not be to be better at Strayer than Strayer.” These, she said are the issues, and they do not imply that she is not receptive to non-traditional students.

Lynn Ford, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, speaking, she said, on behalf of original committee that designed the BPS, pushing back against what she called “an air of bait-and-switch,” argued that the committee did their best to design a program for adults seeking a high-quality education with the flexibility and acceleration they need. The College was not equipped to do this.

The BPS is not designed to be like Strayer, she said, though we do compete with them. The committee was intentional in making the BPS a College of Charleston program, such as in creating the research-based liberal arts seminars. The committee was also intentional in applying the research on what employers are looking for in graduates, “a certain set of dispositions that come from the enrichment of the liberal arts,” she said. Nevertheless, the designing of the BPS took place in somewhat of a “vacuum,” looking to other institutions’ examples and in a context of two wars and a changing economy.

As we are trying to attract a much more diverse population of students, such as returning veterans, she said she is not concerned about the age requirement so much as that we make intentional programmatic decisions across the board.

“We are very intentionally not trying to be Strayer,” but hope to provide an alternative. Three years of experience, under a capable Dean, have imparted lessons. “We have to be as nimble as our competitors in the for-profit sector in order to capture and serve well those students who are not being served by Strayer and a whole host of others.”

Jason Vance, Senator - SSM, thanked AVP Ford for her comments. He said he, too, is not concerned about age, nor about the potential for students to switch from a BA, BS, or AB program to the BPS. Should such happen, it is the choice of the student and there’s no need to stand in the way of a student making a decision as to which program is better for her personal interests. Our goal is to serve students.

Dean Fran Welch, Dean of the School of Education, Health, and Human Performance, told of a recent dinner with Mary Thornly (President, Trident Technical College), Geritta Postlewait (Superintendent, Charleston County School District), and Lucy Beckham (Executive Principal of District 2 Schools, Charleston County). They asked her, she said, why the College of Charleston is not admitting non-traditional students who are forced to go to the for-profits.
While we are graduating some of these students from the College, there is a wealth of such students we are not reaching, and others, external to us, are seeing this and wanting us to step in.

**There was no further discussion on the age requirement proposal.**

On a voice vote (not unanimous) the proposal was approved.

**Discussion on modifying number of hours for admission**

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, commented on one of the arguments for this part of the BPS proposal, that the change respects the students we are recruiting. Senator Krasnoff took issue with this, since currently 60 hours is required, and we are not, thus, disrespecting students with fewer hours since we cannot recruit them until they reach 60.

He also asked a question about whether or not the curriculum would need to be changed for students coming in under the new requirement.

Dean Gibbison replied that the curriculum would not have to be altered because, presumably, such students, would be taking core requirements to fill the gap between 30 and 60 hours.

**Senator Krasnoff** also asked if going to a 30-hour requirement, and taking the entrance requirements down from 60, might have implications for 2+2 arrangements with schools like Trident. Could the new 30-hour requirement make it harder to negotiate agreements with two-year colleges, since they might perceive the BPS as “poaching” on their turf?

**Dean Welch** replied that Mary Thornly (President, Trident Community College) has said that she is for what is best for the students, even if that should mean that a student leaves Trident after 30 hours to pursue a BPS degree at the College.

Senator Krasnoff noted that President McConnell has talked about trying to develop more 2+2 agreements.

Dean Welch said that we have a robust 2 + 2 program for teacher education students from Trident, a smooth transition to the College. But, she emphasized, since students differ in their needs, we may want to look at it from that perspective.

Dean Gibbison pointed out that right now many students do not wait to complete an Associate’s degree at Trident before coming to the College for a BA or BS because they see no advantage to securing the Associates degree.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - SHSS, asked for a clarification: under this proposal, students who join the BPS with 30 hours will need to complete 30 more hours?

Dean Gibbison replied, for a degree at the College, they would need a total of 92 more hours.

Eichelberger speculated that this could add more rigor to such a student’s coursework, since coming in with 30 hours means more coursework at the College.

**There was no further discussion on the proposal to modify number of hours for admission.**

On a voice vote (not unanimous) the proposal was approved.
**Discussion on the proposal to add flexibility**

Gibbs Knotts, Chair - Faculty Curriculum Committee asked Dean Gibbison to sum up the proposal to add flexibility in admissions.

Dean Gibbison explained that, currently, admission requires that students shall have completed the typical courses in the core curriculum, including courses in the humanities, social sciences, math, natural sciences, and English.

The changes would do two things.

The humanities requirements are rigid, owing to the history of the development of the proposal. The proposal would change the humanities requirements so that it replicates the current social science requirements: take two courses from two different disciplines from a list of available courses.

Currently students are supposed to come in with six hours of math and eight hours of sciences. The second change, would have students responsible for entering with a block of 12 hours of science and math which must contain three hours of science and six hours in math. The remaining three hours could come from science or math. The rationale is to align with what we would expect from students coming out of a two-year school.

**Daniel Greenberg**, Senator - Psychology, inquired if students in the BPS under the new proposal would be completing the degree with no laboratory science.

Dean Gibbison confirmed that under the proposal BPS students would not be required to have laboratory experience.

Senator Greenberg pointed out the difference between this and the typical BA and BS. He further asked if there is among the BPS concentrations any that require laboratory science. Would BPS students be able to complete their degree without taking any lab science?

Dean Gibbison replied that there is not a single concentration in the BPS that requires students to have a lab or heavy science background.

Senator Greenberg expressed concern. CofC BS, BA, and AB students all take laboratory science. The proposal is a significant change, he said.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator - SSM, asked for a clarification. The proposal seeks a change in admission requirements, not degree requirements. Are there currently admission requirements, he asked, that are not degree requirements?

Dean Gibbison confirmed this: all of the BPS requirements are admissions requirements.

Kunkle asked if we change requirements to be accepted, are we also changing what they have when they graduate?

Dean Gibbison replied yes, de facto.

**The Provost** asked, at this point, for Dean Gibbison to share the gist of his conversations with SSM Dean Auerbach on the science and math admission requirements.

Dean Gibbison said that Dean Auerbach felt comfortable with the fact that under the plan, students will come in with either nine hours of math and three hours of science or they will enter with six hours of math and six hours of science. Also, these students will not likely pursue sciences.
**Senator Greenberg** asserted that while he gets the logic, the purpose of having a lab science requirement is not to line up with a plan to go into the field but to offer broader preparation.

**Rick Heldrich**, Senator - SSM, said that while he “loves labs” and “loves science,” BPS students are not the same as BA, BS, or liberal arts and science students. They are seeking a professional degree for their careers, a very different thing than the students of whom we require our general education of here.

**Hector Qirko**, Senator - Sociology and Anthropology, said that he thinks "we are giving ground."

Heldrich rejoined, “I agree, and so is Georgetown and so is Hopkins and so is University of Miami and so is Harvard, and so are a million other really good schools and it hasn’t ruined their reputation and stature.” He continued, saying that we are serving the needs of clients that do not need the general education in the same way as our other students.

Qirko responded that he is not worried about reputation so much as about our mission with respect to the students.

**Senator Krasnoff**, said that he thinks the proposal is watering down the science, but he commented that our lab science requirement for BA and BS students is steep and could be pared down.

**There was no further discussion on the proposal to add flexibility to the BPS admissions prior coursework requirements.**

On a voice vote (not unanimous) the proposal was approved.

8. **Physics and Astronomy**
   Proposal to require ASTR 377, move PHYS 230 from being a requirement to an elective, and add a few courses to the list of electives ([Proposal PDF](#))

   **There were no questions or discussion.**
   The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

9. **Teacher Education**
   Creation of a new course (EDFS 402: Education, Health and International Development) that has previously been offered as Special Topics ([Proposal PDF](#))

   **There were no questions or discussion.**
   The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

At this point, a motion to adjourn was made and seconded.

The question was called on the motion to adjourn and seconded.

The question was called successfully on a voice vote, and a vote taken on the motion to adjourn passed at 7:32 PM.

Items remaining on the agenda were as follows and will be put on the agenda under “Old Business” for the December meeting.

**Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs**
Chair, Jo Ann Ewalt
1. Environmental Studies
   New Course Proposal: EVSS 606 – Wildlife Law (PDF)

2. Teaching, Learning & Advocacy (MTLA): Program Changes (PDF)
   - 4 new course proposals (MTLA 668, 671, 672, and 674)
   - 1 program change (adding a new concentration)

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael Duvall
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 6 October 2015

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday 6 October 2015 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. **Call to Order**: 5:03 PM

The Speaker of the Faculty, without objection, changed the order of the agenda to accommodate the Interim Provost’s travel needs. The Interim Provost delivered his report and took questions (see below). The meeting then proceeded according the agenda.

2. **15 September Regular Meeting Minutes** were approved as posted.

3. **Announcements and Information**: none.

4. **Reports**

   A. **Interim Provost McGee (Topics - PDF)**

   The Interim Provost thanked all those who worked long hours over the weekend to address weather-related facilities issues and to make sure students were safe, cared for, and fed, with praise due especially to those in the offices of the Provost, Academic Experience, and the Registrar. The academic deans and program and department chairs also deserve praise, he added, for their work in identifying classrooms and faculty offices that had been affected.

   The Interim Provost reminded the Senate of last month’s reports from the President and himself in relation to budget cuts this year, which total $1.5 million from the general and instructional funds of the College. He added that Academic Affairs, as the largest division, has been asked to find the largest cuts, $1,055,000 in recurring budget cuts this year, minus $250,000 which, he said, he was able to convince the President to defer until next fiscal year. He stressed that protection of faculty lines and creating flexibility going into next academic year have been paramount in his proposals. He added that the President will have to convince the Board of Trustees that the cuts are appropriate and necessary. The Interim Provost promised further budget updates in the near future.

   The Interim Provost reported that SACSCOC reaffirmation work is coming along apace, but a great deal still needs to be done. Policies that should be periodically reviewed and updated, for example, have not been over the years and still need to be for the reaffirmation. The work on assessment continues, as well, and the Interim Provost said that he wanted to “heap praise” on the many faculty who have not only served in their departments’ assessment efforts but who have also served in the college-wide general education assessment. The Interim Provost said that there will be further updates on the SACSCOC reaffirmation efforts at each future Faculty Senate meeting this year.

   He noted that the Senate agenda for the night includes a report from the Faculty Budget Committee and said that he will provide his perspective on the budget at the November Senate meeting. In the interest of allowing Q&A before he had to leave, he opened the floor at this point to questions.

