Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting 11 and 18 April 2017

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 11 April 2017 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115). The meeting continued on Tuesday 18 April 2017 at 5:00 PM, same location.

Agenda

1. Call to Order 5:07 PM.
2. The minutes of the March 2017 regular meeting were approved as posted.
3. Announcements and Information: None
4. Reports
   a. Speaker of the Faculty Todd McNerney

The Speaker gave a brief report in order to complete the full agenda.

He thanked the Ad Hoc Committee on Hearing Procedures for their work, including Chair Roger Daniels, and committee members Claire Curtis, Susan Farrell, John Huddlestun, Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Conrad Festa, Carl Wise, and Angela Mulholland.

The Speaker said he would be leaving at 6:40 PM for a production of Rent which he was directing and would yield the floor to the Speaker Pro Tempore Larry Krasnoff.

The Speaker yielded the floor to President McConnell.

b. President Glenn McConnell

President McConnell delivered prepared remarks, a transcript of which, as delivered, is presented below.

_______________________________________________________________________
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon to all of you. It is a pleasure to be here with you.

I want to start out by thanking you for all you do for the College, for the students here. The time and energy you devote to our institution is helping us become a better and stronger university. So thank you for your passion, investment, talent, and commitment to the College of Charleston.

With that, today, I want to provide you with some updates on accreditation, potential state appropriations, and our vision for the College as we head toward our 250th anniversary in 2020.

As you all are well aware, the College has been involved in a 3-step process to have our accreditation reaffirmed by our accrediting agency SACSCOC.
The first step was to compose and provide a detailed narrative with evidential exhibits that explained we were in compliance with SACSCOC core and comprehensive requirements as well as a set of federal requirements.

All of you who worked on that, thank you so much for your efforts in trying to get that massive document and exhibits to SACSCOC.

The second step of the process took place at the end of March, which was an on-campus visit by members of the SACSCOC team. As I announced in my email to campus two weeks ago, the on-site visit went well, and we were told during the departure interview that the team had no recommendations to make to us. As such, their report to the SACSCOC Executive Committee will state that we are in compliance and our 10-year accreditation should be approved.

Therefore, we expect at the SACSCOC December meeting to have our accreditation voted on or reaffirmed. The December vote will be step 3 of the process. This significant accomplishment could not have been possible without the hard work across this campus. I know that there are people in this room that have been pressed and pushed along the way for everything that had to be done, but it looks like that it paid off real well. To get a report and not have a recommendation is really an accomplishment for the College of Charleston.

The College continues to plan and implement its QEP, “Sustainability Literacy as a Bridge to Addressing 21st-Century Problems.” Through our work, inside and outside the classroom, we will equip our students with the skills and knowledge to handle the problems related to sustainability that they will face in their lifetimes, such as rising sea levels, economic inequality, social injustice, air and water quality, and more.

We will be infusing sustainability literacy into our curriculum and also into our decision making at the College. From ensuring any renovations or new buildings we construct are environmentally friendly to looking at the types of products we are buying to our financials, the College is committing to being a more sustainable university. We will talk the talk and we will walk the walk.

Now, let me talk budgets – everyone’s favorite topic. South Carolina’s General Assembly is currently working through its budgetary process in Columbia.

The College as well as all the public universities in the state submitted budget requests to the General Assembly earlier this year. In February and March, I traveled to Columbia to present in front of the House and Senate budget committees our proposals and requests.

Depending on which side of the General Assembly you look at, the tea leaves read a little differently. For example, as it now stands, it appears that no higher education institution will be receiving additional monies to their operational budgets in the House of Representatives version of the bill. On the Senate side, each College would get a percentage increase in their operational line, which is about $500,000 for the College.
It is likely the House and Senate will pass a 2 percent mandated increase in the employer contribution to employees’ state retirement, but only fund about 50 percent of that for the states’ college and universities. That would result in unfunded costs to the College of Charleston to the tune of approximately $900,000. Incidentally, the Insurance Reserve Fund where we must buy our property insurance has announced they may go up 30 percent on rates, which would cost the College of Charleston about $200,000.

Taken together, the potential $500,000 increase in operating revenue we would receive from the Senate will be quickly consumed by the mandated increased costs that will total $1.1 million.

Unfortunately, most of the new money in the state budget is tied up for repairs to damage caused by Hurricane Matthew last fall. So depending on what appropriations bill is passed and is signed into law, the College’s budget will nevertheless be tight.

That being said, there is some good news out of Columbia. The state is looking to pass a higher education bond bill. I think this will be the first bond bill in about 15 years. This bond bill will help with the renovation and repairs of facilities around South Carolina.

The House version of the bond bill has allocated 12 million dollars to the College of Charleston. $1.5 million is for the renovations of 58 George Street, on the corner of St. Philip and George. It's a historic structure on campus that housed our Rivers Communications Museum, which we had to close due to structural issues.

$10.5 million will go toward the renovation of the Silcox Physical Education and Health Center – a WPA-era building in desperate need of repairs and upgrading to support our growing public health program.

The bond bill will go to the Senate after it passes the House. We are working to keep the money for the College in the House version of the bond bill as well as we hope to pick up additional dollars when the bill gets to the Senate.

If you look at available revenue, it looks like the House didn't spend it all and left for the Senate to put its mark on the bond bill.

There's a good chance we can pick up an additional $8 million for the renovation of the Stern Student Center when the Senate considers the bond bill.

The old swimming pool wing has 19,000 square feet of space, we can recover and repurpose for meeting and student space for students.

If the bill is passed and signed into law later this spring, we would hope to begin these facilities projects toward the end of 2017 or in early 2018.

However, we also have other projects which need to be done such as the Simmons Center overhaul, the Learning Technology Center, other small buildings, and finishing the Sottile Theatre. There are other projects we have that we want to get funding for.
Construction continues on the Rita Hollings Science Center. I had meetings last week about the building and the progress being made. Construction crews have over a hundred people on site daily in an effort to finish the building on time this summer. I am rather confident, based on assurance I got, that the building will be ready for academic use this fall semester with us beginning to move in starting June 23, 2017.

Now, I would like to talk a few moments about the direction in which the College is heading.

I must admit up front that this is not just “my” vision for the College over the next four years per se, but a shared vision – one that represents the input and thoughts of campus administration and academic leaders.

In talking about this shared vision, I guess it’s only right to start at the very beginning and that means answering this question: What’s the need for a vision? Well, without vision, there is no direction, no charted areas for growth. Without vision, when the purse strings tighten and the purse bag lightens, there is no prioritization in allocating limited resources. Without vision, simply put, an institution floats rudderless.

Well, I can safely say we are not rudderless. In the College’s 2009 strategic plan, we outlined a destination for this institution: something we called greatness. I applaud all of the hard work that went into that plan – for it represents a lot of time, energy and thought.

We – everyone in this room, everyone on campus, every one of our graduates – we all want the College to be great – to maximize its power of place, to achieve academic excellence, to connect with the many assets of the Lowcountry.

This institution already has so many pockets of greatness. But we need to spread it across campus – to spark greatness in each and every discipline and program we teach.

I realized in talking with people that first, we really needed to agree on how we define this institution. There are as many different definitions of this place as there are people.

Hence, our somewhat collective identity crisis here on campus. And, to be perfectly honest, that is probably typical for an institution that covers so many different disciplines and caters to so wide an audience.

So who are we right now? Past administrations have tackled that question and articulated answers in different ways. And we stand here today, the benefactors of their hard work.

Now, we, as an institution, have taken an even greater sky view of the College, and we see our university as embodying all the concepts of the previous administrations, but also being something greater.

In fact, in my conversations with some academic leaders on campus, they pointed to us being “nationally ranked,” to the College being “grounded in the liberal arts” and they consistently
used the term “comprehensive.” For whatever reason, our institution has shied away from that last term – comprehensive.

It’s an academic term, I agree, but one that our campus must endorse because if you look at our offerings, look at our programs, look closely at what we do here – we are a comprehensive university – meaning we teach science, business, humanities and so much more. And that is a tremendous thing.

By being a comprehensive institution, we are not moving away from our liberal arts and sciences core, but it does mean that we are recognizing the importance of our professional programs, especially as it relates to student demand and local and regional employer needs – which speaks to our mission as a public university to serve South Carolina and its people.

So, let me share with you our shared definition of who we are: The College of Charleston is a nationally preeminent, comprehensive, public university deeply rooted in the liberal arts and sciences tradition, offering leading-edge programs in business, technology, education and languages and dedicated to its public mission of advancing the region’s economy, culture and future. The College empowers students, both undergraduate and graduate, to be engaged, ethical citizens and leaders in a global society.

That was the definition I gave the Board of Trustees. With that definition, I felt that, as an institution, we can move forward to the next step: identifying our number-one priority.

And in moving forward, one thing became obvious to me in my conversations about the College. Everyone agreed that this institution is at its best when we put our students’ needs at the forefront.

When we consider the student first, everything becomes clear. That applies to our academic offerings, to our extracurricular activities, and to our business decisions. How does this impact the student – is the one question we always come back to.

So, naturally, this shared vision is one that prioritizes the enrichment of our student experience. We, the faculty and staff, all know that our student experience is what makes the College truly distinctive.

And to take our student experience to even greater heights, we will take an approach that focuses our efforts on three overarching themes – the mind, body, and the spirit.

The life of the mind is the centerpiece of our student experience. The College’s faculty understand that knowledge is the best export of any society, and, together, they work to inspire and educate some of the country’s best and brightest students – with direct benefits to the city, the region and far beyond.

Over the next four years, we’ll focus on enhancing the life of the mind by investing in more innovative academic programming and coursework, incorporating the tenets of sustainability literacy with a special focus on digital and technology literacy across all of our disciplines and
committing even more support to the academic part of the College’s budget so that faculty have the resources they need to be exceptional teacher-scholars, mentors and partners in learning.

When referring to our second theme, the body, I mean the student body – its composition – as well as the physical campus.

Through the realization of our shared vision, the College will focus on improving quality and inclusion through these key areas: increasing enrollment of our graduate and undergraduate populations, expanding the School of Professional Studies to attract more adult learners, raising the SAT/ACT scores of our traditional freshman class, increasing the percentage and number of under-represented student populations (with special emphasis on African American and international students), improving retention rates, boosting four-year graduation rates, and prioritizing facilities projects that impact the student experience.

In regards to our last theme, spirit, I believe spirit is the X-factor for any university, a defining characteristic of its culture. It shows what values permeate the campus community, what kind of graduates a university produces. As such, spirit is more than just enthusiasm for the school.

At the College, spirit will speak to character and maturity. If cultivated properly, graduates are then ready for anything – ready for career, ready for further academic study, ready for a life of learning.

The College will foster this type of spirit by emphasizing the institution’s core values as well as focusing on these key areas: pushing for all students to participate in internships and/or professional experiences before they graduate, growing the number of students participating in a study-away experience, and increasing the number and appeal of activities on campus that reinforce our culture of intellectual inquiry and well-being.

Taken together, mind, body, and spirit will significantly elevate the student experience we provide to our students.

In turn, this will grow our national reputation as well as enable us to produce more world-class graduates who will become society’s next great CEO, public servant, artist, educator, scientist, social justice warrior, or change agent in a field that has yet to be created.

I have great confidence in what our future alumni can go on to achieve because I wholeheartedly believe in our exceptional faculty and all the members of our campus community who contribute to the personal and professional development of our students. As you heard a thousand times, it takes a village, and I think we – at the College – all do a remarkable job and play an important role in getting our students from the Cistern on the day of Convocation to crossing the Cistern on the day of Commencement.

I’ll close my remarks by saying this: For those of you in the room who are history buffs, you’ll appreciate the concept that the golden age was never the present age – that, in essence, we don’t recognize greatness while it’s in existence, only when looking backward through time with a sense of nostalgia.
Well, I disagree with that, because I feel that the College is well-positioned for a golden age right here and right now: Now is the time when we can provide world-class instruction in a world-class setting producing world-class minds.

By addressing the mind, body and spirit of this campus, we can and we will achieve something really special for our students and our greater College family. These three overarching themes – of mind, body and spirit – will be the markers of our greatness as we approach our 250th anniversary in 2020.

I hope you share my enthusiasm for the direction in which we are headed. The students are at the heart of everything we do. And with that, I’ll stop right here because if you’re like me, you believe that well done is better than well said.

Thank you for your time in allowing me to address you. I've tried to give these remarks and the Board has consistently asked me, where are we going over the next 5 years, what are the benchmarks, how do we measure it, how do we look at it? We've been looking at this for some time in the light of our strategic plan to make sure we have that roadway clear for them.

I'll be happy, Mr. Speaker, to take any questions.

__________

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about the 900 thousand dollar increase that the institution will have to cover for the retirement shortfall that the legislature is trying to sort out. He said that in his understanding from reading newspapers, that figure is just for next year and will continue to increase in future years. For employees, there will be ceiling, but for state agencies, like the College, this burden will continue. Nunan asked isn’t this just another unfunded mandate? And in that case, was there a contingency plan to deal with this ongoing additional financial burden on the College?

President McConnell replied that there is no basket of cash to pay for it. He said the shortfall will probably continue to occur for the next 4-5 years. He invited Paul Patrick to comment.

Paul Patrick, Vice President for Administration and Planning, replied that the legislation that will likely get passed requires annual increases, not for the employee, but for the employer. Those increases are "a percent a year for five years." He explained if the system meets its assumed rate of return of seven and a quarter percent from investment earnings then the need for the additional contribution increase of the employer is diminished. Patrick said the likelihood of the system returning that assumed rate of return based on recent history is not guaranteed. Patrick offered that over the next five years there might be an increase on behalf of the employer's share to get us to 18 and a half percent. He said he thinks over the next few years, there will be a pension increase on the employer, not on the employee. The employee will max out after this round of increases.

Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked if there is a chance that the bond bill which is to be used for higher education will be used for roads instead?
President McConnell replied that as he understands it, there is an effort underway in the state Senate to move a new highway bill through. President McConnell offered some observations on the Department of Transportation and the highway system. He offered that it was a bad practice to take money from the general fund and use it to pay bonds for the road system. He said that is why there is a separate highway fund. He said that sales tax and corporate taxes were put into place for general core functions, not for roads and bridges. The President expressed that many people in the business community think we should have a bond bill and an infrastructure bill. He said the higher education bond bill would not raise the debt service in the annual appropriations bill. McConnell expressed that if an attempt is made to bail out the road system with the general fund, we have robbed the future of the state and particularly for education.

MConnell hoped the Senate will pass the revenue bill already passed by the House. McConnell used the expression, "burp in a whirlwind," to describe using the bond bill to fix the roads.

Gigova commented on hearing the vision for the College and expressed that it would be easier to be enthusiastic if there were some occasional pay raises. She mentioned performing additional duties for no increase in pay and the cost of living in the expensive Charleston area. She expressed the wish that the issue be part of McConnell's discussion with the Board of Trustees.

President McConnell said he shares that frustration and said after the budget reset and paying bills, we will have make smart decisions to create good opportunities. MConnell said he felt they made a good case for a million dollar increase in the operational budget. He plans on talking with the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee this week.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked if there were any consequences for people in optional retirement plans for the new unfunded mandate from the state on pension plans?

McConnell did not know of any consequences.

Kelly asked about the vision for the next four years and how that translates into decisions about where the College will spend money in a time of diminishing amounts of money available.

McConnell replied that monies would be used to take care of the academy. "where your money is is where your heart is." He stated we are here for the students, and for five years, a greater proportion of our budget will be migrated to the academy. He stated he is trying to keep administrative expenses down going forward. He said he recognized that adjunct pay needs to be increased.

Another area to invest in is attracting students to the College.

McConnell stated that resetting the budget last year, there was a disproportionate cut made to the President's office.

Betsy Baker, Senator (English) asked about plans to increase undergraduate student enrollment in light of the cap of 10,000 students.
McConnell said the cap is left from the College's historical footprint, but it is now expanded to Harborwalk and North Charleston. McConnell said the College needs to grow responsibly, while being able to still pay its bills.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked about McConnell's statement, “The College of Charleston is a national, pre-eminent, comprehensive public university deeply rooted in the liberal arts and sciences tradition offering leading edge programs in business, technology, education, and languages and dedicated to its public mission of advancing the region’s economy, culture, and future.”

Krasnoff wondered why those four areas were emphasized and if the statement was factual or aspirational?

McConnell stated that the areas represent the roots of the liberal arts and sciences tradition and the College is more than that now.

**Simon Lewis**, Guest, thanked President McConnell for the clear statement of the vision and for the acknowledgement that all is rooted in the liberal arts. Lewis pointed out that the statement given was very different from the one used by the College in the last ten years. Lewis pointed out a shift from a nationally pre-eminent liberal arts university to a nationally pre-eminent comprehensive university, rooted in the liberal arts. Lewis stated this is a significant difference and sounds like an afterthought. Lewis stated the primacy of the liberal arts tradition allows for clearer message when recruiting faculty and in convocation with Freshman students.

McConnell stated that when they started looking at the College from an aerial overview, taking into account Carnegie classification and the Masters programs, we are a comprehensive university, founded in the liberal arts and sciences. He used the example of the real estate major as a business course, but informed by liberal arts and sciences.

Lewis said the definition de-emphasizing liberal arts and sciences tradition was less inspiring for faculty.

McConnell said it is not the intent to back away from the liberal arts and sciences tradition, but to define who we are. He said one of the great things about the College is a business student can also manage a stage production at the School of the Arts. The melding of disciplines is a great strength of the institution.

**Divya Bhati**, Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, wished to add to President McConnell's thanks and extended her heartfelt gratitude and thanks to all the faculty and staff who contributed to the reaffirmation effort for SACSCOC. She extended special thanks to the Deans for completion of compliance reports, and to administrators, staff, and to Provost McGee for spending countless hours editing, reviewing, and drafting. Special thanks to President McConnell for his leadership through the whole process, who also spent countless hours reading drafts, and making notes.
Bhati expressed the hope that this work will be ongoing, producing quality work we can all be proud of.

There was a hearty round of applause given.

There were no additional questions.

c. **Provost Brian McGee** (pdf)

Provost McGee recognized Speaker Todd McNerney for three years of service as Speaker of the Faculty and expressed his deep appreciation for his work. The Speaker enjoyed well-earned applause.

The Provost reflected on several items of good news: the wonderful work of the students, and spoke of the multiple awards, ceremonies, and receptions.

The Provost recognized the wonderful work of faculty and staff, and said he recently signed off on the certificates going to faculty award winners and is impressed by the amazing career work reflected by those colleagues.

He expressed the pleasure of reading through tenure and promotion packets, third year review, and other retention files and seeing the impressive work amassed over the years. The Provost said we are a wonderful institution not because our buildings are unusually pretty or we are dangerously close to the ocean, but because of the impressive work of the people.

He gave a report on tenure and promotion and recognized the rigor and work that go into these career milestones. He thanked all the colleagues who worked on departmental evaluation panel letters, the Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review, Deans who provide good and careful review of their faculty colleagues, and are a crucial part of the process of providing four independent recommendations to the President.

The Provost also recognized the good work of the Post Tenure Review Committee.

Provost McGee noted that getting a report back from SACSCOC with no recommendations is the best report in last 30 years. He said we are one of the longer accredited institutions in the southern region, and should be proud of that.

The Provost mentioned that some SACSCOC reports will mention some features of our governance structure and of our curriculum work that has been in place for years and we are proud of that as well.

The Provost said that the College has to be accredited to exist in the modern regulatory environment, but the most important thing from faculty perspective is do wonderful work in teaching, learning, service, and research, and our accreditation should be a good indication of our continued commitment to everything that makes that possible.
On policy development and implementation, the Provost spoke of the Trump presidency plans to deregulate federal government, the private sector, and presumably state government. In higher education, the federal government has been the driver of how we are regulated. It is too early to tell if there will be changes in the regulatory apparatus. The Provost spoke of the challenges to keep administrative costs down while producing information needed by regulatory bodies.

The Provost spoke over the coming months, work will be done on developing new 2 + 2 programs to help Trident Tech student matriculate at the College of Charleston.

He mentioned that the College will be working to clarify the Charleston Bridge Program.

The Provost said that work will be done creating a new comprehensive agreement on joint graduate programs with The Citadel.

The Provost mentioned on-going work on revising cross-registration agreements with other local public and private institutions.

The Provost said the work of maintaining policies and keeping compliant with state and federal regulations and giving clear information to all will continue.

The Provost shared that there will soon be a draft report produced by the Ad Hoc Committee on the graduate school’s organization and thanked the members and Chair of the committee Dean Fran Welch for their work. The Provost said he looks forward to reviewing the report with the Committee chair and discussing the report with the President as we look to the next phase of the development of the Graduate School. The Committee has made some interesting recommendations on the tighter integration of the research and Graduate Commissions.

The Provost said it is customary to work over the summer on revisions produced by Bylaws and FAM Committee. Some of those items are still under discussion and will be incorporated to probably appear in the 2019/2020 FAM.

The Provost commented on the agenda item concerning the report on the GenEd and Catalog Year Policy. The Provost thanked Joe Kelly, Julia Eichelberger, and Lynne Ford for work done on the question, in order to create clarity on how the catalog year works for General Education.

The Provost mentioned many other reports that will probably be heard in the Fall.

The Provost said that the Deans and other academic leaders have been in discussion with the Faculty Budget Committee about the development of next year's budget and thanked all the members for good work done there.

The Provost accepted questions.

**Irina Gigova**, Senator (at-large HSS) asked for an update on student enrollment.
The Provost said that application numbers are strong, and they have had a series of "yield" events, which are held in hopes of convincing accepted students to attend.

The Provost stated it's too early to determine what retention numbers will be from this year for our continuing students. He said for newly enrolled students, which can be broken into multiple student populations, we are ahead of expectations for the Charleston Bridge program, the iCharleston International bridge program is where they expected it to be at this time, the Honors College and regular admission student numbers are slightly behind where they had hoped. When asked, peer institutions report they are seeing the same trend of students waiting later to make final decisions.

The Provost said that the College is adapting to changing behavior of prospective students.

There were no further questions.

d. Lynn Cherry, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources (PPT).

Dr. Cherry introduced Curriculog, the new electronic curriculum process. Curriculog will be implemented in Fall 2017.

The benefits of using Curriculog are many, including no more paper forms. The electronic forms will be easier to track and see where a proposal is in the approval or signing stages. It is a more transparent system. All can see where the curriculum proposals are in the approval process.

The format of the forms will be the same, and the approval process will follow the same path as the current paper system.

Since Curriculog will be accessed through MyCharleston, anyone involved with a proposal can log on and see it, including the people responsible for signing.

Cherry said that the system is accessible from off-campus, as well.

Acculog, the current catalog system, and Curriculog are from the same parent company and work together seamlessly, allowing you to get information from the draft catalog of programs and courses newly approved.

Cherry said that Curriculog will not autofill form boxes; that people still need to do the work of filling out all the correct information.

Training sessions will be offered in Spring 2017. Cherry has already offered overview sessions for Faculty Curriculum Committee, and the Graduate, Continuing Education, and Special Education Committee.

This summer, training sessions will be offered for Chairs and Program Directors.
Cherry said beginning in August 2017, they will begin offering training sessions for faculty.

Throughout the Fall 2017 semester, there will be several workshops offered where you can work with your actual proposal.

Cherry mentioned Megan Gould is the administrator of the system. There will also be some tutorials available.

Cherry thanked those who started the process of adopting Curriculog, including Conseula Francis (former Associate Provost) and Mary Bergstrom (Registrar). Mary Bergstrom, Franklin Czwazka, and Jerry Mackeldon continued to shepherd the implementation after Conseula's untimely death.

Any questions about Curriculog may be directed to Lynn Cherry or Megan Gould.

There were no questions.


Professor Fragile gave a Committee report on recommended changes to the FAM concerning the PTR process. Fragile said the recommendations arose from areas the Committee questioned and did not find clarified in the FAM. Those questions are:

1. When can a candidate seek a Superior rating? Must they wait 6 years after their previous review? For example, if a candidate received a Satisfactory rating one year, must they wait 6 years to pursue a Superior rating?

2. What is the purpose of a deferral? Is it to avoid getting an Unsatisfactory rating? Is it to preserve eligibility to seek a Superior rating? If a candidate doesn’t have to wait 6 years to seek a Superior after a Satisfactory, then is there any reason to grant them a deferral?

3. What time period should be considered for a Superior rating? The time since the last PTR? Always 6 years? The cumulative time since the last Superior?

As described by Fragile, although asked to approve the requests, the Committee felt they didn't understand the purpose of the request to defer.

The committee found that as a result of changes made a few years ago to the Post Tenure Review process, the faculty member can get a satisfactory review as default.

No packet is submitted, and most work is completed by the Chair.

The Committee felt the faculty member may choose to defer the satisfactory rating for two reasons: to avoid an unsatisfactory rating, and if it was necessary to preserve eligibility to go up for a superior rating.
Fragile said the Committee then questioned when a faculty member can request a superior rating?

He expressed areas that the committee felt needed clarification are in the area of faculty requesting deferrals and when is a faculty member eligible for a superior rating?

The recommendation from the committee is that faculty can go for superior rating at their convenience, within existing time frames. They also recommended that it be stated in the FAM very clearly that faculty have some sort of review every six years.

There were several questions.

**Jon Hakkila**, Guest, asked if this means that a superior rating resets the clock?

Fragile affirmed.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator (at-large, SSM) pointed out that if the recommendation is adopted, it eliminates the positive reason for deferral (to preserve eligibility to go up for a superior rating) and asked if the committee recommends eliminating deferral?

Fragile said that the case of a faculty member approaching retirement, it might be efficient to defer that person, but other than this there is no reason for deferrals and that should be clarified in the FAM.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large, HSS) pointed out a small detail that needed correcting. Fragile amended the report [amended pdf linked above].

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) asked for clarification on when faculty go up for superior rating, is there base salary adjustment?

Fragile said yes. DeLaurell next asked if faculty get a satisfactory rating, is there any salary adjustment. Fragile said no.

Fragile said that going up for some kind of rating every six years is in the FAM, but the Committee would like that clarified.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker**, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, added that the intention of the post tenure review changes made three or four years ago were to clarify that faculty could go up for superior without waiting six years from their last superior rating, but it was buried in an appeals section of the FAM, resulting in ambiguity. The PTR Committee appropriately identified the areas needed clarification.

DeLaurell asked if it’s possible to get a satisfactory rating, then it's possible to get an unsatisfactory rating and what are the consequences of an unsatisfactory rating?
Fragile said that is spelled out in the FAM, basically that the faculty member and the Chair design a remediation plan, approved by higher levels and committee, which then triggers follow up.

DeLaurell asked how that affected review every six years? Could you be in remediation for two years?

Caveny-Noecker answered that the remediation is put into place, and the next year, a review takes place, and the PTR Committee determines if the faculty member has met the objectives of the remediation plan. If the faculty member has not, it triggers more serious intervention.

Fragile asked when would that person be eligible for superior rating?

Caveny-Noecker said the person would have to meet the remediation plan, or would not be eligible to remain at the College of Charleston. If after a year, the faculty member did not meet the objectives, that would trigger proceedings that would lead to termination. Caveny-Noecker said she presumes if a faculty member meets the terms of the remediation plan, then the six year cycle of review would continue.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) clarified that according to Fragile's slide, faculty at the rank of professor should be eligible to seek superior rating starting six years after their promotion and not more frequently than once every six years. He asked if that meant faculty may not achieve promotion more than once every six years?

Fragile clarified that the meaning should be faculty can't be awarded a promotion more than once every six years.

There were no more questions.

f. Roger Daniels, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Hearing Procedures, suggested changes to the FAM (pdf).

Professor Daniels offered a summary of the committee’s recommendations.

- Propose language to address conflicts of interest of participants in the hearing process. Motions containing suggested language is in the linked pdf.
- Authorize the Hearing Committee to determine if there is a conflict of interest.
- Prescribe for three year terms to serve on the Hearing Committee.
- Introduce language to expand the number of committee members to eleven. This will help if there is more than one hearing.
- Tighten up the timeframe, so that faculty would not have unresolved hearings over the summer. The Committee added language reducing the number of days for filing a hearing grievance from 20 to 15.
- Introduce proposed language to change from 5 days to 10 days where the committee must meet to discuss whether a hearing will be conducted. The committee will then have 15 working days for which to schedule a hearing.
• There was reintroduction of language that was inadvertently omitted from the FAM on post-hearing procedures.
• New language will require the committee report to the President a grievant within 15 working days.
• Recognize the central authority of the President who will give due consideration to the Committee's recommendation. The recommendation of the Faculty Hearing Committee is just a recommendation. It provides information for the President to make a decision.
• The President will state the reasons for a contrary decision regarding the Committee's recommendation. The Ad Hoc Committee would like to see open dialog if there is a decision contrary to the recommendations of the Hearing Committee, recognizing there will be limitations to what the President can say.

