Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 10 April 2018 and 17 April 2018

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 10 April 2018 at 5:00 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115). The meeting continued on Tuesday 17 April 2018 at 5:00 PM, same location.

1. Call to Order, 5:05 PM
2. Approval of the 13 March 2018 minutes. Richard Nunan suggested corrections, which were accepted by unanimous consent.
3. There were no Announcements and information.

4. Reports
   a. Speaker of the Faculty Elizabeth Jurisich. Speaker Jurisich reminded the Senate that the 2018-2019 Faculty Senate meeting dates have been posted, and so far, no conflicts have been reported. Speaker Jurisich reminded everyone of the Celebration of the Faculty on April 24 in the Stern Center Ballroom. Doors open at 3:15 for refreshments. There will be recognition of significant milestones, including faculty governance recognition. The Speaker reminded committee chairs that their end of year reports are due to Megan Gould.

   Speaker Jurisich spoke of the Presidential search timeline, located http://trustees.cofc.edu/presidential-search/timeline/index.php. She said she expected the earliest the search committee would be presenting a list of choices to the Board of Trustees might be by October. Please contact the Speaker with any questions of concerns, and she will try to answer within the bounds of confidentiality. The Speaker expressed appreciation for those participating in the listening sessions.

   Speaker Jurisich thanked Senators, Committee Chairs and Committee members for their participation in shared governance. She thanked Jannette Finch, Faculty Secretary; Megan Gould, Faculty Secretariat; and George Pothering, Parliamentarian.

   Speaker Jurisich thanked President Glenn McConnell for his service and his heartfelt devotion to the College.

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

   Good afternoon.

   Thank you all for having me here for what is my final address to the Faculty Senate as president of the College of Charleston.

   As I stand before you, I think back to July 1, 2014, when I first walked into my office in Randolph Hall. I remember it being a beautiful sunny day and the beginning of a chapter
of the College’s history that was full of promise. I felt an incredible honor to lead my alma mater as well as an incredible responsibility to do so with great integrity. I knew there were challenges in front of me. Those challenges would not be easy nor would they be insurmountable as well. For example, just 30 minutes into the job, I had the basketball team crisis. Still, there was hope in the air and a belief that better days were to come.

Nearly four years later, I am quite happy with what we have accomplished together. Through the hard work, talent, and dedication of exceptional coworkers like Provost Brian McGee, our deans, our chairs other academic leaders, staff, and, above all, you, my faculty colleagues, we have accomplished a lot. The Provost is a talented leader who deeply loves this institution, and I am grateful for all his efforts to enhance the academic experience at the College and look out for the students’ best interests. He certainly made my job easier and helped me make the right decisions along the way.

In the early days of my presidency, I stated a commitment to academic freedom, a desire to preserve our excellence in undergraduate teaching, and a need to develop academic programs that align with student demand, meet the needs of our community, and ensure our relevance in the higher education landscape in South Carolina and the Southeast.

Since then, many good things have transpired at our beloved university. Our faculty and students have gained national and international recognition, excelling both inside and outside of the classroom; our university has been ranked on many lists in national and international publications highlighting our academic excellence, student focus and special programming; our student-athletes have competed at the highest levels; and our donors have continued to invest in our bright and boundless future.

Drilling down into the details, without trying to be exhaustive, I will speak briefly about accomplishments that we – faculty and administration – have achieved together.

• Together, we secured millions of dollars in recurring monies from the state for our education and general expense account.

• Together, we completed the most successful comprehensive fundraising campaign in our history, creating more scholarship money for our students.

• Together, we created an endowed distinguished professorship in information management and provided support for other institutional advancement achievements, including corporate partnerships with businesses such as Google and Boeing.

• Together, we developed the College of Charleston’s first terminal degree, the Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing, and new degree programs or concentrations in African American studies; meteorology; community planning, policy, and design; data science and analytics; digital media; theatre studies; sustainable urbanism; public policy; hospitality operations management; and South Carolina’s only undergraduate majors in supply chain management and commercial real estate finance.
• Together, we initiated multiple new undergraduate minors, including Portuguese and Brazilian studies, Southern studies, and information management.

• Together, we achieved approval for new graduate certificates in software engineering and information systems.

• Together, we supported significant growth in undergraduate distance-education offerings in both the regular academic year and the summer sessions, with the majority of summer sessions revenue now coming from online course offerings.

• Together, we approved a new Bachelor of General Studies, what is essentially the first entirely online undergraduate program at the College of Charleston.

• Together, we redeveloped the Master of Education in Languages, with the concentration in English as a Second Language to become the first entirely online graduate program at the College of Charleston.

• Together, we instituted school-based fees in the School of Business and the School of Sciences and Mathematics, a new approach to our long-held financial model.

• Together with Trident Technical College, we initiated a new one-semester residential Charleston Bridge Program, which in its first year supported over 200 undergraduate students who intend to transfer to the College of Charleston, thus making the dream of a College of Charleston education even more possible for qualified South Carolinians.

• Together, we approved a two-plus-two agreement with Trident Technical College for the College of Charleston’s primary degree completion initiative, the Bachelor of Professional Studies.

• Together, we created and will launch this month a new Transfer Center to facilitate convenient student transfer to the College of Charleston.