**Questions/Discussion**

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, asked how many vacant faculty lines will be cut.

The Interim Provost replied that there are three faculty line vacancies that, per his proposal to Randolph Hall, will be cut. He added that there are far more vacant staff
positions will not be refilled, on which he said there is more consultation with the academic deans needed before he discusses those staff lines. Each of the academic schools and the library, he said, contributed either a faculty line, staff lines, or operating money or a combination of two or all three of those toward the budget cuts—all made sacrifices.

**Beatriz Maldonado**, Senator - School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs (SLCWA), asked about positions that might be cut next year.

The Interim Provost said that positions currently occupied this year but that are anticipated to be vacant the following year would be “fair game” in budget discussions for next year’s reductions. He reported that discussions planned for the next Academic Counsel meeting will begin a "somewhat longer and more thoughtful process" for meeting budget goals in the next fiscal and financial year, but he added that the process must also take into account the time-sensitive need to let academic units know of the fate of such lines soon so that they can begin recruitment for positions that will not be cut.

There were no further questions.

### B. Speaker of the Faculty McNerney

The Speaker added his thanks to the Interim Provost’s for all those who worked to minimize the inclement weather’s impact on our mission and our students, and he counseled patience and accommodation in working with students who may have been adversely affected due to location and cannot come to class.

He reminded faculty that Saturday 10/10 is the class makeup day for the missed day on 10/5, and that Reading Day 12/8 will be the makeup day for missed classes on 10/2.

The Speaker also introduced the Senate to our new Faculty Secretariat, Jessica Wolcott, who joins us from her last position working at Blackbaud. The Speaker noted that Wolcott will be working not only with the Senate at large but also with particular committees.

The Speaker also offered an update on the Trustee faculty-shadowing program established by Speaker Lynn Cherry about three years ago. The program continues this fall with four faculty-Trustee pairs. He expressed appreciation for these faculty’s participation, invited any other faculty interested to talk with him, and expressed hope that the program will continue.

Finally, the Speaker reminded the Senate that Yammer launches on October 12, noting that it is fairly easy to use, and pointing out that **resources for Yammer** are available online.

### C. Faculty Budget Committee (Presentation: [PPT](#) | [PDF](#))

**Julia Eichelberger, Chair**

Eichelberger called attention to the other members of the Faculty Budget Committee (slide 1) and thanked the committee for their significant efforts.

She outlined how the 2015-16 Academic Affairs Budget was created and how the 2014-15 Faculty Budget Committee participated in the process (which changed over the summer), provided perspective on revenue trends and the College’s growth, discussed the committee’s consultative role over the summer in discussions about the shortfalls and budget priorities, and posed questions about the budget that the committee feels remain unanswered.
I. How 15-16 Budget for Academic Affairs was Created (slides 3-11)

Eichelberger gave the budget figures decided upon last year (College budget of $255,494,000, Academic Affairs’s share, $103,500,000 [40.5% of total]), and explained that the Interim Provost hoped at that time for an increase of around 3%, half of which would go toward inflationary expenses, the other half of which would go toward strategic investments (slide 3).

She outlined the new, open process for budget requests that was instituted last year and the consultative role of the committee on the Academic Affairs budget up to the time that the request went to the President and the senior leadership team, who did no consult with the committee (slide 4).

Eichelberger provided an image of a slide presented by Interim Provost McGee in January (slide 5) that in part listed items that the requested budget would cover, which included eight new faculty lines, five new permanent staff lines, and support in a variety of places. She countered this with a second slide (slide 6) that lists what survived from that January list in May, after a shortfall (“shortfall, part 1,” as the slide has it). The shortfall became apparent in the spring as a result of a number of non-resident students not staying at the College (transferring out) and a lower than expected yield for non-residents coming in the fall. The pared-down list from the Interim Provost’s requests (slide 6) included a LCWA line (CofC would begin funding an existing line initially funded by donors, as previously agreed), a line supporting the MFA in Creative Writing (for a program predicted to generate revenue), four temp-to-permanent line conversions, and library serial cost hikes. Together, these additions cost about 300K.

While Eichelberger stipulated that she was still in the process of trying to nail down the latest figures on the total current budget for Academic Affairs, all indicators seem to suggest that the net total is down from last year (slide 7). Within that total figure, recurring revenue is up and nonrecurring revenue is down. She suggested that some new expenses may help explain the difference between last year’s and this year’s net and listed them at the bottom of slide 7.

To fill in the context of the May shortfall (slide 8), Eichelberger pointed out, in addition to the drop in revenue vis-a-vis nonresident students, a directive from external auditors that software licenses, instead of being paid for out of nonrecurring funds, as has been the practice, must become recurring costs. This created a new recurring budget expense of $427,000.

The budget committee met twice in May and offered recommendations to the Interim Provost to offset the shortfall (slide 9) and thereby try to protect the faculty lines that were proposed. These recommendations included shifting monies for software from non-recurring to recurring over several years, not all at once, and using non-recurring funds to help meet critical faculty staffing needs for the short term. The committee also expressed concern that the College not fall behind on living up to the Senate-approved salary raise goals of the Faculty Compensation Committee.

In their 27 May meeting with the President and the Interim Provost, the committee, Eichelberger said, indicated their concern that Academic Affairs appears to have “just gotten the leftovers.”

Eichelberger reported that in August there was a further “melt” of non-resident students when many of these students who had paid their deposits decided not to come (slide 10). The President, faced with this and with the strong
recommendation of the Board of Trustees, has asked for cuts in the recurring budget to offset the revenue loss and, assuming that the loss of non-resident students will be permanent, has asked for a “right-sizing” of the budget. Cuts to the recurring budget will be $1.5 million. The difference between recurring and non-recurring costs is explained at the bottom of slide 10.

Academic Affairs must cut $1.055 million, 70% of total cuts required of the College (slide 11), a situation with which the committee is unhappy. The committee has been consulting with the Interim Provost, who has shared his rationale for which vacant lines might be cut, and the committee offered advice for how to mitigate negative affects on departments that might experience cuts. The committee expects to be fully involved in the budget process for next year. Eichelberger explained that one feature of next year’s budget may be reallocation of lines. For instance, hypothetically, if one department is losing a faculty member due to retirement, another department may be allocated that line to offset a prior loss of a line.

II. Long-term Contexts for Current Situation (slides 12-21)

State support, Eichelberger noted, has, from 1990 to 2012 (slide 12), declined from 41% to 8%. A graph on slide 13 plots declining state support in roughly the same time frame against the relative rise in tuition revenue.

Meanwhile, the College has increased our faculty and staff and added programs and facilities in line with the Strategic Plan (adopted 2009, revised 2013). Slide 13 graphs growth in part-time (PT) and full-time (FT) staff, 2009-13, and slide 15, shows “major gains” in total FT and PT staff and faculty between 2008 and 2013. Eichelberger reported that we added 31 FT faculty between 2009 and 2013 (the most recent year for which the committee had data) and 181 FT staff in the same period. Paying for the growth in faculty and staff has been where part of the tuition revenue has been going, she pointed out.

Charts on slides 16-18 demonstrate long-term and recent trends in enrollments broken down by resident and non-resident figures.

Turning to data available in the College’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for 2014 (slides 19 & 20), the committee charted trends in instructional and research expenses (Eichelberger stipulated that it is not clear what is covered in the latter expense category) against revenue from student tuition and fees from 2004 to 2014 (slide 21). The graph reveals the research spending in the period has been essentially flat and instructional expenses have gone down, while tuition revenue has gone up in relation to decreasing state support, as previously established.

III. Some Unanswered Questions (slides 22-24)

The committee, Eichelberger said, has several questions for which they would like to find answers.

- Why is Academic Affairs, whose budget is around 40% of the total College budget, now being asked to take 70% of the cuts? (slide 22)
- What is the basis for continued increases to budgets in other units? (slide 22)

Eichelberger asked how Academic Affairs is asked to take budget cuts when other units are apparently getting budget increases. With all respect to the work done and people doing the work in such other units, she asked how these unit’s needs are deemed more critical than those of Academic Affairs.
• Does the new budgetary regime for software costs in IT coming out of recurring funding free up some non-recurring funds that would have been used for software? If so, could this money be used elsewhere? (slide 23)

• Based on figures available in NCAA reports, Eichelberger pointed out shortfalls in Athletics of $1,432,000 in 2012-13 and $547,000 in 2013-14 and queried how such shortfalls were handled. How were these shortfalls made up? (slide 23)

The committee has additional questions related to the above regarding the student fee for athletics ($1200 annually or about 11% of their total fees). What benefits are secured by the fee? Could they come at a lower cost? If so, perhaps, Eichelberger speculated, the remaining margin could be applied to academic costs without adding to the student's total fees.

• How will Academic Affairs’ budget requests be treated in future years? Will Academic Affairs’ portion of the College’s budget be diminished further? (slide 24)

• How is the performance of other units assessed, and how will this assessment affect the funding they receive? (slide 24)

Here Eichelberger noted the numerous ways in which the performance of academic departments is measured (peer reviewed publications, service, student evaluations, student credit-hour production, etc.). The committee, she said, does not know by what metrics other units’ performance is assessed and what the relation is between such measures and funding for those units.

• Will principles of shared governance and transparency apply to President McConnell’s budget planning in the future? How will the Faculty Budget committee participate? (slide 24)

Eichelberger said these last questions are rhetorical, perhaps, but it is a concern of the committee that it be involved in budget deliberations before the fact.

Questions/Discussion

The Speaker explained that, as Eichelberger pointed out at the outset, this is a committee report requiring no specific action by the Senate, but he suggested, given the relative lightness of the night’s agenda, that the Senate take a few minutes for questions, discussion, and conversation.

Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), said that there is a tradition of exclusion of the Faculty Budget Committee in deliberations on the College budget as a whole, yet the by-laws, ratified by the Board of Trustees, specify that the committee is charged with advising the President on the budget, which is not limited to the Academic Affairs budget alone. Senator Kelly suggested that with a relatively new President not steeped in the way things have been done in the past, there is an opportunity to do things differently. He said that he would like to see the Senate try to solve the problem of the committee’s exclusion from advising on the College’s overall budget. He added that the urgency for this was laid bare in the committee’s report, citing in particular the disturbing shortfalls in Athletics. An over half million dollar shortfall last year amounts to about a third of this year’s shortfall. If Athletics is losing a large amount of money annually, other units, such as Academic Affairs may be paying for it. He cautioned that he doesn’t know if this is the case, but
he would like to know. We need the budget committee’s full involvement in the College’s entire budgetary process, he argued.