The ad hoc committee’s recommendations will go to the Committee on Bylaws and the FAM.

Daniels offered that this will begin a good conversation between administration and faculty on the Hearing Process.

There was discussion.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) gave comments regarding the overlapping of the faculty and administrative parts of the FAM.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs asked if Krasnoff's question concerned portions of the hearing procedures are contained in Faculty Bylaws, and portions are in the Administrative sections of the FAM?

Krasnoff noted that the report overlaps both sections.

Caveny-Noecker said that the constitution of the committee, the terms of the committee, are in Bylaws, and the process including the timeline and happens to the recommendation of the committee is in the Administrative portion of the FAM. Caveny-Noecker said that the part that is overlapping is in the definition of the committee and the role of the committee.

Speaker McNerney said recent practices call for any changes to the FAM, including the administrative part, to be brought before the Senate by the Committee on Bylaws and the FAM as notices of intent.

Krasnoff asked about the language concerning the Hearing Committee's determination of conflict of interest. Could the determination of conflict of interest be appealed to the Hearing Committee by the grievant or the President?

Krasnoff pointed out that the appeal is being made to the committee that is making the decision of conflict of interest. Is it a matter of asking for a re-hearing? Krasnoff said the appeal is not made to a second body.
Daniels said that once the Committee has determined that there is a conflict of interest, that information may be of use to the President as they consider if that testimony is valuable. The President may have a different view of conflict of the interest than the faculty member.

Daniels said the conflict of interest motion was the most controversial to the Ad Hoc Committee and legal issues were brought up on which he did not elaborate. He said the committee could address a potential conflict of interest somewhat informally.

Krasnoff agreed with the idea and said the Hearing Committee should be able to run a hearing according to their rules and said he wanted to make sure he understood. He said the appeal is asking for a re-airing of the issues before the committee and stated that usually an appeal [of conflict of interest] is made to a different body. He said he was not criticizing, but seeking clarification that the Hearing Committee makes a decision, then other parties (the President) can say, I want you to talk about it again.

Daniels said the thinking of the Ad Hoc Committee was that the President might not agree there is a conflict of interest, and could make that determination. The Hearing Committee may make recommendations about the merits of the case.

Krasnoff asked about the recommendation that faculty serve on the Hearing Committee for three consecutive years in light of this year's change to the Bylaws allowing faculty to serve up to five years on a committee. He asked if the Ad Hoc Committee would allow five years, or mandate for three?

Daniels said that their intent was to assure continuity and consistently, and can't imagine that anyone would want to serve on Hearing for five years.

Speaker McNerney had to leave at this point to direct a CofC theatre production of Rent and remanded the floor to Speaker Pro Tempore Larry Krasnoff.

Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff asked for other questions or concerns.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) expressed that including timeframes was commendable. She mentioned that the language in Motion 1 bars any attorneys, and that some faculty are attorneys.

Daniels expressed that he would need to defer to College of Charleston legal counsel on the question, but he would assume a faculty member would not give up their rights; a grievant would represent themselves not as an attorney, but as a faculty member persuading their colleagues that they have been wronged. The motion is designed to prevent people from "lawyering up."

DeLaurell suggested modifying the language to exempt current roster faculty.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker contributed that the language specifies only that the College's representative is not an attorney.
De Laurell asked if the College's representative is the Provost, what happens if the Provost is also an attorney?

Caveny-Noecker said the language is open for conversation.

DeLaurell suggested that the language may need to be adjusted.

Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff reminded the Senators that this is a report, and there is a process whereby the suggestions may be introduced as motions and amended.

Daniels suggested that Bylaws may want to adjust the language based on suggestions.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large HSS) seconded Caveny-Noecker's points about the legal representation language, and said it was to protect the grievant from someone who possessed legal training gaining an advantage. Someone who is an attorney cannot serve as the College's representative. Nunan pointed out that attorney Andy Abrams served as Provost in past years, and designated the Dean from the School of the grievant as his substitute. Nunan said since the condition applies only to the College's representative, he is not sure there is a problem, but he is serving on the Bylaws Committee in 2017-18 and will welcome questions.

Nunan questioned Daniels on the conflict of interest. He said Motion 1 specified the person should not have conflict of interest in the proceeding and Motion 2 gave authority to the Hearing Committee to determine whether there are conflicts of interest among participants. Nunan said he is not sure what the Hearing Committee does with Motion 2, as witnesses would possibly have a conflict of interest.

Nunan pointed out the overlap in the two motions. He said the Hearing Committee could rule in Motion 2 that the Provost, for example, has a conflict of interest to serve as College representative because the Provost was involved in the decision-making that led to the hearing in the first place. So the Provost, in that example, would have a conflict of interest because the outcome of the hearing would affirm their decision. The conflict of interest would apply to the Dean in the relevant school, the department chair or panel members that sat in judgement of the grievant, if this was a T & P case. Nunan offered the opinion that the language should probably state that none of those people should serve as College representative ever. He said if we stop short of that, can the Hearing Committee simply decree that the Provost, Dean, Department Chair or others involved should not serve?

Daniels said that the language in the motions is designed to apply to any of those conditions described. He said the intent of this is to keep the outcome from being contaminated by those who may have a conflict of interest.

Nunan asked if the Ad Hoc Committee is advising future Hearing Committee chairs to routinely exclude the Provost and the Department Chair?

Daniels said no, the Ad Hoc Committee was not advising that.
Nunan said they all have a conflict of interest, and used the analogy that we don't put policemen in charge of making decisions about the people they have arrested, for a reason.

Daniels said he understood, but asked if that meant the case would be farmed out to someone outside the institution?

Nunan replied that no, the hearing "would be farmed out to someone who was not in that chain of decision-making." He provided an example: Provost McGee could appoint Deanna Caveny-Noecker to represent him on behalf of the College at the Hearing. Caveny-Noecker would not be in the line of decision-making that led to that grievance in the first place.

Daniels said that it's possible she could have conflict of interest through transitivity, to which Nunan replied that life is not perfect.

Nunan said direct conflicts of interest, at least, should be avoided.

Daniels reminded Senators that the process is not jurisprudence, but is a forum for hearing a grievance from a colleague. He asked how you avoid a conflict of interest from a Provost.

Nunan replied, "By not having the Provost serve in that capacity" [as College representative].

Nunan brought up the point for clarity.

Daniels said the conversation has been moved further along towards recognizing possible conflicts of interest which contaminate the outcome.

Nunan asked if the intent of the Ad Hoc Committee was not to assign a Hearing Committee Chair the authority to say, the Provost cannot serve because the Provost was involved in the decision-making and that's reason enough to exclude the Provost. Nunan elaborated that he was asking for clarification as to whether assigning that general authority was not [emphasis added] the intent of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Daniels agreed that was not the Ad Hoc Committee's intent.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker** was asked to contribute as another member of the ad hoc committee. She agreed that it was not the committee's intent to suggest that the Provost by virtue of making a decision always has a conflict of interest in a hearing and can never be the College's representative. The intent discussed a lot in the Ad Hoc Committee was to reflect and acknowledge the possibility that the person representing the College could have a conflict of interest. Caveny-Noecker expressed the committee's sentiment, as she understood it, to present motion 1 and motion 2 separately because there was agreement that there was a need to acknowledge that someone serving as the College's representative could have a conflict of interest.

Caveny-Noecker explained that there was not consensus in the committee about the appropriate ways of addressing a possible conflict.


**Jason Vance**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked for an example where the College's representative did have a conflict of interest. Would this be a case where that representative is also serving as a witness?

Daniels replied that the committee very deliberately did not consider past grievances. Daniels mentioned that, for example, a Provost could be married to a grievant, in which case they would need to exclude themselves from the process.

**Provost McGee** said that would be a good example.

Daniels said that if a grievant had a formerly settled grievance against a member of the Hearing Committee, that could be a conflict of interest.

Vance said if, for example, a grievant has named the College representative as the source of the grievance.

Daniels said that would be something that the Hearing Committee would have to consider, and the facts and circumstances of each case would be unique. Daniels said the Committee members would have to have some dialogue.

Vance replied he was asking for clarification, following a point made by Nunan. He asked what types of scale did the Ad Hoc Committeidentify or were the possible conflicts of interest ambiguous?

Daniels replied the discussions were not ambiguous and did not wish to discuss conversations the committee had, since he viewed that as a breach of trust.

**Simon Lewis**, Guest, was curious about the process in setting up two ad hoc committees to look into Grievance and Hearing Committees, which worked in parallel fashion and submitted reports and potentially motions for the Bylaws Committee. He wondered if there is any way the Senate can mesh those two responses. As an example, Lewis stated that the Ad Hoc Committee on Grievance came up with a suggestion for two years of service on that committee and that the Ad Hoc Committee on Hearing suggested three years of service.

Daniels stated that he thinks there were compelling reasons why Grievance and Hearing are separate, and said that Hearing Committee deals more with academic freedom issues and denial of tenure and promotion, and those things are different than what Grievance does, which is a little more undefined.

Daniels said there could be discussion in the future about combining the committees, but the Ad Hoc Committee on Hearing Processes, which he chaired, did not look at that issue.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about the reports, and suggested that since there will be no adjustment to the FAM until the 2018-2019 edition (affirmed by Provost McGee) and since Bylaws will bring the issues to a new Senate in Fall 2017, that debate be taken up at that time.
Kelly thanked the ad hoc committees for their hard work, and suggested that there was not much more business to be done by this Senate body.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker** said in the interest of shared governance, if there is substantive feedback that people wish to make, give it to the chair of the Bylaws Committee for 2017-18, or to Roger Daniels, or herself, so that feedback on the ad hoc committee's report is not lost.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large HSS) expressed that this is a useful occasion to have the conversation and begin the discussion, as it becomes recorded in the minutes. People who look at the minutes might have suggestions that emerge as a result of reading the conversation. The Bylaws Committee of next year may be guessing about what Faculty Senate may think about a lot if these issues, so he thought it was worth spending time on.

Daniels said he is happy to continue answering questions, and he thinks this is important.

Nunan asked about the 15 working days versus 20 for a grievant to file a complaint. He wanted to know the thinking behind the suggestion to change, in light of the hardship a grievant faced when realizing they would no longer have a job, in the case of a tenure decision. In light of all that has to be done at the end of the semester, it seems shortening the days they can file a grievance represents hardship.

Daniels replied that the committee thought that by shortening the time frame, cases could be resolved before the summer, when committee members, witnesses, and grievants are no longer under contract. He offered the opinion that five extra days would not help the grievant, but prolong the agony.

Nunan said that erring on the side of the grievant is preferable to erring on the side of the convenience of the institution or committee, and people who are willing to serve on the Hearing Committee should be willing to work into the summer.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) said that the 15 days does not operate for the convenience of the committee and expressed the opinion that what the grievant wants is a resolution, and the more you allow resolution to not take place, the more difficult it will be for the grievant. She noted keeping a schedule that will get a decision out quickly will allow the grievant to progress to the next legal step.

Nunan commented that the Ad Hoc Committee on Grievance made a report [in March] which included the suggestion that members of that committee receive mediation training. Although, as Nunan remarked, the Hearing Committee is very different, in that they deal in adversarial, legal matters, he thinks that those committee members need some form of legal training as well. He asked if the Ad Hoc Committee on Hearing discussed that?

Daniels said the committee discussed it and thought it was a good idea. He offered the opinion that everything committee members needed to know was included in the FAM.

Nunan dissented.
Daniels said the consensus of the committee was supportive for some sort of training.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker said that the Ad Hoc Committee on Grievance suggested mediation training for both committees: Grievance and Hearing. She said that the Hearing Committee, based on its charge, does not have the authority to mediate.

Caveny-Noecker said that the Ad Hoc Committee discussed the need for training and that is one of the reasons the Committee pool was expanded to 11 committee members (to be able to hold two hearings in a year), and that is why the committee suggested Hearing Committee members serve three years (for continuity of experience). The Ad Hoc Committee discussed training through mentoring by former committee members, but did not formalize those recommendations.

Nunan summed up that the Ad Hoc Committee then was not opposed to training?

Daniels said they were not opposed, just unclear about what kind of training and who would conduct the training (legal training provided by the College of Charleston counsel would be a conflict of interest, for example).

Roxane DeLaurell said that overtraining committee members may lead to less fact-finding, and fact-finding is really their charge. She said listening and using basic sense are essential to the faculty members on the Hearing Committee, and that might be compromised by legal training.

Nunan wished to make a point on the grievant's ability to make a request for a public hearing. He asked if the current weak language in the FAM was addressed in any way by the Ad Hoc Committee?

Daniels said the Ad Hoc Committee did not address that language and thought the language in the FAM, giving the grievant the right to request a public hearing was clear.

Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff asked a question of Parliamentarian George Pothering on procedure. He wondered if reports could actually contain motions. Wouldn't motions be more appropriate as new business?

George Pothering, Parliamentarian, said that motions could be made with reports.

g. Quinn Burke, Chair, Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid Committee (FCAS).

Professor Burke presented the Grade Redemption policy in March 2017 to the Senate. He incorporated feedback from the Senate and is waiting on the input of many campus groups (Athletics, Financial Aid, Scholarships) that need to study the proposal more carefully. In order to give groups enough time to study, he wanted to guarantee that the new committee members of FCAS would make it a priority to present the Grade Redemption policy to the Senate in September 2017. Burke also believed a charge from the Senate would ensure timely feedback from the different groups.
Burke presented the Motion: The Faculty Senate charges the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions & Financial Aid (FCAS) to present a final Grade Redemption Policy for the Senate’s consideration and vote at the September 2017 Faculty Senate meeting. (doc)

There was discussion on the motion.

**Susan Kattwinkel**, Senator (Theatre) had a question on timing since the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (FCAS) would not meet over the summer and wondered if the committee would have enough time to work on the wording for September.

Burke said FCAS would convene over the summer and they would be able to get the wording together.

**Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff** asked for the vote.

The motion carried.

h. **Jason Vance, Chair, Committee on Bylaws and the FAM** brought a report (doc) and a motion (doc) on a Proposed Motion to Change the Order of Senate Business.

Vance gave a brief history of the motion, stemming from the March meeting where Senator Meg Cormack proposed endorsing the Senate meeting end time of 7:00 PM.

Discussion at that meeting, as reported by Vance, reflected the need to keep the option open to extend business past 7:00, and proposed changing the Bylaws to flip the order of business in the agenda, in order to move reports to later in the agenda and curriculum first.

Vance reported that he met with Parliamentarian George Pothering and the Bylaws and FAM Committee on the issues. Vance confirmed that there are already provisions in the Bylaws that allow the Speaker of the Faculty to modify the order of the agenda, and any Senator can call for a change in agenda order, if there is a concern that important business, such as curriculum proposals, be addressed in the first part of the Senate meeting.

Vance also confirmed that reports may contain motions, according to the Parliamentarian and Robert's Rules. He suggested that a Curriculum Committee report could contain a motion to change the order of business in that meeting’s agenda, in order to address curriculum matters.

Vance reported that discussion in the Bylaws and FAM Committee meeting reflected that the reports contain valuable information that needs to be disseminated in our departments. Shared governance might suffer if reports are moved to the end of the meeting, where Senators are tired, and a quorum may not be maintained.

Vance shared an interesting graphic in his report (doc) on Faculty Senate attendance, and calls for a quorum. While business being stopped for a lack of quorum occurs rarely, people may
perceive that meetings are emptying early due to fewer Senators in attendance at Senate meetings later in the year, and guests leaving early after their reports are given or their courses are proposed.

Vance suggested that changing the order of business will not address apathy.

Vance said the Bylaws and FAM Committee recognized the need to address Senate business in a timely manner, but found that the proposed motion to change the order of business would not address the root of the problem, and may have a negative impact on transmitting information from reports to our colleagues. Since there are already mechanisms to change the order of business, the Committee could not endorse the motion.

Vance on behalf of the Committee suggested that the Speaker of the Faculty, at the start of Senate meetings, could ask if there are any objections to the agenda as presented. This could be offered as a reminder that Senators have the privilege to make a motion to change the agenda.

Vance then presented the motion (doc).

The Speaker Pro Tempore called for discussion on the motion.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) gave Jason Vance an A for his excellent report. DeLaurell brought up the possibility that moving agenda items around on the day of the meeting could be discourteous to the Guests present to make their reports. DeLaurell disagreed that voting for the motion would be abdicating faculty governance, but on the contrary would move faculty governance to the forefront, as is proper for the importance curriculum has. DeLaurell maintained that a vote for curricular matters at the end of a long Senate meeting when people are anxious to get home means that too little attention and discussion is paid to curriculum. DeLaurell said that changing the order of business could be more respectful to those giving reports, as they would know when to show up and would not have to experience the possibility that their information is not presented.

Vance said that the Bylaws and FAM Committee discussed this, and gave another possibility--since we know when curriculum will be heavy at Senate meetings (February and October), Senators may use a majority vote to change the agenda order on those meetings.

Gayle Goudy, Guest (Chair of Curriculum Committee) suggested the Senate could designate three meetings a years to feature Curriculum Committee items.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) spoke in favor of defeating the motion.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at-large, HSS) offered the observation that changing the Bylaws to amend the order of business would not solve the problem, as going later than 7:00 PM is a new problem. Kelly suggested that the Senate of 2017-18 look at how it deals with Curriculum. He suggested that the Faculty Senate does not need to look at new courses or changes to courses, but should be dealing with new programs, significant changes to programs, and larger issues. He urged Senators to vote against the motion.
Jon Hakkila, Guest, spoke of his experience several years ago as Chair of the Graduate Curriculum Committee. He said that Committee introduced a "consensus proposal," suggesting that both the Graduate Curriculum and Curriculum Committees present curricular changes that were not programmatic changes as consensus items, to be voted on in bulk unless someone had an issue with a particular item. Hakkila suggested that the Chairs of the Committees reconsider that "block" approach.

Vance said he thought that was a great idea and made the point that as Robert's Rules defines it, committee reports can introduce motions and recommendations which may be presented for a vote.

Vance reminded the Senate that the Faculty Curriculum Committee could bring a recommendation of courses to approve, with the understanding that the Committee had vetted the courses thoroughly. He spoke of the concern others may have with voting on the whole battery of courses, without chance of discussing them individually.

Hakkila said there is an assumption that Faculty Senators are able to see a copy of the proposal, are able to review it in advance, and can make a note of any questions in advance of a Senate meeting.

Robert Westerfelhaus, Senator (at-large, HSS) said that regardless of the scheme used to look at committee reports, "we are not resolving the problem before us now, which is to have deliberation in a deliberative body that hasn't deliberated much this evening although we've already met for almost three hours." He said regardless of which of the described schemes for addressing curriculum we might adopt, it wouldn't matter in terms of shortening meetings or enabling us to expeditiously deal with business, as we haven't even begun to discuss curriculum yet.

Blake Stevens, Senator (at-large, School of the Arts) was curious about agenda item # 7 [Constituent's General Concerns]. Stevens said if Vance is sensitive to the critique that the Senate body is reactive, then always putting agenda item 7 at the end is confirming that, since it is a catch-all. Stevens stated that the meetings where he has been able to stay until 7:45 or 8:00, he finds the open-ended moment is often very productive and yet, it is still deferred to the end. Why is this?

Vance said the Bylaws and FAM committee focused on business and reports. He said that Stevens brings up a great point. Vance said sometimes constituent concerns often roll into things that are brought up at subsequent meetings.

Stevens suggested offered that if Senators are to think of their activities as being more proactive, we should consider moving agenda item #7. With fewer people at the end of the meeting, the opportunity for hearing constituent concerns is lost.

George Pothering, Parliamentarian, commented that constituent concerns is at the end because you don't know what's going to come up. He said at the end, if issues are raised, they can be
Brian McGee, Provost, said that this is a good discussion about how we do business together, and offered a motion to call the question.

The motion to call the question was seconded. The Speaker Pro Tempore asked for a vote and the motion carried.

The Speaker Pro Tempore called for a vote on the Proposed Motion to Change the Order of Senate Business. The motion was defeated.

Provost McGee moved that the Senate recess the April 11 meeting and convene again on Tuesday April 18 at 5:00.

The motion was not seconded.

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) spoke in favor of the final report, which is relevant for advisors of current Study Abroad students, and will necessitate changes in Degree Works, and her team needs all the time they can get to rebuild those changes.

Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff asked Lynne Ford is this a report, and not a motion?

Lynne Ford affirmed that her report is a clarification for which she would like the Senate's endorsement.

Ford clarified that the report was necessitated by two prior actions taken by the Senate on how we will clarify General Education within the catalog year policy moving forward.

i. Lynne Ford, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, Gen Ed and Catalog Year Policy clarification (doc).

Ford reminded Senators that in the November 2016 Faculty Senate meeting, Senators declined to pass a motion to adopt a new three year cycle of a fixed GenEd curriculum (called a "Freeze"). As a result, additions and deletions and requirement changes to the GenEd curriculum can be adopted by the Senate. Curriculum for General Education is based on catalog year and is addressed by the Catalog Year Policy adopted in 2012.

Ford read the Catalog Year Policy, “students must fulfill the general education and degree requirements, and must abide by the academic regulations in effect at the time of their matriculation at the College. Matriculation is defined as the first term of degree seeking enrollment or the first term of readmission at the College. This catalog year remains fixed during the time a student is continuously enrolled.”

Ford mentioned that a strict interpretation of this policy means that the 97 courses added to and the 3 deleted from GenEd at the March 2017 Senate meeting would only apply to the students
admitted to the College in 2017-18. Ford said many faculty want these courses to apply to all students.

Ford offered the clarifying proposal, three types of changes may be made to the GenEd curriculum: courses may be added, deleted and requirements may be changed.

She gave the examples of increasing or decreasing the number of hours in a distribution category (example of a requirement change, Natural Sciences might say instead of 8 hours in a single science, they can be in two separate sciences).

Ford said the 2015 catalog to 2017 is the foundational block. That is the curriculum that was frozen; that is the curriculum that was determined by the faculty using the approval criteria of student learning outcomes, assessment plans, the review and recertification of all the courses.

Moving forward, Ford asked Faculty Senate to consider the following summary of how the changes affect the catalog years.

- Any courses approved for addition to the list of approved GE courses will apply to CY 2015 and all subsequent catalog years.
- Any courses approved for deletion to the list of approved GE courses will apply to the next catalog year (e.g. 2017-18) and all subsequent catalog years, but not retroactively to previous CY years.
- Any change to a GE requirement will apply to the next catalog year (e.g. 2017-18) and all subsequent catalog years, but not retroactively to previous CY years.

Ford said these changes allow the curriculum to grow, but holds students harmless. She said the General Education Committee plans to bring a process to 2017-18 Senate suggesting ways to better manage the growing size of the GenEd curriculum without a freeze and with a cycle of regular review.

Meanwhile, Ford said the points listed above offer an interpretation of catalog year and our understanding of General Education within the catalog year will serve as a compromise. She said students will be allowed to make the best use of courses faculty have determined are appropriate for GenEd, but at the same time, ensuring that courses do not disappear from a student's program of study if a department decides to remove them from General Education.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) said he remembered this being part of discussion, and faculty members pointing out that adding courses retroactively was not harmful, but he did not remember if that was part of what the Senate voted on.

Ford said it is important for all to be clear, with a record of the minutes, so we can revisit the issues when it comes up in future years.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked for a point of clarification. He asked if a student came in prior to catalog year 2015, are they not affected by any of this?
Ford said yes, if a student came in prior to 2015, and they have had continuous enrollment, the old GenEd, which was nearly every course in the curriculum, is available to them.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) asked if students could elect to choose different catalogs.

Ford said not for General Education. When a student declares a major, they get a catalog year, and can move up, not back, but they can't move their GenEd catalog.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator (at-large, HSS) thanked Lynne Ford for pulling together the clarification. He said the clarification makes GenEd consistent with what we already practice with majors, where if a department adds a course to a requirement in a major, any student can take that course to satisfy the requirement.

Kelly made a motion that the Senate resolve to approve the clarification.

**Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff** asked for unanimous consent to suspend the rules to allow Kelly to make the motion. The Senate gave unanimous consent.

The motion was made to endorse the clarification on Gen Ed and Catalog Year Policy. That motion was seconded.

**Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff** asked for discussion.

**Brian McGee** (Provost) commended Lynne Ford, Joe Kelly, and Julia Eichelberger for their work on the clarification. Provost McGee cautioned the faculty and the Senate on the complexity of the catalog scheme created by College of Charleston. He noted that the complex nature presents an ongoing training issue with the management of undergraduate and graduate curriculum.

Provost McGee summed up the scheme as we have a catalog year for General Education, potentially a different catalog year for the major, potentially another catalog year for a minor. He said with the adoption of this interpretation, we have an asymmetrical approach to the addition and deletion of General Education curricula on a student by student basis depending upon their entry into the institution on what is the default catalog year for GenEd plus modifications in some ways but not others.

Provost McGee said it is manageable, but it means that there is an ongoing challenge for training and we will have to remind colleagues who advise students part-time of the complex scheme we have adopted.

**Mary Bergstrom** (Registrar) added that Degree Works should become your advising source. Multiple catalogs might be useful to search for courses, but Degree Works will have the list based on catalog year.
Provost McGee said the average advisor of an undergraduate cannot advise if they are unable to stare at Degree Works at the same time as the student does.

Ford said this was primarily a situation in the Humanities as that is the greatest source of growth.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at-large, HSS) said that this will deal with an absurd situation, and gave the example of two students in the same class; one gets Humanities credit and one does not get Humanities credit and both students want Humanities credit. He said difficulties in advising are far outweighed by solving this problem.

Ford said, in response to Mary Bergstrom's point, that the advisor has to go to Degree Works and perform an individual audit for the individual student to make certain that student knows what courses are available.

Roxane DeLaurell asked for clarification on why the Senate is asked to vote endorsing something that already exists.

Ford explained that when the GenEd curriculum was adjusted in 2015, the freeze was part of that. The freeze got lost in the business of adjusting GenEd. Ford wanted to be absolutely clear that the three part decision rule [reflected in the bullets above] is endorsed so next semester, when the GenEd committee brings proposals, the Senate can apply one of the three conditions to scribe the change into Degree Works and to apply to a student based on their catalog year.

Ford explained that the Senate's other option, with a negative vote, is to apply strict interpretation of the catalog year rules.

Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff clarified that the Senate is voting on expressing support for the clarification of the policy, as presented by Ford.

There was no further discussion.

Speaker Pro Tempore Larry Krasnoff asked for unanimous consent to endorse the clarification. That motion passed.

There was a motion to move unfinished business to April 18 at 5:00. That motion passed.

The April 11, 2017 Senate meeting adjourned at 7:58 PM.

______________________________________________________________

Items Discussed and Actions Taken on 18 April 2017

Speaker McNerney called to order the continued Senate meeting at 5:05 PM.

McNerney gave a brief report and reminded Senators of the Board of Trustees meeting Thursday, and stated he will share the report he gave at the March Senate meeting on faculty
participation on evaluations and the President and Provost with the Board and will make a formal request for the Board to work with faculty leadership to develop an evaluation process and instrument.

Speaker McNerney reminded everyone that Board of Trustee meetings are open to the public and he encouraged Senators and interested others to attend. He said he has learned a great deal by attending the meetings.

McNerney informed the Senators that a report traditionally given by the Faculty Compensation Committee at the final Faculty Senate meeting is not yet ready and when completed will be shared by Speaker McNerney via email and placed in Senate archives.

Speaker McNerney recognized Provost Brian McGee who asked for unanimous consent to amend the agenda to include a resolution to award degrees (pdf) during May 2017. The agenda was amended, the resolution was introduced, and seconded. A vote was taken. The resolution to award degrees passed.

5. Old Business

None

6. New Business

Speaker McNerney introduced the first item of new business and explained the process. The Committee on Nominations and Elections will present slates for three standing committees and call for nominations from the floor for any of the three.

a. Tom Kunkle, Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections introduced the Slates and Election for the 2017-2018 Standing Senate Committees (doc).