• Together, we secured our ten-year reaffirmation of SACSCOC accreditation, with no recommendations or focused reports.

• Together, we launched our Quality Enhancement Plan on Sustainability Literacy, which is further distinguishing us as a university in South Carolina and in the country.

• Together, we received $2 million from the state to help us buy from the state the DEW Building on Lockwood Blvd at a low price. This property is now CofC WestEdge and houses the offices of Procurement and the Controller as well as the Joseph P. Riley Jr. Center for Livable Communities. This has opened up more space on our historic campus footprint for students.
• Together, we launched the first Collegiate Recovery Program in the state of South Carolina. Five students in the program will graduate in May.

• Together with our support, the Office of Institutional Diversity launched the Crossing the Cistern program, which is a new one-year scholarship and mentor program for rising sophomores and juniors that awards up to $4,000 and helps at-risk students stay on the path to graduation.

• Together, we witnessed and supported the launch of the Race and Social Justice Initiative, which supports community outreach programs that foster dialogue surrounding social inequities. This is made possible by a Google grant and funding from other community partners.

• And together we witnessed the creation of a new office for veterans and military student support.

It is clear that the work we have done together has strengthened our university, particularly our student-focused approached to education.

Some of these accomplishments were not easy and certainly required a lot of effort and hard work from many of us. The majority of these items required a willing partner in the Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees as well as faith that this was indeed the direction in which the College needed to go. Our successes were not given to us. Our successes had to be created – and we were able to do so because we all rolled up our sleeves and worked together toward common goals.

You – our faculty – should be proud of what we together have accomplished in nearly four years. We are truly in a great position as an institution because of your dedication and commitment to our students and our university. The College’s mission, vision and values are well aligned for continued success.

Over the past four years, we have ensured the College has a bigger voice in the state and grown our presence nationally and internationally – all while retaining our student-focused community and commitment to academic excellence.

Through our shared commitment to our core values, the College of Charleston is – without question – among the best public universities in the state of South Carolina, and, I think we can all agree, in the United States.

As long as we continue to remain true to our mission – to provide students a community in which to engage in original inquiry and creative expression in an atmosphere of intellectual freedom – the sky is the limit for what we can achieve. After all, it’s in this community, that we prepare our students to be responsible, character-driven leaders of our global society and graduate the next lineage of a faithful and caring College of Charleston family.
I am proud of the progress we have made in the face of the challenges laid down before us. I believe that together my colleagues in the administration and I have tried to do our best to support this great institution and to put it on a sustainable financial model.

Thank you for all of your efforts and – when it was necessary – your patience with me. I firmly believe you are the best teacher-scholars in the country. You do a great job with the students, and are dedicated to the students. This is a comment we hear out on the road about what distinguishes this university. It is the relationship of faculty and students that is seen in the teaching model here.

It is because of your efforts – and the efforts of our talented staff – that we produce graduates who are ready for career, ready for advanced and graduate studies, and ready to live the life extraordinary.

I will look back fondly at my time as president of the College of Charleston. Our College is on the verge of a new chapter and its future will yield even greater results.

We are a stronger College of Charleston today than when I arrived over three-and-a-half years ago. We have a remarkable collection of faculty, staff, and senior leadership as well as incredibly bright and talented students.

In addition, we also have a proven and successful fundraising operation. We have set the table for the next president, and I hope you share my enthusiasm for the direction in which we are headed.

Let me close by saying it had been my intention to serve out my last year, and probably could have served until the 2020 events, but I had to change my plans. It was time to slow down.

I thank you all and I wish you the very best. I hope the College of Charleston prospers and grows to greater heights. It is a great institution and all of us who went here feel that it opened doors in our lives and gave us an opportunity to do the very best we could do. It is a great school and a great mission and I'm looking forward to watching students in their moment of triumph at Commencement. I always see that as a highlight of the year.

This will be my last address to you. I will be happy to take any questions. The transition will go very smoothly. Steve Osborne and I have begun familiarizing him with all the things that are pending. I have enjoyed working with the Deans and getting to know everybody. I will be supporting the College in the years to come and it's been a great experience. I have enjoyed working with both Speakers.

With that, thank you, Madam Speaker and members of the Faculty Senate, for your time. I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

Speaker Jurisich again thanked President McConnell and he enjoyed a round of applause.
There were no questions.

c. **Provost Brian McGee [Appendix A]**

Provost McGee gave his personal thanks for President McConnell's four years of service. He said he found him to be a warm, caring, and funny person behind a stern demeanor: a person of the utmost integrity. Although they occasionally disagreed, Provost McGee knew there was a principled reason for it. He said President McConnell put principle first, and integrity was his touchstone. Provost McGee said he has been privileged to work with him.

Provost McGee then turned to his presentation slides and spoke of the image there: the Latin Gate inscribed with 1968, the year it was erected. He said it is a great marker of our heritage as a liberal arts and sciences institution.

The Provost provided this year's numbers for tenure, promotion, and third year review, as well as comparative numbers for 2016-2017. He recognized the many hours of work that is spent on this process, from the roster faculty within academic departments, by Chairs, Deans, and by the different committees on Tenure & Promotion, Post-Tenure Review, and Third Year Review.