Kelly closed by saying that he is not sure what action the Senate should take but that the need to act is apparent.

The Speaker replied that the Senate could take action, if it so desired, in the form of a motion from the floor. Kelly replied that he would make a motion, but he doesn’t know exactly what to move.

**Hector Qirko**, Department of Anthropology, asked Eichelberger what steps are being taken to get answers to the committee’s open questions.

Eichelberger replied that the committee’s report is the first step. She said that the committee did meet with the President in the May, the first time in her memory a budget committee has ever met with the President, and she had hoped he would be present at this meeting. She said a meeting with the President and, perhaps, Steve Osborne (Executive Vice President for Business Affairs), might be able to help the committee understand some of the other budgets.

She added that the committee has requested to see the Athletics budget a couple of times but has not gotten a response. In the absence of that information, the committee used the NCAA report.

**Linda McKee**, Senator - School of Business (SB), commented that one of her concerns when we moved to the Colonial Athletic Association was that it was going to be more expensive due to the farther travel required of the athletes. She wondered if this has added to the budgetary problems in Athletics.

**Jon Hakkila**, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, thanked the budget committee for their efforts and commended them, especially, for locating information that is essential in understanding our situation but not necessarily easy to get.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM), asked what the Interim Provost may have meant when he said that Academic Affairs is taking the largest amount of the cut because it is the largest division. Did he mean “largest” in terms of the number of people in the division?, in which case, Senator Kasman added, this might be analogized to a regressive tax.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, replied that her understanding is that the budget cuts were apportioned based on “personnel dollars associated with each division,” with each division’s share of the cut to be determined based on their portion of personnel dollars of the College as a whole.

Senator Kasman asked for clarification: this is based on salaries alone, not accounting for other expenses? Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker agreed.

Senator Kasman followed up, asking if there is a rationale for that method.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker said she was not privy to that conversation and, therefore, does not have an answer to the question.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, said that he had a number of short items to add to the discussion.

He commented that as Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, he will inquire about the President meeting with the budget committee.

He asked if the athletics fee charged to students, because it is a fee, is not subject to the same legislative capping as tuition is.
Eichelberger explained that Athletics is an "auxiliary enterprise," and such enterprises are supposed to be self-funded, but because the athletics fee is a universal fee (a fee paid by all students), the athletics fee is factored into how much we can raise tuition on students.

Speaker McNerney added here that this year’s increase in tuition of around 3% did not include a relative increase in the athletic fee. That was specifically not done.

Senator Krasnoff also noted that, while he has not seen any public conversation of this fact, we now pay stipends to athletes. Speaker McNerney added that these are for cost of event attendance. Krasnoff said that the bigger the name of the athletic conference, the more pressure there is to provide stipends in addition to scholarships for athletes. This relates to the discussion earlier of our membership in the Colonial Athletic Association, he said. The stipends may be welcome, but they are another financial commitment to consider.

Senator Krasnoff also asked about staff hiring as represented in slide 15 of the presentation, seeking clarification on the ratio of faculty to staff hired between 2009 and 2013, which he thought was about 6:1.

Eichelberger replied that the figure was 181 FT staff to 31 FT faculty, verifying the 6:1 ratio.

Senator Krasnoff further inquired if he saw correctly that in 2010, 100 full-time and part-time staff were hired. Eichelberger confirmed this (slide 15).

Krasnoff said that this was a remarkable amount of hiring and said that he would like to know more about it.

Eichelberger replied that this was not among the things that the committee specifically had questions about, but she thinks it bears further investigation. She noted that part of the Strategic Plan was to hire more staff and speculated that perhaps this uptick might be explained as part of that effort.

Senator Krasnoff closed by asking whether the figures that Eichelberger provided in slide 12 (state support from 1990 to 2012) expressed spending in absolute dollars (and not dollars adjusted for inflation).

Eichelberger confirmed this and a brief discussion ensued as to how cost-of-living adjusted figures would paint and even bleaker picture of state funding for the College over the years.

Brian Lanahan, Senator - School of Education, Health, and Human Performance (SEHHP), inquired whether anyone has approached the state legislature about how they have financed us into an "artificial budget freeze" with the various limitations they have put on the College, such as in enrollment. Presenting the budgetary state of affairs now, might we ask the legislature to free up some control over what we do?

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, thanked the committee for their work and asked Eichelberger if there are any figures from other colleges available, anything like national figures, to which we might compare our budget.

Eichelberger replied that this would be a good idea, but the committee has not looked into it yet. She thought perhaps the AAUP might be helpful to this end. Such figures, she said, are probably available.

Tom Baginski, Senator - German and Russian Studies, commented that, based on an email he has recently read from the Dean of Humanities at Trident technical College, Trident is experiencing an $8 million shortfall. He assumes, he said, they are experiencing issues similar to ours.
Joe Kelly, Senator - SHHS, said that at this point, it is probably premature to offer a motion, but he did recommend that the budget committee return in November with any follow up they may have on their questions. The Senate might also invite Steve Osborne to speak at the December meeting, Senator Kelly said.

The speaker agreed.

There were no further questions.

5. **Old Business** (none)

6. **New Business**

   A. **Curriculum Committee**  
      Bonnie Springer, Interim Chair  
      1. BA in Public Health, Change of Program  
         Deletion of HEAL 495 from electives ([PDF](#))  
         **There was no discussion.**  
         **The proposal was approved on voice vote.**

   2. Data Sciences  
      Change prerequisites for DATA 495 and change of Major – Remove Calculus 2 from the degree ([PDF](#))  
      **There was no discussion.**  
      **The proposal was approved on voice vote.**

   3. Mathematics  
      Change prerequisites for MATH 440 ([PDF](#))  
      **There was no discussion.**  
      **The proposal was approved on voice vote.**

   4. Biology  
      Change of minor, adding BIOL 314, Immunology to the list of general electives, change of course for BIOL 314 adding “or permission of instructor” to prerequisite statement ([PDF](#))  
      **There was no discussion.**  
      **The proposal was approved on voice vote.**

   B. **Motion to Reduce Redundancies in Standing Committee** ([Word](#) | [PDF](#))  
      Heath Hoffmann, Department of Anthropology and Sociology  
      Speaker McNerney explained that the motion is to change our by-laws, and it can be discussed, but the Senate can not take any action on the motion at the present meeting. It will be referred, per the by-laws, to the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, who are charged with returning a report and any recommendations or amendments to the Senate by the next meeting.

      **Heath Hoffmann** introduced the motion.

      He explained that he is currently on the Academic Planning Committee, which at their first meeting were brought by Academic Affairs two items: a request to develop a new policy and to review a new policy developed in their office, but in draft form. The first of these was simultaneously charged to three different committees, the second to four separate committees.
This, he said, strikes him as a waste of faculty’s valuable and expensive time. He called attention to redundancies built into descriptions of faculty committees in the by-laws. He added that upon bringing the redundancy to the attention of the Interim Provost, the latter suggested that one way to address the issue was through bringing it to the Senate for consideration as a by-laws change.

**Questions/Discussion**

**Alex Kasman,** Senator - SSM, commented that he always assumed that redundancy in committee charges was due to the need for each committee to look at different aspects of the matter brought before them.

Hoffmann agreed that this is a reasonable argument for redundancy, but that in practice redundancy is not achieving that goal.

Senator Kasman asked for further elaboration, and Hoffmann replied that the three committees right now tasked with developing a new policy do not seem to be coming at that charge with uniquely different issues in mind.

The motion, he explained, would allow the Speaker to charge a single or multiple committees to a task if he saw the need for unique viewpoints from separate committees. The motion makes multiple committee charges optional, not de facto.

**Larry Krasnoff,** Senator - Philosophy, asked if such multiple committee tasking is mandatory now or is it just a matter of providing a courtesy review. It is not, he asserted, written into the by-laws that multiple committees need to be tasked in certain situations. He proposed that the Provost could simply consult with speaker prior to the former’s engagement with committees. Senator Krasnoff added that he is hesitant to change the by-laws when there doesn’t seem to be written rule already governing the situation the motion would remedy.

Hoffmann replied that Senator Krasnoff’s point is well taken but that our current Interim Provost seems to use the most conservative reading of the by-laws possible and given that we do not know whether or not he will become the actual Provost or who will, Hoffmann said he would rather err on the side of not relying on the personality of the person in office. The motion, he argued, would make us leaner and help eliminate the useless redundancy currently in place.

Krasnoff replied that it could just be a norm that the Provost always goes through the speaker.

Hoffmann replied that we tend to rely on informal norms, but later these can cause problems when personnel change. The by-laws, he added, are not like the Constitution and we need not treat them with that level of care.

Krasnoff said that it is Academic Affairs’s choice to bring these policy matters to the faculty, and we are not going to constrain them with rules.

There was no further discussion.

7. **Constituents’ Concerns**

**Margaret Cormack,** Senator - Religious Studies, expressed concern that images of “enthusiastic young frat guys” frequently appear on the College webpages. She reported that in conversations she had with a group of female Religious Studies students about these images, the students found them not appealing from a recruitment standpoint and, moreover, disconcerting—one student, who self-disclosed as a victim of sexual assault, said she found the image scary. The image of is of a group of white males, and Senator Cormack speculated that this might not be very appealing, either, to students of color we are trying to recruit.
She asked to whom she might express concern and was met by a chorus of “marketing,” to which the Speaker added that Senator Cormack might try speaking to the Division of Marketing and Communications and offered to give her the name of a contact who might be able to help.

**Jennifer Mantini**, Senator - Adjunct, Department of Physics and Astronomy, informed the Senate that she has been in touch with a number of parties in the legislature and elsewhere regarding the State Legislature’s mandate that permanent, full-time state employees making less than $100,000 annually be given a one-time $800 bonus in November. Under this program, she added, a professor making $90,000 will get a bonus, while an adjunct working a full-time equivalent contact (we have around 90) will get nothing.

She pointed out that while the Senate cannot do anything about this, individuals might consider becoming a voice for adjuncts by contacting legislators and agitating on behalf of adjuncts, who despite the designation, are not add-ons to the College but essential to the College’s mission.

8. **Adjournment:** 6:08

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael Duvall

Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 15 September 2015

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday 15 September 2015 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order

2. 7 & 14 April 2015 Regular Meeting Minutes were approved as posted.

3. Announcements and Information

Speaker McNerney noted that a total of four copies of the Senate roll for the meeting were circulating for Senators to sign in, and he encouraged Senators to sign one of these. If after the meeting any Senator discovers that she may have not signed the roll, he added that she can contact the Speaker, the Faculty Secretariat, or the Faculty Secretary.