Professor Kunkle explained that a new committee, voted into creation at the March 2017 Senate meeting [Adjunct Oversight Committee], would have to be filled in August or September 2017.

He introduced the slates for the three standing committees: Budget, Bylaws and FAM, Academic Planning. He called for additional nominations.

Jacob Steere-Williams, Senator (History) nominated Christophe Boucher (History) to Academic Planning.

Paper ballots were distributed to Senators. All Senators vote on standing Senate Committees.

The slate for Academic Planning was elected; Christophe Boucher, as write-in, was not elected.
Speaker McNerney gave the names of the four candidates he has received thus far for the Committee on Nominations and Elections. The Speaker will make call to campus to fill the slate for Nomination and Elections.

Tom Kunkle made a nomination (as a faculty member) of Jared Seay (Library).

b. **Shawn Morrison, Chair of the Committee on General Education** introduced Mathematics/Logic Alternative Coursework for General Education (doc).

Professor Morrison explained the GenEd Committee has identified student learning outcomes (SLO) for the new Mathematics/Logic Alternative Coursework. Any programs and courses proposed for GenEd will need to meet the student learning outcomes, identify a signature assignment, and describe how the SLOs are assessed.

Speaker McNerney asked for questions or discussion.

**Irina Gigova**, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked for clarification that the courses need to match one student learning outcome, not both of them? She asked if this would make counting more complicated for the Registrar or the GenEd Committee?

Morrison said the GeEd committee will utilize a list similar to the list they use for Foreign Language Alternative where there are categories and once the student has taken one course in each of the categories, the registrar will know that the SLOs have been completed.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked if there was controversy or discussion about theory or abstract principles that were vague?

**Jason Howell**, Senator (at-large, SSM) spoke as a former GenEd Committee member and a member of the Mathematics department. He said the proposal was created with the approval of the both Math and Philosophy departments. In terms of the abstraction, any course considered for SLO2 will have to write a proposal, which will be vetted by the departments of Math and Philosophy.

Krasnoff asked if that was part of the proposal?

**Lynne Ford**, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, said that the proposal specifies that representatives from Mathematics and Philosophy will be asked to sit with the GenEd Committee during the certification process.

There were no additional questions.

The Speaker called for a vote and the Senate voted in favor.

c. **Speaker McNerney introduced items on behalf of the Faculty Curriculum Committee.**
Chair Gayle Goudy was absent due to a family matter. Two ex-officio members of the Faculty Curriculum Committee were present. Faculty representing their department's proposals were also present.

Each item was introduced, open for discussion, then voted on.

There was short discussion about the proposed Portuguese minor [item xviii].

Alex Kasman asked about the future of the minor dependent on two faculty members.

Mark Del Mastro (Chair, Hispanic Studies) had no qualms as department chair and addressed the concerns satisfactorily.

All courses listed below were passed unanimously.

i. Asian Studies (Jin): create an independent study course in Hindi. (ASST)

ii. Archaeology (Newhard): change one of the options for its capstone experience. (ARCH)

iii. Biology (Byrum, Pritchard): BIOL 381 internship has revised SLOs and is now graded rather than P/F. They have submitted it to AA for reconsideration. (BIOL)

iv. Classics (Newhard): create 5 new courses, deactivate CLAS 221 and 222, change the title and/or description of 7 courses, while also restructuring the major and minor. (CLAS)

v. Communication (Kopfman): convert COMM 380 from a "Studies in" to a "Special Topics" course (COMM)

vi. Computer Science (Mountrouidou): create two new courses in computer security. (CSCI)

vii. Elementary Education (Perkins): Reactivate EDEE 374 to allow the Elementary Education department to teach out existing students who require that course (correct an oversight from last year). (EDEE 327)

viii. Middle Grades Education (Veal): Delete EDEE 327 from their Middle Grades Program major. (EDEE 374)

ix. English (Seaman): convert ten "Studies In" courses to "Special Topics" courses: ENGL 350, ENGL 360-366, ENGL 370, and ENGL 390 (ENGL)

x. Environmental and Sustainability Studies (Welch): add more electives to the program. (ENSS)

xi. Film Studies (Bruns): add several recently created courses to the list of options in their minor. (FMST)
xii. Geography (Long): create two new courses (GEOG 206 cross-listed with POLI 206 and GEOG 290) and add them to the minor. (GEOG)

xiii. Historic Preservation and Community Planning (Stiefel): change HPCP 290 a variable credit course (HPCP 290)

xiv. Historic Preservation and Community Planning (Gilmore): change description and renumber HPCP 280 to HPCP 306, create two new courses (HPCP 285 and HPCP 350, both formerly Special Topics), add more capstone courses to major, and add ARTH electives to HPCP major and minor. (HPCP major)

xv. Irish and Irish American Studies (Kelly): remove a restriction that students can count only six hours of IIAS 304 toward the minor. (IIAS)

xvi. Latin American and Caribbean Studies (Colomina-Garrigós): add seven courses (FYSE 125, LING 260, MUSC 234, HONS 381, SPAN 400, SPAN 401, SPAN 491) to their major and minor. (LACS)

xvii. Political Science (Curtis): create three new courses (one cross-listed with GEOG), rename POLI 310, renumber POLI 368, make corresponding changes to their major, and lastly add one of the new courses to the newly approved PLCY concentration (POLI)

xviii. Hispanic Studies (Del Mastro, Moreira, Moreira): New Portuguese Minor with three new courses, one deactivation, catalog description changes on six courses, and prerequisites changes on six courses. (PORT)

xix. Public Health (Sundstrom): revisions to the ethics courses in B.A. program. (PBHL BA)

xx. Public Health (Balinsky): create a new course (HEAL 470) and add it to their B.S. (PBHL BS)

xxi. Philosophy (Grantham): PHIL wants to reword the catalog description of the BA. They also want to restructure the minor to emphasize depth rather than breadth. (PHIL)

xxii. Psychology (Galuska): create new course (PSYCH 198) to formalize volunteer lab work experiences, create a new course (PSYC 330) and add to the BA, BS, and minor, and deactivate PSYC 355. (PSYC)

xxiii. Sociology (Burkett): change the description of SOCY 260. They also want to restructure their minor: making the core smaller (a choice of one of three 200-level classes, instead of requiring two specific 200-level classes), and making the elective portion broader (adding a requirement that the courses come from two different areas within Sociology). (SOCY)

xxiv. Supply Chain and Information Management (Shockley): add INFM 390 to the electives in their major (SCIM)
xxv. Theater (Appler): create a new concentration within their major, focused on academic study of theater, rather than performance and design. They also propose a new course that will be required within the concentration. (THTR)

xxvi. Urban Studies (Keenan): add a new category in their minor, for sustainable urbanism (URST)

xxvii. Women and Gender Studies (TBD): change major and minor: add LACS 310 as elective, and add WGST 400 as an alternative to WGST 401. (WGST)

d. Christine Finnan, Chair of the Committee on Graduate Education introduced the following course changes and proposals.

Each item was introduced, open for discussion, then voted on. All course matters passed.

i. MED Languages - remove EDFS 704 from ESOL emphasis
   · LALE - REMOVE COURSE

ii. MAT Performing Arts - remove 1 hour of 2 hours of MUSE 601 from degree requirements for Choral concentration
   · EDPA - CHANGE TO DEGREE REQS

iii. MS Marine Biology - remove requirement for organismal elective course
   · MBIO - REMOVE REQ IN ELECTIVES

iv. MFA Creative Writing - add ENGL courses to electives - *this proposal has 3 bookmarked sections*
   · MFA - ADD ELECTIVES

v. MPA - delete PUBA 614, 615; new course PUBA 514 - *this proposal has 3 bookmarked sections*
   · MPA - DELETE COURSES, NEW COURSE

vi. Urban and Regional Planning Certificate - changes to certificate organization; add EVSS 549 and EVSS 605/PUBA634 to certificate - *this proposal has 2 bookmarked sections*
   · URBP CERT - ORG CHANGE, ADD COURSES
vii. MS Environmental Studies - delete EVSS 646; new course EVSS 611; change program to add and delete - *this proposal has 3 bookmarked sections*

- **EVSS - NEW COURSE, DELETE COURSE**

viii. MPA and MS Environmental Studies - new course PUBA 651/EVSS 651; permission to cross-list; add PUBA 651 to MPA - *this proposal has 5 bookmarked sections*

- **MPA&EVSS - NEW COURSE, CROSS-LIST, ADD COURSE**

ix. MPA and MS Environmental Studies Concurrent Program - delete EVSS 646 from degree requirements; add EVSS 611 and PUBA 651/EVSS 651 to degree requirements

- **CONCUR.EVSS-MPA - ADD & DELETE COURSES**

x. MAT Elementary Education - remove co-req for EDEE 690 and 695; change course titles for EDEE 614, 665, 695; change course descriptions for EDEE 665 and 695 - *this proposal has 4 bookmarked sections*

- **EDEL - TITLE, CO-REQ, DESCRIP. CHANGES**

xi. Teacher Education - new course TEDU 536

- **TEDU - NEW COURSE**

xii. MAT programs and MED Languages - add TEDU 536 to technology course options for all MAT programs and MED Languages - *this proposal has 6 bookmarked sections*

- **MAT&LALE - ADD COURSE TO TECH REQS**

xiii. MED Teaching, Learning, and Advocacy - add EDFS 685 to all concentrations; add MTLA 706 to Curriculum & Instruction concentration; remove MTLA 711 as required course in Diverse Learners concentration; remove MTLA 605 and 678 as required courses for New Literacies concentration; remove registration restrictions on EDFS 730, 731, 740, 741, 750, 751; remove EDFS 762, 763, 764, and MTLA 667 from New Literacies concentration; add MTLA 671 and 672 to New Literacies concentration - *this proposal has 7 bookmarked sections*

- **MTLA - CONCENTRATION CHANGES**

7. **Constituent’s general concerns**

There were none expressed.
Speaker Todd McNerney gave concluding remarks, and encouraged everyone to attend the Faculty Appreciation celebration.

Speaker McNerney thanked everyone for giving him the opportunity for the last three years to serve as Speaker. He spoke of his years of service as teaching him a great deal about the College of Charleston. He said one of the things he has always enjoyed about being a member of the academy is how it allows him to continually learn. He expressed that he looks forward to helping the next Speaker, Liz Jurisich.

The Speaker shared some of what he has learned, and mentioned the faculty's commitment to shared governance remains strong. He said a great many across campus regularly engage in the messy and sometimes difficult work of shared governance. He acknowledged that shared governance is a fragile thing. The faculty voice in shared governance requires constant and diligent work, and if we don't put forth the effort to maintain it, like anything else, it will erode.

The Speaker said if we the faculty do not accept the challenge of serving on committees, approved by the faculty, or of serving as a Senator, or if we devalue these efforts in our Tenure and Promotion panels and discussions, we may expect senior administrators not to value these efforts either.

Speaker McNerney shared that when he was a junior faculty member, he was encouraged to get involved after his first year in shared governance, and he believed this advice has proved valuable.

His time as Speaker has allowed him to learn about many things being done on campus that can be a source of pride. Working to further those efforts is a valuable use of anyone's time.

The Speaker reflected that The College and all of higher education is going to face challenges in the near future, and said that in looking over the archives of Senate minutes, he noticed that similar challenges occurred 30 years ago. McNerney surmised that those challenges may have always existed.

Speaker McNerney thinks how we choose to address those challenges is the question.

The Speaker said the last three years has reinvigorated his commitment to the faculty's role in navigating, adjusting, and finally finding means and methods to capitalize on those challenges.

He thanked the body once again.

The Speaker enjoyed well-deserved applause.

8. The Senate meeting for April 18, 2017 was adjourned at 5:56 PM.
Minutes of the Faculty Senate regular meeting on Tuesday 14 March 2017.

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, 14 March 2017 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order, 5:05 PM

2. The 14 February 2017 minutes (pdf) were approved as posted.

3. Announcements and Information.

None

4. Reports

Speaker Todd McNerney

Speaker McNerney thanked the members of Ad hoc Committee of Grievance Process.

The Speaker announced that Faculty Senate Budget Committee will be having an open meeting with the division heads of Academic Affairs, on April 10, 2-4:30, Location TBD (William Veal is Chair).

The Speaker shared the results of inquiries he made concerning faculty leadership at other institutions and if they are involved with about evaluations of the Provost and President. Ten schools were contacted and include other state institutions and our CAA conference affiliated schools. Of these ten schools, five of the schools have input into evaluation of the President. Eight out of the ten have input in the evaluation of the Provost. In the case of the schools that did not respond, Speaker McNerney researched their websites. In most instances, the system used was survey. The Speaker spoke of the course evaluations familiar to CofC faculty as being similar, in that we see the results, our immediate supervisor sees the results, and when we come up for Tenure or Promotion, a wider group of people sees the results. The results are not shared universally.

The same type of system is in place at Francis Marion. The results of the surveys are not seen by the faculty; they are taken into account by those charged with evaluating the President or Provost. Some universities share the results in report fashion with faculty leadership (their equivalent of the Senate).

Towson is part of the University system of Maryland. Their survey is similar to Francis Marion, but the speaker expressed that the questions are similar to ones we might like to adopt.

The responses he received to his inquiry to date are here: http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2016-2017/march-2017/FacultyPart_Evalsof_Leadership.pdf
The Speaker expressed that he will share his report with the Board of Trustees, and he will make a formal request recommending the President and the Board adopt a process to collect faculty input in the evaluations of the President and Provost. Speaker McNerney advocated that the process be collaboratively determined.

The Speaker asked for questions.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked what is the timeline for sharing with the Board? Senator Krasnoff spoke in favor of a collaborative construction of the instrument, and if that does not happen, the Faculty can construct an instrument, collect data and give that to the Board of Trustees.

Speaker McNerney said he will ask for a formal response in advance of the April Board of Trustees meeting. Speaker McNerney said he perceives a willingness on the part of the Board to establish a working plan, either with current leadership, or with the next Faculty Speaker.

Provost Brian McGee declined to give a report (memo regarding the absence of a report), in consideration of the busy meeting agenda, but accepted and answered questions.

Betsy Baker, Senator (English) asked about the Bridge Program with Trident Technical College, and had questions about Trident Tech instructors teaching on the College of Charleston campus holding office hours outside of class.

Provost McGee said that as part of the Bridge program, there has been discussion about Trident developing and using a course that would be satisfactory to our English department as Trident's version of a four credit hour English 110 in addition to their two semester English sequence. The Provost said that in conversation on the developing program, they have uncovered some cultural differences. Trident instructors do most of their interacting with students virtually and part of the ongoing discussion has included an emphasis on meeting student face to face in traditional office hours. In conversations with Trident, a leading source of transfer students to the College of Charleston, the Provost mentioned that we are learning more about their strengths as an institution.

Senator Baker followed up with asking if Trident instructors would be provided office space.

The Provost affirmed that they would.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked for a comment on Spring 2018 spring break, observing that spring break will be two weeks later we have seen previously.

Provost McGee said that as part of building the calendar, there is periodic review of the calendar. Questions were raised about if the model for the old calendar, about mid-point of the semester, was optimal or would other models work. Discussions with Academic Council, with Student Government Association (SGA), and with Graduate Student Association (GSA), revealed a range of opinions. The President opted for a later spring break consistent with the preference of
SGA. This model will be reviewed in ongoing fashion. In deciding on the later spring break, any academic disadvantage could not be identified.

Senator Krasnoff asked if this was an SGA initiative.

The Provost replied that the review stemmed from Academic Affairs, in conversation with the President, then to Academic Council. The question came up separately from SGA and GSA, so was not initiated by SGA.

There were no more questions.

**Divya Bhati, Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning** reminded the Senate of the SACSCOC onsite visit and thanked everyone for their time and support.

There were no questions.

Speaker McNerney introduced the next report and informed the Senate that some of the recommendations will go to the Bylaws Committee if there are suggestions for changes to Bylaws or the FAM, and suggestions will go to Academic Affairs if there are changes recommended for the administrative side of the FAM.

**Simon Lewis spoke on behalf of the Ad hoc Committee on Grievance Process (doc).** He praised Amy Rogers for chairing the Committee. Lewis said that the committee looked at a number of peer institutions for best practices.

Lewis stated that some recommendations are not significantly different from what is already being done, but there are at least two suggestions that have not be done before.

The first recommendation is the creation of a Faculty Assistance Pool, which would consist of people who had experience on Faculty Grievance or Faculty Hearing, offering a point of contact for people outside of the formal Grievance and Hearing process. Lewis stated that the Faculty Assistance Pool would have a limited role, more helpful for procedural questions than advisory.

Lewis stated that if the grievance was between faculty and staff, then the course of action is still advised: to go to the Ombudsman office or contact Human Resources.

The question of combining faculty Grievance and faculty hearing committees was raised. Lewis said that although combining committees would require less bodies to fill positions, it was still thought that keeping the committees separate was best. Lewis reminded the Senate that the Faculty Hearing Committee also has an ad hoc committee assigned to it, so that committee may have different results.

Lewis stated that a new recommendation is that all members of Faculty Hearing and Faculty Grievance and all alternates should receive mediation training. Receiving this kind of training will allow members of the committees to give better advice within the committee. The best time for providing training was offered as the beginning of the academic year.
Lewis demonstrated an outline of the flow of grievance process, available in the linked document.

Lewis restated that the two suggestions that are new are:

- the creation of a Faculty Assistance Pool;
- the suggestion that committee members and alternates receive mediation training.

The Speaker asked if there were questions.

**Jacob Steere-Williams, Senator (History)** asked if there was thought given to the numbers of members of the committees?

Lewis stated the numbers would remain as they are now.

**Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS)** offered the observation that the Hearing Committee's function was to deal with adversarial disputes between administration and someone who is facing being fired. Their function is to provide recommendations to the President who then takes action or not. Nunan offered that there is little mediation taking place on the Hearing Committee, while Grievance is all about mediation. Nunan did think that some sort of legal training would be useful, especially since the College's legal counsel is often involved.

Lewis said the ad hoc committee on Grievance would probably take Nunan's suggestions to provide appropriate training as a friendly amendment.

Senator Nunan asked about the people who will serve in the Faculty Assistance pool. He pointed out that there may be people interested in the Hearing process who have not served on the Hearing and Grievance Committees. Restricting membership to those who have experience on those committees might restrict the pool too much.

Lewis pointed out that the rationale behind the composition of the Faculty Assistance pool hinged on the fact that they will have received the suggested training.

Nunan mentioned that if a commitment would be made for training, then should faculty be asked to commit to serving for at least a couple of years?

Lewis said he would be in favor of requiring this.

**Kevin Keenan, Senator (Political Science)** asked about the about the clause that stated people could go directly to the grievance committee if they were not comfortable approaching their Dean or Chair.

Lewis affirmed that is part of the existing structure of the Grievance Committee.

The Speaker said that is part of the current Bylaws.
Roxane DeLaurell, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) asked what happened if the Faculty Grievance Committee decided not to hear a grievance?

Lewis said you would be able to take that out of the Committee structure.

Nunan replied that language from the FAM on page 25 indicates that "grievances unresolved by the grievance committee will be referred by the Committee chair to the appropriate authority."

Irina Gigova, Senator (at large, HSS) asked a question on behalf of a constituent. How many representatives will serve on the proposed Faculty Assistance pool? And is the pool to be a faculty standing committee or a more informal pool?

Lewis stated that their committee views it as an informal pool. He and the committee thought that at least three members so that there would be a range of experience.

Gigova next asked about current language in the FAM which talks about limits of time. Will the current timeline applied to hearing complaints stay in place?

Lewis said although his committee did not address the issue of the timeline, he thought current processes would stay the same.

Brian McGee, Provost, said that the processes vary depending on the nature of the grievance involved. The Provost gave some examples of grievances. Grievances other than those that are outside of more complex employment law, for example, involve an attempt at resolution using the chain of command with Chairs and Deans. In the cases where there is dissatisfaction between the faculty colleagues and their supervisors, the Grievance Committee would provide an attempt to resolve the grievance that is consistent with the existing FAM. If that process doesn't lead to a satisfactory result, the faculty colleague may make use of the ombudsman office. Once internal processes are exhausted, the colleague may choose to look outside the institution for resolution.

Lisa Covert, Senator (at-large HSS), brought a suggestion from a constituent to spell out what exactly is meant by mediation training, including how long the training will take. The training should be clearly defined so there is some uniformity of experience.

Lewis said at this stage, they are looking for agreement on the suggestions, and that those details may be worked out later.

The Speaker said the recommendations will be moved to the Committee on Bylaws and the FAM.

5. Old Business

Jason Vance, Chair of the Committee on Bylaws and the FAM introduced two motions:
· Motion to Split the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs into Two Committees: The Committee on Graduate Education and the Committee on Continuing Education (doc)

Vance presented a brief background provided by Committee on Graduate Education chair Christine Finnan, and offered as explanation the workload has grown past the composition of the current single committee.

Vance read a description of the duties of each of the committees and the composition of each committee.

The Speaker reminded the Senate that a motion coming from committee did not need a second, and asked for questions.

Jon Hakkila, Guest, pointed out that Continuing Education may refer to undergraduate not graduate education.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) said that she is not sure there is a distinction between undergraduate and graduate levels in non credit courses. Non-credit is sufficient.

Hakkila agreed.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) commented on the composition of the committees. Although both have five members, the Graduate Committee will still probably have a heavier workload than Continuing ed.

Christine Finnan (Chair, Committee on Graduate Education) said she thought that five members was still enough to get the work done for Graduate Education.

The Speaker called for a vote and the Motion carried.

· Motion to Form a New Standing Senate Committee: Adjunct Oversight Committee (doc)

Vance gave a brief history of the Motion brought in Spring 2016 by Julia Eichelberger and Betsy Baker (English). Vance said the Committee will be a new standing committee called the Adjunct Oversight Committee. Currently, there is no committee dedicated to recommended practices and policies concerning adjuncts at the College. Given the importance at adjuncts, it is necessary for their concerns to be part of the shared governance structure. Vance described the composition of the committee and the duties.

Both motions were thoroughly discussed and after each discussion, a vote was called. Both motions passed with majority vote and will be posted for ratification by all faculty.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS) said it was interesting to pull the committee membership from the other standing committees and said he could see that benefit when the
members could report back to their standing committees issues with adjuncts. He expressed worry that faculty from those committees are taking on additional burden.

Vance said there was discussion on possible overlap between the Adjunct Oversight Committee and the Advisory Committee to the President both composed of members of the standing committees, but felt the communication between the relevant committees was worth it. Vance offered that centralizing the reports function of the Adjunct Oversight committee may lessen the burden on existing committees.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked if the flow of membership go the other way: each member of the Adjunct Advisory Committee could be ad hoc members of the standing committees.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) noticed that some standing committees had adjunct representation. In the example of the Faculty Welfare Committee, would that adjunct also serve on the Adjunct Oversight Committee?

Speaker McNerney said the intent would be that no, the adjunct representative on the Adjunct Oversight Committee would be an additionally elected adjunct representative. It does bring one more adjunct voice into the shared governance system.

**Lisa Covert**, Senator (at-large HSS) asked about the composition of the committees and whose decision would it be to designate the members of the Adjunct Oversight Committee.

Vance said each committee would designate their representatives for Adjunct Oversight and the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Guest, said that committee members coming from the standing committees would be able to understand what the committees could do to address adjunct issues they see, whether it be a budget issue, welfare issue, or compensations issue. She said one of the major functions of the Adjunct Oversight Committee would be to act as clearinghouse for data concerning adjunct faculty, providing a single consistent source for information collecting and sharing.

Eichelberger said that what Krasnoff suggested would not be counter to the intent of the committee, but would it would be more practical for existing members of each standing committee assign members to Adjunct Oversight.

**Provost McGee** called attention to overlap of committees. For issues concerning the employment and working conditions of faculty, the Office of the Provost would feel compelled to share information specific to adjunct colleagues simultaneously to both committees: Faculty Welfare and Adjunct Oversight. The Provost said the overlap would have to be managed based on the intention of the Faculty.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) wondered at the practicality of getting people motivated to serve double duty. He mentioned more logistical concerns, including when in the Fall
Speaker McNerney said he assumes that future Speakers with the Faculty Secretariat would have the responsibility of determining who the members of the committees are.

Krasnoff said it does represent another burden for the Secretariat and the Speaker to make sure the committee is staffed and chaired, so that when the Fall starts, it is a committee.

Eichelberger said she does not see that the committee would be prevented from still doing important work and collecting information for reports even if it was convened in October.

Irina Gigova, Senator (at large, HSS) suggested that the duties of the standing committees include the new duty of assigning representatives to the Adjunct Oversight Committee.

Bill Manaris, Senator (Computer Science) suggested that it could happen the other way, that members are elected, but they sit on the standing committees.

Speaker McNerney said it could only be an option if someone makes an amendment to change the motion.

Vance and Speaker McNerney said that suggestion is in line with the one made by Senator Krasnoff.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) pointed out that the committee might be more invested in adjunct welfare if they self-selected onto the committee, instead of being appointed from standing committees.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) pointed out that requiring members of the Adjunct Oversight Committee to attend all the meetings of the standing committees would be a waste of their time.

Kunkle said that sometimes it would be better to reduce the load on faculty already serving on standing committees by requiring four new members of the Adjunct Oversight Committee. He was not sure which method would be easier to fill.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) gave her perspective as someone who sits with Faculty Compensation, has been called to have conversations with Faculty Welfare Committee, and has worked with people on adjunct matters. Caveny-Noecker said that Faculty Welfare, Faculty Compensation, and Budget are complex committees, requiring that members learn a lot in order to be effective in a shared governance system. She said she appreciates and values the learning curves of serving on those committees and appreciates the reinforcement of members returning to those committees to serve more than a single year. Caveny-Noecker offered the belief that there is value in those members serving on the Adjunct Oversight Committee and offered that shared governance works well when there are
connections between committees that have overlapping responsibilities and likes the structure of having those relationships be within the composition of those committees.

Emily Skinner, Senator (Teacher Education) spoke from her perspective of serving on Faculty Welfare, and said much of their committee business did involve adjuncts. She said adopting this motion would formalize the process for connecting people who are working on similar issues. She offered the observation that the standing committees often had various subcommittees and someone invested in adjunct issues would volunteer to be the representative on the Adjunct Oversight Committee. She spoke in favor of a formal cross-committee structure.

The Speaker called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed.

The Speaker said both motions will be posted soon for ratification by all faculty.

Senator Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) made a Motion to Amend the Standing Rules (doc), requiring Faculty Senate to end at 7:00 PM. The Speaker explained as a standing rule change, the motion would not have to go to the Bylaws and FAM Committee.

The Speaker asked for discussion.

Jason Vance, Senator (at-large, SSM) mentioned changing the order of Senate business.

Speaker McNerney said that the order of business is part of the Bylaws, so a change would have to go through the Bylaws and FAM committee, if voted on by the Senate.

Kevin Keenan, Senator (Political Science) asked about calling for a quorum at 7:00.

The Speaker said that sometimes the Senate still has a quorum after 7:00, and at any point a Senator can call for a quorum, and at any point, a Senator can make a motion to adjourn.

Betsy Baker, Senator (English) pointed out that even if a motion is made to adjourn, sometimes the Senate votes for continuing business. Senator Baker said since mechanisms are in place to either adjourn or call for a quorum, then she is in favor of not changing the Standing Rules.

Meg Cormack, Senator (Religious Studies) averred that tired people do not make the best decisions, so having important business at the end of Senate meetings is not a good idea. Senator Cormack pointed out that tasks expand to fill available time, and used the example of the retooling of the Gen Ed curriculum several years ago, in which major business was done by 7:00 each meeting, because Senate members knew the 7:00 end of meeting would be honored.

Senator Keenan asked if it would be possible to automatically call for a quorum at 7:00?

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS) advocated against forcing an automatic stop in favor of getting business done if it is the will of the Senate.
Christine Finnan, Guest, said flipping new business to the front of the agenda would make sense, because you don't need a quorum to listen to reports and make comments, but you need a quorum to conduct business.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) said at one time in the Senate's history, there have been those who call for adjourning at 7:00, and that any Senator has that option.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator (Accounting/Legal Studies) liked the suggestion to flip new business to the beginning of the agenda, with reports appearing toward the end.

The Speaker called for a vote on the motion to amend the standing rules. The Motion did not pass.

Bill Manaris, Senator (Computer Science) made a comment on the wording of the motion.