Provost McGee said reading the files is inspiring, and he is humbled by the quantity and the quality of the work.

Provost McGee spoke of a topic brought up in the March Senate meeting on classroom scheduling. Course scheduling policies have been in effect since October 2006. The course scheduling policy states that no more than 70% of each department's course offerings can be offered at meeting times beginning at 9:00 AM and ending at 3:00 PM. Both conversation sections and express sections must be held after 3:00 PM. The Provost said the reason for the rules were to create equity for faculty teaching loads, and for students who would need to schedule classes outside the prime time hours of 9:00 to 3:00.

Provost McGee provided a slide containing data on classroom scheduling by School [see Appendix A].

In Fall 2015, the Provost office studied classroom assignments which revealed that the College was due for a classroom allocation study.

The Provost expects to return in Fall 2018 with suggestions for classroom re-allocation.

The Provost suggests discussions will be transparent, with focus on the wisdom of the 70/30 rule.

Provost McGee asked unanimous consent to move the last item of business on the agenda, the Resolution on Degree Recipients ahead in the agenda, in case quorum was lost by the end of the evening. That resolution reads:
Resolved: The Faculty Senate approves the list of May 2018 degree candidates for graduation, as certified by the Office of the Registrar, subject to review and determination by the College of Charleston Board of Trustees.

Unanimous consent was granted and the Resolution on Degree Recipients was passed.

Provost McGee spoke of the work done by the ad hoc Committee on Institutional Identity and Vision. He has read their reports and found significant concerns focused in the areas of compensation, clarity of vision, and distance education.

Provost McGee said he has recently endorsed and directed that the College should join the Universities Studying Slavery, a consortium organized under the leadership of the University of Virginia. [http://slavery.virginia.edu/universities-studying-slavery/](http://slavery.virginia.edu/universities-studying-slavery/)

He thanked the faculty who have outlined the benefits of being aligned with the consortium.

Provost McGee reminded the Senate of the Celebration of Faculty, April 24 at 4:00 in Stern Center Ballroom. For those colleagues recognized for their teaching accomplishments this semester, he has presented an apple while they teach class.

He congratulated all faculty nominated for awards.

The Provost accepted questions.

**Irina Gigova, Senator** (at-large, HSS) asked about the success of the Bridge program.

Provost McGee said that about 140 students out of 200 successfully bridged over to become College of Charleston students.

Gigova asked if those students will continue in Fall 2018, and Provost McGee replied that is not known yet for any student.

**Stephen Short,** Senator (at-large, HSS) asked for clarification on if distance education courses were considered part of the 70/30 course allocation rule.

Provost McGee said completely online courses are outside of the classroom scheduling rule since they don't require any classroom space.

**Christine Finnan,** Guest (Teacher Education) asked if both undergraduate and graduate classes were added into the classroom allocation percentages.

Provost McGee said the customary analysis had been to only include Undergraduate, but the most recent numbers include Graduate course sections.

Finnan and McGee suggested that might advantage schools with large graduate sections, but the College still offers many more undergraduate courses than graduate.
d. **Senate Budget Committee** (William Veal, Chair) [Appendix B]

Veal listed the members of the Standing Senate Budget Committee and read the charge of the committee from the website.

Membership duties include reviewing College policies relating to long-range financial planning, budget preparation, the allocation of funds within budget categories, and the recommendation of policy changes. Committee members review projected costs of proposals for new College programs, initiatives, and program termination (brought forth by the Provost). The members inform the Senate, before these proposals are put to a vote, of the Committee’s overall evaluation of their potential budgetary impact. Finally, committee members review each annual College budget. The Chair of the Budget Committee, or a designated representative, attends meetings of the Budget Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Veal explained that most of the work completed this year involved the curriculum system Curriculog. The Budget Committee also met with the Deans, the Executive Vice President for Business Affairs, Paul Patrick, and regularly with Provost Brian McGee, who attends Budget Committee meetings.

Recommendations based on the Committee’s work include:

- the Departments originating curriculum proposals need to articulate more clearly and honestly how the addition of a program or courses will affect student enrollment, faculty allocation, and costs.

  Veal explained this will require more questions in Curriculog that are specific to the budgetary process for minors, certificates, majors, and other programs. The Committee would like to work with the Curriculum Committees and those responsible for Curriculog in the development of the budget-related questions.

- the Committee would like to request and review data from the Provost's office on the current economic state of programs, certificates, minors, majors and degrees and compare with the proposals from four to five years earlier.

  Veal gave the explanation that the proposals state how much they plan to spend for key resources, including faculty resources and library resources, and the proposals state how many students they expect to enroll, but data has not been examined. What programs expected compared to what actually happened will help future programs more accurately prepare.

- Deans in invited conversation with the Budget Committee over the past two years were asked questions such as, what have been the biggest challenges in your school due to ongoing budget issues, what are your plans for outreach in news and existing programs and what are any new plans for budget processes and requests do you have for your school?
Handouts completed by the Deans are included in Appendix B. Veal said it was interesting to see how each school was going through the budgetary process.

- examples shown by Veal included the Office of Academic Experience, which receives unfunded mandates from the president, Board of Trustees, and various vice Presidents, but the office awards no certificates and no degrees.