The Speaker announced that George Pothering has agreed to serve again this year as Parliamentarian. Applause followed.

The Speaker also went over the standing rules for speaking in the Faculty Senate.

- Everyone attending has speaking privileges when recognized by the Speaker. Non-senators, too, may ask questions and/or speak on a topic.

- When recognized, the participant should identify herself by name and department and specify whether or not she is a Senator—and at all times speak loudly and clearly.

- An individual should not speak on a single topic more than twice and not for longer than five minutes.

He noted that he has not enforced speaking limits in the past, preferring to allow conversation and discussion, but he said he may invoke the rules if the meeting seems to be going long or if many individuals wish to speak on an issue.

Finally, the Speaker asked for and received unanimous consent to change the order of business to allow the President and Interim Provosts to deliver their reports and take questions prior to the Speaker’s own report.

4. Reports

A. President McConnell

*The following is a transcript of the President’s report as delivered.*

Good afternoon to all of you.

I am glad to be here with you today. If you are like me, you are probably feeling very energized by the start of the school year.

This semester is off to a great start. As some of you may know, we have finished the field research stations at Dixie Plantation. These are beautiful, state-of-the-art facilities, and I can't wait to see how our professors and students collaborate out in the field at this new facility.

We are also in the last 10 months of our Boundless campaign, and we have tremendous momentum going into the home stretch now. I thank those of you who have contributed to this philanthropic effort.
Through this campaign, we have been able to create and award more scholarships than ever. Since FY 2011, we have grown student aid and scholarship support from the College of Charleston Foundation by nearly 70 percent – thus making the dream of a College of Charleston education a reality for many of our students.

Regarding state appropriations, the state legislature has shown a great deal of support for our vision to bolster programs that benefit the Lowcountry and South Carolina. We received nearly $600,000 in recurring funds over and above what we normally get in the budget bill for our Computer Science and Supply Chain Management programs. Plus, they gave us $1.75 million for the renovations of the Stern Student Center for repurposing the pool area.

In addition, we also secured CHE approval to offer the College’s first terminal degree: an MFA in Creative Writing. This new degree will take full advantage of our incredibly talented faculty in the Department of English. Also, the MFA will set the stage for future university offerings that will benefit the College.

These achievements are just the tip of the iceberg of all the great news, activities and initiatives that are shaping our academic culture at the College.

...  

Today, I want to talk to you about two topics: our process for reaffirmation of regional accreditation and our opportunity to move the College in a new direction, one that I feel will make the College more financially stable as well as expand and better deliver on our promise of being a student-focused community.

As many of you may know, our 10-year SACSCOC reaffirmation visit will take place in March 2017. While that date may sound far off in the future, I can assure you that it is not that distant. There is much to do, a great amount to do.

As we prepare for that visit from SACSCOC, the College is responsible for undertaking a thorough review of its programs, policies and procedures.

We will submit a Reaffirmation Compliance Certification Report in September 2016 and a Quality Enhancement Plan in February 2017.

As several of you know firsthand, our current review is underway. Dr. Divya Bhati has joined the College as Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Planning. She is a very highly talented professional and has hit the ground running at full speed. In order to help her team, I have appointed some of you and other faculty, staff, students and trustees to serve on various working groups and to help develop our Quality Enhancement Plan.

These working groups are writing narratives and attaching the supporting evidence of the core requirements, comprehensive standards and the federal requirements as defined in the SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation.

Everything needs to be in order, such as correct course numbering, faculty credentialing and college policies.

I want to thank in advance the many people who are serving on our various working groups and QEP teams and everyone involved with our reaffirmation process. This is a large undertaking and a top priority not only for this administration, but for this entire campus. We can only achieve our reaccreditation by working together. I greatly appreciate the additional time and attention you all will put into making our 10-year reaffirmation operation successful.

Interim Provost Brian McGee will touch more on this important topic in his report.
Now, I want to switch gears and discuss a new vision – both academic and financial – for our College of Charleston.

Over the past year, the College’s leadership team has taken inventory of our institution, we’ve engaged in fact finding about who we are, studied our financial model, looked at our recruitment data, and we have reviewed trends and practices in higher education.

Analyzing the data reaffirmed that, first, we do an incredible job at teaching at the College and truly provide a student-focused community that enriches the mind and prepares our students to be successful leaders in whatever fields or industries they choose. And the world is taking notice of our accomplishments.

In the rankings released by *US News & World Report* just last week, the College was named one of the best undergraduate teaching institutions in the South. While rankings do not necessarily showcase a university’s true value, it’s nice to see this continuing recognition of our excellent academic reputation.

Whatever the rankings say, I know we are truly blessed at the College to have countless faculty who teach exceptionally well and invest in the personal, educational and professional development of our students.

The personal connections you form with your students last a lifetime and are something they will remember and cherish. Students feel like there is no place else they would rather be because of YOU. And I thank you for all you do for our students.

The data, however, also alerted us to some sobering truths about our enrollment and budget.

Each year since fall 2012, we have missed our student enrollment projections. While our total student population has not changed greatly, our mix of resident and nonresident students has.

Due to the substantial difference between out-of-state and in-state tuition, which is $17,500 per student, missed projections with regards to the makeup of our student body can have serious budget implications.

When we compare our current fall 2015 numbers to fall 2012, we are down 359 non-resident students and up 262 resident students. While a difference of just 97 students may not seem significant, and at face value it’s not, trading 359 non-resident students for 262 resident students creates a current tuition revenue gap of $7.4 million.

While additional revenue has been generated through tuition increases and other sources, to date, the real cumulative revenue impact of these successive missed projections and lost students over the last three years represents a nearly $5 million reduction to our bottom line.

We have been able to cover this shortfall by pulling dollars from our enrollment reserve fund and by other administrative savings. However, these solutions are designed and intended to address short-term variabilities in revenues, and based on the data before us, we now need long-term solutions.

For example, last year (Fiscal Year 2014-15), we drew nearly $1.8 million from the enrollment reserve and shifted additional one-time administrative savings to fill gaps where needed.

For one year, this is a perfectly acceptable practice, but we are now in our third year of having to make mid-year adjustments to our revenue forecast. And this year, the available enrollment reserve is not sufficient to fill the gap. The anticipated total
revenue shortfall for the current fiscal year is $2.5 million, which is nearly $500,000 more than our available enrollment reserve.

In an effort to appropriately right-size the budget and protect a portion of the enrollment reserve, I have asked our budget team to prepare a budget reduction package of $1.5 million. Ultimately, the College’s leadership will decide how these reductions will be portioned across campus and then have the various divisions manage the specifics.

While the goal is to shore up our current budget, it is my plan to do it in a way that will protect our academic mission.

The rationale for going beyond the structural shortfall is twofold: one, after successive years of revenue adjustments, it is clear that what we hoped was an anomaly is now a trend. Thus, any temporary solutions are insufficient. And two, the enrollment reserve does have purposes beyond filling unusual revenue deviations. Each year the bulk of the unused enrollment reserve is used to fund maintenance and capital projects at the College.

Multiple years of fully exhausting this reserve will have real and visible effects on maintaining our buildings and our classrooms. We simply cannot have another year in which we have no enrollment reserve funds available to carry over into the building maintenance fund.

Now, let me talk a little about out-of-state recruitment and its challenges.

You may be thinking that the simple solution is just to find more non-resident students, and I must admit that is where I was just a few months ago. But I now agree, I do not think the hope for more of these students is a responsible plan.

For our freshman class and transfers, the applications from out-of-state students were the same number from last year, but we did not yield the students we needed. Competition for these students and price cutting of out-of-state tuition by our competitors has flattened this enrollment.

Other states, such as Georgia and Florida, have negatively impacted our recruiting numbers by offering better lottery scholarships in order for their students to stay home. Added to this, in some of our prime recruiting areas, we are seeing fewer high school graduates. For example, in the Northeast, there is a projected net loss of 25,000 high school graduates between 2012 and 2022.

That means competition for those students will be even fiercer in the years to come.

It is clear that our current revenue model relies on an unsustainable enrollment strategy. Until now, we’ve expected out-of-state students to make very significant contributions to our total revenue picture. A reduction of that dependence is now inevitable.

The bottom line for us is that we cannot solely depend on out-of-state students. This is economic quicksand, and we must not get sucked under.

Roughly, if nothing else changes, we can potentially increase our tuition about 3.25 percent each year, which barely covers inflation and fixed costs, but nothing else.

The landscape has changed, ladies and gentlemen, for many reasons, and we must change with it or be changed by it. We must now look at other opportunities to secure more revenue for the College and, thus, shape for ourselves who the College will be.

I do want to make clear that there are many positive things going on in our recruitment efforts. While our out-of-state numbers are not where we like or want
them to be – which is an unsettling trend affecting many universities across this country – our in-state numbers are doing great. In fact, this year, we brought in the largest in-state class ever! We also had the largest number of in-state applications that we have ever seen.

Students from all over want to come to the College. In terms of the power of place, few universities in the country can match us. However, there is a more important reason our students, both in state and out of state, are coming here and that's our academic reputation and academic excellence. Our education is the key building block of the College of Charleston experience.

Our schools – no matter the discipline – prepare their graduates to be successful: successful in their careers, successful in their civic engagement and successful in their lives.

But we must also remind ourselves that as a public institution, we have a very specific purpose, a very public mission.

We must provide our education in a way that:

1. Is affordable to diverse groups of people.
2. Recognizes that the families' ability to pay for an education will not grow over the next decade.
3. Provides a mix of majors in the liberal arts and sciences and in professional disciplines.
4. Engages in active learning.
5. And makes decisions using evidence-based assessments of learning outcomes.

Some of you may have seen the cover story in Forbes Magazine's August edition that touts a liberal arts education as the golden ticket to success in the new economy. It's great that the business community is realizing today the power of a liberal arts education, something we've known here at the College of Charleston since the 1700s. As industries streamline more tasks and automate more and more jobs, a creative mind will always be the leader in change and innovation.

And that's what we develop here at the College: minds that can handle and respond to change. And as an institution, we must do the same.

We must be more creative moving forward. We must tap into our liberal arts approach and apply it to our own institutional decision-making. We can't just raise tuition to raise more revenue. That plan won't work long term.

As we are seeing in the surveys and in the actual numbers, today's college student is more tuition aware and debt adverse. These students and their families want to ensure a return on investment for the amount of money they are paying for their education. So, we can't keep raising our tuition year after year. If you are a climatologist, you might describe our situation in terms of reaching a tipping point – a tipping point between being a best-value university and an overpriced luxury.