A Motion from the floor was made by Senator Roxane DeLaurell for the Committee on Bylaws and the FAM to recommend amending the Bylaws to change the order of Faculty Senate Business, putting Business ahead of Reports. That Motion was seconded.

Jim Young, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if it was ever the case that a report introduced a piece of new business.

The Speaker said that was possible.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at-large, HSS) said that there will be a chance to debate the issue when the motion is presented from the Bylaws Committee and called the question.

Calling the question was seconded, and passed.

The Motion to recommend amending the Bylaws to change the order of Faculty Senate Business, putting Business ahead of Reports was sent to Bylaws and the FAM Committee.

The Speaker called for a vote and the Motion passed.

The Speaker introduced the next piece of old business.

Quinn Burke, Chair of Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid Committee introduced the Proposal for Academic Forgiveness Policy, Student Government Association (original doc from February agenda)[Updated by FCAS, Grade Redemption Policy (pdf)].

Quinn Burke gave a brief history of working with SGA on the policy for over a year. Burke explained the Proposal was first designed as academic forgiveness by way of exclusion, and gave the example of a student getting a D in a course, then taking that course over and getting a C. The student would be able to strike the D off the record.
After much discussion in Committee and with different groups, the Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid Committee designed a policy of redemption.

Burke revealed the current policy and reminded the Senate that the policy is presented for information, not for a vote. The proposed Policy will be introduced for vote in April.

Burke said that the majority of our peer institutions have a forgiveness policy and the majority of those policies are ones of redemption (sometimes referred to as replacement or substitution).

Burke asked for feedback from the Senate which he will take to committee

Godfrey Gibbison, Guest (Dean of Professional Studies) asked if there was a maximum number of times a student could use the policy.

Burke gave an example of one attempt allowed to better a course grade, in order to prevent "grade shopping."

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked what was the logic of having a small limit on the number of credits. Basically two classes seemed like a small number.

Burke said it began with the exclusion policy but was continued in the redemption policy.

Kasman mentioned that there was paperwork involved in the redemption policy whereas the default policy does not have paperwork. If there was no limit mentioned, a student could take any course more than once, and count the second one.

Burke said he will have more conversation with the Registrar.

Mary Bergstrom, Guest (Registrar) stated that the repeat policy remains the same. Both redemption policy and repeat policies have paperwork associated.

Jacob Steere-Williams, Senator (History) asked about a sentence in which the option will not be allowed when a student is assigned a grade as a result of an honor code violation.

Burke said any student found in honor code violation should be not allowed.

Jon Hakkila, Guest, asked if this type of policy improved retention? He mentioned that every institution he has worked at had some sort of similar policy.

Beatriz Maldonado, Senator (at-large, LCWA) asked if a student could apply the policy to any grade? A through F? Have other institutions stipulated the grade?

Burke said some other schools specify the grade would be D or below. Burke said that they felt the language should be clear that the student needed to me satisfied with the second grade earned.
Maldonado asked if this policy applied to the major GPA or will we see the averaging of the two classes in the overall GPA?

Mary Bergstrom, Guest (Registrar) said it would affect cumulative GPA, and therefore, would also affect the major GPA.

Speaker McNerney clarified that it is not an averaging of grades. The lower grade is completely erased. The grade would not appear, but the course would still be listed on the transcript as having been taken.

Mary Bergstrom, Guest (Registrar) said that the transcript key will need to change and the look of the transcript will change.

Bill Manaris, Senator (Computer Science) asked [unintelligible].

Godfrey Gibbison (Guest, Dean of Professional Studies) said that one of his last acts as a Senator while working at Georgia Southern was to get rid of a policy like this. He said he was comfortable allowing a limited number of repeats, but going beyond that is asking for trouble.

Burke said since an advisor will have to sign off on the requests each time, then that can act as a cap.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if the course repetition policy would still be in place.

Bergstrom said yes.

Jason Vance, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked about courses that are always filled being repeated and the burden this would place on teaching classes which are already in demand.

Burke mentioned the redemption issue is different for students who need to take a particular course. The exclusion issue was a problem for people on the committee.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at-large, HSS) mentioned that Senators have given the committee a lot to think about, and we will have opportunity to debate the issue in April.

6. New Business

Gayle Goudy, Chair, Faculty Curriculum Committee introduced the following curriculum changes. All curriculum proposals were introduced for discussion separately, voted on, and approved by the Senate.

   i. Business Administration (Mack): add six more elective hours to the major, in the form of upper-level courses. [BADM]
ii. Bachelor of Professional Studies (Gibbison): add PSYC 333 and PSYC 334 as BPS electives [BPS]

iii. Computer Science (van Delden): add new course (CSCI 381) [CSCI]

iv. Environmental and Sustainability Studies (Welch): Add existing courses (BIOL 211, MGMT 350, SCIM 371, URST 313, URST 361) to various requirements of the Environmental and Sustainability Studies minor [ENSS].

v. Geology (Callahan): terminate the Environmental Geology (EGEO) from the Geology BA degree and the Environmental Geosciences (EGEO) concentration from the Geology BS degree [GEOL]

vi. International Studies (Friedman): add the newly created MUSC 233 to its "Culture and Literature" options, and add MUSC 234 to the INLA electives [INTL]

vii. Marketing (Pitts): create a new course (MKTG 355 Marketing and Society) and add it to major and minor [MKTG 355]; create three new courses (INTB 309, MKTG 309, MKTG 315) [MKTG-INTL 309]; change the title and prerequisites on MKTG 425, make corresponding changes to the MKTG major and minor, and also make some other small changes in the major [MKTG major]

viii. Religious Studies (Siegler): create a new course (RELS 276), and add it as an elective in their BA and minor [RELS 276]

ix. Southern Studies Program (Eichelberger): add ENGL 361 to their electives [SOST]

x. Spanish (Del Mastro): change major by adding two new courses (SPAN 449 and SPAN 450); change minor by eliminating 6 credit hours from the fixed set of 300-level courses, add SPAN 381 as a required course, allow 3 credit hours to be satisfied with any SPAN 300 or 400-level elective, and add SPAN 449 and 450 to electives [SPAN]

Christine Finnan, Chair of Committee on Graduate Education introduced the following curriculum proposals. All Graduate Education curriculum proposals were discussed separately, voted on, and approved by the Senate.

Provost McGee asked about the CSIS courses and asked if the Citadel would simultaneously pursue certificate status for the same constellation of courses?

McGee asked if the courses described would be offered solely on College of Charleston campus, or would the courses rely on some Citadel faculty?
Bill Manaris, Senator (Computer Science) said the certificate was a stepping stone toward completing the Master degree.

Provost McGee asked if there had been any discussion about course management or seat allocation that might be affected by the addition of the certificate programs?

Manaris said the issue was raised and that they have available seats.

Finnan said she will contact Computer Science for answers to these questions.

Speaker McNerney asked if the courses needed to be pulled and sent back to committee.

Provost McGee said the questions need to be answered before the courses go before the Board of Trustees, but if it's the will of the Faculty Senate, the courses could proceed.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked how many hours is normal for a certificate.

Provost McGee replied that the most recent update done in 2008 specifies 12 hours is standard for a graduate certificate.

i. CSIS-new certificate Information Systems

ii. CSIS-new certificate Software Engineering

iii. EDGT course changes

iv. MAT-EDEL

v. MAT-EDSP.

vi. MBIO-Core Regs

Shawn Morrison, Chair of the Committee on General Education requested approval of the following courses in the following categories for the General Education program, beginning Fall 2017.

Speaker McNerney suggested discussing each proposal as a block.

Susan Kattwinkel, Senator (Theatre) expressed her concern with "humanities creep." She described the purpose of GenEd as teaching the skills associated with the areas, but also to get students from a wide variety of disciplines. She expressed introducing topics like Geography courses as humanities risked students being able to complete all their requirements without ever leaving their department. Kattwinkel expressed if everything becomes a humanities, then what are the humanities?
Kevin Keenan, Senator (Political Science) asked to see the syllabus for the Geography course and said that there are some courses that sit more in the Humanities than in Social Sciences. For example, he said, the History of Geography is considered writing about the Earth.

Kattwinkel said she did not see a connection between the Humanities learning outcomes and the assignments in the Geography classes.

Keenan gave examples of Humanities type of questions that a course of this type would offer.

Shawn Morrison offered that questions she had about the relevance of a course as humanities were answered by another committee member.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) said that the soft definition of Social Science at the College allows for a broad inclusion of courses in the Humanities.

Provost McGee offered a comment on the three Humanities packets. If passed, he said there will be an astonishing expansion of Humanities courses that will count for General Education.

The Provost said an addition of 96 courses to the Humanities list yields an increase of 38 percent increase of courses qualifying for Humanities credit. 58 percent of catalog courses in English would count as Gen Ed. 68 percent of History courses would count as Gen Ed.

The Provost said that although the courses are fine, and meet the signature assignment requirements, he wanted reflected in the minutes that next year's catalog Humanities requirement will be remade.

The Provost said that although this change will not result in any additional hours taken by students, it will result in a different advising scheme to manage, a different approach to making sure we assess the courses, and it will add additional complexity and will create new challenges. The Gen Ed curriculum for next year will be meaningfully different from this last year's. It will be very difficult to model the implications for enrollment management that come from these changes.

The Provost noted the stresses on Deans, Chairs and Program Directors as they try to manage seat counts, and emphasized that these kind of changes do have profound consequences.

Irina Gigova, Senator (at large, HSS) said that in the case of History, for example, they will not offer all the courses all the time, as all courses listed are not offered every semester. She said in actual enrollments and advising, she thinks the effect won't be as significant. She agrees that the catalog will look larger.

Gia Quesada, Guest and Faculty Coordinator for General Education said that this model is going back to the less structured Gen Ed model that existed three years ago. Quesada reminded the Senate that for advising purposes, the Gen Ed courses listed here will be available only for students entering in Fall 2017.
Quesada asked to help spread the word that these changes will affect only Freshmen entering in Fall 2017.

**Jason Vance**, Senator (at-large, SSM) observed that English is offering practically their entire upper division range of courses, and he presumes that includes any prerequisites.

Larry Krasnoff pointed out that we have left the discussion of Humanities Packet and suggested we continue with the order.

**Beatriz Maldonado**, Senator (at-large, LCWA) returned the conversation to the Geography class and spoke of having to make the decision for courses that were borderline Humanities and Social Sciences as one or the other.

The Speaker invited more discussion on Packet 1.

**Jolanda van Arnhem**, Senator (at-large, Library) was curious about the Provost's comment about changing the flow of students and where they will wind up. Is the change so major that it will result in loss of enrollments?

Provost McGee said every time you add more possibilities, you may have more students taking class because it fulfills GenEd. Upper division courses will be less likely than lower division courses to be taken for that reason. Modeling at this level of complexity and at this kind of seat count is extremely difficult to do. Provost McGee said it is an experiment and we won't know the severity until we've done it.

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

A quorum was established by count.

The Speaker called for continued discussion of Packet 1.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) said that we are not really going back to the old system. He said that we do have a broad distribution system. Programs can add new courses and reconsider old courses. Krasnoff said if courses meet the criteria, then they are in.

Packet 1 was added.

The Speaker called for discussion on Packet 2.

Scott Peeples, Guest (English) addressed a question on prerequisites for English courses. The prerequisites are the same as those for the 200 level courses that are currently part of GenEd. He said that the courses were once part of GenEd, with non-majors taking them. He resisted the suggestion that there was a raw number of GenEd courses that a single department should have.

He asserted that the courses met the requirements for GenEd courses as much as the 200 level courses do, and would like them counted.
**Joe Kelly, Senator** (at-large HSS) added a comment about the rationale for adding the large number of courses into GenEd. He said a number of courses were dropped during the push a couple of years ago to streamline GenEd courses, and that there were unintended consequences to doing so. He added that one consequence was severe difficulty with any Study Abroad courses. In order for students to sign up for Study Abroad, students look for courses that will count for Humanities credit. This has affected recruiting for Study Abroad programs.

**Jason Vance**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if students could take a menu of courses that satisfy GenEd and not really experience diversity?

**Betsy Baker**, Senator (English) added that there are some prerequisites for English majors, but not for [unintelligible].

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) pointed out that diversity is important—there is still a standing rule in place that you can't take more than two Humanities in any field.

The Speaker called for a vote. Packet 2 passed.

The Speaker called for discussion on the third Humanities Packet.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large HSS) wanted to follow up on a point brought by Jason Vance on prerequisites in History.

**Lisa Covert, Senator** (at-large, HSS) said either two History courses or permission of the instructor are the prerequisites.

Packet 3 passed.

The Speaker called for discussion of the Natural Science packet.

There were no questions. Natural Science packet was passed.

The Speaker called for discussion on the Social Sciences packet. There was no discussion. The packet passed.

There was no discussion of the removal of the two courses. The removal passed.

Course list cover sheet: [pdf](link)

GenEd Foreign Languages [pdf](link)

GenEd Humanities Packet 1 [pdf](link)

GenEd Humanities Packet 2-English [pdf](link)

GenEd Humanities Packet 3- History [pdf](link)
7. **Constituent Concerns**, Senator Alex Kasman voiced concern about the limited availability of the free Health Screening opportunities offered as a perk. Senator Jolanda van Arnhem pointed out that the screening is still available through vouchers for screenings at multiple Doctor’s Care facilities, so it is still available. Contact Ed Pope or Sandy Butler in Human Resources or search on Yammer for more information. You can download a screening voucher here: https://statesc.southcarolinablues.com/web/nonsecure/statesc/Member+Home/Health+and+Wellness/Preventive+Screening/

8. Adjournment, 7:34 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jannette Finch
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on Tuesday 14 February 2017

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, 14 February 2017 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. **Call to Order**, 5:05 PM

2. **The 17 January 2017 minutes** [pdf](#) were approved as posted.

3. **Announcements and information**
The Speaker encouraged everyone to sign the roll found at both doors.

4. **Reports**

   **Speaker of the Faculty Todd McNerney**

   Speaker McNerney attended the Board of Trustees meetings, Jan. 26 and 27, but left most of the information shared at those meetings to the reports from others, in consideration of the full agenda. Speaker McNerney did mention the Placement of Core Values on plaques in every classroom. The Speaker was inspired to work with administration to develop the plaques after seeing similar plaques at Hollins University. The plaques serve as a reminder to students and ourselves about our community. He stated that a similar plaque will hold the Honor Code.

   The Speaker mentioned that the Ad hoc Committees on Grievance and Hearing are meeting regularly and accomplishing much work. These committees are expected to provide reports in March.

   The Speaker mentioned a forum held by the Faculty Senate and the local chapter of the AAUP on shared governance on February 10. He yielded the floor to Bill Olejniczak who shared a brief report.

   Olejniczak said that two faculty members from Francis Marion University were invited to campus to share thoughts on shared governance and what FMU might be doing right to be consistently listed in *The Chronicle of Higher Education’s* “Great Colleges to Work For.” FMU is a South Carolina public university, which is governed by the same oversights and constraints and the same state legislature as the College of Charleston. FMU has some advantages of space and flexibility over the College of Charleston. The FMU faculty shared their views, and Olejniczak reported they were interested in gathering what are they doing well and what can we replicate.

   Following is a summary of what FMU faculty said, according to Olejniczak:

   1) **Clarity of vision.** FMU knows exactly what its function is; meeting the higher educational needs of a particular region of SC. All faculty and staff understand and buy into that vision.
2) The vision is shared. Steps are taken to form community, everyone pulls together for a common purpose. Sense of shared commitment has been achieved by practical steps in terms of pay. Even when the state did not mandate pay raises, FMU found a way to offer minimal pay raises. Rewards are prioritized according to need. Christmas bonuses are granted to all those below a certain pay threshold.

Also contributing to the shared vision is a relatively small administrative staff. Faculty and staff share in task development with limited administrative supervision. People feel they have a stake in determining and implementing policy.

3) Transparency. Information on campus is available, transparent, and factual. Their Chair of Faculty (the equivalent of our Speaker of the Faculty) is included in the weekly meetings of senior staff, which includes budgeting discussions. Department chairs have direct access to their Provost.

4) Research is generally well-supported. Faculty members can draw up to $2750 per year in professional development funds. Departments can supplement this amount as they see fit. A college-wide research committee can reward stipends up to $4,000. For the last several years, the Provost has authorized a stipend for individuals on sabbatical.

5) Social interaction is important. Social events are routine, inclusive, and supported. Guests from the community, students, staff, faculty and Trustees all attend events. Some examples are annual faculty-staff breakfast and annual December party.

6) Leadership of Fred Carter, their president. Dr. Carter has been President for 15 years. When asked, FMU faculty expressed that they believe the culture attributed to Dr. Carter can continue, since it's been well-established over the last 15 years.

Speaker McNerney said that Simon Lewis will share draft of the notes in the shared governance listserv and over Yammer.

There were no questions.

The Speaker spoke about his continued communication with the Board of Trustees about faculty input for evaluations of Provost and President. The Speaker took many questions at January’s Board meeting, and expressed that he senses the Board will consider this further. The Speaker is gathering information from the leadership at other South Carolina institutions as well as those others in the Colonial Athletic Association to find out about their evaluative processes. He intends on collecting this data to share it in a report for Board and at the March Senate meeting.

There were no questions.

**Provost Brian McGee** (pdf)

Provost McGee spoke about the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The plan has been finalized and prepared for review by SACSCOC.
Provost McGee mentioned that the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs (LCWA) is led by Interim Dean Tim Johnson (Classics) and they are now planning the search for the new Dean of LCWA, in collaboration with faculty and other constituents of the School. The faculty have made clear their desire for a thoughtful process.

Provost McGee spoke of some of the elements of the Tenure and Promotion process that could be improved. A memo has been sent to the Faculty Welfare Committee with some questions, and the Provost thanked the Committee and the Deans for their work on improving the process.

The Provost reported that the name of the proposed major, Commercial Real Estate Finance, was approved by the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs for the Commission on Higher Education (CHE), the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and the full Board of Trustees. The Provost plans to meet with the Faculty Curriculum Committee about the name and proposal.

Provost McGee spoke about the launching of a new larger Bridge programs with Trident Technical College announced by President McConnell on January 23, 2017. The Provost thanked everyone who was involved in working on the launch and development of the program. It is a work in progress, and classroom management issues will occur in Fall semester. The Provost thanked Chairs working with the registrar to meet classroom needs. He encouraged everyone to please continue to have patience.

The Provost offered a few comments on the night's agenda. There is a proposal to create a new committee, to support and sustain adjunct faculty. He encouraged some consideration of how the workload will be shared with the Faculty Welfare Committee.

The Provost mentioned near the end of the agenda a discussion on a Grade Forgiveness policy that has been worked on by the Student Government Association, and introduced by the Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid Committee. The Provost thanked everyone for their work on the topic and appreciates the work of students.

The Provost accepted questions.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if the Faculty Welfare Committee's responses to the Provost and Deans suggestions for improving the Tenure and Promotion process publicly available?

The Provost replied that the email received from the Committee reflect different points of view, and are the beginnings of a conversation.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator (at large, HSS) spoke from his perspective as a senior faculty member that he has become aware of a high degree of anxiety experienced by junior faculty about the new student complaint system. Senator Kelly asked for reassurance that a possible abuse of the system would not occur, including that it would not be used to suppress academic freedom on campus. Some student groups seem to be publishing guidelines on registering complaints against faculty who are expressing "leftist ideas, or something like that."
The Provost explained that the system was designed to more conveniently comply with regional accreditation. It is not designed to create a new panopticon to examine faculty, but it is designed as a successor to previous systems to allow students, after exhausting the informal complaint process, to enter a formal complaint process. The Provost has not ready any complaints using the new system; they are managed and passed back to Chairs, like in the old system.

The Provost noted that faculty academic freedom rights are unabated and unchanged and are listed in the Faculty Administrative Manual (FAM), last clarified and expanded in 2011.

The Provost attested there is "no secret agenda," and faculty rights in the classroom remain unchanged and uncircumscribed.

In regards to the new system, the Provost said it would be months before enough data was collected to reveal if there is an uptick in complaints received.

The Provost considers it irresponsible to encourage complaints for no other reason than to pursue an ideological agenda. The first goal of any complainant should be to resolve it informally with the faculty member, and in rare cases in mediation with the Chair or the Program Director.

The Provost said he does not see any change by policy or process, other than adopting a newer technology.

Senator Kelly said the statements are reassuring and asked for an assessment of type of complaints once a year's worth or more of data is collected.

The Provost said it would be added to the list for February 2018.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS) wondered if junior faculty are worried about the accumulation of electronic data. He asked if this was now part of an electronic institutional memory?

The Provost replied that a similar question was asked at the recent forum. We do need to be able to count number of complaints and their resolution status. The Provost will work with the Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning (OIEP) to make sure that is the only data that is being collected.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) commented that the context of this discussion seems to be narrowly focused on student use of the complaint system to register complaints of ideological nature. Senator Krasnoff brought up the example, not necessarily from the College of Charleston, of complaints of sexual harassment that had gone on for years, despite a history of complaints. He stated that it is not a balanced view to consider that the only vulnerable people are junior faculty and suggested that there needs to be a system for taking student complaints seriously.

Provost McGee said that complaints such as this should be taken very seriously no matter how they come to us, and that Senator Krasnoff made a good point about why we must have robust student complaint systems.
Lisa Covert, Senator (at-large HSS) spoke from her perspective as a junior faculty member. Senator Covert stated that there is a need for transparency, and she is not clear how decisions are made to decide what information gets kept and what is discarded. She stated that she hears the Provost's assurance that the student complaint process is not intended to be misused, but that as administrations change, as misunderstandings occur, and through a lack of transparency, how the information is used and where it goes needs to be clarified. It would be useful to know how decisions are made about how long complaints are kept and how it decided who has access to the complaint system.

The Provost stated that because of time, he would offer an abbreviated answer. The process for how student complaints are managed is available to be reviewed in multiple places. The Provost states that a grade complaint is managed differently from a sexual harassment complaint. How they are handled is in some cases responsive to federal regulations or federal and state law and are governed by College of Charleston policy 9.1.10 (http://policy.cofc.edu/documents/9.1.10.pdf).

The Provost reaffirmed that policies concerning student complaints have not been changed, just the technology to gather complaints centrally, then parcel them out. The distribution of complaints is made by a small number of employees in Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

There were no additional questions.

Executive Vice President of Business Affairs, Steve Osborne gave a financial update using information that had been shared with the Budget and Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees at their January meeting.

Osborne said that a year ago, he presented to the Faculty Senate on resetting the budget, including some mid-year budget reductions. Those have been incorporated successfully in this year's budget. Based on the resetting of the budget model, he said there is an increase in enrollment of instate students. Osborne said that this year, the budget will be fully balanced, and the institutional reserve of 2 million dollars will be restored. For this year, Osborne expects no budget reductions, a stable budget, and a slight surplus at the end of the year based on enrollment for this year.

Osborne spoke about the budget at the state level. He said that the revenues at the state level through the end of December are tracking closely to the estimate developed by the Board of Economic Advisers. Revenues through the end of December were running about 31.6 million dollars ahead of their estimate. That's a positive number even though it is less than 1% of a 7.5 billion dollar budget. The State does have a capital reserve fund of about 139 million dollars. The lottery fund estimate was 376 million dollars this year. Osborne said this is important to CofC because the College receives some funding for technology as long as sufficient lottery funds are available. Osborne said at the state level, there is stability for the rest of this year.

Osborne next spoke about the College of Charleston's financial management. He shared a couple of external ratings. Elliott Davis, the College's external auditor, presented their findings to the Audit and Governance Committee of the Board of Trustees in January. It was a clean and
Osborne mentioned that the College had two external bond ratings done recently by Moody's Investor Service and Fitch Ratings. The bond ratings were part of a bond refunding issue that was performed in January. The bond rating by Moody's was an A1 rating with a stable outlook. The Fitch rating for the bond issue was an A+ rating for that specific issue and the overall financial [unintelligible] was a AA rating. Osborne stated that the AA rating is the highest the College has ever received, that it's the first time the College has received a AA rating.

Osborne gave a capsule of the refund issues. The two refund issues were for bond issues that were originally done in 2007 for the George and Liberty Street residence halls, the arena, part of the Science center and the School of the Arts. The issues that were done in January totaled 74 million dollars. They were sold in January, and as a result of these refunding issues, the College will see a total bond refund savings of approximately $26 million with 16 and a half million of that in auxiliary services and the other 10 million realized in the E&G capital fund. Osborne said that overall we were fortunate and the timing in the market was good. He stated that right now the financial picture of the College is sound.

There were no questions.

Assistant VP of Admissions and Financial Aid, Jimmie Foster

Mr. Foster shared with Faculty Senate enrollment numbers for Fall 2017. In the cycle of admissions, they are in the middle of review for Freshman applicants. They expect decisions to be made by April 1, and will expect deposits by May 1. Foster shared the goal for projections of the Class of 2120 is 1205 residents, 915 non-residents. He stated his department had a successful year in terms of building prospects (students who reach out to the College as interested students). They also purchase names through SAT and College Board and other means.

Foster stated a record number, 50,000, represents the largest applicant pool in the school’s history. They expect to finish with around 13,000 Freshmen applications.

Foster credits this to the hard work of staff in recruitment. It will be up 10% from last year, and he attributed this to the staff's hard work.

Foster stated that a new SAT began in March, and test scores are higher. Nationally, they are at about a 40 point increase, the College's increases are higher at about 50-60 points for both in-state and out of state applications. Foster expects this is due to the stronger number of applicants or to the scores of test takers or both. There is a 70 point increase in students of color.

Foster said that they will have the highest number of resident applications, about 6,000 state applications. He said part of this is due to an increase of population in the region. The highest number of applications are expected to be received from students of color at 3,000. For comparison to last year, that number was about 2400.
The average SAT of those students who have applied to the College of Charleston is a 3.7 and 1190, which includes in state and out of state students.

Foster expects the acceptance rate to be 1230.

These are not final numbers.

Foster asked if there were any questions.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) asked what impact the Top 10 Percent rule has on applications?

Foster said last year about 244 students from the designated counties applied and were admitted, and 81 of those students were enrolled. Foster said they have spent time in those counties and the high schools know them. Gains in student enrollments have occurred from rural counties. He quoted Senator Kelly as saying the light above the door was not on for some of those students and now it is. They are encouraged by the increase in students from the Top Ten Percent program.

Foster mentioned that most nonresident applications are coming from states where other Colonial Athletic Alliance member schools are located, like New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Virginia.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if Foster could speak to what impact the bridge program would have on the applicant pool and SAT scores.

Foster said that previously, those students were admitted to the College provisionally, and now will be admitted as transfers in the Spring. Those students haven't been offered yet, so their numbers are not included in the numbers given in today's report. He stated that counselors and student support services staff are excited about working with these students and the students are looking forward to being part of our community on a daily basis.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked for specific numbers.

Foster said the numbers are from memory, not official numbers, but that our admit rate peak in 2004 was low 60s. Last year, the admit rate was slightly over 81%. This year so far, with incomplete numbers, is slightly below 75%.

There were no more questions.

**Dean of Professional Studies, Godfrey Gibbison** reported on the Adhoc committee task force interim report on the General Studies major. (pdf)

Dean Gibbison said that members of the task force are encouraged to share information about the General Studies major widely, and to please ask any members of the task force questions.
The information shared reflected thoughts and suggestions and Gibbison said that now is the appropriate time to gather feedback.

Gibbison revisited the charge of the of the committee. The Provost had asked the Committee to research General Studies curriculum at other universities and to answer several questions. The questions included if we offered a General Studies program, what would be the administrative structure, would it be offered online, face to face, or both, what impact on faculty workload, and the use of roster faculty and adjuncts?

Other questions offered by Gibbison included if the program was offered online, would enough courses be available online, as the entire General Education requirement would have to be offered online in order for students to complete it? They would need to complete several minors online as well.

Gibbison reported that another question to be answered is who will we be serving with this program, who are the students likely to take advantage of this major, and very importantly, how will we provide student services.

Gibbison shared that there is a population of stop out students from the College of Charleston. Over 5400 students from the last 5 years. These are junior and seniors who did not go on to graduate someplace else. A lot of the students have stopped out in good standing. The average stopout has a 2.5 GPA. He said about 60% of stopouts are juniors and seniors, and 2/3 of them are South Carolina residents.

Gibbison said some current students might want the breadth of a general studies major.