  The Budget Committee wants to examine how they can better support this Office.

- other examples given by Veal include Schools that have money for faculty lines, but cannot get them approved through Business Affairs. The process can be slow, not transparent, and Deans and faculty would like to know where the process is being held up.

  the Budget Committee would like to examine The Study Abroad program in hopes of gathering funds that don't transfer in with the credited courses students complete at other affiliate schools.

- another item brought up by the Deans is bottom line budgeting, and if there other ways of looking at it.

  the Budget Committee is interested in the faculty/staff turnover monies that have not been resupplied after current budget cuts.

- the Committee also hopes to examine a process for carryover money or a percentage of that money instead of money swept.

Feedback from Paul Patrick indicates that he is open to working with a representative of the budget committee.

The Board of Trustees Budget workshop in May will include discussion of substantial issues related to the College instead of just reporting out of numbers.

The Budget Committee agrees that the process for budget development should be more transparent, which would be helped by the Speaker or a member of the Budget Committee being present and involved in the discussion, instead of just witnessing the process.
Veal revisited the budget crisis starting in 2015-2016 and encouraged Senators to bring the information to their departments. He said massive budget cuts in 2015-2016 of 1.6 million twice in one year due to low enrollment and fewer out of state students. He said many programs were reduced and many staff and instructor lines were frozen. Financial reports on the budget are available http://budgetingandpayroll.cofc.edu/reports/index.php.

Veal showed the transition from 2015-2016 to the current budget and how it affects other factors than enrollment. Unfunded mandates provide a burden.

He said an increase in tuition is quickly used up by unfunded mandates, strategic action items, and mandatory increases in other monies, like insurance.

Veal said the process for developing a budget is ongoing. The Deans submit a request in April, then the Provost submits the budget to the CFO and the President, then at the budget workshop in May with the Board of Trustees, more discussions take place to finalize a budget by June. Veal wished for more transparency in this process, and said the Budget Committee will strive for that in the next year.

Veal accepted questions.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if the Committee would like more transparency from the Board of Trustees.

Veal affirmed that the Budget Committee would like to be more included in the budgeting process.

e. Ad hoc Committee on Institutional Identity and Vision (Irina Gigova and Jen Wright, Committee members) [Appendix C]

Gigova recapped the purpose of the Committee and explained the three-step process of gathering College Community feedback: designing the survey, holding listening sessions, and releasing a second survey in March with content informed from listening session minutes.

Wright gave an explanation of some of the data gathered. All data is provided in Appendix C. Wright pointed out areas faculty and staff strongly agreed on and strongly disagreed on.

Wright mentioned consensus on creating a healthy environment included the need for more direct communication, more transparency, more autonomy in making decisions regarding institutional matters, and more collaborative culture. Other desired improvements are more opportunities to engage outside of our divisions, more common space for interaction, and more involvement for both staff and faculty.

Disagreements were in the areas of shared governance, and if Yammer has improved our ability to communicate.
For improved morale, considerations of salary and benefits was high, job status, our voice in decision-making, and good relationships among employees.

Email is still where we get most of our information.

Answers to questions addressing what kind of programs we should be offering and what kinds of students we should be targeting were not surprising.

Most survey respondents think we are the right size.

Many respondents indicated strengths as experiential learning, and the teacher-scholar model.

Wright said plans for 2018-2019 include conducting a deeper analysis of the data to expand on campus dialogues, examining differences in faculty and staff, and younger and older faculty, and conversations about our identify and visions for the future.

There were no questions.

5. Old Business
   a. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
      (Richard Nunan, Chair)
      Motions 1, 2, 3 were approved by Faculty Senate at the March 13 2018 Faculty Senate meeting. Motion 4 was discussed. Cover Memo for the seven motion proposals [Appendix D]
         i. Motion 4: By-Laws Article V, Section 3
         ii. Motion 5: Language clarification (Motions 4, 5 are included in By-Laws Committee proposed modifications to FAM Hearing language-[Appendix D]
         iii. Motion 6: Modify FAM language, PTR Post Tenure Review revisions from PTR-[Appendix D]
         iv. Motion 7: New FAM language, PTR_PTR Superior Rating standard language-Appendix D

      The discussion on Motion 4 begun in the March 13 Faculty Senate meeting continued. There was an amendment on the floor to delete the second occurrence of the word "randomly."

      Speaker Jurisich asked if there was further discussion of randomly.

      The proposed amendment to change randomly was withdrawn.

      Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) presented an amendment to limit the Hearing Committee to two panels, which would alternate in hearing cases as they come up in the year.

      The text of that proposed amendment is below.
Amendment 04/10 from Senator Tom Kunkle (seconded and approved by the Senate)

(Blue strike-throughs and Green text are proposed amendments to Motion 4 from the By-Laws committee.)