It's clear from statistical and strategic points of view that we need to make a course correction in how we move forward.

At the Board of Trustees' retreat in June, the board charged me with developing an academic and financial vision that enables the College to invest in our students' academic enrichment and our faculty and staff's excellence. The deans have played an integral role in shaping the possible outcomes of this charge and giving input, and
we look forward to their ideas as we go forward. as to where we go. I will continue to work closely with the deans and with every one of you to achieve this.

The College’s leadership wants the institution to be able to maintain and expand our competitiveness well into the future. That’s something that I think we all can agree on.

As the 13th oldest institution of higher learning in the country, we have been on a long, hard-fought journey to where we are today. We started as a small, private college, became the country’s first municipal college, then became a private college again, and then a state institution in 1970. Through all of that change, all that uncertainty, we got stronger. Change and evolution are in our institutional DNA. We protected our core mission while we grew and changed.

When I was a freshman here 50 years ago, the College was very different. Except for Randolph Hall, the Cistern Yard, Sottile House and 10 Green Street, the College looks nothing like it did back in the late sixties. Our student population has grown – both in size, ethnicity and nationality – we’ve added more facilities, and our degrees have changed. Yet, we have remained a student-focused institution centered around the liberal arts and sciences while growing our professional undergraduate and graduate programs.

We have evolved daily, weekly, monthly and yearly into who we are today. Some of this transformation took big changes and others were slight tweaks here and there along the way.

We now operate under both a College of Charleston and a broader University of Charleston, S.C. banner. This distinction allows us to create a firewall around our liberal arts and sciences core while addressing specific programming needs of the Charleston community.

We can change again while still protecting our core and our student-focused brand.

On any journey like this, there are pivotal moments when you must choose a path that may fundamentally affect your future. And for the College, we have an opportunity right now. I believe now is the time for the College to control its destiny.

First, we do this by strategically targeting non-traditional students who never received or who are trying to finish their degree. According to the national numbers, these community college transfers and adult degree completers represent nearly 20 million people nationwide.

These types of students are here now and are also moving into this region daily because of the evolving diversification of Charleston’s economy. For example, our tech economy is growing 26 percent faster than the national average. And our per capita wage growth is almost double the national average. In addition, the Charleston Metro Chamber of Commerce estimates that 43 people move to Charleston every day; that’s more than 15,000 coming into the area every year.

Of these newcomers, 27% are non-traditional students. They are mostly part-time students – 22 and older, working full- or part-time jobs. This is largely an untapped segment for the College and one that is only growing in size.

Most of these students have little interest in being a part of our downtown campus. They want to take classes closer to where they live and work, which is good for us because our growth is limited on the peninsula. And as you know, we have agreed to keep our enrollment here at 11,000 and under on the historical footprint.

These non-traditional students would enable us to focus our growth outward at our North Campus, perhaps in Mt. Pleasant, and also outside of Summerville close to the
Nexton community, between I-26 and I-95. These satellite operations can meet an important and growing educational need while making a financial contribution to the College.

In no way does pursuing these students weaken our core mission of educating our more traditional students – full-time 18–21 year olds. Rather, it generates revenue not only for possible extension campuses, like the North Campus, but for the College as a whole. As the market data shows, degrees – not courses – drive demand.

In order for us to attract these non-traditional students, we will need to expand program and degree offerings through our School of Professional Studies. And I’ll need your help in this particular endeavor.

Dean Godfrey Gibbison will have a set of academic policy reforms for you to review for approval that will simplify the matriculation process for transfer students and provide even more options for degree completion.

Some of these reforms are:

Reducing the age of admission into the School of Professional Studies programs from 24 to 21 as many promising students are younger than 24.

Allowing the transfer of students who have earned college credit elsewhere with a 2.0 GPA into the School of Professional Studies. Currently, students must have a 2.6 GPA, a minimum GPA that we have learned is not realistic.

Addressing the minimum number of credit hours a student must have to transfer into the BPS program.

Creating an admissions committee for the Bachelor of Professional Studies, so that we can better assess the whole person, rather than relying on a GPA cut-off.

Adding additional concentrations within the BPS program.

Offering additional undergraduate certificates in such topics as project management and procurement and contract administration.

Adding new evening classes in several disciplines. The possibilities for these courses include offerings in Computer Science, Accounting, Education, Psychology and Corporate Communication.

Enrollment growth in the BPS program will be facilitated by more online, night and weekend courses, and I hope that roster faculty will remain open to meeting the needs of our students for such courses.

Next, we must expand our graduate programs according to market needs. Matching real-world demand to student demand and offering these at non-traditional and traditional sites will enhance our student populations as well as our bottom-line financial position.

Our broadened educational approach will prevent other institutions – both public and private, for-profit and non-profit – from coming here to set up shop and eventually compete with us for the traditional student base.

In addition, we must continue to pursue hybrid and distance education and pursue them more aggressively. We must continue to join with other universities in collaborative programs to bring much-needed offerings to our area. This can be cost-effective and financially beneficial to all.

It is my hope that this approach to educating more diverse student populations will have us involved with more executive education, more certificate education, more hybrid-distance education, and embracing the anticipated needs of the community
in graduate studies, involving, for instance, such disciplines as Supply Chain Management, Computer Science and Information Management. There will be needs in other disciplines and fields, of course, that we do not yet anticipate.

The College must also embrace the concept of school fees for higher-cost curriculums so that lower-cost majors and minors do not have to subsidize higher-cost academic programs.

We are also initiating now a more robust international recruitment strategy. Over the next several months, our admissions team will be working with many of you – deans, other faculty members and staff – to develop a plan, both the structure to bring the students here and to support their success on campus. We see this having both a short-term and long-term impact on our recruitment numbers as well as a positive effect on our campus community.

Together, these changes diversify our academic and financial portfolio, so to speak, which will keep us competitive and strong.

This is not about disruption, but about connection. Our tradition and curriculum are about growth and change. We must be focused on a future that brings the humanities, the arts, the sciences, education, business and languages together in a way that enriches our liberal arts degrees and presents our students not just as employable, but as the most desirable additions to any company, nonprofit or graduate programs.

In order to best protect and strengthen this institution that has given so much to so many students, faculty and staff, we have to adapt now, we have to change now, we have to innovate now. It is the best way to preserve this remarkable and storied institution for future generations.

Further, it is the best way to ensure you – the faculty – have the competitive salaries and resources you need to continue to be effective and excellent teachers, researchers and leaders in your fields.

This evolution, if you will, does not mean drastically altering the experience we provide at the College or even the mission of our institution. It simply means altering how we fund our institution and how we make-up our student population.

If there is any doubt in your mind about how the College has responded to change in the past, I invite you to go to our Special Collections in the library and look at some of our old course catalogs. Our curriculum has changed according to demands of the times.

For example, in 1900, amidst some controversy, President Harrison Randolph introduced the Bachelor of Science degree. I don’t think anyone today believes that Randolph’s controversial reform was a mistake.

Like I said earlier, although we have grown bigger and added and subtracted academic programs, we have remained our true self.

We have remained student-focused with small classes, dedicated to enriching the whole mind.

So we have to embrace, as we have done over the decades, the communities we serve. We do not need to fear that innovation may ruin us. It won’t. Rather, it’s going to help preserve what we all have found special about the College.

The best universities in the country are always reinventing themselves – finding a way to change, yet remaining true to themselves, their core mission and their rich traditions.
Like them, we must find the balance of maintaining the best of the past while undertaking new opportunities for the future. And, working together, I know we will. Together in shared governance, let’s make decisions that strengthen the institution and the student experience.

Thank you so much and I’ll be happy to answer any questions.

Applause followed.

**Questions/Discussion**

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), asked the President what role he envisions for the faculty Budget Committee in reviewing all the potential initiatives he outlined and asked, more generally, about the role the faculty will play through its official governing structures.

**President McConnell** replied “a big role.” Most of what he discussed, he said, cannot be done without the faculty’s involvement, citing in particular matters of curriculum and developing new programs and degrees. He said he envisions a “team approach.”

Returning to the “sobering truths” he discussed in his address, the President, reiterated that “we have to make changes” and said that he wanted to clearly and directly lay out our situation. We are not the only school in a bad financial position: he mentioned evidence from a study he had with him at the podium that other universities are about to face stark reality. While at the College “we are not in trouble,” he said, we are “at a crossroads” and we can “tread water” or we can make the College financially strong.

He noted the College’s prior failures to do the latter, giving the examples of Dixie Plantation, for which we never implemented a plan to make it pay for itself, and the North Campus, which is under lease and needs to be financially supporting the College’s core mission but has not yet. He added that he needs the faculty’s help in addressing the latter.

First pausing to address the recent *Post and Courier* piece on the possibility of a football program at the College, to which he said he should have said to the reporter not just “no,” but “hell no,” the President said that we will not take on additional expenses and that his goal is to “enrich the core mission.” He added that we do not do a good enough job in showing “the great job we do with the human mind,” building students’ capacities for critical and creative thinking.

He said that he expects faculty and faculty committees to be involved in a big way in charting the future course of the College in developing, considering, and approving initiatives, and turning specifically to the School of Professional Studies, listening to the Dean’s appeals for change.

He assured the faculty that he will be pursuing all avenues of financial support in Columbia. Citing the proposed Learning Technology Center, he asserted that we need to build in an endowment so that it can continue to “support and modernize itself.” On the whole, we need to consider how to make things “revenue positive” at the College.

We have to make, he asserted, “course corrections”: not to do so may be an invitation to other universities to come into our market to develop undergraduate programs in the Lowcountry. While we may collaborate with other institutions, we cannot leave the non-traditional student population unserved. Once other institutions come in to
serve that population, they may become cost effective enough to also start cutting into our traditional student market as well.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, following up on Senator Kelly’s question, agreed that the faculty will and should be involved in any upcoming initiatives and program development. But he also asserted that the faculty want to “look hard” at any evidence that programs will generate revenue. Up to 2003, he said, the College seemed to be doing well with respect to non-resident students, a segment of the market that is wealthy and from whom we gain an enhanced reputation.

After that, he noted, we added an MBA program and the BPS degree, which, we were told, would enhance our revenue. Now that our situation is more precarious, we are being told, Krasnoff said, that “we have to double, triple, or quadruple down on that same approach.”

He added that the non-traditional student end of the market is larger but their own ability to pay for school is lower and their reliance on student loans greater. He also noted that there is a concern that many in this market will not even be able to pay back their loans.