Other students may want to finish a specific major, like math, but may have stopped out due to lack of online access, or work or family responsibilities and may be able to finish a degree if more courses were offered online. Over time, these components necessary to offer the degree may help a wider population of students.

The committee is interested in faculty and staff feedback, and will share a survey (survey closes March 3, http://cofc.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_24hgleyA6CbvW4J).

The current thinking of the committee is that students should be able to complete course work both online and face to face, in order not to restrict students.

Gibbison reported that the committee spent a lot of time looking at the curriculum of programs across the country. The committee thinks an introductory course is important and provides an orientation to the program. Students should complete the General Education requirement, and on campus students could choose from any two majors if they meet prerequisite requirements, and the committee thinks it could develop paired minors. In their opinion, the paired minors could help craft the synthesis experience.

Also considered is requiring students to do much of their course work at the 300 level or higher. They would like 21 hours or more to be at the 300 level or higher. If a student is taking courses
online, they would have to choose from a more limited list of minors. In the next few years, probably six to eight minors would be available.

Gibbison said the committee thinks it's very important that veteran faculty who have taught online and developed courses are able to participate in the program. They think it is important for faculty to have incentives to develop rigorous 300 and 400 level courses online. Also important for lab courses to be developed online or as hybrids when possible. They have spent some time exploring how universities provide these services, including looking at some vendors. There are several SSM faculty on the committee that have been helping with this.

As far as administrative structure, Gibbison said there should be a program director, an oversight committee to ensure quality. Some places have adopted a revenue sharing structure, for those departments that are heavily involved to provide good incentives to remain involved. That revenue could be shared back to faculty in several forms. They hope to see what kind of form that would be based on the survey results.

Gibbison said they have been talking with some consultants on developing student focus groups to gauge interest.

That concluded Dean Gibbison's report.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked for confirmation that the conversation surrounding the development of a General Studies major is still ongoing. He received assurance that this was the case. Kunkle then asked if it was the consensus of the committee that the major should be available entirely online?

Gibbison said that the thinking right now was that it should be available in both delivery modes, face to face and online.

Kunkle asked if all online, would there be the same Gen Ed requirements? He pointed out that the current minors policy states that minors cannot overlap.

Gibbison affirmed this was true, that students would be completing distinct minors.

**Gayle Goudy**, (Guest and Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee) wanted clarification that the committee is talking with vendors to form focus groups, not to provide instruction.

Gibbison said that the program would be taught only by College of Charleston faculty, and hopefully, by veteran faculty with experience teaching online to insure vested interest in the program.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large HSS) asked about upper level online courses and labs online? He wanted to know how that be handled. He asked about the number of minors available online, and if it possible to having the number that Dean Gibbison envisioned.
Gibbison and the Committee, with the help of Doug Ferguson, Faculty Coordinator for eLearning and Distance Education, determined having all Gen Ed available online is close. At this point, there are probably 3-4 minors that are 50% or more available online.

Gibbison responded that there is a subcommittee studying science labs online. They looked at some of the packaged labs, and found that the ones they looked at weren't as inquiry-based as the College would require.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) and member of the General Studies Task Force Committee said that the lab sciences are not supportive yet of online alternatives. They were considering the potential of offering a separate lab course (developed by the College, not a vendor) that would not count toward a science major, but would be designed to fulfill GenEd requirements and for those students completing the General Studies major. It is still under discussion.

Nunan said that meant that a science minor would not be possible, and Gibbison stated that in some cases, a student may have completed the lab requirements already and they would transfer. A student could also take the one lab in person and the rest online.

Julia Eichelberger (Guest and Member of the General Education task force) said that while it's very important to offer a science course fully vetted and approved by CoFC faculty, the degree can still work in the interim while waiting to figure out how to deliver quality online labs.

Kendall Deas, Adjunct Senator, asked if special incentives are necessary for course development? He noted that adjuncts might be required to teach in this program?

Gibbison replied that the Committee has looked at many universities and the wide range of incentives they offer. They do not presume to guess what might incentivise faculty to develop courses.

Bill Olejniczak (Guest) asked if the task force was considering all the minors, or did they have ideas about which would be offered.

Gibbison said that any minors for which a student meets prerequisites should be available. Some minors might make better pairings, which could be suggested to students. For students who are fully online, they have seen that more limited choices work best, at least while the program is being developed.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) and member of the General Studies Task Force Committee, advocated for academic and practical reasons that it makes sense to limit the minor pairings at first, and each pairing would have an administrator charged with the students in that pairing.

Gibbison said a list of pairings could be developed, and each pairing will have a faculty adviser to offer guidance.
Jolanda van Arnhem, Senator (Library, At-large) offered her perspective from several angles. As an adjunct, she has taught 24 courses. As a former non-traditional student, van Arnhem said she appreciates the support for the stopout population that is not currently served. She next asked what are the 4-5 minors that Doug Ferguson identified?

Gibbison, with assistance from Doug Ferguson, said that Business Administration and Sociology are quite close to being available online.

van Arnhem asked if any consideration was given to offering Arts Management and a low residency type of structure for other areas?

Gibbison said they are looking at the list of those minors that are close to being online, and that they any department that would like to participate.

van Arnhem offered that independent studies might be another component of filling in a minor.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked how quickly students can get to the 300 level and 21 hours in most minors.

Gibbison said some minors, like Philosophy, Geography and Economics, offer 300 level after two courses are completed. Other minors it takes longer, and some require at least one course at the 300 level.

Daniel Greenberg, member of the General Studies task force, said his subcommittee found similar results. For many minors, not that much coursework is required to get to the 300 level. If there is a lot of demand, there might be a need to offer targeted help to departments with additional resources.

Provost Brian McGee thanked the General Studies task force committee for looking at the entire 122 hour curriculum. He noted that it a near certainty that graduates of the College of Charleston who took an entire distance lab course from another university, and transferred in. The Provost emphasized that this underscores the importance of developing robust offerings in science labs.

Responding to a question from Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM), the Provost stated that our accreditors do not allow us to refuse transfer credit based on mode of delivery.

Jon Hakkila, Guest, commented that it would be difficult to get to the 300 level in physics because of the sequential nature of the minor; the student would have to take "a whole slew" of math and physics courses.

Adjunct Senator Oksana Ingle reported on Adjuncts at the College of Charleston (original ppt)(updated ppt posted 2/8).

Senator Ingle said she started as an adjunct at the College of Charleston in 2008, but was naive and did not understand what it really meant to be an adjunct until this last year. She taught
courses, developed new courses and promoted the Russian program. Her goal was to become full time faculty and she loves the College and teaching. Only in the last year, did she realize the road she started on was a dead end.

Senator Ingle paused to thank Julia Eichelberger and the Faculty Welfare Committee committee for their work on adjuncts. They worked for four years to prepare a detailed report on adjuncts at the College, which was presented to the Senate in Spring 2016. She said her report would not be possible without their work.

Ingle said her presentation asks three basic questions about being an adjunct at the College: Where are we, where do we want to go, and how can we get there?

Ingle provided a definition of the word, adjunct. From Webster's, "Something joined to or added to another thing, but not essentially a part of it." [italics from Ingle]

Where are we? She stated that many adjuncts view themselves as instructors or professors instead of contractors. She attributed one reason to they are paid as W-2 employees, not as 1099 contractors.

Ingle stated that 30% of undergraduate courses are taught by adjuncts. But in thinking of this in terms of the definition, they are still "not essentially a part of it."

Ingle said that adjuncts live with uncertainty at the beginning of each semester, at the last minute their courses can be cancelled.

She said that adjuncts do the same amount of work as full time faculty. They spend the same time preparing, teaching, grading, doing paperwork, being available to students, but they earn less than minimum wage.

Ingle said that recently, President McConnell said that it is obscene how little adjuncts are paid.

Job scrutiny for an adjunct boils down to pleasing students and ensuring that the College retains students. Ingle said those are not motivating factors and not good for students or instructors.

Ingle said that adjuncts have nowhere to go professionally, and they are stuck in a system that has not changed since the 1960s. Ingle addressed the Senate as thinking that adjuncts are a small part of the faculty and are therefore unessential to the overall success of the College. She showed a slide with information (source: http://irp.cofc.edu/) 364 adjuncts make up 41 % of all faculty. Of these 364, only 40% are eligible for health insurance benefits. Ingle said that even when adjuncts teach full time (12 credit hours or more), they are treated as part time becasue they are paid on a contract basis, which is misleading.

Ingle asked what does an "obscenely" low salary look like? She said it varies from department to department and showed a slide containing a breakdown of how adjuncts are paid per course over a semester and a year. 2 courses is $2,550 per course, or $2,650 if you have a PhD. $100 more for having a higher degree. If you teach 3 courses, the salary jumps to $450 more per course. If
teaching 4 courses, it jumps another $325 per course. The difference may not seem like much, but it is significant over the course of a semester and a year. It more than doubles and almost triples for those who get more courses. [for clarity, please refer to Oksana Ingle’s PowerPoint]

Ingle stated that even though adjuncts are employees for tax purposes, in reality they are contractors, but they don't even receive a contract. They receive a "teaching effort."

She presented a slide with her "teaching effort," and demonstrated the confusing amount of detail.

The course started in mid-August, but HR did not receive the document until mid September, which is when she received it from HR via email. When she received the email, the document showed only partial information, that led Ingle to expect a different salary than what she received. Once she went to sign her teaching effort, the salary had been adjusted down by $3400, without her knowing it. But she had already been teaching a month--too late to do anything about it.

Next, Ingle asked where do we want to go? Some departments do plan adjuncts schedule a year in advance, and those adjuncts have some certainty about the year ahead. Most other adjuncts live with the anxiety of uncertainty twice a year.

Ingle stated that earning positive student evaluations and achieving student retention for its own sake are humiliating ways to show your worth as a teacher. In the end, this does not benefit the students or the College.

Ingle stated that not being clear about contract terms and not finalizing contracts before classes state is unethical. She admitted that unethical is a strong word, but that any Senator would not do business in this way.

Next, Ingle asked how can we get there? She spoke of the benefits of including adjuncts in decision making or professional development. This makes them feel subordinate and non-essential, even though they are very essential to the students they teach.

Ingle stated that 90% of adjuncts feel they are not compensated fairly, but they have no choice and spoke of this as being psychologically demeaning, defeating the sens of being a professional.

She asked why is there no career path for adjuncts? Why are open positions not recruited from the pool of qualified experienced teachers who already know the College?

Ingle spoke of these issues being discussed in the past, but that change will only occur if it happens from above.

She showed two images drawn by her daughter that captured where we are (adjuncts in subordination), and where we want to go (adjuncts as professional equals).
She admitted that subordination is a strong word, but quoted a Russian poet as saying, "It would be funny if it was not so sad."

Ingle said she tried to present just the facts objectively, after talking with dozens of people.

She spoke of the frustration of learning that the Fall class schedule had been posted, and that she had no say in it, as she had not seen any drafts nor had any discussion. She mentioned that in Russian Studies, three adjuncts built the program, but they have no say. They have three adjuncts and one full time faculty member.

She said that many adjuncts would like to be included as peers and professionals with equal career opportunities. She spoke of adjunct treatment as displaying a lack of professionalism, a lack of collaboration, and a lack of courtesy.

She said she knows it can be better.

She included a quote from President Glenn McConnell, from his welcome back email dated January 11, 2017. Ingle quoted in a slide, "Our hope lies in the future and all that we can accomplish by moving in lockstep as ONE College of Charleston. Together, we can and will be a force for much positive and lasting change on campus, in Charleston, and beyond."

Senator Ingle was loudly applauded.

The Speaker asked if there were questions.

**Lisa Covert**, Senator (at-large HSS) thanked Senator Ingle for sharing. She asked how to include adjuncts in more meeting and plannings without compensating them?

Senator Ingle responded that there are different kinds of adjuncts. She said there are about 10% of adjuncts who don't work for money. She has asked some adjuncts who don't even know how much they earn. And other adjuncts work for four courses, because that is their source of income. She offered that those adjuncts who want to be included should be included, and those who don't should not.

**Jolanda van Arnhem**, Senator (Library, At-large) said she thought one problem, from speaking to adjuncts, is that their 3-4 class load was cut after the Affordable Care Act was implemented. She asked what is the difference between an adjunct teaching a four class load and a senior instructor?

Ingle said she has been doing everything like instructors for years because she likes doing it and did not expect to be paid.

**Provost McGee** addressed van Arnhem's point by saying that Chairs, Program Directors and Deans were expressly told to not take anyone out who was eligible for the Affordable Care Act as a cost-savings measure. Staffing decisions were to be made solely and entirely based on the academic need of the institution.
The Provost would like to know of any cases where people operated differently.

The Provost answered that the difference in compensation for a senior instructor and an adjunct was based on prevailing market wages on a discipline by discipline basis. The lowest compensated entry level instructor colleague in recent years has been in the upper 30s or low 40s, with a higher benefits expense as is the case for an adjunct colleague teaching full time.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large HSS) observed that little has changed since he was department chair 10 years ago and called that sad and thought we could do better. He said some of Senator Ingle's suggestions will be controversial, like hiring from within, but other suggestions would find good support from faculty, such as increasing adjunct salaries and planning in advance. Nunan said much of this is common human decency, and we depend on Program Directors and Chairs to know what that is. Perhaps we need more explicit policies, or required sensitivity sessions for those departments that hire many adjuncts.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest** (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) said that she has the responsibility for signing adjunct appointment forms and for the processes concerning adjunct employment. She stated that while not defending what they pay, it is more than minimum wage, based on the calculation of two hours outside of class for every contact hour within the classroom, so that would be 9 hours a week, for a 3 credit hour course. She said in an 18 week period, the lowest paid adjunct is making is making $15.74 an hour, if they're an hourly employee. She said most adjuncts are exempt employees and that's why hourly wages are not calculated.

Caveny-Noecker expressed appreciation for Senator Ingle's presentation and commented that an individual’s experience varies depending on what department they are a part of. She also thanked Julia Eichelberger and Faculty Welfare for the work they had done, saying that Academic Affairs had learned some things from their report. [report is found here: http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2015-2016/apr-2016/adjunct_practices_senate_report_2016.pdf]

She said that some things on campus are better for adjuncts as a whole than they were when she was department chair 10 years ago. She stated that there is a critical mass of commitment to adjunct welfare on campus, but there should be more effort in all departments to:

- integrate adjuncts in our work,
- recognize their critical role at the College of Charleston,
- the contributions that they make,
- be thoughtful about how we engage adjuncts in our work,
- be mindful how we offer them courses,
- improve timing of the scheduling.

Caveny-Noecker said that Chairs have the difficulty of balancing enrollment needs, fiscal responsibility, and the desire to give adjuncts their schedules as early as they can.
Caveny-Noecker said the simple idea of inviting participation is a good one, and said adjunct faculty are able to submit proposals for the writer's retreat, are now part of orientation and are compensated for that. She said to keep the conversation going as we learn from Eichelberger's report and Senator Ingle's presentation.

Tom Baginski, Senator (German and Russian Studies) asked about the contract being adjusted downward.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) said some program are very small and have low enrollments. Their department works hard to balance this, but sometimes it becomes a negotiation with the Program Director as they wait for more students to enroll.

Baginski asked about variations in the pay scale.

Provost McGee answered that difficult decisions have to be made by Chairs and Program Directors when a course is below minimal enrollment to communicate to faculty that they won't receive full pay. The timing of when this is communicated varies, and Directors and Program Chairs should be very blunt about the possibility that a course won't make without a sufficient number of students enrolled. If the course is offered anyway, that might only be possible with reduced levels of compensation. The Provost said that kind of information needs to be provided earlier in the process, so there are no surprises. There are differences in staffing from one program to another.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) provided a brief history from more than ten years ago of a former Provost's effort to increase adjunct pay for adjuncts teaching the greater number of hours. This created a tiered pay scale, which is problematic when peoples' course loads change. Caveny-Noecker would like to move away from the tiered scale. She stated this would mean holding the rate relatively stable at the top while we bring it up from the bottom. Her department is open to feedback and suggestions.

Baginski asked if this was a similar system as used for summer teaching? If a class falls below, are adjunct faculty paid per student head?

Beatriz Maldonado-Bird, Senator (at-large, LCWA) contributed that she is married to an adjunct professor and cannot ever recall her husband getting paid on time. She asked if the paperwork could get completed on time. Can due diligence be done so that adjuncts can get their contracts done early enough for them to plan?

Caveny-Noecker said that the Provost's office has been working very hard to process as many adjunct contracts as they possibly can before the first adjunct pay date of the semester. She said they have also worked on adjunct start dates that is prior to the first day of classes, since they recognize that people are doing prep work. The enrollment management issue is a problem. Senator Ingle is affected by working for a very small program that is trying to offer a robust set of courses. Logistical problems exist that they are trying to work out with respect to the
processing of paperwork. We believe an electronic system is helping. They have also worked to negotiate earlier first pay dates for adjunct faculty.

**Simon Lewis**, Guest (English) expressed appreciation for having this discussion. He pointed out that not only is this a problem for College of Charleston, but that it is a national scandal.

He gave four suggestions:

1) When he worked on Faculty Welfare Committee, there was an effort made to recognize long term adjuncts with a salary increase.

2) If an adjunct has been teaching 3-4 courses continually, then there should be a path to instructorship on a permanent basis

3) When bonuses are given, there should be a differential maintained so that the adjunct pay rate goes up as well.

4) Adjuncts get no cuts on costs. Parking costs $800 for both Deans and adjuncts. Prorate those incidental costs.


One best practice suggests rewarding departments and schools for treating adjuncts well, as reflected in the reports the departments produces. Some of the positive treatments might include:

- predicting employment ahead of time,
- how many adjuncts are offered professional development,
- how many invited to meetings (it is their choice to attend or not)

Eichelberger offered that while we are waiting for action from Randolph Hall, individual colleagues can take action in treating their adjunct colleagues more fairly and collegially.

Another suggestion made by Eichelberger is that department chairs or program directors can write a memo of understanding to the adjunct faculty member, detailing how long they will wait for the course to fill, and explain that if the course does not make, they will have to discuss the change in pay. Academic Affairs can help provide language for this sort of communication made in writing. Questions of salary are more difficult to address, but of course very important.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large HSS) commented that the estimate of two hours outside of the classroom for every one hour in the classroom was probably inaccurate. He stated that in his experience of teaching for over 30 years, he spent much more time than the estimate doing work related to each course that he teaches.
Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) said that this estimate is grounded in the fact that roster instructors teach 12 hour loads. When their department was working on integrating the Affordable Care Act, they looked at other institutions to see how the calculation of average weekly hourly work and the conversion of contact credit hours was being done. In the State of SC, Caveny-Noecker said that the College of Charleston is the only institution using the [unintelligible]. She stated that she did not think she could use a higher number to calculate an average hourly wage for adjuncts.

Nunan suggested it's fine to have "administrative fiction," as long as we all recognize it. He suggested it is not a great idea to tell Senator Ingle she is not working for minimum wage based on this fiction.

Speaker McNerney asked if there were other questions.

Meg Cormack, Senator (Religious Studies) thanked Senator Ingle for her presentation, called for a round of applause, and moved to adjourn.

Richard Nunan seconded the motion.

The Speaker opened the floor for discussing the motion.

A short discussion ensued.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at large, HSS) called the question. It was seconded.

The question was called with a majority vote.

Next, a vote was taken in favor of adjourning.

The majority voted in favor of not adjourning.

5. Old Business

None

6. New Business

Gayle Goudy, Chair, Faculty Curriculum Committee introduced curriculum items.

Provost McGee asked for unanimous consent to consider the entire proposed set of proposals for the undergraduate Curriculum Committee as a single omnibus motion.

That motion was seconded.

More discussion ensued.
Unanimous consent was not given. The proposals began to be considered separately and with deliberation.

i. Accounting (ACCT) wants to add ACCT 204 as prerequisite for ACCT 307, deactivate ACCT 336, add ACCT 307 & 308 as prerequisites for ACCT 409 (pdf)

The proposals passed.

ii. Studio Arts (ARTS) wants to add ARTS 119 and six credit hours of upper-level courses to the major requirements, change which ARTH courses count toward ARTS degree, and change prerequisites on ARTS 220, 410, and 430 (pdf)

The proposals passed.

iii. Chemistry (CHEM) wants to add CHEM 232/232L as prerequisites for CHEM 421; add CHEM 231/231L as prerequisites for CHEM 422 (pdf)

The proposals passed.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at large, HSS) asked that the Senate announce and table any curriculum proposals that caused concern.

Discussion ensued. The Speaker asked for one proposal (item xiv) to be pulled from the group for discussion. The Speaker called for a vote for the other curriculum proposals. All curriculum proposals listed below passed.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked about the inclusion of PHIL 175 in the Public Health proposal, for the PBHL BA.

Deborah Socha McGee, Guest and Gayle Goudy, Chair, Faculty Curriculum Committee clarified that PHIL 175 was not included in the proposal (the coversheet of the proposal shows that it was removed from the proposal and initialed by both parties). Satisfied with this change, a vote was called for and the proposal passed.

iv. Classics (CLAS) wants to change the perquisites for CLAS 320, 322, 324, and 325 by allowing students to take these courses after completing 3 credit hours of CLAS courses. (pdf)

v. Communications (COMM) wants to add newly created COMM 216 as a prerequisite to COMM 301, 310, 315, 410, 480, and 481 (pdf)
vi. Computer Science (CSCI) wants to change the prerequisite on a few courses, create two new courses and add them to the CSCI BA/BS and CITA programs; expand the options of the CSCI minor (pdf)

vii. Education (EDEE) wants to change the prerequisites to align better with recent program changes in Early Childhood Education (pdf) and Elementary Education (pdf)

viii. Entrepreneurship (ENTR) wants to expand possible paths into ENTR 320 and 406; Broad overview of changes to ENTR, MKTG, MGMT, and INTB. They also want to create a new internship and add it to the concentration. (pdf) (pdf)

ix. French (FREN) wants to add new courses (FRCS 101 and 102), deactivate FREN 370, and change prerequisite for FREN 380, 381, and 383. (pdf) (pdf)

x. International Studies (INST and INTL) wants to add RELS 215 and the newly created FREN courses to the relevant concentrations in INTL (INAF, INEU, INCL) and to the INST minor (pdf) (pdf) (pdf)

xi. Italian Studies (ITST) wants to create a new course and add it as an elective to the ITST minor (pdf)

xii. MGMT/INTB capstone: Add DSCI 304 or INTB 314 to the prerequisites for MGMT 408 and change capstone requirement in INTB major from INTB 409 to MGMT 408 (pdf)

xiii. Music (MUSC) wants to create three new courses, change prerequisites on MUSC 381, and change requirements within the major and minor. (pdf)

xiv. Public Health (PBHL) wants to add HEAL 217, and HEAL 257 to the options for the PBHL BA (pdf)

xv. Physics (PHYS) wants to add PHYS 272 to the elective lists in the BA and Minor and remove PHYS 301 from the Operational Meteorology (METR) concentration because it is no longer a prerequisite for a required course. (pdf) (pdf)

xvi. Urban Studies (URST) wants to add electives (ECON 340 and ARTH 396) to Urban Planning concentration as electives and create a new course (URST
397 Special Topics in Urban Studies) and add it to all of their concentrations and restructure Sustainable Urbanism concentration.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded.

The Speaker asked for any discussion on the motion to adjourn.

There was none.

Faculty Senate voted to adjourn.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

None

8. Adjournment, 7:29 PM
Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on 17 January 2017

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, 17 January 2017 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order, 5:04 PM
2. The 6 December, 2016 minutes (pdf) were approved as posted.
3. Announcements and Information
   The Speaker welcomed the Faculty back to the new year. He reminded the Senate about the roll located at both doors and circulating.
4. Reports

a. Speaker of the Faculty Todd McNerney

On January 6, the Speaker worked with Shirley Hinson to bring together some faculty members, Deans, senior leadership, and members of the Chamber of Commerce. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss two things:

- 2016 Talent Demand Study, [http://www.charlestonchamber.net/talent/](http://www.charlestonchamber.net/talent/)

Discussion centered on the Chamber's efforts to facilitate internships in partnership with the College of Charleston through an "intern portal," which may still be in development. If your unit or School has significant numbers of internships, then this information may interest you.

The Speaker updated the Senate on two ad hoc committees on the Grievance process and the Hearing process. They were formed in the Fall semester, have been meeting regularly and will give a report at the February meeting.

The Speaker reported that the Faculty Senate, in partnership with the College’s AAUP chapter will be hosting faculty from Francis Marion University who are in their faculty governance and leadership. Francis Marion is consistently ranked as a "Great College to Work For," and we hope to learn something from them about how faculty governance works at Francis Marion. Once those dates are set, specific dates and times will be announced.

The Speaker presented at the October Board of Trustees meeting the desire of the Faculty Senate to work with them on a method to participate in the evaluation of the President of the College. The Speaker has also communicated with the President that the faculty wishes to have a means to share feedback in the President's evaluation of the Provost.

The Speaker planned to speak more specifically about this at the next Board of Trustees meeting.

The Speaker encouraged faculty to participate in the open faculty forum on academic freedom after the national election on January 23, School of Education, Health, and Human Performance alumni center at 5:00 PM.
There were no questions.

b. Provost Brian McGee

Provost McGee welcomed those in attendance to the new year. The Provost recognized guest Board of Trustee Randy Lowell, who is the new chair of the Board's Academic Affairs Committee.

The Provost thanked everyone, including faculty and students, for working to make the compressed schedule of Fall 2016 work. The Provost noted that faculty evaluations were completed at a comparable rate to those in the previous semester. The Provost mentioned that there were some problems with missing and incomplete grades relative to other semesters. He asked those attending to please help getting grades in as quickly as possible.

The Provost thanked Dean Tillis for his leadership of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs and recognized Classics Department Chair Tim Johnson as Interim Dean. An announcement will be made soon naming the Interim Chair of the Department of Classics. The Provost said that he has received extraordinarily high quality feedback from the LCWA faculty on securing permanent and interim leadership of that School. Provost McGee expressed that he is grateful to his faculty colleagues in LCWA for providing that feedback and he will be meeting with the President soon on permanent leadership.

Continuing on the topic of leadership, the Provost expressed thanks to Dean Fran Welch who is heading up the ad hoc committee reviewing the structure and organization of the Graduate School. The committee is broadly represented by graduate students, Graduate School faculty and Graduate School staff. The Provost mentioned that their work will be completed in the current semester.

The Provost said that there are several ad hoc committees working this semester, including the ones studying the Grievance and Hearing processes, one studying grading systems, and another working on the possible creation of a General Studies bachelor’s degree.

Provost McGee reported on an opening discussion on the Tenure and Promotion process, which has grown out of concerns expressed in meetings held each Spring with the Deans on their experiences with the Tenure and Promotion process. Recurrent issues include the five member composition of the Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review Committee. Since there are six schools and library faculty, it might make sense to increase the Committee to seven to include representatives from each academic school and the library. Another discussion centered on whether there should be a different set of roles for faculty in the review of promotion applications for the rank of full professor or of Librarian III and IV. In the current scenario, associate professors are asked to vote on applications for full professor of colleagues who might subsequently be voting on that associate professor's promotion. This challenge is addressed at many institutions by restricting voting on applications to full professor to those who hold full professor rank. Also discussed is whether to require external review letters. This issue and others will be shared with the Faculty Welfare Committee for thoughtful review and discussion. There
is no deadline or timetable for this. The Provost does not foresee any changes occurring from these discussions until the 2018-2019 academic year.

The Provost gave an update on the Real Estate Major name. The major went through all the regular channels and was expected to be offered in the Fall of 2017. When under review by CHE, CHE staff reported that the proposal was fine, but the name was problematical. It was thought the name should reflect a more academic nature. Renaming the major was done in discussion with the CHE staff, School of Business leadership, and Finance faculty in record time due to deadlines necessary for launching the major in 2017-2018 academic year. The new name is Commercial Real Estate Finance, dependent on the renamed major going through the regular curriculum review process, and final CHE approval.

Provost McGee reported on the new Bridge Program, in development with Trident Technical College. In December, the plan was discussed with some members of the Academic Planning Committee, and in the past few months, with Academic Council and the Board of Trustees. Several bridge programs with Trident have been tried in the past, and have been small in scale, with fewer than 100 students. The international bridge program, iCharleston, has been doing well, but the local bridge programs have had mixed success. The current bridge plan with Trident calls for 300 students, and involves a residential experience on the College of Charleston campus.