12. Faculty Hearing Committee

a. Composition: Twelve Eleven (11) tenured faculty members, at least six four of whom shall hold the rank of Professor. Each September the committee Chair will divide the Hearing Committee pool into two panels of six members each, including at least three at the rank of professor, with one of those three designated as a panel alternate. Panels are to be constructed with an eye to broad disciplinary distribution, and submitted by the Chair to the Committee as a whole for majority approval. Each panel will determine its own chair at that time. If a case emerges over the course of the academic year, one of the panels will be assigned randomly to that first case, and the remaining panel to any second case. Any additional cases will be heard by new the panels in alternating fashion, randomly constituted out of the committee pool, minus any members obliged to recuse themselves for conflicts of interest. The position of panel alternate will rotate among the three professors on each panel. In the event of conflicts of interest emerging in the first two panels as initially constituted, members will be swapped as needed, by the Committee Chair, subject to majority approval by the Committee as a whole. Five members will be randomly among those with no conflict of interest, including two members with the rank of Professor. In the event of a second hearing in a given academic year a second committee of five will be constituted. Members of the first committee may elect to not be considered for service in the second Hearing. Each iteration of a group to hear a case will consist of five members, two of whom must have the rank of Professor. Two years of service is encouraged.

2nd Kunkle Amendment to Motion 4

Each Hearing Committee member will normally serve two three consecutive academic years.

Speaker Jurisich asked for further discussion of the amendment to motion 4.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) said that there was no need for rotating alternates to the panels. Caveny-Noecker said there are twelve people constituting two panels of six, and one of three panel members who are professors will be considered an alternate, in case any panel member must recuse themselves.

Caveny-Noecker and Nunan discussed the need for a second alternate in more than one case.
Kunkle clarified that the alternate would attend all the hearings but would not attend deliberation.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) supported having a different alternate for extra cases.

**Speaker Jurisich** called for the vote in favor of the Kunkle amendment. The amendment passed.

Discussion on Motion 4 concerning the structure of the Hearing Committee continued.

Nunan reminded the Faculty Senate that the change if passed would require a change to the By-Laws that would have to be approved by all faculty.

Nunan pointed out other discussion items, such as the proposal from the ad hoc committee on Hearings to extend service to three year periods. Language referring to one-year periods of service would have to be altered to reflect the three year suggestion.

Tom Kunkle suggested an amendment changing three consecutive years of service on the Hearing Committee to two years.

There was no discussion. Speaker Jurisich called for a vote on the proposed amendment. There was unanimous positive vote for the amendment.

Nunan explained the next item for discussion was how many days were awarded to all parties.

There was no more discussion.

Speaker Jurisich asked for a vote on Motion 4, which addressed the structure of the hearing committee and the number of faculty on the hearing committee.

Motion 4 passed.

Motions 3 and 4 will require full faculty vote. The link to those motions is: [http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2017-2018/apr-2018/By-Laws_Motions_3and4_for_Faculty_Vote.pdf](http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2017-2018/apr-2018/By-Laws_Motions_3and4_for_Faculty_Vote.pdf)

Nunan introduced Motion 5, and spoke of the sections that regarded Hearing Committee procedures, which do not require full faculty vote.

The first part, as explained by Nunan, involve the rights of faculty and adjuncts to grieve the circumstances of their grievance.

Nunan said that AAUP guidelines and specific laws dictate that if CofC wishes to terminate someone in the first two years, they should receive an explanation of why.

Nunan said termination reasons that violate academic freedom or are discriminatory, or if there are procedural violations are all problems.
Nunan said that suggested language changes provide Junior faculty, instructors, and adjunct faculty with the right to challenge their termination, if they disagree with the stated reasons for dismissal.

**Mark Del Mastro, Senator** (Hispanic Studies) asked about "inadequate consideration" and asked if this was defined anywhere.

Nunan said that failure to go through proper procedures to terminate someone is the likely interpretation. He said the By-Laws Committee left the language in the motion because it appears elsewhere.

**Provost McGee** said it involves whether or not the terms of the contract are being honored appropriately. He said the process of examining legal terms in the language of By-Laws and the FAM might encourage a separate legal review.

Speaker Jurisich asked for discussion on the first part of Motion 5.

Provost McGee said that some parts of the Faculty Administration Manual were drafted as early as 1982-1985, before Senior Instructor and Instructor ranks were created and added to the FAM.

McGee urged Senators to employ caution in adding to the work burdens of Chairs.

Nunan explained the next part of Motion 5, which involved how many working days were allowed for the grievance process. The By-Laws committee wished to afford the grievant time for due process, instead of adhering to a time frame that emphasizes efficiency for the institution. The Committee wants to maintain 20-day windows of working business days instead of the 15 days suggested by the ad hoc committee on Hearings.

**Irina Gigova, Senator** (at-large, HSS) asked about the approximately 93 days allowed for preparation for the Hearing process and suggested the costs increase for the grievant. She asked about extending the process versus shortening the process.

Nunan responded with different Hearing Committee scenarios and examples.

Gigova asked why the President had eleven working days rather than ten to respond and pointed out that in one place, the President has ten days, in another, it is listed as two weeks.

Nunan suggested that By-Laws will change two weeks to a specific number of days when possible, in order to be more precise, and will strive for consistency.

Provost McGee said because of timing in the spring semester, everyone involved wants that process to conclude in a timely manner and everyone wants more time for the grievant to prepare, and whatever timeframe is decided will be imperfect.