There may not, he argued, be revenue that can be shared to help our core mission, even if this is a large market. Faculty buy-in will be contingent on whether or not, in fact, the revenue is there and can be used to enhance the College’s core mission. He closed by saying that the faculty have not been provided evidence of this in the period from about 2003 to the present.

**President McConnell** said that, of course, he cannot speak to what was said in the period prior to his tenure, but that he is providing the best evidence he has of flat-lining enrollments in the non-resident segment and how those enrollments are not likely to get any better. Additionally, he said that the presence of for-profit educational outfits tapping the non-traditional market suggests that the revenue is there. He added that statistics, studies, and experts all indicate that there is a market there. The President referenced a study he had with him at the podium that speaks to “choosing where to compete” and suggests “low-income high-ability, English language learners, community college transfers, adult degree completers, and professional masters’ degree seekers. He added that he and the administration have also looked at studies of the “curves universities are on,” what other schools are doing.

He also observed that big universities, whom he said he would not name, directly compete with the College for non-resident students by drastically cutting tuition with abatements. Some of these schools are based on a model of constant growth.

Returning to the issue of the non-traditional population, the President said that people with jobs who are trying to complete degrees are “not without funds.” They have money, may be eligible for grants, and are entitled to a college education. The School of Professional Studies will give such students access to a degree.

He suggested that these degrees could be creatively “fire-walled” from the degrees offered at the downtown campus, such as by making these degrees only available from the University of Charleston, South Carolina at the College of Charleston, instead of the College of Charleston, making sure they aren’t BA, BS, or Artium Baccalaureatus degrees. If there is a concern about branding, such things can be done, the President said, inviting faculty to look at what has been done in the same vein at the University of Virginia and other schools.

**Irina Gigova**, Department of History, asked if there has been any discussion of lowering out-of-state tuition in order to make us more attractive.
President McConnell responded that the administration is looking at this very thing but reiterated that a large rival institution is "slashing" non-resident tuition via abatements, and this makes competing difficult.

Gigova assented to the President’s characterization of the competition but added that our attractiveness also derives from our location, which may even be a more enticing selling point with a reduction in non-resident tuition.

Gigova also asked, in relation to the non-traditional student population the President spoke of pursuing, if these students would go into the Bachelor of Professional Studies program or if they might also go into expansions of existing BA and BS programs offered on new campuses.

President McConnell said that many of these students will be attracted to the BPS in order to complete their degrees. Others may want a BS or BA from the College, and we may be able, the President said, to offer some courses at night for students who meet admission standards and also might be able to offer courses in a hybrid format to help meet such a need. He expressed hope that faculty will discuss these possibilities since offering such programs could help create a positive cash flow.

Daniel Greenberg, Department of Psychology, asked how potential areas of expansion that the President listed—Computer Science, Accounting, Education, Psychology—were identified as such, generally, but also with specific reference to Psychology, and what kind of expansion the President envisions.

President McConnell, first noting that, as a rule, he prefers to leave academic matters to academics, said that the Charleston Chamber of Commerce in their studies identified Computer Science, Supply Chain, and Information Management as areas for potential expansion and this is still under study and the subject of conversation. The other areas, he said, he “was given by staff” and he added them to the report. He said that decisions on any program expansion will be made, in part, on demand and supply. Another factor to consider in this area is potential collaborations with other institutions.

There were no further questions.

The President thanked the Senate, and invited faculty to contact him, anonymously or over signature, with any ideas that they may have.

Applause followed.

B. Interim Provost McGee [Powerpoint Slides]

The Interim Provost said that there is much good news to celebrate at the beginning of the academic year and began his report with three varying examples.

Last year marked the third year in a row of substantial growth in funded research ($9.8 million at a highly competitive time for research dollars, particularly federal research monies). He called this a tribute to the faculty’s excellence and hard work.

This past summer saw the delivery of 94 sections of courses through distance education, and these accounted for 21% of the summer offerings and had higher enrollments than face-to-face course sections. Face-to-face classes, he said, will always been a central part of the College’s undergraduate and graduate programs, but recent experience in distance education suggests that we can “with quality and integrity … expand opportunities for our students,” another tribute to the faculty and a marked contrast to 2007, when the Senate entertained a motion to ban distance education at the College.
We also, he noted, have an increasingly diverse student body, up from 13.3% of degree-seeking undergraduates in minority categories in 2010-11 to 18.1% in 2015-16. This is evidence that we are making real progress toward becoming a more inclusive campus.

**Budget and Academic Vision,**

The Interim Provost provided data on the decline in the non-resident student population since 2012, broken down into regular, provisional, and transfer populations (see slide 2, “Non-Resident Undergraduate Summary”) and added additional evidence to the President’s analysis of the causes for the decline.

Note: in slide 2, “NR” denotes “non-resident.”

The Interim Provost pointed out that despite efforts to improve how we recruit and to increase scholarship offers and vary them to make them more attractive to these students, non-resident new, regular freshman enrollment since 2012 has gone from 973 down to 906 this year.

We also saw substantial decreases in the same period in the numbers of new provisional first year non-resident students and non-resident transfers.

Overall, our non-resident student numbers have gone down from 4,121 in 2012 to 3,752 in 2015. While some refinement of the numbers might happen if we account for re-admits and other details, the trend and magnitude of the change is obvious and, with non-resident students paying two and a half times the tuition of resident students, the financial implications are obvious.

The causes for these declines are many and complex, the Interim Provost said, as the President indicated in his report. Added to the President’s observations on competition from other institutions in-state and out, he noted that we are pitted against organizations that aggressively pursue enrollment growth, have increasingly innovative approaches, and when they have deeper pockets, add that to the mix as well. In addition, stagnation in middle-class income has parents particularly sensitive to higher education costs.

We continue, nonetheless, to recruit non-residents and are working on ways of best doing that—here the Interim Provost singled out the efforts of Jimmy Foster, Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid. We are also looking into recruiting from new non-resident groups, he said, notably international students, keeping in mind at the same time that such students may also need special student services to ensure their success.

Given our financial situation on the revenue side, the Interim Provost said that we will be looking at cost-saving reductions that will be necessary, at least in the short term. Principles that Academic Affairs will adopt for any cuts that are required, he said, include

1. working to preserve our ability to maintain and improve faculty salaries so that they remain competitive for recruitment and retention
2. understanding that operating budgets (which have already been cut over the years without full replenishment) cannot be a source of further cuts, which means that
3. we will have to, therefore, look at faculty and staff positions, permanent and temporary (the largest cost item in institutions of higher education), and
4. there will be shared governance in this process, involving the Faculty Budget Committee, Academic Planning Committee, and other faculty committees.
There will be a thoughtful, multiyear approach to budget reduction, he emphasized, and we will not make ill-advised cuts that undermine our ability to meet our institutional goals.

On the revenue side, the strategy will include recruiting students in our current prospective student populations, seeking new opportunities with graduate students and non-traditional undergraduate students, and concluding the comprehensive fundraising efforts, which are also contributing to our bottom line.

Returning to non-traditional students, since there was a question for the President about them with respect to degrees, BA, BS, and BPS, the Interim Provost said that the answers have yet to emerge through a process that will engage faculty for their expertise in curriculum and audience. He said it is well to keep in mind that only 29% of the students in American higher education—undergraduate and graduate—fall into the 18-21 year old range of traditional undergraduate students. Thus, 71% do not fit into the typical mold of the College of Charleston undergraduate: there are plenty of other students, he said, that we might serve as a public institution.

“In short,” he asserted, “it isn’t enough for the College to have a viable enrollment strategy and a prudent budgetary strategy. We need those strategies, but they are not enough. Most fundamentally, we need a coherent and compelling vision for ourselves as a public university in the quality sector; we need a vision that allows us to thrive financially and intellectually, not merely survive. And I believe that our vision is going to require that we succeed in offering educational excellence to more than one type of student, as President McConnell so amply summarized.”

Accreditation

The Interim Provost noted the necessity of successful accreditation—“or else we’re out of business”—and said that the upcoming SACSCOC reaffirmation effort will require the efforts of all, not just administrators writing reports. He offered some specifics that can help in the process:

- all faculty by May 15, 2016, should have at least a year’s prior complete data entered into the Faculty Activity System. It is essential to do this.

- faculty involved in assessment should “close the loop” by making changes to course design and delivery based on what assessments reveal. Evidence of closing the loop should be provided for accreditation purposes, but also for the simple fact that it is “our professional responsibility as faculty.”

- department and program heads should be systematically documenting adjunct evaluation to meet SACSCOC standards for evaluation of all faculty (over a third of our instruction is offered by our adjunct faculty colleagues). A shift, the Interim Provost noted, from less formal, largely verbal processes of adjunct faculty evaluation to formal, written documentation of the same may amount to a culture change in some departments, but he hopes that guidance from Academic Affairs will help.

Additionally, the Interim Provost asked for the faculty’s patience while many policies in the works are being developed: a course numbering policy to represent the progressive sophistication of courses from the 100-level through graduate courses; policy to clarify the meaning of “academic program,” “department,” “center,” “institute,” and so on; a scheme for undergraduate program review analogous to the graduate program review scheme (he noted that CHE used to do this work but stopped over ten years ago).

Faculty committees, he added, can expect frequent and repeated consultation as these policies develop.
Faculty/Administration Manual and Catalog Changes Last Year

The Interim Provost noted that there is some repetition in his comments here in the upcoming report from the Chair of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual.

A title of “University Professor” has been added to the F/AM that, as funding permits, gives the College a means of recognizing accomplishments of some of our best faculty.

A graduate faculty definition was added to the F/AM to clarify for ourselves and outside audiences what attainments we expect of graduate faculty.

In addition, he discussed the College’s compliance with state law requiring the teaching of founding documents of the United States. He noted that changes have been made to the undergraduate catalog for compliance. Citing a public email exchange between Professor Robert Dillon and himself last spring and noting that there may be questions remaining about the College's means of discharging the legal requirement, he invited further discussion and questions in Q&A.

He also singled out for discussion the proposed creation of adjunct faculty titles. While the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual vetted the language (see PDF), it did not get discussion in the Senate’s final meeting last year. The Interim Provost provided hard copies of the proposed language.

Adjunct faculty at the College, he observed, do not have titles, except in cases in which a Dean names adjunct faculty something like “Adjunct Assistant Professor,” “Adjunct Associate Professor,” or “Adjunct Professor.” A title for adjunct faculty, such as is in place at many other institutions, “signal[s] the dignity and importance” of their work at the College. Multiple committees last year vetted the proposed language. Adjunct faculty would have the title of “Adjunct Lecturer;” and after a long term of service including 30 or more course sections, eight separate semesters (including summer terms), and at least 500 student enrollments would be eligible for the title of “Adjunct Senior Lecturer.”