The Provost described the current plan, being developed, future bridge students will live in CofC residence halls for the Fall semester. They will be Trident Tech students, and take Trident courses taught by Trident tech faculty in College of Charleston classrooms. The Trident tech students would be provided services on the College of Charleston campus through an agreement with Trident Tech. The bridge program would last one semester, with students bridging to the College in Spring if they met required targets for GPA and hour completion. The Provost appreciated the efforts of many faculty, staff and administrators for working through the details of the program. He expressed appreciation for the partnership of Trident Tech leadership and the work of our colleagues at Trident Tech for thinking through the Bridge program. Trident Tech has sent many transfer students to us in the past, and the Provost said that wouldn't change.

The Provost thanked the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid for their patient review of the options of calculating the major GPA.

The Provost thanked the working through of issues with the Bachelor of Professional Studies, which was taken off of a previous agenda and appears on today's agenda.

Speaker McNerney asked for questions.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS) offered an observation about the composition of the Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review Committee from five 5 members to seven. As a faculty member who has served on the Tenure and Promotion committee and on the Nominations and Elections committee, Senator Nunan expressed that increasing the size of the committee would be a bad idea for several reasons. It is difficult to find five people who Nominations think express good judgement and don't have ideological axes to grind, and not many people volunteer
for that committee because it is a lot of work. He expressed that the Nominations Committee has trouble finding five people to serve. Added to this is the logistical complication of finding times that seven people can meet, and the number of meetings this committee has to have is huge. In Senator's Nunan's experience of serving on the Committee, representation from each School doesn't really matter.

**Irina Gigova**, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about the T & P process. Will the changes be tied to post-tenure review? It makes sense to review both processes.

Provost McGee said that if Faculty Welfare would like to examine both, he would be amenable to doing that. He agreed with Senator Gigova that the two review processes are linked in some ways.

Dr. Gigova next asked for clarification about the Bridge program. She understood that there will be about 300 students who will stay in College of Charleston dorms for one semester, then they will stay or not?

Provost McGee said that the way the Bridge program is currently devised, successful students will continue to stay in the residence halls and if they are not successful, they will be respectfully asked to move out.

**Bob Mignone**, Guest, asked if consideration of rank in the Tenure and Promotion Committee will extend to Departmental Tenure and Promotion panels as well?

The Provost affirmed this was correct. He stated that this is a good opportunity to discuss the relative participation of instructional faculty, associate and full professors in consideration of colleague's promotion to more senior rank. He stated that the discussion would include departmental tenure and promotion panel, the Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review, and the creation of colleague letters.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator (at-large, HSS) had three questions related to admissions. For the 300 students who will be in the bridge program, have there been any provision for these students to be supported as a cohort, will there be programming or common lectures, or any planning of a common experience to communicate to these students that they are here because they have been selected as people who are likely to succeed?

Provost McGee said affirmed that these plans to present a positive message are in place.

Senator Kelly asked again if that infrastructure will be in place?

Provost McGee said they want to build it, that there are lots of challenges to make sure students are gathered together, but not isolated.

Senator Kelly voiced his support for the Bridge program and hopes it succeeds.
Next, Senator Kelly asked about financial support for students who are selected from the Top Ten Percent program, and in particular, those students who have a financial need as opposed to academic merit. He asked if we have numbers on how many students are entering through that program who have financial need and if we've assessed whether we are meeting that financial need. How many of these students have the door opened to them as Top Ten Percent students who are not able to attend because of financial need?

The Provost said this is a great question about the first year of the Top Ten Percent program. He said we have a series of programs that are both need and merit-based for scholarship. We don't want a single student to decline admission offers to the College of Charleston based upon a gap between need and an offer, although we know that does happen. There have been a series of financial programs for students who have need that predate the Top Ten Program. The decision was made to begin the pilot Top Ten Percent by saying the same opportunities available to student in the Top Ten that would be available to any other student. The College has scholarships that go back decades that have a needs-base or merit-base, or a combination of need and merit and the Top Ten students are eligible for this financial support, too. The Provost said in his opinion, the program needs two years of data, which they are collecting. The goal is to use that data to make needed adjustments to ensure the success of the program.

Senator Kelly asked that as the data becomes available, please share it with the Senate as a regular annual report.

The Provost said that the earliest useful report will be from Fall 2017 when they have data from two classes.

Senator Kelly's final question concerned philanthropy. He would like to see regular reports from Institutional Advancement regarding raising money for endowed scholarships that will positively affect diversity.

The Provost suggested that knowing non-endowed scholarship totals would be useful as well.

Senator Kelly suggested these reports could come at the beginning of each academic year, at the Faculty Senate September meeting.

**Tom Baginski**, Senator (German and Russian Studies) offered that the renamed major, Commercial Real Estate Finance, did not reflect residential real estate finance.

Provost McGee invited subject experts to speak on the name.

**Jocelyn Evans**, Guest (Associate Dean and Professor, Finance) explained that since the Carter Real Estate Center and Finance major began, there has been an orientation to commercial real estate. At the beginning survey level, there is some residential real estate content, but as students progress to careers at the corporate level and in investment banking, emphasis is placed on evaluation and strategic market analysis, which are part of commercial real estate. From its inception, the Center and the major were designed to be comprehensive in terms of evaluation, and to examine other aspects such as what drives cash flow, the effects of regulatory restrictions,
market drivers from outside the business major perspective, and other considerations that a Finance major doesn't consider. Because the Commercial Real Estate Finance was designed with a comprehensive liberal arts focus, it will have a strong business finance analytic nature, and will include other areas to help explain how to complete an evaluation.

**Bill Hassett**, Guest (Finance) added that they did not want the major to be confused with classes offered at night for becoming a broker. He stated that commercial includes residential, including multi-family, condominium development, and other residential components will be included, but it is considered commercial because of the investment aspect.

**Bob Mignone**, Guest (Mathematics) stated that the Math department supports the Top Ten Percent and the Bridge program, but noted the additional support role Math will experience getting students ready for college level math. Math is already having a difficult time keeping up with current structure, and this will increase as students from Top Ten and Bridge programs go into STEM areas, Business, Health professions, and anything else that requires an algebra-based foundation. There is evidenced-based pedagogy that offers models for supporting College Algebra and increasing effective teaching, but Math doesn't have facilities to scale that up to what will be needed. Mignone asked for support for a testing lab so that they can expand their support at a higher level than current facilities allow. Mignone stated that 30% of students who come to college don't place into College Algebra.

Provost McGee said that he heard him and affirmed that responding to changing pedagogies and the need for new resources is part of the shared responsibility of faculty and administration. Part of the plan for the Bridge program students is to create tracks for students so that the first courses they will take with Trident Tech will align with the requisite courses most needed for a particular major.

There were no further questions or comments.

c. **Divya Bhati**, Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning gave an update on the SACSCOC reaffirmation process.

- They will submit focus reports by February 10, 2017, based on the questions the off-site committee asked. That committee has given feedback on eight standards.
- Dr. Bhati said they will also need to submit the Quality Enhancement Plan.
- Many faculty and staff will receive notice of preparations for SACSCOC visits, and reminded us to save the dates for SACSCOC onsite team visits March 27-30.
- She gave her deepest thanks for continued support during the College's reaffirmation process.

d. **Todd LeVasseur**, Director QEP gave an update on the Quality Enhancement Plan.

- The Plan would be finalized, given to Marketing, and submitted by the February 10, 2017 due date. The document will be shared with faculty and staff via email.
- LeVasseur said there would be a increased marketing presence leading up to the SACSCOC March visit. He asked faculty to find a PowerPoint loaded onto each
classroom computer’s desktop and to please try to make time to show this to your students.

- He stated there will be a call forthcoming for Sustainable Literacy Student Fellows (four positions).
- There is an art exhibit devoted to Sustainable Literacy, sponsored by the QEP, on the second floor of Addlestone Library.
- On February 10, 2017, everyone is invited to a reception on sustainable literacy, which will include student art and faculty research related to sustainability literacy from 3:30-5:00 in Addlestone Library room 360.

There were no questions.

5. Old Business

Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid gave the committee’s ranking results for the three Major GPA Options [pdf] [doc].

Committee Chair Quinn Burke reported that the Committee met on January 6, 2017 to discuss and rank the three options presented to Faculty Senate in the December, 2016 meeting.

The Committee’s seven members unanimously chose Option 3 as the most preferable.

The second choice of the Committee was to eliminate the College's major GPA policy altogether.

Burke sought to make a motion to recommend the Faculty Senate adopt Option 3, but this was not possible, as the motion had not been listed on the agenda.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) offered that he supported Option 3, but as part of the ad hoc committee exploring the development of an online General Studies degree, he wanted to ask if adopting Option 3 would conflict with the General Studies major.

Provost McGee said that he thought that part of the proposal for the General Studies major would be how to calculate the major GPA, since the calculation would be required.

Meg Cormack, Senator (Religious Studies) wondered about the note in Option 3.

Note: Any course approved through exception management or identified by the department in the special topics selection process that will be used as a substitute for a course within a program of study’s exclusion list will not be calculated in the major GPA.

Cormack asked for clarification about whether a student could get special permission to count some other course that is not normally part of the major as part of the major, but that wouldn't be counted as part of the GPA? It seems if the student wants to count the extra course as part of the major, it should go into the GPA.
Chair of **Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid** Quinn Burke said he understood the point, but thought they didn't want too many exceptions.

**Mary Bergstrom** (Registrar) followed up with the information that there would be an exclusion list. The major would list the requirements, and at the bottom, they would list exclusions. She said, this is referencing that if a course is used as a substitute for a course that is listed on the exclusion list, the course would not be included in the major GPA.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) pointed out the procedural error of offering a motion, since that was not included in the agenda.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked for a definition of "exception management."

**Mary Bergstrom** (Registrar) answered that the exception management process is where a substitution is requested within a student's degree audit in order to meet graduation requirements for the major or degree.

She said there is a published list of exceptions, but in some cases, like a transfer credit, there might be extenuating circumstances, and some guidelines are available in that same published document.

**Speaker McNerney** consulted with **Parliamentarian George Pothering** and said that the will of the Senate as expressed in the December 2016 meeting asked for a report on the ranking of options from the Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid Committee. The Senate could choose to accept the recommendation of Option 3, which would require a new motion made from the floor.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked if departments would really do different things than is reflected in Option 1?

Burke said he received several emails from Department Chairs strongly supporting Option 3.

Senator Krasnoff asked if they had given examples of why Option 1 would be a burden?

**Alex Kasman**, Senator (at-large, SSM), said that in his interpretation of Option 3, it is a list of classes that either count or they don't.

**Jim Young**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked what the committee thought about Option 2, the Committee's second choice. He then asked what other institutions do regarding Major GPA. How many do not have a major GPA?

Burke said that the **Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid Committee** found that many schools allowed student to calculate their own GPA, based on how that College recommends the student calculate it. Many schools provide a link to a Major GPA calculator. Another argument for getting rid of the major GPA is it doesn't go on the transcript.
Joe Kelly, Senator (at large, HSS) moved that Option 3 be adopted. The motion was seconded.

The Speaker asked for discussion on the motion.

Susan Kattwinkel, Senator (Theatre and Dance) asked for an explanation of the differences between Option 1 and Option 3.

Burke said the big distinction between the two is courses that are identified by the department or program as counting or not counting.

Bob Mignone, Guest offered an example from Mathematics. In the BS Program, the Actuarial track, there are 18 hours of required Business courses that don't count for the major GPA, but under Option 1, they would be counted, since they are required courses, although not necessarily math courses.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) suggested a clarification in the language to make it more clear to students that major courses were identified by the departments or programs.

Jason Vance, Senator (at-large, SSM) suggested changing the word "all" to "those."

Provost McGee asked for unanimous consent to change "all" to "those."

The Senate gave unanimous consent to the language change (reflected here).

The Speaker asked for a vote on the motion to adopt Option 3.

The motion passed.

6. New Business

a. Gayle Goudy, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, introduced the proposal in BPS Hospitality Management.

Speaker McNerney mentioned that this proposal was first introduced in November, and was pulled in order to address possible concerns. Those concerns have been addressed, and are reflected in the documents and memos listed.

BPS Hospitality Management, Supporting documentation

Memo from Dean Godfrey Gibbison (pdf); Memo from Dean Shao (pdf); Change of Program form (doc); Memo concerning Trident Tech transfer credits (pdf)

There were no questions.

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.
b. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual
(Jason Vance, Chair)

Motion to Increase the Number of Years Faculty May Serve on Committees
(doc)

Vance gave history and explanation of the Motion, beginning with a proposal introduced by Dan Greenberg.

The Speaker asked for discussion.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) expressed that he likes the fact that lapses of less than three years are addressed. He said this seems like a good solution.

Bob Mignone, Guest, asked if it will be the Speaker's job to keep track of how many years committee members serve?

Speaker McNerney replied that it will be the job of the Faculty Secretariat.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked what would happen when service was interrupted by sabbatical, and was concerned that faculty would opt not to serve on any committee. He asked if this would be a problem for Nominations and Elections to fill seats.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS) mentioned that what they have done in the past is ask on surveys what committees faculty have served on. This is self-reported.

Pam Riggs-Gelasco, Senator (Chemistry and Biochemistry) asked how soon the change would take place.

Speaker McNerney explained that changes in the Bylaws would need to be approved by the Senate, then ratified by the faculty. The earliest it would appear in the FAM is in 2017-2018.

Vance then discussed how this would apply retroactively. He stated that the rule would still work retroactively, using the example if you serve on a committee for three years, under the old Bylaws, you would need to take a hiatus. Under the new proposal, you would have two more years to serve on the committee. You would not be able to serve 5 years MORE years, but for a total of a five year uninterrupted period.

The Senate voted on and passed the motion to amend the bylaws.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

a. Tom Kunkle, Chair of Committee on Nominations and Elections, reminded faculty that nominations are still needed by February 1 for Speaker of the Faculty, Secretary, and several at-large senators from schools. Please send any nominations to kunklet@cofc.edu
b. **Jason Vance**, Senator (at-large, SSM) reminded us at the December meeting, he brought up concerns the Biology department had with the protection of minors policy. He mentioned that Dean Auerbach (SSM) sent out an email on the progress of re-evaluating the protection of minors policy. Vance thanked everyone for working toward a resolution that will ensure continuation of outreach in the public schools.

8. Adjournment, 6:26 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Jannette Finch, Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on 6 December 2016

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, 6 December 2016 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. **Call to Order**, 5:07 PM

2. Approval of the 1 November, 2016 minutes (pdf).

   A change to the minutes was proposed and accepted. Richard Nunan asked if the minutes could be modified to clarify his comments found on page 14.

   The modified language follows: Is it not the case that we could set a group of courses to be the ones used to do GenEd assessment for a four-year period without instituting a freeze on new GenEd courses?

   Lynne Ford replied that this would be an option to explore.

   No other additional request. The minutes were approved with the friendly amendment.

3. **Announcements and information**

   None.

4. **Reports**

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

   The Speaker introduced the new faculty secretariat: Megan Gould. Megan has been serving as Interim Secretariat for the semester. The Speaker announced this is a shared position with Academic Affairs. Some of her duties include maintaining Senate webpages, assisting committee chairs, and reserving the conference room in ECTR 228. There is a networked printer in the faculty secretariat office, located in ECTR 227.

   The Speaker announced another round of meetings with faculty and Chamber of Commerce coming up in January. Contact the Speaker if you want to participate on January 6. The Chamber will provide updates on their workforce strategies and will begin a conversation with College faculty on internships.

   The Speaker's last item of business was to call for a moment of silence for the passing of Trustee Dr. Eddy Thomas in November. The Speaker recognized Dr. Thomas for his commitment and great caring for the College of Charleston.

   b. **Provost Brian McGee** (pdf)
Provost McGee thanked the Senate for recognizing Trustee Thomas’s passing and expressed sorrow that he did not have a chance to serve longer.

The Provost thanked the Faculty Senate for all those serving on T & P panels, recognized the Dean's work with T & P letters, and recognized the difficulty of working with the compressed academic calendar.

The Provost shared the first stage of reaffirmation from SACSCOC: the off-site review. SACSCOC reviews over 80 standards for compliance. The Provost was pleased to report that the majority of materials was favorably received by the off-site team. They did flag some policies and procedures outside of Academic Affairs, some materials relevant to assessment, and a handful of faculty credentials issues.

The Provost reported the next steps will be to provide lengthy documentary evidence in the form of a focused report.

On March 27-30, the SACSCOC on site team will look at the items flagged by the off-site team’s report, and will be able to call on anyone to answer questions at any time during the business day during this time.

After the onsite review in March, we will receive a written report, have an opportunity to respond, and then by the middle of 2017, we expect to receive the final accreditation report.

One item flagged as a result of an earlier review of the SACSCOC Compliance narrative concerned the new intake process for student complaints. (pdf)

One of the over 80 SACSCOC standards states that the institution has adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints and is responsible for demonstrating that it follows those procedures when resolving student complaints.

This is not a new standard, the Provost stated, but has been around in its current form for over a decade.

The Provost shared examples in his PowerPoint (pdf) of other institutions' policies and examples of similar requirements from other accrediting associations.

By long-standing federal requirements, students have three opportunities for pursuing a complaints process: the institution, CHE (state), and the accrediting agency (federal).

There are three approaches to documenting student complaints:

1. a fully decentralized approach, in which every office intakes complaints and processes them according to institutional policies or procedures, then deal with them, resolve them, and document them. This approach was taken in 2006 to demonstrate compliance and it essentially the approach taken this time to demonstrate compliance. The Provost explained that under fully decentralized approaches, it may be a challenge to demonstrate
compliance when the on-site team comes, since offices are randomly selected for their log of student complaints.

2. the centralized approach is the model we are adopting now. In this approach, there is a formal source to receive complaints.

3. The third approach, as seen at James Madison University, leaves the process decentralized, but requires all departments to use a standard form in processing complaints, and every spring, a report is required detailing complaints received and how they were resolved.

In deciding to adopt the centralized approach, a committee made up of employees across the institution decided on the process that caused the least stress for chairs, program directors, Deans, and other administrators.

In the new process:

- Students Directed to Website;
- Student fills out a web form;
- the Complaint is directed to the Appropriate Personnel (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources-currently Lynn Cherry);
- the complaint is pushed down to the lowest level it can be resolved at (usually Department Chair or Program Director)

At every point, the student is pushed back to our published and existing process.

Management of Academic Complaints is the Sole Responsibility of Academic Affairs.

We’ve been required to track student complaints for years; we have just changed how we address complaints to make it easier to track and monitor in order to satisfy the requirements of the federal government, state government, and our regional accreditor.

The previous process did not require units to keep track of complaints.

The Provost went on to assure Senators that this is not a building of a master database of tracking faculty behavior, this is merely an attempt to comply with regulations.

The Provost asked for questions.

Bob Mignone, Guest (Mathematics), asked where can we get a definition of when a student concern becomes a complaint? If a student comes in to talk, how do we know when the student moves from discussing a concern to registering a complaint?

The Provost said we can continue to keep an informal log of students coming in to talk, but this process exists for that student who wants to pursue a formal complaint.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS), offered one reason that this policy set off warning bells for some was due to not having the complaint process in any context other than an email
received from President McConnell. Senator Nunan pointed out that the email came out atop the national election, national media coverage about threats to higher education, and a memo sent to the Deans from the Provost about the reminders, in Nunan's words, to "cool it about politics in the wake of the election," and the President's memo suggesting that "everybody should remember to be tolerant of all opinions, which itself is a kind of problematic statement."

Nunan declared that receiving the message about student complaints was worrisome on top of everything else. He commented that it's good to hear there is no master list being built of complaints. Nunan suggested that it would be helpful for the President or the Provost to speak about the new student complaint process publicly to alleviate concerns.

The Provost explained that the email send from the President concerning tolerance was at the request of Chairs and Deans, who had said that such a note would be helpful to our campus climate.

There was further discussion between Senator Nunan and Provost McGee.

Senator Nunan returned to the subject of the formal complaint procedure with the opinion that a student going to the department chair if they have a complaint against a faculty member works pretty well most of the time, and he worries that this procedure will encourage student complaints to some degree.

The Provost wanted to clarify that in his email sent to Deans and Chairs on November 10, 2016, his intention was not to warn people to "cool it on politics," but to address student concerns who reported “crudely partisan” opinions expressed. The students expressing this concern wanted to insure that the tone of discussion remained respectful.

Kevin Keenan, Senator (Political Science) asked if the faculty member be able to see the complaint a student lodges?

The Provost stated that in most cases, he would anticipate that would be necessary.

The Provost next addressed several newly published policies and procedures and welcomed any suggestions for improvement, or corrections to mistakes in the text.

On the topic of academic administrative vacancies, one of the line Deans will step down in the next few months and pursue opportunities at another institution. The Provost wants open dialog with faculty from that school on the process of securing leadership for the school. The dialog thus far has consisted of two meetings and a call for letters from faculty of that school. Since Deans are important academic leaders, feedback from faculty colleagues gathered in this way will be part of the consultative process for filling future Dean positions.

Heath Hoffman, Senator (Sociology and Anthropology) asked which school is this?

Provost McGee affirmed it is the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs. Dean Tillis has publicly announced he has accepted position at another university.
In regards to admissions and enrollment, Provost McGee said that it appears that our enrollment for new students in the Spring has exceeded projections and the students are good quality. There are strong applications for Fall 2017.

Provost McGee said that they continue to experience success with the international bridge program called iCharleston, and continue to work with Trident Technical College on the possibility of a larger bridge program than we have had in the past.

On the subject of several Ad hoc committees and several task forces, Provost McGee stated they are doing ongoing work. The latest committee formed is the ad hoc committee on the organization of the Graduate School.

The Provost introduced the motion regarding December graduates, "Resolved, the Faculty Senate approves the list of December 2016 degree candidates for graduation as certified by the Office of the Registrar, subject to review and termination by the College of Charleston Board of Trustees."

The Provost asked that the resolution be removed from New Business and considered and voted on. The Senate gave unanimous consent for the change to the agenda order.

The Provost moved for adoption of the resolution. There was a second of the motion. Without discussion, the Senate voted on and passed the motion.

The Provost offered comments on the agenda.

As a result of conversations with Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, there will be some new contributions from the Registrar and the Provost regarding the Major GPA when we reach that point in the agenda.

The Provost will share any news of how Governor Haley's move to new duties in the Trump presidency, resulting in a new Governor of South Carolina, will affect us.

The Provost asked for questions.

**Heath Hoffman,** Senator (Sociology and Anthropology) spoke on behalf of his colleagues. They have concerns about the mandatory requirement to have a REACH student in the class, whereas in the past, faculty were invited to participate and once they agreed to participate, they agreed to go through training.

He spoke of concerns over the organization and administration of the REACH program that seemed to be continuation of complaints about the program that were published in the Post and Courier article from May 2015. He asked what role do faculty play in overseeing and advising the REACH program and its administration of services to intellectually disabled students at the College?
The Provost said that faculty have been centrally involved with the Reach program and with REACH students in structural and in other roles since its inception. The REACH program is faculty driven in terms of the ideas for an initiative for it.

The Provost asked for time to become more informed about the dialog between Sociology and Anthropology and Director of REACH, Edie Cusack.

Senator Hoffman asked the Provost to comment on how faculty were alerted to mandatory participation?

The Provost stated that the decision came from an Academic Council meeting two months prior, in order to make equitable educational opportunities for all students.

The Provost asked Lynne Ford to contribute any critical points to the conversation.

**Lynne Ford**, Guest (Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) shared that the REACH program has become a national model for academic programs for students of intellectual disability for full inclusion. Universities around the country are looking to what we do. Once admitted to the College, students in the REACH program take two academic courses every semester, and those academic courses are taken in pursuit of a concentration, in place of a major. If a student has an area of interest and faculty in that department are not willing to accept all students, then that student cannot pursue their area of interest. As an institution, we cannot do that. While not sure they have used the word, "mandate," Ford affirmed that her department did begin a conversation with Deans and department chairs, starting with Dean Hale and Humanities and Social Sciences.

Their plan is to transition from the building phase of the program to providing 10 students with intellectual disabilities a year full access to educational opportunities.

Dr. Ford said she welcomes feedback from colleagues about what sort of language could be used, but the expectation is that faculty are not able to exclude students from their classroom.

Senator Hoffman asked if other Senators were familiar with the REACH program? He observed that many people were not, and wished for better communication in the administration of the program. What came from the conversation with Director Cusack was that participation is mandatory, but Senator Hoffman offered the opinion that the program could be better managed, since of the faculty in his department who had REACH students, none had been contacted to date about receiving training.

Senator Hoffman stated that the difference in group training for 4 hours and one on one training, which lasted from 30 to 90 minutes, seems problematic. His colleagues report that they do not feel prepared to work with REACH students. He reported that they have received mixed messages about whether faculty must modify assignments to be appropriate for students with intellectual disabilities or to not change anything, just do what you do normally. Dr. Hoffman reported that one professor expressed that they have not heard from the tutor assigned to the REACH student.
Dr. Hoffman stated there is a problem with REACH students taking a 300 level Sociology class, and being helped to reach at least a 40% completion rate of the class material by a tutor who is not in the class, and is often not a Sociology major.

A final point expressed by Senator Hoffman is that faculty receive a one-time stipend of $1,000 for training, but are not given additional funds when facing increased levels of work for multiple REACH students many years after initial training.

Senator Hoffman stated that his concerns and that of his colleagues is not about denying access, but about administration and organization problems.

The Provost appreciated the set of concerns, and asked for time to examine the issues. The Provost expressed that it is appropriate to bring REACH program back to the attention of the Academic Planning Committee for an update.

Meg Cormack, Senator (Religious Studies) echoed concerns with the REACH program.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at large, HSS) appreciated the concerns Senator Hoffman expressed and expressed that in his view, REACH is one of the things that College of Charleston should be bragging about and should be really proud about. Senator Kelly stated that it behooves us to address problems with the program responsibly to assure the success of the program. He expressed that having REACH students in his classes has been a terrific experience, improving his teaching and classroom dynamics. Senator Kelly stated that we need to commit ourselves to the success of the REACH program by solving any problems that we have.

There were no other questions.

5. Old Business

   a. Quinn Burke, Chair of the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid introduced four proposals.

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

This item was introduced in November, but could not be discussed due to loss of quorum.

Dr. Burke reminded the Senate that the ITEP will not replace TOEFL or any other test Su Frost from Admissions was available to answer any questions. The test is on demand and recorded. It is less expensive than competitors. About 640 universities are using this for admission.

Speaker McNerney stated that a Motion from committee does not require a second and asked for any discussion?

There was no discussion. The Senate voted, and the Motion carried.
ii. Proposal that the language associated with Restriction #4 of the College’s Pass/Fail Option (as outlined here in the current catalog) be amended to be more clear and make the distinction between coursework that counts toward the completion of the major/minor and that which does not (doc)

Burke stated that the proposal originated the proposal for Biology 381 as a course. The course is an internship that would only be available to Biology majors, but it would be graded as a pass/fail. The course is repeatable up to six credit hours and would not count toward the major GPA and would not be included on the Biology elective list.

Based on the current language, the course could not be approved as a pass/fail.

Burke read the current language, then read the amended language.

He explained that the amended language is to reflect that the Biology pass/fail course used as an example is not being used to fulfill a requirement.

Burke welcomed discussion to clarify.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked for a distinction between requirements for the major.

After some discussion between Kasman and Burke, it was clarified that any course required for the major could not be pass/fail.

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) offered a point of clarification and said this policy is a business process when students wish to take a course that originates as a gradable course for pass/fail. Adding the language does not solve the Biology problem. This policy addresses a student requesting a pass/fail grade for a class that is normally graded. There is not a policy regarding "birthing" classes as pass/fail.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked Bergstrom is she meant to say audit, because he thought pass/fail was different than audit.

Bergstrom said it's in that section of catalog: pass/fail.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked if there is a procedural process to creating a pass/fail course and asked if there were any rules against doing this.

The Provost said that we don’t have much language about the creation of pass/fail courses.

The Provost suggested that the Senate clarify whether it wishes to permit pass/fail courses, and suggested the Curriculum Committee be involved in the larger discussion.

The Provost commented that the change in language will not solve the Biology problem, but clarifies what can be done with courses that are created with the intent of assigning a letter grade.
Krasnoff asked what are the courses on the list of exceptions and why are they on that list.