Gigova made a motion to change references to eleven working days or two weeks to ten working days. That motion was seconded.
Gigova Amendment to Motion 5 (p. 125 of current FAM)

13. President’s Decision

The President shall make a final determination within two weeks, ten working days after she/he receives recommendations from all of the following: the department evaluation panel, the appropriate Dean, the Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Provost.

There was no further discussion about timing.

The next section of Motion 5 under discussion involved the authority of the Hearing Committee to make decisions about conflicts of interest.

The Speaker asked for discussion.

There was none.

The next section of Motion 5 involved small modifications of language that dealt with the alternate on the Hearing Committee.

There was no discussion.

Speaker Jurisich called for a vote on Motion 5. Motion 5 passed.

Motion 6 was introduced.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker explained when the streamlined post-tenure review was put into place, and the differences in satisfactory and superior reviews for Chairs.

Mark Del Mastro, Senator (Hispanic Studies) noted a natural conflict when the Chair of a department come up for superior rating, and is reviewed by a panel of colleagues, who the Chair is responsible for evaluating. Del Mastro asked if there had been discussion about that dynamic. Del Mastro found it problematic to put colleagues in that situation.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker said the same thing happens when a department chair comes up for promotion to professor. She said she sees this as a natural by-product of faculty self-governance and peer evaluation. She said there are alternatives, such as having a panel for the School. That would remove the autonomy of voice within that Chair's department.

There was no further discussion of the motion. The Speaker called for the vote. Motion 6 passed.

Motion 7 was introduced.

Nunan said the motion involved language on how to apply standards for post-tenure review that is more flexible.
There was no discussion.

Speaker Jurisich called for the vote. Motion 7 passed.

_A motion was heard and seconded to continue the April 10, 2018 faculty Senate meeting on the next meeting date of April 17, 2018. That motion passed._

_The April 10 meeting concluded at 7:30 PM._

_The continuation of April 10 meeting was called to order on April 17, 2018 at 5:05PM._

6. **New Business**

   a. **Committee on Nominations and Elections**
      (Tom Kunkle, Chair)
      
      i. Election of 2018-2019 Senate Committees

      The slates for committees were accepted as shown on the projector with no additional nominations. The vote was unanimous accepting the 2018-2019 Senate Committees

      ii. Call for nominations, Committee on Nominations and Elections

There were no additional nominations.

Speaker Jurisich closed the nominations for Committee on Nominations and Elections. Election for this committee will take place by electronic ballot in MyCharleston.

   b. **Committee on General Education** (Lisa Covert, Chair)

      i. For approval for the Gen Ed Social Sciences requirement:

      - **ANTH 203** (pdf)

      - **HONS 169** (pdf)

_**Richard Nunan, Senator**_ (at-large, HSS) asked if these courses existed yet.

_**Christine Finnan, Guest**_ replied in her role as Anthropology professor that ANTH 203 had existed as a Special Topics courses, but it had not yet been approved by the Senate.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) suggested approving the courses for inclusion in General Education, contingent upon Faculty Senate approval later in the meeting.

      ii. For approval for the Gen Ed Humanities requirement:

      - **RELS 103** (pdf)

      - **RELS 223** (pdf)
• RELS 276 (pdf)

All curriculum proposals were passed.

c. Committee on Graduate Education (Christine Finnan, Chair)
   i. Communications program change Communications program change (pdf)

   Deactivate course COMM 500 Introduction to Graduate Studies in Communication, (pdf)

   COMM 502 Qualitative Research Methods, (pdf)

   COMM 681 Classical Rhetorical Theory, (pdf)

   COMM 682 Modern and Contemporary Rhetorical Theory(pdf)

   Course change COMM 501 Research Methods in Communication (pdf)

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about the master’s program mode of delivery as completely online.

Amanda Ruth-McSwain, Guest (Director of Communication Graduate Studies) said that her department had been working on the program revision for three years, and had robust conversation within the department about what the online mode of delivery meant for the degree and the degree experience. In researching aspirational peers and other departments of Communication, most programs offer online degrees in order to reach the professional audience that is the primary student target as professed by the mission of the College of Charleston Communication graduate program. Ruth-McSwain said the current curriculum, expectations, and student learning outcomes will be maintained, just the mode of delivery is changing.

Nunan asked what other programs are offering this type of model.

Ruth-McSwain said Purdue, Northwestern, University of Florida, quite a few R1 institutions, Georgia, Central Florida, and several others. She said College of Charleston would be one of the first to offer the masters online in the state of South Carolina, which they hope will be an advantage.

Iana Anguelova, Senator (at-large, SSM) said she thought Communication is uniquely suited for an online degree.

Ruth-McSwain agreed that best practices in digital communication is part of what they teach.
Christine Finnan, Chair of the Committee on Graduate Education, said the Committee was impressed with the rigor that stays within the courses and program.

The Speaker called for a vote. All Communication curriculum passed.

ii. Early Childhood program change  Early Childhood program change (pdf)

Christine Finnan mentioned an error in the agenda. EDEE 542 was incorrectly listed in cross-listed courses, and it should be within new courses.

Speaker Jurisich said the listing is correct within Curriculog.