In April, Rick Heldrich, Chair of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, circulated the notice of intent to change the F/AM to add the titles (PDF) via email and asked if there were any concerns. Two Senators, the Interim Provost said, did express concern and a desire to talk about the proposed language in the Senate in the coming fall. The Interim Provost invited such discussion in the Q&A.

Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review

The Interim Provost shared a slide (#3) that he also shared last April listing numbers of cases for review, tenure, and promotion last year and the outcomes of those cases.

He reported that at the beginning of the year last year and also in the spring he had discussions with the Deans related to review, tenure, and promotion processes. They identified topics for further discussion this year with the Deans, the Faculty Welfare Committee, and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review

- adding clarity to the selection process for external reviewers
- streamlining cases where there is no controversy at the school level
- reviewing the continued use of Associate Professors in the process of promoting colleagues to full professor
The Interim Provost said that it is his intent to initiate a review, starting with these topics and with these parties, which would not effect this year's cases but could have implication for future reviews.

**Senate Agenda**

Colonial Academic Alliance - The Interim Provost congratulated Faculty Athletics Representative Vince Benigni for his enormous work to create academic opportunities for student athletes and other students, such as Honors College students, for undergraduate research and in bringing a guest faculty member from another CAA school for a talk and to meet with students (see Benigni’s report below).

New Business - The Interim Provost noted that an active tenure and promotion grievance at the College may impinge on the discussion of a motion in new business relating to administrators’ roles in tenure and promotion (see below). He stipulated the he is bound by the F/AM’s code of professional conduct to be circumspect with regard to speaking to open grievances. Thus, he said, he will listen to the discussion and answer any direct questions he can without speaking to the active grievance.

He thanked all who are involved in the critical and sometimes onerous process of evaluating colleagues for tenure and promotion.

—

The Interim Provost closed his report by saying "the opportunity for this year is to address questions of fundamental importance to our future identity, as challenged by the President, and emerge with a clearer picture of how we will balance tradition with change, the past with the future. The College, as I have known it," he said, "is in many respects a conservative organization, and its faculty have been protective of the many strengths of this institution. Indeed, I would agree that there is much here that must be conserved, and faculty will rightly be thorough in consideration of new initiatives. However, as the President has noted, the College has embraced new opportunities repeatedly over the past century, and I am confident we will do so again. So, let's carefully consider the President's call to build a new financial model, with new locations, new programs, and new students, and a university as deeply committed to its public mission as to its wonderful liberal arts and sciences heritage."

He thanked the faculty for all they do for our students and for the institution. Applause followed.

**Questions/Discussion**

**Daniel Greenberg,** Department of Psychology, inquired to what extent the Interim Provost will involve junior faculty in the discussions about tenure and promotion. Their insight derived from how they see and experience the process could be very helpful, he said.

**The Interim Provost** observed that junior faculty are among the members of the Faculty Welfare Committee, which is one reason for the customary involvement of that committee in such discussions. He added that if and when it becomes apparent that there has been insufficient input from junior faculty in the discussion, it would be wise to seek additional counsel from them.

**Iana Anguelova,** Senator - Mathematics, asked for more specificity on the issue of potential cuts in faculty and staff positions.
The Interim Provost replied that if curtailing operating budgets cannot be a source of making up the roughly $1.5 million deficit and there is not enrollment reserve money to cover it, there is only one remaining place to go: staffing. The College has up until fairly recently grown in faculty and staff, with periodic contractions due to the economy but not due to budget shortfalls. This is new territory for many of us. We may need, he said, to freeze positions for a time or even eliminate them at the academic department/program level. He said he cannot say what positions and how many will be under consideration, but he added that the work of identifying positions will be done in consultation with the faculty Budget Committee, the Academic Planning Committee, and the Council of Deans, among others.

Senator Anguelova asked a second question about what can be done to address transportation needs as we consider adding other campuses. She gave the example of insufficient transportation to and from the North Campus.

The Interim Provost noted that there is a longstanding “chicken and egg problem” regarding transportation to and from the North Campus. We need a sufficient number of students and courses to make transportation cost effective, but without transportation already in place, building that kind of enrollment is difficult. We recognize the problem and are working on it, he said.

Morgan Koerner, Department of German and Russian Studies, asked the Interim Provost to break down the diversity figures he gave at the beginning of his report into subgroups. He expressed particular interest in our number of African American students.

The Interim Provost noted that we have had a “moderate rise” in African American students, a rise in students self identifying as two or more races, and we have had “very substantial growth” in Spanish-speaking students. He offered to break down things further for Koerner over email.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, in regard to the expansion of courses, asked if there has been any work toward streamlining the process for vetting new courses.

The Interim Provost deferred to Daniel Greenberg, a former Chair of the Curriculum Committee, who said that new software will streamline the process and help move us from a paper-based process to an electronic one. He added that the current committee has streamlining on their agenda.

Bonnie Springer, last year’s Chair of the Curriculum Committee and representing the committee at this meeting, noted that the committee is investigating processes for different categories of change, such that relatively small course changes might not have to go through an intensive review. Other institutions’ examples have been helpful in this regard. The committee is also looking carefully at the current forms and toward the goal of developing an electronic workflow system.

There were no further questions.

Applause followed.

At this point, the Interim Provost noted that, among with many other guests, one member of the Board of Trustees was present in the audience: Randy Lowell.

C. The Speaker of the Faculty

Speaker McNerney said that, in order to keep his report short, many of the items he might have touched on he has included in his recent Speaker’s newsletter and
he strongly urged those who have not read the newsletter, which he sent out via email on 8 September, to read it.

Especially given the amount of work ahead of us, the Speaker, on behalf of both the Nominations and Elections Committee and himself, shared his deep appreciation for colleagues who have volunteered to fill committee vacancies.

The Speaker then addressed a failure last year to ratify a change to the F/AM regarding how meeting agendas are distributed, which struck the implied requirement that these be printed. This change will be up for ratification this year; but in the meantime the Speaker asked for and received unanimous consent to continue the practice of distributing agendas and materials electronically.

The Speaker also announced that we have hired a new Faculty Secretariat, after having done without one for most of the summer and the beginning weeks of the fall semester. She will start working shortly.

A good part of the summer, the Speaker also reported, he spent reorganizing the directories and files of the Senate website to make the site more coherent and sensible as an archive. As a result, he said, inadvertently, some hyperlinks to other pages and files have been severed. The Speaker said he appreciates being informed about these, plans to address them, and invited further reports of broken links as they become apparent.

He also explained that the Senate has not been reapportioned since it was reduced in size a few years back. Reapportionment will need to occur this year and a policy to guide future reapportionments will need to added to the F/AM.

Finally, the Speaker clarified that an $800 one-time bonus, legislatively-mandated but not state-funded, to occur in November for employees making less than $100,000, is only for full-time employees. Our part-time, temporary, and presumably, he added, adjunct colleagues will not see the bonus. Since the bonus is one-time, it will not affect salaries, and, he hastened to add, since it is not a state-funded initiative but a mandate, nonetheless, it has to be paid from the College’s limited funds.

D. Faculty Athletics Representative
Vince Benigni
Colonial Academic Alliance

Benigni reported that recent discussions he has had with the President and others have revealed concerns about a lack of faculty engagement in some major and smaller events on campus. Thus, he has shifted his report to the Senate from the customary subject of student athletics to faculty engagement opportunities available through the Colonial Academic Alliance.

The College will be the inaugural scholar exchange host of Northeastern University Presidential scholar William Mayer, who will deliver a keynote address on Donald Trump as Presidential candidate and, in addition, talk with classes. If the event goes well, Benigni said, we hope CoC scholars will have the opportunity to go to Colonial Alliance schools on the program.

Benigni also discussed the Alliance’s undergraduate research conference, to which Dean of the Honors College Trisha Folds-Bennett has taken over 20 students with funding from the Office of Academic Affairs, which, Benigni said, he hopes can continue this year. The Alliance also runs an annual faculty pedagogy summit to which our faculty are invited, the most recent of which was held at Drexel University and focused on technology in teaching.
Andrea DeMaria and Jeri Cabot, Benigni said, have launched a federal bystander intervention program that has taken a leadership role in the Alliance, which is producing PSAs and enabling scholarly work on bystander intervention.

He noted that information about other opportunities to get engaged with the Alliance is forthcoming.

He closed by emphasizing the importance of faculty engagement. He reported he has been meeting over the last few months with such people as Mark Berry, Paul Patrick, Jimmy Foster, Todd McNerney, Jerry Hale, and Mark Halberg to think of ways to increase faculty engagement “but pulling some of the layers back so we have more time to watch theater shows and to go to athletic games and to go to faculty and sabbatical presentations,” etc. Yet we have 12-14 hour days, he said, that mitigate against such engagement. He issued a challenge of sorts to everyone, the Interim Provost, and the President: how do we change so that we can bring back faculty engagement? He asked for faculty to send ideas to him about how we might increase faculty engagement in CofC activities and events and develop more camaraderie and a better esprit de corps.

E. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual
Jason Vance, Chair
Update on Changes to Faculty/Administration Manual, 2014 –15 (Presentation Slides - PDF | F/AM Change Log - PDF)

Vance reported on changes made to the F/AM last year, which are listed in the presentation slide PDF file. He asked the Senators to call their constituents’ attention to these changes and encourage them to consult the change log.

Vance also listed items on the committee’s agenda this year and that are carry-overs from last year (see Presentation Slides PDF, p.11): reapportionment of the senate, the status and procedures of the Faculty Hearing and Grievance committees, separating of process/procedure and policy in the F/AM, addressing concerns raised over titles for adjuncts, and clarifying language on committees (such as charges, purview). He also noted that Academic Affairs and Legal Affairs will be reviewing institutional policy for consensual relationships.

Applause followed.

There were no questions.

5. Old Business

A. Faculty Curriculum Committee
Bonnie Springer, Chair

Department of Health and Human Performance
Course and Program Change Proposals (PDF)

Speaker McNerney prefaced this set of motions by the faculty curriculum committee by saying that the items for consideration by the Senate were “sort of approved, but not exactly” last year. There was a header in the agenda that addressed these changes; however, the corresponding files were not posted with the agenda and, consequently, Senators did not have access to the details. Nonetheless, the Senate approved the items listed. This was discovered in the summer, the Speaker said, at which time it was decided that the appropriate path to take was to bring the proposals back to Senate for any deliberation the Senate wished to have.
Springer explained the motion is to approve the changes listed in the files: delete the Health minor and to deactivate HEAL 495 as a capstone course in the Public Health major (with a teach-out plan for students who still need it).