**Bob Perkins**, Guest (Teacher Education) explained that the courses offered as clinical practice courses or student teacher courses are not graded and are not required for the degree, but are required for the teaching license.

Krasnoff asked if every student submits a petition to take these courses pass/fail?

There was affirmation from Perkins and Mary Bergstrom that these courses are the exception.

The Provost said that the Senate created space for these courses.

Krasnoff is in favor of making this change, allowing students to take an extra pass/fail course. If a student has already taken all the courses in the major, what is the harm in taking an extra course that is pass/fail?

**Gayle Goudy**, (Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee) added that the course in question is an internship. Most of the internships offered at the College of Charleston are graded, so the Biology course is different from other internships.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator (at large, HSS) asked for Burke to the confusion about requirements. Is the intent here as Senator Krasnoff said that if a major requires 36 hours and a course is counted toward that 36 hours, it cannot be taken pass/fail?

Quinn Burke affirmed this is how the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid read it.

Speaker McNerney asked for any additional discussion?

There was none.

The Speaker said since this proposal comes from a committee, it does not need a second.

The Senate voted and the motion passed.

iii. Proposal, Major GPA Policy with amended language (doc)(pdf)

Quinn Burke reminded the Senate that the GPA proposal was seen by the Senate in October, 2015, and was remanded back to the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, which voted unanimously to keep the major GPA.

The proposal includes revised wording.

Burke asked for questions or discussion.
**Pam Riggs-Gelasco,** Senator (Chemistry and Biochemistry), asked about the new wording in the context of an internship that was not a requirement of the major. Is it correct that this internship would not count toward the major GPA?

Burke affirmed.

There was further discussion from Riggs-Gelasco using the example of required Bachelor essays. Many departments don't have the Bachelor essay as an option to fulfill a degree requirement, so is it correct that the Bachelors essay course is not going to be counting in some departments?

Burke affirmed that yes, the course described is not going to go toward the major GPA.

**Larry Krasnoff,** Senator (Philosophy) said he is not sure that is correct. That it depends if the Department allows the Bachelors essay to count as an elective course.

The only case where the Bachelors essay wouldn't count is where the Bachelors essay is already excluded as an elective.

Krasnoff said he thinks it would still count.

Riggs-Gelasco said that she didn't think it would count in her department and her department does not have a large list of electives. In English, for example, it looks like every possible class is on the list. So a student taking courses with the English acronym would be able to count those courses. Departments that have a much more prescriptive list, like Chemistry and Biochemistry, if the proposal passes, will have to add a requirement for an additional elective to add to our 72-hour credit major. They will have to list every class that is not already a requirement. Riggs-Gelasco said she thinks hers is not the only department which would be affected. For example, Communication has quite a few upper level classes that are currently being counted in the major GPA. There will possibly be less incentive to take those classes. She expressed that she has more concerns, but allowed others to speak.

**Joe Kelly,** Senator (at large, HSS), still confused about the language, and if he is confused, a student would be confused. A course taken to satisfy the number of hours in a major but not to satisfy any requirement in the major counts to the GPA.

Senator Kelly said that this language means that what Senator Krasnoff is calling a required elective would count.

Senator Krasnoff affirmed and said if it says, okay, now take 9 more hours. That's a requirement that you choose an elective from a large list, so it is to fulfill a requirement and even if you take 6 courses to do that, that counts.

Krasnoff asked if this would be understandable to the student?

Provost McGee said this problem had come up before and asked what is our theory of requirement? Provost McGee complimented the committees who had tried to take the enormous
complexity of curriculum as designed by the College over decades and tried to articulate a set of principles. He said he doesn't think we are quite there yet. Some departments are simple, like German with a 27 hour major, and the complexity of the 72-hour major in Chemistry or Biochemistry. The Provost mentioned the additional challenge of the courses that can fulfill requirements for the International Studies major. Those of us who have advised students are familiar with the incredible range.

In the challenge to provide transparency to students, a requirement was a course you had to take no matter what its course prefix was, or the options for fulfilling that requirement.

The Provost stated that if we cast the term requirement expansively, it means pretty much everything, regardless of prefix.

That may or may not be the intention of the committee, but speaks to how we would scribe this in software.

The Provost said that Mary Bergstrom and he would make a different suggestion to get us to the point of a calculable major GPA, and have discussed it with Bob Mignone and Quinn Burke.

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) told of an informal sampling of students in which she asked them to read the language of the proposal and they had the same questions as expressed at the Senate.

Bergstrom offered for consideration going back to the 'original thought.' We currently have several different ways in how people calculate and what courses make up that calculation in each of your departments.

As part of SACSCOC process, they wanted to know the definition of how the GPA is calculated. Each department does set how the GPA is set in their major.

We would list in the catalog all of the courses that could count in the major GPA in order to achieve transparency. There would not be a definition of requirement, or a prerequisite for a required course, or a prerequisite for an elective course. Those definitions are not familiar to students.

What the Registrar and the Provost propose is returning to a simpler approach. She read the proposal, copied below:

Calculation of Major Grade Point Average
Proposed Undergraduate Catalog Change Regarding Degree Requirements
College of Charleston
Prepared: November 1, 2016

Current Undergraduate Catalog Description: Complete all of the requirements for at least one major with a minimum grade point average (GPA) of 2.000 in all major courses
(or for interdepartmental majors such as Urban Studies, all courses in the area of concentration). Some programs require a GPA greater than a 2.000; see specific major requirements in the “Schools and Colleges” section of the catalog.

**Proposed Undergraduate Catalog Description:** Complete all of the requirements for at least one major with a minimum grade point average (GPA) of 2.000 in all major courses identified by the department or program. See specific major requirements in the Programs of Study section of the catalog for a list of major GPA courses and exclusions. Some programs require a major GPA greater than a 2.000; see specific major requirements in the “Schools and Colleges” section of the catalog.

*Note:* Any course approved through exception management or identified by the department in the special topics selection process that will be used as a substitute for a course within a program of study’s exclusion list will not be calculated in the major GPA.

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) said what the proposal is basically saying is that you calculate the major GPA in a certain way. Tell us how you're calculating it and what courses would count in it. Let us be transparent about it. She said that it is in the audit, but if a student fails a course, the audit breaks down to the work not applicable area because it doesn't really apply but still counts towards the major GPA.

Bergstrom said the catalog can serve as a source for letting advisors know how this works and for students. They would see all the requirement for your course and we can build in a section at the bottom that says, "These courses, when taken, will count in the major GPA."

Quinn Burke, Chair of the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, said that's how USC does it, and other schools have just gotten rid of it altogether.

Provost McGee summarized that the Senate has three options:

1) Get rid of major GPA (rejected by Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid);

2) Cast a wide net and count everything listed in the catalog as a course that could fulfill major requirements gets swept into the major GPA;

3) Give students clarity and transparency, but have the academic majors through their faculty designate the courses that count toward major GPA and publish them in the catalog with the major and any course that does not count for major GPA does not count.

The third option is easy to program and easy to show and explain. There would still be significant variation from one unit to another, which is what we currently have. The difference is that we would be transparent about it.
The Provost said the Senate could vote on this proposal or push it to the January meeting. He mentioned the handout that is reproduced above, and said there would be time to read the options and think about them before the January meeting.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator (Mathematics) was in favor of the third option.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator (at large SSM) wanted to clarify that each academic major would set their own requirements? Would committees have oversight?

The Provost stated that in the initial exercise, they would go to each undergraduate academic major and say tell us (within the minimum of 27 credit hours). After the initial process is complete, it would be part of curriculum approval with the Faculty Curriculum Committee. Part of proposing a new major would be proposing a list of courses that allow for major GPA calculation. It would be regulated in the normal way, through existing committee structure.

**Scott Peeples** (Guest) spoke as a member of the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, and expressed one other concern about the constant updating required from departments. Any time a course is added or removed from the curriculum, that list also has to change. Peeples asked Mary Bergstrom if this presented a serious obstacle and acknowledged that inconsistency also seemed like a serious obstacle. Peeples stated that the Committee might have gravitated to the third option had they not tried to accomplish an institution-wide consistency. Peeples asked if the Registrar's office was really okay with every department setting its own rules and asked about keeping up with the changes in curriculum.

**Mary Bergstrom** said that their hope is since the departments set it, they are okay with locking it down. She reminded us that this will be catalog based, so if we continually change how the calculation is done, then we have to match up the student with how the major GPA was calculated in that student's catalog year. Bergstrom expressed hope that it remains relatively static.

Peeples asked if departments will be able to easily add new courses to the major GPA requirements? He wanted to make sure that the Registrar's office and the departments would be able to do that type of maintenance, so that courses don't get lost in the cracks and not count towards the major GPA.

**Provost McGee** said the original problem we tried to solve was to find a consistent and transparent method to make it clearer to students how major GPA is calculated.

Since we can't seem to achieve both, as Chief Academic Officer, the Provost would choose transparency for students over consistency.

**Bob Mignone** (Guest) asked if it would be parliamentary consistent if the Senate chose to replace "this with that." He asked George Pothering, Parliamentarian, if it would be possible to go back or is that too much of a change?

Speaker McNerney said he believed the motion would have to be voted on.
George Pothering (Parliamentarian) said it could be solved by strike and replace.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at large, HSS) had two questions. He clarified that after we come up with the initial list of courses that count for the GPA in each major and in each department, changes to that list will come through the Senate. He used the example of a course that will stop counting for the major GPA, but you are not deleting that course, you would have to fill out a change of course form, and go through the Curriculum Committee and go through the Senate.

Kelly's second question was if the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid was happy with the proposed solution?

Quinn Burke, Chair of Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid said no, but agreed with Provost McGee that transparency was desirable, and all three options are better than what we have now. He gave the example from the School of Education that it is mandated by the State of South Carolina that education students need to have a minimum GPA in the major.

George Pothering (Guest) asked if you had an English major, who was a Junior, and English proposes a new course that goes into effect the following year, a 400 level course, if the Junior student takes that course, does it count towards the GPA?

Bergstrom and others said no, it would not be part of the catalog year for that student.

Susan Kattwinkel, Senator (Theatre and Dance) expressed her difficulty with all options as based on fear that departments will put a higher than 2.0 GPA in their major, and risks students not being able to get higher GPA. She offered that this is a potential real problem which would be exacerbated by the long list of classes that count, so there are fewer classes that students can use within the department to increase their GPA.

Quinn Burke said that Clemson doesn’t do major GPA, but there is a minimum cumulative GPA that is required to get into many programs.

Jason Vance, Senator (at-large, SSM) expressed that the department of Biology was not in favor of option 2. He believes his colleagues would support the third option.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked if the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid has talked about third option?

Bob Mignone (Guest) spoke as a member of the Committee, and said he considered an option like Option 3, but it didn't solve the need for institutional consistency.

Mignone asked Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) if a new course was started, and a student takes it the year after they declare a major, if that course satisfies the requirement, then why wouldn't that course be part of the major GPA? If the calendar year doesn't determine what course the student can take to satisfy the major, then why should it determine what counts toward the major GPA?
Senator Krasnoff added that the good thing about the other proposal is that it wasn't a list of courses specified by the department, it was a rule. So when you added a new course, the rule applies to it.

There was some discussion.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest** (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) attempted to explain the questions. She explained that every set of degree requirements has to be scribed in Degree Works for auditing, and the scribing is based on lists. And they're based on the list of courses for that catalog for that catalog year. So if you have nine hours at the 300 level and above of a MATH course, then if I was a student under the 2015-16 catalog and a course appears in 2016-17, and it is not in the 2015-16 catalog, but it's a MATH 300 level and above, that is not going to count for my major because it is not scribed in Degree Works and it won't get picked up in the audit, unless I change to the next year's catalog.

Senator Krasnoff said the Senate thinks it's legislating according to rules, but we are not, we are legislating according to lists.

Provost McGee stated that the rule was set by the Senate as a catalog year base, which was healthy for students because it gave them certainty that when they choose a major in a catalog year, they know what courses fulfill requirements and which do not. They are listed there. If a student wants to switch to a catalog year to pick up the new course added, they can do that, but they have to intentionally do so. The student can change the rule on themselves; faculty do not change the rule on the student. The calculation of the major GPA is student friendly. When you add a new course to your catalog, it affects the people on that year's catalog.

Senator Krasnoff claimed that the programming could be rule based.

Provost McGee reiterated that the choice was one made by the Senate.

Senator Krasnoff next said that it would be hard to argue against letting every department do it the way they want to. He said that consistency does matter, and does not think we are far away from transparency. He stated that adding the parenthetical language of including courses that could fulfill an elective requirement as a modifying phrase is pretty good.

Senator Krasnoff expressed that it is good to decide the question on the basis of whether it's good to have common rules and not on the basis that it's simply impossible to write the language clearly and transparently. He said with good writers and good legislators on campus we could get it done. Krasnoff preferred the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid to consider the three options, bring the Senate a report, and then we really debate about the three options.

Quinn Burke said that everyone thinks in terms of their department, not necessarily in terms of the College, but will do what the Senate recommends.
Iana Anguelova, Senator (Mathematics) said that even though the language appears consistent, it will be read differently by the different departments, so reaching consistency is not an option. Is it possible to program based on rules, not on lists? Each department can set their own rules. For example, Mathematics could set the rule that all 400 MATH courses count. Can we program so each department makes their own rules?

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) said as an example that Chemistry could say their major GPA is calculated. We require Organic, but we don't count it in our major GPA. Isn't that what we are saying in the third model?

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) said the problem is that it would violate the transparency principle.

Using a notation on every course description or on the list of major requirements so that someone can easily see what is counting and what is not counting instead of students and faculty having to interpret rules achieves one of the two principles, which is transparency.

There was brief back and forth discussion between Caveny-Noecker and Anguelova.

Simon Lewis (Guest) said that trying to get consistency is nuts. Option 3 seems to be a sensible way of dealing with it, especially since students have an option of opting in to another catalog year.

Meg Cormack, Senator (Religious Studies) asked if a student could petition to have a new course count both for their requirements and for their GPA?

Speaker McNerney said that currently, students can change their catalog year.

Provost McGee said that there are limits on how much we can customize the student experience. In this case, he would recommend that we force a choice of catalog year rather than customize options.

Godfrey Gibbison (Guest) asked a "rare" question, could someone explain to me the attachment to the major GPA? He used the example of when applying to graduate school, he picked courses that he thought applied to his major and calculated a GPA based on that, that the program director probably looked at his transcript and picked some course that they thought were the major courses and calculated a GPA.

Bob Mignone (Guest) explained that it determines who can graduate and who cannot in the major. It doesn't show up in the transcript, but if you don't have a major GPA, then students can potentially graduate with a .7 average in the major.

Gibbison said why not select the simplest rule you can select which is: the department sets the rule, and the department sets the list, whether the rule is 2.0 or 2.5 and you're done.
The Provost made a motion to remand the question to the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, to force rank the three options in the preference of the committee, then to bring that back to the Senate with the presentation of each option to the Senate for an up/down vote, and if one gets a majority, we would have a change, if none gets a majority, we would have no change.

Senator Krasnoff seconded.

**Bob Mignone** (Guest) asked a procedural question.

**Pam Riggs-Gelasco**, Senator (Chemistry and Biochemistry) asked if just one committee would be looking at this?

Quinn Burke will take the options back to Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, will rank, and bring back in January.

**Heath Hoffman**, Senator (Sociology and Anthropology) asked if one of the three options will be to eliminate the GPA?

The Speaker and Burke said yes.

The Speaker asked for additional questions on whether to remand the options back to Committee.

**Jim Young**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked about who the consistency was for, the student? If so, he doesn't see how consistency between departments in how the GPA requirement guidelines for a major matters to the student. As long as each department has a very clear set of guidelines, he believes that clarity is better than consistency.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) said that student really care about their major GPA.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator (at large, HSS) said he would like to call the question. That motion was seconded.

Next, the Speaker asked for a vote to remand the question to committee.

The Senate voted and the question was remanded to committee.

6. **New Business**

a. **Christine Finnan**, Chair of Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs, presented three proposals.

   i. **EDEL-Course Deletion** (pdf)

Bob Perkins clarified that the course is taken out of the requirement, not the catalog.
The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

ii.   ESOL-Certificate Termination (pdf)

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

iii.  LALE-New Course (pdf)

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

b.   Gayle Goudy, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee presented five proposals.

i.   Professional Studies: HMSM prerequisite changes (pdf)

Godfrey Gibbison (Dean, Professional Studies) spoke to the changes as a change to prerequisites, adding permission of department or junior standing.

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

ii.   Finance: Prerequisite changes to FINC 360 and REAL 360 (pdf)

Weishen Wang (Chair, Finance) spoke to changes in an attempt to become consistent with other departments that specified Junior standing or permission of instructor.

The Provost appreciated the explanation and asked about the management of a list of "ghost prerequisites."

Wang specified that the list of prerequisites will be removed, and junior standing or instructor permission will be the criteria for admission to the classes.

The Provost asked that the clarification appear in the minutes.

The Senate looked at the Finance curriculum change forms and the Provost noted that the strikeout initialed by Wang on page 2 of 4 should be taken as a modification of the language on page 1 of 4.

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

iii.  Economics (pdf)

   1.  Prerequisite changes to ECON 200 and 201

Beatriz Maldonado (Economics) explained that the intent is to have students brush up on their math before taking these ECON classes.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked about the requirements.
Maldonado explained that the South Carolina student can finish their math requirement in their sophomore year in high school, so by the time they get to the ECON class, it may have been several years without seeing any math. The department finds they are better prepared for ECON by brushing up on basic math.

Krasnoff said there seems like there should be an exception for the student who takes math all along.

**Jim Young**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if the department would consider a simple diagnostic test in lieu of taking a math course?

Maldonado said that the department has looked at lots of options, and the Math department changing the math placement test a couple of times in the last ten years makes it hard to make that rule. They are trying to make this the least obtrusive prerequisite.

Young suggested that the ECON department could address this within itself, instead of requiring a math course.

**Doug Walker** (Guest, ECON) stated that the department is trying not to make this overly complicated. They want to discourage students from taking this their first semester of College. The ECON classes plus Math destroys these students in their first semester.

**Godfrey Gibbison**, (Guest, ECON) spoke to the administrative burden if a test is required.

**Jason Vance**, Senator (at-large, SSM) spoke at a faculty member in SSM in support of this prerequisite.

**Pam Riggs-Gelasco**, Senator (Chemistry and Biochemistry) and Bob Mignone (Guest) spoke of the decline in math skills, failure to place in college Algebra, and the need for math preparedness in all the STEM classes.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) affirmed the point of the proposal is a good one. Does it do what you want it to do? He expressed that there needs to be some way to allow the well-prepared math student into the courses.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) said that in conversations with ECON Chair Calvin Blackwell, they agreed that any math that transferred in as a math, the student would not be precluded from taking the course.

DeLaurell said this is an attempt to get everyone up to an adequate math level. She also wished to go on the record as stating that we need to examine the salaries we pay our admins. They are our first responders, invaluable to departments, and we need to reward them with raises.

**Jason Vance**, Senator (at-large, SSM) clarified that it is the timing of taking the math that this changes. They would still have to take a math as part of GenEd requirements.
**Jason Howell**, Senator (at-large Science and Mathematics) asked if the prerequisite change would allow a student who had AP Calculus to take the course.

Maldonado said any math that shows up in their transcript is accepted.

Some more discussion occurred.

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

2. Prerequisite changes to 300- and 400 level ECON courses

Maldonado said if the student meets the prerequisites then you should not have to wait to take the courses.

**Bob Frash**, Senator (Hospitality and Tourism Management) said that it seems that a 300 level should imply junior level.

The Speaker and the Provost said that the course numbering policy does not state class standing. He stated there is a lack of consistency in labeling 100 and 200 level courses.

There followed some discussion about defining course numbers, and inconsistency across departments. Changes in course numbering would require significant curricular reform to achieve.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator (at large, HSS) called the question. The motion was seconded. The motion to call the question passed.

The Speaker called for a vote on the course changes.

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

iv. Mathematics: Add MATH 455 to the Actuarial Studies track (pdf)

Bob Mignone (Chair, Mathematics) said that it was an oversight to leave this off the list.

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

v. Communication: Add new course to the COMM degree requirements (pdf)

**Ryan Milner**, Senator (COMM) explained that they are adding a 200 level foundation course.

**Susan Kattwinkel**, Senator (Theatre and Dance) asked a question of the Provost. Are all departments required to have a 36-hour major?

Provost McGee stated that the requirement was removed by the Senate several years ago.
The Provost asked Milner if still possible for student to finish in 4 years with 39 hour major?

Milner said the department is examining some options, including moving the major back to 36 hours.

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) brought up that one of our students was cited and ticketed for having a protest after the Presidential election. Senator Krasnoff said at some point, the student protest attracted more than 50 people, and there is a city ordinance that says you must have a permit for more than 50 people.

Krasnoff could not find how long it took to get a permit on the city's website. He is concerned because since students do organize rallies and protests, he would like legal clarification on the rules in order to support students.

The Speaker and the Provost will ask Legal Counsel for legal clarification.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS) asked about the news story which suggested that the Secessionist party provoked the citation.

Another student reported to Senator Nunan that in organizing about ten protests, he applied for a permit only once. and the rest of the time the city left them aloe.

Nunan asked if students being targeted? Nunan stated that as an institution of higher education concerned with free speech, we should be thinking about ways to support our students in these kinds of situations.

Jason Vance, Senator (at-large, SSM), reported that there is still misunderstanding of protection of minor’s policy and science outreach to schools. Currently the language is fairly restrictive, even beyond what CCSD requires, and faculty wonder how the rule applies, how much vetting they will have to do with the volunteers from the schools that participate in this outreach, including parents.

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) clarified that students’ official transcript does not contain major GPA. It is not displayed anywhere.

8. Adjournment, 7:42.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jannette Finch, Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 1 November 2016.

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

1. Call to Order, 5:06

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

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

3. Announcements and information

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

Please mark the roll at each door.

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

Unanimous consent was granted by the Senate.

4. Reports

a. Speaker of the Faculty Todd McNerney

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No Questions.

b. Provost Brian McGee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Provost asked if there were any questions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. **Old Business**

None.

6. **New Business**

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

   i. **New course, BIOL 612** (pdf)

   ii. **Course deletion, BIOL 618** (pdf)

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

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

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

The Senate voted on and passed the Biology course proposals.

   iii. **Course change, ENGL 700** (pdf)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Senate voted on and passed the Math program change.

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

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

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

The Senate voted on and passed the French course proposals.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

i. Gen Ed Cycle of Freezing

ii. Course additions during the Freeze

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

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

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

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

Speaker McNerney invited questions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That was affirmed as correct.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Speaker McNerney** stated this is searchable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Provost McGee called the question.

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

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

The discussion continued.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was some discussion of Degree Works from Mary Bergstrom.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Back and forth discussion.

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

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

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

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

Lynne Ford affirmed that two years is certainly shorter.

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

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

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

The Speaker asked for further discussion of the amendment.

The Senate voted on and rejected the amendment.

Business returned back to the original motion.

**Provost McGee** called the question.

It was seconded.

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

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

The Senate voted on and rejected the motion.

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

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

Speaker McNerney asked for discussion?

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

Dr. Burke and Senator Krasnoff discussed.

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

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

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

Senator Krasnoff and Dr. Folds-Bennett discussed.

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

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

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

There was no objection. The friendly amendment was accepted.

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

Trisha Folds-Bennett said no.

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

Trisha Folds-Bennett stated it would be repeated violations?

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

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

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

There was back and forth discussion.

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

Senator Riggs-Gelasco made a motion to adjourn.

Seconded by Senator Krasnoff.

The Senate voted no to adjournment.

Quinn Burke introduced the next proposal.

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

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

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

18 faculty remained.

There was no longer a quorum.

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

Speaker McNerney repeated that we do not have a quorum.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

8. Adjournment, 7:48 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jannette Finch
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 11 October 2016

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

Agenda

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

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

4. Reports
   a. Speaker of the Faculty Todd McNerney

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

b. Provost Brian McGee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Provost McGee asked for questions specific to Hurricane Matthew?

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

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

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

Questions?

There were none.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Questions?

There were none.

d. Faculty and Staff Giving Committee (Seaton Brown)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Questions?

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

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

e. Academic Standards Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Option #1
All Applicable Coursework & All Electives

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

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

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

Option # 2
Eliminate a College-wide Major GPA Policy

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

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

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

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

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

Iana Anguelova, Senator (Mathematics) asked if the Registrar prefers Option 1 or Option 2? Mary Bergstrom says the Office of the Registrar prefers Option 2, to eliminate the major GPA. This would bring the College in line with other universities, such as UNC. Their second choice would be Option 1, the Applicable option.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Quinn Burke and Bob Mignone sought to explain that courses taken out of individual interest or as electives outside of the major are not applicable to the major GPA.

Will clarify this with an example and attempt better wordsmithing.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator (Mathematics) finds option good.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was further discussion and examples offered by Bob Mignone.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. **Old Business**

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

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

Results would be aggregated into information that might be useful.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Speaker McNerny affirmed with, "Yes."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bill Manaris, Senator (Computer Science) [unintelligible]

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

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

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

Is the intent for the results to be made public?

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. New Business

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

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

   Questions?

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

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

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

   The Senate voted on the motion, which was approved.

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

   Jason Vance explained the history of the motion.

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

   Dr. Vance introduced the revised motion.

   Speaker McNerney asked for discussion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Senate voted on the motion, which was approved.

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

i. History Proposal (pdf)

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

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

No discussion.

The Senate voted on the change, which was approved.

ii. English Proposal (pdf)

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

The Senate voted on the change, which was approved.

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

i. New course CSCI 281 (pdf)

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

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

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

No discussion.

The Senate voted on the change, which was approved.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

Speaker McNerney asked for constituent concerns. There were none.

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

8. Adjournment, 7:24PM
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 13 September 2016

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, 13 September 2016 at 5 PM in the Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order at 5:05 PM
2. The 5 & 12 April 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes were approved as posted.
3. Announcements and information
   - There is a roster at the door.
   - George Pothering is parliamentarian again!
   - Senate rules—5 minutes per topic, identify yourself when granted the floor. State your affiliation.
   - Introduction of new Faculty Secretary, Jannette Finch.
   - Our faculty secretariat Jessica Wolcott has left to pursue other opportunities. Megan Gould is filling in.

4. Reports
   a. President Glenn McConnell

President McConnell read from prepared remarks. Any errors in transcribing accurate speech is the responsibility of the Secretary.

Good afternoon to all of you. Thank you for the opportunity to come and address you. It's hard to believe that this is already week four of the semester. It won't be long before we'll be in December, looking at commencement, the holiday season, getting ready to start back up. Today, I want to begin with the budget.

As you all know last year, we made some difficult choices in order to achieve a reset of our budget. At that time, we made strategic cuts, especially on the administrative side of the house in order to protect the academic core of this institution as much as possible and position the College for a healthier financial situation going forward. As we all know, our enrollment count and mix played a significant role in the makeup of our budget and slight variations in that have profound consequences. So let me talk briefly about our enrollment numbers. Toward the end of August I received an update on our enrollment numbers and it was very positive. We'll share more final numbers with you later this Fall but there are some overall highlights I want to mention at this time.

It's looking like the class of 2020 will perhaps be our largest class of in-state students ever at the College. I firmly believe that serving more in-state students assisted us this past year in getting an additional two million dollars in recurring operating money from the state General Assembly last session. In addition, this will be our largest transfer class in recent years. For the fourth year in a row, we expect to have around the same number of non-resident students. We also are
projecting to have another increase in our minority enrollment representing more than twenty percent of the incoming class. All in all the class of 2020 which will graduate during the celebration of our 250th anniversary or the Sestercentennial for those of you who work in Classics, and the Provost is very fond of that term: Sestercentennial. It's shaping up to be the largest Freshman class in the history of the College. As such it appears that we will make our enrollment projections and our budget is stable. I want to thank Jimmie Foster and the Admissions and Financial Aid team for all that they have done and continue to do to recruit and to shape our enrollment. They did a tremendous job at this College this year. Jimmie, thank you and all of y'all for what you've done.

Moving on, I want to provide you with an update on our SACSCOC reaffirmation process. We have submitted our compliance certification report to SACSCOC and now we wait for the offsite reaffirmation committee to review and deliver a report on their findings which we should receive later this Fall. Every indication I have is that all the electronic copies got where they had to go, the hard copies, everything made it under the deadlines. But I want to thank everybody across this campus for the hard work on this large and at times it was a daunting process. I know that reaffirmation efforts have consumed a lot of everyone's time and energy and I'm grateful for your diligent work, your cooperation in helping us and working with the office of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning for moving this through to completion.