- Early Childhood new courses

  EDEE 542: Early Childhood Mathematics Content & Instruction, (pdf)
  TEDU 535. Creating Welcoming Learning Environments for Students and Families, (pdf)
  TEDU 537. Teaching Early Childhood & Elementary Social Studies & Science (pdf)

  iii. Early Childhood electives  Early Childhood electives (pdf)

  iv. Early Childhood renumbering and cross-listing

  EDEE 520: Methods and Materials in Early Childhood Education. Field Ex. 2, (pdf)
  EDEE 529: Advanced Instructional Strategies for Emergent Literacies PK-3, (pdf)
  EDEE 538: Advanced Teaching Writing. Design. Children's Literature..., (pdf)
  EDEE 588: Advanced C, I & Literacies Assess. PK-3(pdf)

  v. Elementary renumbering and cross-listing

  EDEE 503: Creativity and the Fine Arts, (pdf)
  EDEE 507: Creating Effective Learning Communities (pdf)
  EDEE 509: Teaching Diverse Learners (pdf)
EDEE 525: Advanced Foundations of Language and Literacies Development, (pdf)

EDEE 535: Theories and Strategies for Developing Literacies, (pdf)

EDEE 545: Advanced Teaching Writing..., (pdf)

EDEE 568 Science for the Elementary School Teacher, (pdf)

EDEE 590: Field Experience: C&I (2-6), (pdf)


vi. Elementary program change Elementary program change (pdf)

vii. Elementary electives Elementary electives (pdf)

All Education courses were approved.

viii. English program change English program change(pdf)

ix. Historic Preservation new course and course change

HSPV 840 Digital Tools for Historic Preservation, (pdf)

HSPV 893 Independent Study in Historic Preservation (pdf)

x. Middle Grades Education electives Middle Grades Education electives (pdf)

xi. Public Administration course number changes PUBA 511. Urban Policy, (pdf)

PUBA 513. Planning Law, (pdf)

PUBA 516. Local and Regional Economic Development, (pdf)

PUBA 517. Urban Transportation, (pdf)

PUBA 520. Local Government Politics and Administration, (pdf)
PUBA 522. Intergovernmental Relations, (pdf)
PUBA 530. Natural Resources Law and Policy, (pdf)
PUBA 531. Administrative Law, (pdf)
PUBA 534. Environmental Law and Regulatory Policy, (pdf)
PUBA 535. Land Use Law, (pdf)
PUBA 537. Wetlands Policy, (pdf)
PUBA 540. Leadership and Decision Making, (pdf)
PUBA 550. Essential Elements of Nonprofit Administration, (pdf)
PUBA 551. Research & Management in Environmental Orgs., (pdf)
PUBA 554. Human Resource Management for Non-Profit Orgs., (pdf)
PUBA 555. Nonprofit Capacity Building, (pdf)
PUBA 556. Fundraising & Marketing for Nonprofits, (pdf)
PUBA 557. Managing Public/Private Partnerships, (pdf)
PUBA 560. Contemporary Perspectives on Arts Management, (pdf)
PUBA 561. Advanced Arts Management, (pdf)
PUBA 563. Arts and Technology, (pdf)
PUBA 564. Arts Education, (pdf)

x. Special Education renumbering and cross-listing

EDFS 501: Introduction to Exceptional Children and Youth, (pdf)
EDFS 505: Field I: Assessing & Instructing Students with Disabilities, (pdf)
EDFS 510: Characteristics of Individuals with Mental Disabilities, (pdf)
EDFS 512: Educational Procedures for Individuals with Emotional Disabilities, (pdf)
EDFS 513: Field II: Assessment & Instruction of Students with Disabilities, (pdf)
EDFS 520: Characteristics of Students with Learning Disabilities, (pdf)
EDFS 522. Educational Procedures for Individuals with Mental Disabilities, (pdf)
EDFS 525. Literacy Development & Intervention for Students with Disabilities, (pdf)
EDFS 528. Educational Procedures for Students with Learning Disabilities, (pdf)
EDFS 530. Characteristics of Individuals with Emotional Disabilities, (pdf)
EDFS 537. Educational Assessment of Students with Disabilities, (pdf)
EDFS 550. Classroom and Behavior Management(pdf)

xi. Special Education electives Special Education electives (pdf)

Speaker Jurisich asked for a vote on curriculum items as a block, unless there was objection.
There was no objection.
All Graduate Education curriculum items were passed.
All Graduate Curriculum items passed.

d. Curriculum Committee (Chad Galuska and Gayle Goudy, Co-Chairs)

   i. Anthropology: Create a new HONS course (HONS 169: Language and Culture) (pdf) and add it to the ANTH B.S. degree requirements (ANTH-BS) as an alternative to ANTH 205. (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

iii. Computer Science:

- Prerequisite changes to CITA 280, 395, and 495. (pdf) (pdf) (pdf)
- Create a new concentration (Computing in the Arts, Game Development and Interaction, B.A.). (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

iv. English:

- Create a new course (ENGL 498: Eportfolio Workshop). (pdf)
- Create a new minor in Writing, Rhetoric, and Publication (ENGL-WRIT). (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

v. Honors: Complete restructuring of the HONS Program. (pdf)

An overview of the Honors proposal was provided by Trisha Folds-Bennett, Dean of the Honors College and projected during the Senate meeting. It is included in Appendix E below.

Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked if there would be opportunities for team taught courses in the proposed curriculum.