There was no discussion.

The motion was approved on voice vote.

6. New Business

A. Election of Speaker Pro Tempore

Speaker McNerney explained the function of the Speaker Pro Tempore, who will take on the Speaker’s duties should the Speaker be unable to perform them. Also, in a case in which the Speaker wishes to participate in discussion, the Speaker Pro Tempore will preside over the debate.

The Speaker called for nominations from the floor.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM) nominated Julia Eichelberger, Senator - SHSS.

There were no further nominations. Eichelberger was elected Speaker Pro Tempore on a unanimous voice vote.

B. Motion on Administrators’ Roles in Faculty Evaluation (Word | PDF)

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy

Speaker McNerney explained how Senator Krasnoff’s motion is being handled with respect to Senate by-laws and procedures. In the case of a motion for a by-laws change brought to the Senate, the Senate would have an opportunity to discuss it, but it would be remanded without a vote to the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual for further study and possibly work before being brought back to the Senate. Senator Krasnoff’s motion, however, seeks a change to the administrative portion of the F/AM and not the portion of the F/AM over which the Senate has control. Ordinarily changes to this section of the F/AM begin with language being brought to the committee first before it comes to the Senate for debate and advice to the Office of Academic Affairs in the form of a notice of intent to change the administrative section, but such a notice is not subject to approval by the Senate. Senator Krasnoff’s motion, the Speaker said, is, in some respects, the reverse of that process: a motion from a faculty member to change part of the F/AM over which we do not have control.

The Speaker described three possible actions on the motion:

1. approve the motion by a vote
2. disapprove of the motion by vote
3. remand the motion to the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual for further conversation before it comes back to the Senate

The Speaker then turned the floor over to Senator Krasnoff.

Senator Krasnoff observed that the motion deals with potential conflicts of interest in faculty evaluation. Two principles are in play:

1. There are several levels of evaluation in the T&P process and at each level evaluators are supposed to apply the same criteria for tenure and promotion. Even if they disagree about how to apply the criteria,
the criteria are the same at all levels from department, to school, to Provost.

2. Decisions at each level, as well, have to be arrived at independently. While evaluators must understand what happened at prior levels, they still need to arrive at independent decisions. We have to be convinced, Krasnoff asserted, that the evaluation at each level derives from judging the case on its merits, independently, and based on the same criteria.

Sometimes, however, he said, it is not easy to ensure such a process and, for those occasions, conflict of interest provisions come into play, such as the recusal of a member of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review when a member of her home department comes up for review at the Advisory Committee level. The idea, he said, is that one cannot serve at two levels. But it is also important to note that such recusals could happen not just in the way it ordinarily happens, as a above, but also could take the form of recusal of an Advisory Committee member at the home department level, which would then allow the member to review the case at the college-wide, Advisory Committee level. But we don’t do it that way, Krasnoff argued, because the fact of that individual’s “existing web of relationship” with the department may interfere with the independence of judgement at the college-wide decision level.

The case of administrators in respect to this issue is complicated. Most administrators have a home department, but how strong their web of relationship is with that department may vary. One can see, Krasnoff added, for instance, how a new member of the college in an administrative position might have fewer ties and relationships to her faculty home department and might, thus, have less potential for conflict of interest.

Administrators from the same department as T & P candidate will also, he added, be applying criteria from the discipline, which means that the review at the administrative level is not the same as it would be were it conducted by an administrator from a different home department.

While Deans and administrators may be perfectly capable of differentiating between different roles, which Krasnoff stipulated, the real question is if we can know that such differentiation is taking place. Krasnoff argued that we can only feel confident in such cases if the appearance of conflict of interest is removed.

Conflict of interest protections are not, he said, in place to prevent people from doing bad things, but rather, to prevent the appearance of people doing bad things, preventing people from coming to incorrect interpretations about how an outcome was arrived at. As such, conflict of interest protections do not punish administrators, but protect them and ensure that administrators’ decisions can be seen as independent.

Krasnoff here posed a hypothetical T & P situation that might lead to the appearance of a conflict of interest, hastening to add that he speaks only in the hypothetical and not of the case involved in the active grievance to which the Interim Provost referred in his remarks on the Senate’s agenda. Suppose, Senator Krasnoff said, that a department found against a candidate and subsequently so did the Dean and the Provost, who are both members of the same department, yet the college-wide Advisory committee came to the opposite decision. Additionally, in the hypothetical, the faculty grievance
committee upheld a claim that at the departmental level of review there were violations of due process. “Can we be sure,” Krasnoff asked, that in the hypothetical case, “the administrators’ judgment was entirely independent, that they were making decisions, as it were, about the merits of the case and not, in some sense, driven by their relationships with the particular department?” “I don’t know,” he replied.

Such a situation points out the need, Krasnoff argued, for a system that eliminates the appearance of a conflict of interest and thus protects the independence of the administrator’s judgment. That is the point of the motion, he said.

**Questions/Discussion**

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked why the motion excludes the Dean of the Libraries.

**Senator Krasnoff** replied that in that school there is no comparable department structure. The motion assumes that there are multiple departments in the schools to which the motion would apply. He did note, however, that the School of Education, Health, and Human Performance poses potential challenges for the motion since it only has two departments.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator - Mathematics said that she would oppose the motion. It is part of the description of the job of Dean, she argued, to abstract themselves from networks of relationships and to render independent, professional judgment. If we don't trust their professionalism in rendering T & P decisions, why would we trust them, she asked, in other areas that require their professional, independent judgment.

**Krasnoff** replied that it is easier to render such judgment in cases where there is no question of a conflict of interest. He reiterated that he is not arguing that it is impossible for Deans to abstract themselves from their departmental relationships. But if there's any question, in this most important decision of T & P, administrators should recuse themselves.

**Anguelova** said she would agree that T & P decisions are among the most important decisions a Dean makes, but if her own Dean had to recuse himself from T & P cases from his home department of Biology, he would have to recuse himself from half the T & P cases in his school.

**Tim Johnson**, Chair - Department of Classics, said he finds the motion problematic, especially in the case where a Dean's home department is an especially large one. Were he coming up for review from such a department and the Dean had to recuse herself and an Associate Dean or another person from outside step in, that could result in someone with less expertise reading the review packet. A more important question to ask, Johnson said is, since conflict of interest can occur in so many different forms at all levels, if there are sufficient checks and balances in the system at each level of review from the department up. We want the best readers at every level of review and the motion, he argued, might actually undermine that.

**Idee Winfield**, Senator - SHSS, spoke in favor of the motion. She suggested that the motion offers a similar check and balance as we have at the departmental level, where we have an outside committee member join in the process not for their expertise in the field but to ensure that correct procedures are followed. The college-wide committee has that check in the form of recusal of committee members from the same department, but at the
Dean's and Provost's level, no such checks exist. She asserted that these decisions are critical since they involve lives, and we really need to have a system that we have confidence in and confers legitimacy to decisions about who stays at the College and who goes.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker**, Associate Provost, speaking as someone with many years of administrative experience, having served as Chair of Mathematics for ten years before joining Academic Affairs, she said, argued that we have a "pretty consistent process," due in part to the fact that at the higher levels of review a single person makes most of the recommendations. Handing off some of the decisions to others, as specified in the motion, risks fracturing the consistency gained by the year after year of experience of an administrator serving in that role.

**Jason Coy**, Department of History, noted that he understands the need for consistency, but we do not worry about consistency when alternates serve in the stead of those who have to recuse themselves on the college-wide committee. He added that he has a problem with the idea that faculty cannot be trusted to be objective on the college-wide T & P committee and must, per the F/AM, recuse themselves, but once they are promoted to administrative posts, in contrast, they can be trusted to be objective. This is "not in the spirit of shared governance: you either assume that everyone can be objective or have checks that protect against" conflict of interest," he said.

**Caveny-Noecker**, offered a clarification to differentiate the current process of faculty recusal from cases in the Advisory Committee from the recusal of Deans and the Provost asked for in Senator Krasnoff’s motion. The former is a policy in place to prevent the “double jeopardy” of having a single person act twice as an evaluator of a candidate in a single year, first at the departmental level and then again at the college-wide level. The case that Senator Krasnoff’s motion addresses is different, since Deans and the Provost do not participate in departmental evaluation panels but only in their administrative roles.

**Coy** offered point of clarification as well, observing that faculty, according to the F/AM are not allowed to choose which process, departmental or college-wide, that they are allowed to act in: they are specifically recused from the college-wide process.

**Iana Anguelova**, replying to Coy, said that faculty are specifically recused from college-wide T & P processes because they will only be in the committee for a short while. It is also better, she asserted, to have them involved in their departmental processes.

**Kelly Shaver** asked Krasnoff, hypothetically, what would happen in a school in which the (only) Associate Dean and the Dean are from the same department?

**Krasnoff** replied that the motion would provide an incentive not to do that and added that it is probably a bad idea to have a Dean and an Associate Dean from the same discipline.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - SHSS, noting that the Senate will not be able to give the motion its full due at the meeting, given the hour, moved that the Senate send the motion to the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review, who are already involved in several discussions around T & P processes. The motion was seconded.
Senator Krasnoff asked for a clarification as to the charge to the committees. Kelly replied that he would ask them to come back with a report to the Senate.

Discussion/Question

Jason Vance, Senator - SSM, asked if these committee reviews will include looking into historical data as to how many times, given the motion’s definition of such, potential conflict of interest existed in T & P decisions.

Speaker McNerney replied that, once remanded to committee, the committees can seek whatever information they require (such as that mentioned by Vance, information from other institutions, and the like) to produce their reports for the Senate.

There was no further discussion of Senator Kelly’s motion from the floor.

The motion was approved on a unanimous voice vote.

7. Constituents' Concerns

Speaker McNerney noted that the by-laws specify that 15 minutes be set aside for constituent concerns at the end of the Faculty Senate’s regular meetings.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, raised a longstanding concern of hers that the effort required to earn a superior rating in post-tenure review at the Professor rank is same as that needed to earn promotion to Professor, yet the raise is not equivalent. She announced that she will be bringing this concern to the Faculty Compensation Committee, the Faculty Welfare Committee, the Budget Committee, and the President’s Advisory Committee

8. Adjournment: 7:21 PM

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael Duvall
Faculty Secretary