As we all know, we are not alone in this process. Many universities around the country are doing the same work we are doing because more and more regulations and requirements are being imposed on higher education as well as greater follow up from the various accreditation agencies. I've spoken with other Presidents who are getting ready to undergo it. Regardless of the outcome, I strongly believe that we are a better and a stronger university for having been through this exercise. The College of course could not have done it without the efforts of everyone who participated and again, I just want to say this a true example of what we can do when we work together to get to the end of a goal.

Speaking of a common goal, I want to touch on the current College of Charleston Strategic Plan. As many of you know, at our meeting in April, I reaffirmed our commitment to the College's Strategic Plan which was approved in 2009 and revised in 2012 and most recently in 2013. After reaffirmation, we need to revisit this Plan for any fine-tuning. In my remarks to this body, I stated that I've chosen to highlight certain priorities that fit into the Plan which the College will focus on as we approach the 250th anniversary in 2020. These priorities are deceptively simple, but as we all know, they are complex in their execution.

They are:

1. Become a nationally preeminent, student-focused, liberal arts and sciences university, with outstanding professional programs in Business and Education;
2. Address the ongoing enrollment trends and broaden recruitment;
3. Successfully pass our ten-year re-accreditation;
4. Increase diversity;
5. Embrace sustainability in all forms on the Campus.
Within these priorities we will retain our teacher-scholar model, which has been a foundation of the College since we first began instruction in the late 1700s. At the same time, we must offer some advanced degrees in targeted areas, such as: Computer Science, Supply Chain Logistics, and Information Management, and potentially a few others for which there is a student and market demand in our local, state, and regional communities. We will never be nor will we want to be a full-fledged research university. Only a targeted one through our home institution, the University of Charleston, South Carolina. On the contrary, we will continue to offer our signature public liberal arts and sciences experience, while also offering superior educational opportunities in Business and Education. We will also continue to have the look and feel of a private university experience at a public institution.

Focusing on these priorities of academic excellence and inclusion supports the goals and strategies outlined in our strategic plan. In the next few years, we will focus on areas where we can take action now and have a real and lasting positive impact on the campus. In April, I also stated that we would develop measurements to confirm we are effectively and efficiently achieving these priorities as outlined in the Strategic Plan. The College's leadership team has been working all summer and through the beginning of this semester to identify the right goals for the institution over the next four years. We are close to finalizing some of these goals and I look forward to unveiling them to the entire campus community later this Fall when we get them completed. So much of what we do points to a bright and limitless or as George Watt reminds me, a "boundless" future, including the very nature of our mission of education and service. We seek to prepare our students for the careers and service opportunities of today and tomorrow. There is still more work to be done but I think we are headed in the right direction.

In closing, I want to talk about faculty compensation. I am committed to enhancing your experience and making sure you have the resources you need to be successful. In fact, I will be recommending that we increase the salary steps associated with tenure and promotion. I will propose that salary increase for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor be increased from fifty-five hundred to six thousand. Further I will propose that the salary increase for promotion to full professor will be increased from sixty five hundred to seven thousand. This change of course will require approval from the Board of Trustees based on available resources but I will work with them this year to establish these new increments and I've told the Chairman that I would.

It was also brought to my attention this summer than salary compression remains a significant issue for roster faculty in many academic departments and programs. I discussed ways of addressing this concern with Provost McGee. One way to address compression is to provide meaningful funding for faculty merit pay and for market adjustments of faculty salary. Our faculty and staff work hard and deserve merit pay increases. I firmly believe this is about making things right for our employees who are here and I will be working with the College's leadership and Board of Trustees to address this issue this academic year.

I will also work to provide the financial support necessary to increase our total compensation for adjunct faculty.
As we move toward our 250th anniversary in 2020, I am inspired and optimistic for what is to come at the College and it my plan that we will celebrate our 250th anniversary in grand fashion for an entire year. There are not a lot of universities in America that have been around as long as we have. As such, we deserve to properly tout this significant milestone and enjoy every second of year 2020. Our 250th anniversary will be a time of academic and institutional commemoration and celebration.

I welcome your ideas and your suggestions on how to celebrate this remarkable and incredible event.

In 2015, we added the honorary rank of University Professor and University Librarian IV to the administration manual with the idea that this honorary rank could recognize a few of our most highly accomplished full professors in any given year. Because of our financial concerns during the last academic year, we have not yet initiated this program. In light of our improved financial condition and the upcoming Sestercentennial celebration, I now expect to begin the university professor screening process in Fall 2017 with the first of these highly distinguished faculty to be recognized in 2018, Spring semester. Further, in recognition of the College's Sestercentennial and the foundational role of the faculty in the continuing success of our students, I will direct that a maximum of twelve faculty awarded the honorary rank of University Professor 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021 will have permanent use of the title Sestercentennial Professor or Sestercentennial Librarian IV for the duration of their careers at the College.

The College is moving forward and upward with great momentum. I believe that our stars are shining brighter than ever and I firmly believe that now is our time. With that, Mr. Speaker and members of the Faculty Senate, I thank you for your time. I'll be happy to answer any questions that you have.

Questions/Discussion *(All following sections are not actual transcription)*

**Meg Cormack**, Senator (Religious Studies), asked how the Sestercentennial Professors and Librarians will be chosen, who will they be?

The President replied that he will work with the Provost on that, but they will be chosen on merit.

Senator Cormack offered thoughts on faculty compression and reward those who work hardest by using the review that takes place six years after faculty reach full professor. Superior rating requirements are identical to those for full professor. In her opinion, the raise received should be the same for both. At present, the raise received for superior rating is half that of full professor.

President McConnell said he would note that and talk to the Provost.

**Irina Gigova**, Senator (at large, HSS) thanked President McConnell for his upbeat speech. She asked how the lower surplus in the state budget would affect the College's budget?
President McConnell has been vocal about opposing fixing roads out of funds from the general fund. The taxes for general fund were designated for core government functions, not roads and bridges. Spoke about sales taxes imposed on automobiles and expressed that Higher Education never got restored cuts imposed in 2008. If they had, we never would have had to reset the budget last year. It is his hope that higher education will not be cut, and the presidents of public institutions should speak out against robbing the future. We cannot afford to go backward, we need to go forward. It should be about investing in the future. It presents a great danger to the state if the general fund is dipped into. He mentioned that we should have a gas tax for the roads-the gas tax is one of lowest in the country.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at large, HSS) thank you for bold action regarding the fraternities. What action is being taken about formal review of the Greek system? Senator Kelly urged to make part of a review the segregated nature of fraternities. Segregated nature is at odds with our core values.

President McConnell said formal review will take place and that the Greek system was founded on core values and we must work to get them back to those values. He welcomes any thoughts on how to “get them back.”

President McConnell stated that we are in the process of looking at how we reset on the question of substance abuse with the help of Student Affairs. Included comments on the best attributes of the Greek system: people achieving, building friendships, studying together, working together, socializing together. It was never about tearing people down. At the College of Charleston, we have to be civil, polite, and inclusive.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked about selectivity of admissions. He commented that by some accounts, admission rates were up to the high 80s or nearly 90 percent. Is this something the President is concerned about?

President McConnell stated that he is concerned about the quality of the College of Charleston and that depends on the quality of the applicants we are getting. Mentioned some university admission trends such as "test optional" and the "bridge program." In his opinion, our admissions people will maintain as high a standard as possible.

Senator Krasnoff would like to see the ACT scores and SAT scores more often.

Scott Peeples (Guest) asked about the two million dollars in state appropriations, due to accepting more in state students?

President McConnell said he thought sharing data with House, Ways and Means helped. The $2 million appropriation helped us balance in state and out of state students.

Dr. Peeples asked if this would affect targets for resident and non-resident students?

President McConnell stated he is not going to back off from recruiting out of state. He will be combining fundraising with recruiting. It helps fulfill one of our core values of building
diversity on campus. We have also energized our recruiting internationally. Mentioned many building projects at this public institution. Stated that buildings are taxpayers’ property and should have a vested interest in maintaining them. Spoke to listening to Dean requests to pick up one time and non-recurring monies, too.

No further questions.

b. Provost Brian McGee (pdf)

The Provost welcomed the Senate to week four. Recognition of personnel changes. Last academic year, we felt keenly the loss of colleagues Conseula Francis and Alison Piepmeier. We have had changes in the Graduate School, he will discuss in a meeting with Graduate Council on Friday, September 16. As a result of those changes, The Provost is also serving as Dean of Graduate School; that is a temporary arrangement lasting only as long as it takes to complete a review of the organization and management of the Graduate School. The review will be conducted with the Graduate Council during the current semester. The review will include the leadership model of the Graduate School, and will examine the division of labor among the Graduate School, that academic schools, the Graduate Program directors, and the Registrar. Provost McGee thanked in advance the folks who will assist in that important work.

Provost McGee announced that Lynn Cherry, former Speaker of the Faculty, is Associate Provost of Curriculum and Institutional Resources. Dr. Cherry is thanked for agreeing to serve on very short notice.

Provost McGee spoke of strength of undergraduate and graduate enrollments. He is also now a parent of a College of Charleston undergraduate. Strong undergraduate enrollment this Fall, continue to attract students from up and down the East coast, we have applicants of good quality. Graduate enrollments are stable, based on unofficial numbers. All of this points to a stable financial future.

Provost McGee believes we are continuing to tell a compelling narrative about the College as a pre-eminent public liberal arts institution.

Notes that in response to Senators Krasnoff's and Dr. Peeples's comments on additional data and the relationship between in-state and out of state students, the Committee on Academic Standards, Admission and Financial Aid has been focusing more on the academic standards piece and a bit less on admissions and financial aid. Provost McGee would like Jimmie Foster to spend time with this committee each year so we always have clear channels of information.

Provost McGee would like to see us work more aggressively to increase our selectivity while meeting our financial goals and bringing a good and diverse student body here from in state and out of state.

Provost McGee stated that the College now with slightly fewer out of state students in the Freshman class is still bringing more out of state students than it did just a few years back.
Provost McGee then turned to an update on the budget updates for Academic Affairs. One of the reasons for budgetary challenges this year was meeting state mandated salary increases for permanent staff and roster faculty.

The Provost appreciates a lengthy conversation with the Faculty Budget Committee, which included a review of the impact of last year's budget cuts and the cuts for the current fiscal year, with a focus on what additional data would be helpful for the Committee to have.

In summary, the global numbers. Academic Affairs reduced its budgets by just under one million dollars in two major budget cuts during 2015 and 2016.

Also reduced budgets by almost 2.2 million dollars for 2016 and 2017. Cumulatively about just over a three-million-dollar effect on operating and personnel budgets for permanent funds over the course of these cutting cycles.

These were significant reductions for Academic Affairs. We have a recurring budget of under 95 million dollars, so that is a lot of money to put together. Across two fiscal years, we had 19 roster faculty lines defunded along with seven permanent faculty positions, along with operating cuts.

Operating cut examples:

- Faculty R & D down to 52 thousand, well short of 100 thousand. Academic Affairs will add to faculty R & D to bring that total up to nearer 90 thousand.
- IRCA. Working on getting money back into that system.
- Operating and staffing cuts across Academic Affairs.

These cuts would have been deeper but for the decision of the President and Board of Trustees to take disproportionate cuts in other divisions for 2016-17 fiscal year.

The Provost thanks colleagues in other divisions, the President and the Board for this support.

Good news:

- Budget reset complete
- Financial outlook is strong
- 2 million dollars in unrestricted, recurring funding is helpful, and thank you to President McConnell for securing that.

The Provost proposed that that budget cuts be considered strategically. Some of the current funded defunded positions may be restored if they meet a strategic priority.

Continuing needs:

- Loss of operating budget purchasing power due to budget cuts or inflation.
- Roster faculty wage compression.
- Meaningful salary increases for adjunct faculty colleagues.
Accreditation and quality enhancement plan (QEP).
Urges colleagues to work with QEP director for successful QEP review and implementation.
Wants to emphasize continuing work on some policies that need review, development and revision.

We must continue to present accurate information through our websites. Thanks for the efforts in checking websites for currency.

Faculty Administration Manual for 2016-2017 was published August 8. Summary of changes:

- updated title of adjunct lecturer,
- revised descriptions of courtesy faculty appointments,
- more flexibility for the chairing of graduate thesis committees,
- references new intellectual property policy
- clarifies appointing tenured and eligible faculty to academic schools and to the library
- updated and made current state and institutional travel regulations for faculty,
- updated library faculty terminal degree to MLIS,
- recognized program directors in academic leadership roles,
- recognized faculty responsibilities for program assessment,
- description of President's role in light of Board by laws and applicable state laws and legal presence,

All changes will be reviewed with the Committee on Bylaws and FAM. Any clerical mistakes will be addressed in a reissue.

Policy Development, Revision and Implementation

Some policies have to be College-wide and are required by SACSCOC. Some divisional policies have been updated to bring them into alignment with existing practice, compliance narratives, College policies and institutional policies.

Some of these are:

- Credit hours.
- Divisional policies on faculty credentials.
- Academic program director credentials, courtesy faculty appointments, adjunct and visiting faculty evaluation, new policy on creation of site codes in classrooms.
- Other upcoming policy revisions or creation will be discussed with Deans and academic leaders and faculty committees as appropriate in the hopes of establishing clarity and consistency.

Recognize many of the changes are due to work by key folks: Conseula Francis, Lynne Ford, Lynn Cherry, Mary Bergstrom, should get credit for an enormous amount of work.

Special review committees and shared governance
• There will be a review this year of the Faculty Hearing Committee organizational management and procedures.
• Faculty Grievance Committee.
• Review of grading systems to include ten-year review of the move to minus and plus grading.
• New committee launched to look at the possible design of a general studies or liberal studies degree, with the possibility that the program could be offered through distance education.
• Provide more consistency and transparency in how we calculate major GPA. Hope to complete this this year.
• Graduate and undergraduate admission standards. Improve communication between faculty, staff, academic standards, admission, and financial aid.
• Clarify in the FAM and Bylaws who is supposed to review and approve changes to admission programs for existing graduate programs.
• Changes made in graduate programs will be made with input from faculty and shared governance.

The Provost emphasized that Committee on Academic Standards is concerned with all admissions, not just admissions for undergraduates.

Any changes to graduate program admissions standards will go move the same procedures as outlined in Bylaws: Committees on Academic Standards, Graduate Education, and the Senate before they are published in the catalog. The Provost advised if faculty desire a more streamlined approach to review of changes in admission standards, especially at the Graduate level, then consider revising and inserting these changes in the Bylaws.

The Provost mentioned the demeaning aspect of appearing on Princeton's List of "Party" Schools. The Provost commented on changes in undergraduate GPAs from 2003 (2.88), to 2010 (2.98), to 2015 (3.03). A key factor in appearing on the Princeton list is a low number of hours spend studying outside of class. Suggests the Committee who will be looking at our grading systems also examine grading and assessment of student work over time at the College.

The Provost reminded the body that we have examined the question of holding December Commencement in the past. In light of the relatively low numbers of students who participate, we will hold December commencement in 2016 and 2017, then reassess.

Comments on agenda

The Provost delivered an aside comment on Post Tenure review increment diminished by inflation which should be assessed in the near future and possibly adjusted upwards.

Comments on upcoming motion for adjunct oversight committee. If that Committee is formed, Academic Affairs and the Provost office will work with it, but that committee's mission may be subsumed by the Faculty Welfare Committee. The Provost urges attention is necessary to prevent overlapping missions in Faculty Committees.
A personal note is added as the Provost recognizes the loss of Conseula Francis and Alison Piepmeier, and appreciates the support and commiseration he has received in a dreadful period.

Questions/Discussion

**Simon Lewis** (Guest) asked about unilateral manner in which Dean of the Graduate School Amy McCandless's position was terminated. Lewis spoke of lack of faculty input and damage to morale in the office of Graduate School office as well as the possible reasons for the change (budgetary?) and plans for the future (combined roles for Director of Graduate School and vice president of research?). Dr. Lewis asked for more background about the decision.

Provost McGee expressed difficulty in speaking of personnel matters in a public setting. Will conduct a full and honest review of the organization of the Graduate function. Will look at many models, including the one adopted by the Citadel, giving Graduate School functions to the Deans of the School, and the one mentioned by Dr. Lewis. Spoke of many difficult decisions made by recent budget challenges, and although decisions made regarding senior leadership at the College are made with the help in conversation with well-placed folk, the responsibility for Deans serving belongs to the Provost. The Provost asserts that this decision was made in order to deal with financial goals.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator (at large SSM) asks about the storm makeup day scheduled for the same Saturday as family weekend. Senator Kasman asked if there was rationale behind choosing the same weekend, and if not, to make sure they are not scheduled the same time in the future.

Provost McGee points out that every single weekend has something important scheduled. Although imperfect, optimal contingent storm days are set, and in some years, there will be conflicts and in other years, probably no conflicts. Parents have been informed.

**Bill Olejniczak** (Guest) recognized the Provost's discussion of possible grade inflation. Salary concerns were addressed several years ago by work done by the Faculty Compensation Committee. At that time, the Committee worked with the Provost and with Academic Affairs to create a target for faculty salaries. That target, agreed upon by the Administration, is coming up in 2018. Dr. Olejniczak also spoke on shared governance, reminding us that in April, the Senate passed a resolution calling for the Speaker of the Faculty to be a representative on the Executive Team, specifically regarding decision-making on budget matters. Could the President speak to this?

President McConnell responded that he has been reluctant to expand the executive team. He stated the budget process engages at the Board of Trustees workshop, which the Speaker attends.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) offered two questions. Where are reports showing what every faculty members gives as grades? You could also see grades by department and the individual faculty grades given relative to the student's GPA. Everyone saw it and could also see who was grading differently.
Deanna Caveny-Noecker (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) affirms that the reports still exist, and will do a better job communicating to teaching department Chairs of their availability. Provost McGee affirmed they will be made available in Deans and Chairs reports.

Larry Krasnoff's second question was regarding defunded positions that will be revisited and possibly reallocated. Needs a clearer timeline in order to synch with a department's disciplinary hiring practices.

Provost McGee appreciates the challenge and tries to prioritize positions that have been lost relative to instructional need. Acknowledged the Deans have been excellent at prioritizing and rank ordering requests when asked.

c. Speaker of the Faculty Todd McNerney

Speaker McNerney will organize and conduct a search this Fall for a new Faculty Secretariat. As we function temporarily without a Secretariat, please let Speaker McNerney know of any incorrect information on senate website.

He would appreciate verification on Senate Committee service when nominated faculty are contacted.

Reminder that Faculty Committees have access to meeting space in ECTR 227. Check the calendar for availability here: http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/committees/Conference-Room-Booking.php

One of the Speaker's duties is to attend Board of Trustees meetings. The Speaker reported on the Board of Trustees meetings he attended over the summer.

At June Budget meeting, there was a change in agenda and procedures. This year, led by Chairman Padgett, the Board invited Deans and additional faculty invited by Speaker McNerney to participate. Speaker McNerney thanks Mark Del Mastro, Jon Hakkiila, Gibbs Knotts, Julia Eichelberger, William Veal, Todd Grantham, Lynne Ford, Jim Deavor, and Rhonda Mack for attending.

The Speaker read into the record at that time comments from Senator Krasnoff, who could not attend.

The June meeting concerned the budget. Budgetary reductions are not intended to diminish the mission of CofC. Much of the remainder of the meeting concerned two paths forward: targeted growth and reduction or contraction in what we do.

Consensus seemed to favor targeted growth.

Data presented at this Board meeting by Trustee Jeff Schilz is available in their minutes, found here: http://trustees.cofc.edu/documents/minutes/june-13,-2016-.pdf
The Board voted to approve the budget, which included a tuition increase of 3.5, needed to cover state mandated salary increase.

Also notable in this budget approval was one new faculty position, and some positions in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning.

The Board of Trustees took action in implementation of school-based fees (beginning in School of Business and School of Sciences and Mathematics in Fall 2017).

The August BOT meeting included recommendations from President's Diversity Review Committee. Updates on facilities, including renovations to Rita Hollings Science Center, Jewish Studies expansion, Rutledge and Rivers dorm, the Lockwood Building.

Reminded us that the new CIO, Mark Staples, was announced and will be starting in October.

Speaker McNerney reiterated that any of us are welcome to attend any Board of Trustee committee meetings and encouraged us to do so. We are invited to attend, and we should be there, we should be listening and we should be asking questions.

The Speaker mentioned that the question of including student representation on the Board of Trustees was the subject of a report by Trustee Golding, Chair of Audit Committee, in the August meeting. A summary of some of the history of this request as reported by the Speaker includes the Senate's 2014 support of the resolution SR10-2014 and a summary of obstacles for including the SGA President on the Board of Trustees. In light of these obstacles, President McConnell recommended to SGA President to remove the student Trustee request. Both the SGA President and the GSA President now have regular engagement with the Board of Trustees, and the process is included in the Bylaws of the BOT. Trustee Demetria Clemons proposed that it was the Board's opinion that all of the SGA's demands have been addressed.

Joe Carson (Guest) clarified with Speaker McNerney which BOT meetings the public, including students may attend: BOT Committee meetings (Thursday) and the full Board meeting (Friday), except when a committee or full Board goes into executive session.

Dr. Carson suggested that since the Student President is not allowed to attend the executive session portion of meetings, they do not actually have more access to BOT meetings.

Speaker McNerney would like to formally endorse "Cultural Passport" program. This program is to encourage faculty and staff participation in many College events. There is a self-reporting tab in MyCharleston. More information: http://culturalpassport.cofc.edu/

Two Ad Hoc Committees were collaboratively called: The Committee on The Hearing Process includes John Huddlestun, Claire Curtis, Susan Farrell, Roger Daniel, Carl Wise, Deanna Caveney-Noecker, and Conrad Festa.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Grievance includes Amy Rogers, Jean Everett, Anthony Leclerc, Simon Lewis, Laura Penny, Lynn Cherry.
In spite of bad news of budget cuts, we are fortunate to welcome 23 new faculty colleagues. The Speaker hopes they are adjusting well. The Speaker attended their orientation and welcomed them on behalf of the faculty.

The Speaker spoke of the creation of an "old school" shared governance listserv in association with the AAUP and Senator Bill Manaris. Administration of the listserv will be done by whomever holds the position of Speaker of the Faculty and President of the AAUP in order to foster shared governance.

Faculty Budget Committee has completed a report which will be shared with Senators in advance of next Senate meeting.

No questions.

d. **Quality Enhancement Plan: “Sustainability Literacy as a Bridge to Addressing 21st Century Problems”** ([web link](#))

   Graphic ([pdf](#))
   (Todd LeVasseur, Director QEP)

Dr. LeVasseur gave an update of the hard work of six subcommittees, the leadership team, and over 60 faculty and staff working on the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). Shared the website which holds key definitions guiding the QEP. The definitions relate to shared values.

The graphic design is a brain tree, which pertains more to the environmental piece of sustainability. There are two other pieces to sustainability: social and economic.

You will see the handouts around campus. It is made with 100% renewable energy.

First goal of QEP is enhancing student learning on shared sustainability.

Lots of ways to get involved—mentions talks coming up:

- Faculty Panel on Sept 22 in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115) on the Triple Bottom Line.
- Other topics include sustainability literacy and environmental racism, systems thinking and tipping points, climate change, social issues, LGBTQ+ issues, impact economics, corporate responsibility.
- On Sept 30 in Stern Ballroom, there will be two training sessions (9-12 and 1-4) on how to teach sustainability literacy, led by Bill Throop from Green Mountain College.

There is a QEP Yammer group.

Calls will come out asking for new course proposals this week.

- Year 1: water quality
• Year 2: social justice
• Year 3: food
• Years 4 and 5: [unintelligible]

Other calls to watch for:

• Summer faculty research fellows.
• Exhibit in Addlestone Library (assisted by Joey van Arnhem) highlighting existing strength of faculty/student collaboration.
• By September 25, all QEP subcommittees will finalize a draft for Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning.
• New initiative emerging is a sustainability literacy institute. If approved, look for a call for faculty fellows to administrate this.
• Possible formation of new Faculty Standing Committee on to work with all QEPs to work within timeline for reaffirmation.

No questions.

e. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual
   (Jason Vance, Chair) (pdf)

Two motions were presented at the April meeting that carried over.

Presentation of the proposal presented by Betsy Baker on behalf of Julia Eichelberger, on development of a Committee for Adjunct Oversight. Bylaws and FAM found the proposal to have merit, but returned the proposal to Betsy Baker with some comments concerning qualifications of members and logistics on seating the committee, as well as clarifying the charge of this committee. Will provide a more detailed report to the Senate after the comments are addressed.

Next was discussed the motion proposed by Dan Greenberg to increase the number of times an individual may serve on a committee. The current limit is three years and Dr. Greenberg's proposal would increase this to five. Comments at the Bylaws meeting spoke positively about the benefits of longer service. Bylaws committee members had some reservations about making extended time compulsory. It will also require the Committee on Nominations and Elections to keep track of how long a committee member has served. Other concerns involve possible overlap of committee membership on third year review panels and Tenure & Promotion Committee, potentially having the same person review a candidate at both third year review and tenure review.

Also posed is a question of how would serving for a long time on one committee appear on Tenure and Promotion. Is varied service more valued?

It is also unclear what a 3 year hiatus refers to? Needs further discussion and clarification.
Speaker McNerney reminds us that any Committee and any Senator may submit a proposal to alter the Bylaws. The report given by Bylaws does not take any action, but clarifies language in order to bring the motion before the Senate.

5. **Old Business**

None

6. **New Business**

   a. **Election of Speaker Pro Tempore.** Must be a senator. Will serve as Speaker if speaker unavailable.

   The floor was opened for nominations. Alex Kasman, Senator (at large, SSM) nominates Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy). The vote for Senator Krasnoff to be Speaker Pro Tempore is unanimously positive.

   b. **Motion to Alter the Composition of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President.**

      Change to Bylaws Article V, Section 3, B, 9 [pdf](doc)

      (Alex Kasman)

   The Speaker reminds us that we can take no action on this motion. The motion is introduced to begin a conversation which will guide the Bylaws and FAM Committee.

   **Alex Kasman,** Senator (at large, SSM) stated that there is a Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, which is good for facilitating conversation between the President and the faculty. This proposal grew out of AAUP meeting and seeks to tweak the Faculty Advisory Committee in order to enhance its role in shared governance. The proposal is to set aside six positions of the eleven on the Faculty Advisory Committee for the chairs of six important standing committees. The chairs should be able to name others available to attend meetings if they cannot. There are some negatives, such as asking the Chairs of these standing committees to do more, but in conversations across campus, the benefits outweigh the negatives.

   **Questions/Discussion**

   **Tom Kunkle,** Senator (at large, SSM) asked what is the composition of committee?

   Senator Kasman replied Academic Planning; Budget; Faculty Welfare, Curriculum; Assessment; and Compensation Committees.

   **Iana Anguelova,** Senator (Mathematics) asked for clarification on these 6 Chairs of standing committees are part of the eleven?

   Senator Kasman affirmed.
Senator Anguelova pointed out the negative repercussion that including these 6 as part of the eleven leaves out more faculty involvement.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked if these are the right committees? He agreed that Budget should be included. He wondered about including Curriculum since it's not necessarily a policy making body. Why not Academic Standards and Admissions, especially in light of Provost McGee's visioning of a more active role for that committee. Why Curriculum and not General Education? General Education's recommendations have affected the entire campus.

Motion will move to Bylaws/FAM and Jason Vance, Chair, will bring report or recommendation.

Speaker McNerney asked if we want to continue, there is still quorum.

Senator Krasnoff mentioned that he would be fine in moving the Motion to Include Faculty in Routine Evaluation of President and Provost to the next meeting.

**7. Constituent’s general concerns**

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at large, SSM) spoke in his role as Chair of Nominations and Elections asking for adjunct faculty to serve in vacant at large Senator seat. Please nominate an adjunct or have interested adjuncts contact Tom Kunkle.

Speaker McNerney asked for a moment of silence to recognize two great losses to our collective family, our body. A moment of silence was observed in honor of Conseula Francis and Alison Piepmeier.

Thank you.

**8. Adjournment, 7:09PM**

Respectfully submitted,

Jannette Finch, Faculty Secretary