Trisha Folds-Bennett, Guest (Dean of Honors College) said the Honors program would continue to support those courses.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) thanked Dean Folds-Bennett for providing the overview [seen in Appendix E], as it explained the program changes more clearly than the pdf provided in the agenda. Krasnoff said Philosophy supports the proposal, as courses must contain the central question of foundational texts or sources. Krasnoff suggested moving two courses, HONS 169 and HONS 180, from the Exploring Complexity and Diversity section to the Foundations of Knowledge and Methods of Inquiry section.

An amendment to move the courses suggested was proposed and seconded.
**Mark Del Mastro, Senator** (Hispanic Studies) asked if the Dean of Honors agreed with the proposal.

Dean Folds-Bennett said it made sense at this time to include the courses in the Foundations section even though that may change over time.

**Iana Anguelova, Senator** (at-large, SSM) asked how could Business Ethics be considered part of Foundations of Knowledge and Methods of Inquiry?

Larry Krasnoff said thinking about ethics in business is foundational.

Anguelova said it is true there is no discipline for business statistics, but there is a discipline for statistics, and a method of inquiry that is associated with statistical methods of inquiry.

**Julia Eichelberger, Senator** (at-large, HSS) asked about the interdisciplinary nature of the courses in the Complexity and Diversity section and asked why HONS 180 needed to be removed from the Complexity and Diversity section.

Krasnoff said HONS 180 was not interdisciplinary enough to remain on the Complexity and Diversity section.

**Richard Nunan, Senator** (at-large, HSS) added that HONS 180 along with Business Law had traditionally been used for students who are on an Honors Business track.

Folds-Bennett said that had been the case in the past.

**Wesley Burnett, Guest** (School of Business) said they now advise more on a case-by-case basis.

Nunan spoke of linked courses that are sequences for students and said the list of courses serves as a useful advisory tool.

Folds-Bennett said they wished to offer students as much flexibility as possible.

The motion to move HONS 169 and HONS 180 to the Foundations section was approved.

Speaker Jurisich asked for other discussion points on the Honors proposal.

Richard Nunan asked for clarification on the senior seminar and asked if there would be any students to take the course.

Folds-Bennett said this is not a required category, and they will be working on developing more one and two credit courses for the category.

The Honors Curriculum changes passed.

---

vi. **International Studies:**
• Create a new special topics course (INTL 291: Special Topics in International Studies) (pdf) and add it to the INTL-BA major. (pdf)

• Add numerous courses to the INST-Minor. (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

vii. Linguistics: Add four existing courses (EDEE 325, TEDU 325, SPAN 449, SPAN 450) to the options within the interdisciplinary LING-Minor. (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

viii. Mathematics:

• Terminate the BA-MATH (pdf)

• Terminate two concentrations: Applied Mathematics Track (BS-MATH-MAPP) (pdf) and Pure Mathematics Track (BS-MATH-MPUR). (pdf)

• Add a new concentration within the BS degree: Mathematics Track (BS-MATH-MATT). (pdf)

• Modify two concentrations within the BS degree: Statistics Track (BS-MATH-STAT) (pdf) and Teacher Education Track (BS-MATH-EDMT). (pdf)

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked about the uses of the word track and concentration and if they are two different things?

Mary Bergstrom, Guest (Registrar) said that concentration, cognate, and track describe 18 hours or more. For the Registrar, the terms fall into the same bucket.

Bob Mignone, Guest (Chair, Mathematics) said he considered track and concentration as the same.

Provost McGee said the terms mean different things on other campuses and use of the terms has consequences for regulators, including CHE and SACSCOC. In the future, Provost McGee supports the Senate examining the definition and use of the terms.
Iana Anguelova, Senator (at-large, SSM) pointed out examples where the terms concentration and track are used interchangeably.

Math Curriculum proposals passed.

ix. Neuroscience: A number of changes are being proposed to the Neuroscience Minor, including changes to make prerequisites more explicit, changes to electives, and the addition of more options for students to complete the research requirements (NSCI-Minor). (pdf)

Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large, HSS) expressed concerns about "double-counting" and about the size of the minor at 30-36 credit hours. She said in terms of size and structure, neuroscience resembled an interdisciplinary major more than a minor.

Jeff Triblehorn, Guest (Director, Neuroscience minor) said that additional classes are not being added to the minor. The number looks large, because the pre-requisites are listed in order to make it more explicit. The number of credits is not actually increased, but remain the same, or are actually decreasing. The revisions in the minor make it easier for students in a number of ways: the research options now include a bachelors essay option for those student not able to research in a lab; some courses count towards GenEd requirements; more courses count towards GenEd, from disciplines outside of Biology or Psychology. Triblehorn explained that a rule prohibiting double-counting more than one course for the major or for the neuroscience minor. They have removed the double-counting restrictions to allow students to double-count additional classes. Triblehorn described the research component, as students are introduced to conducting hands-on research, asking experimental questions, writing scientifically, giving presentations, designing experiments, all giving students some exposure to neuroscience research.

Larry Krasnoff asked how many neuroscience minors have there been and how many of those are Biology or Psychology majors?

Triblehorn replied between 50 and 70 and about evenly split between Biology and Psychology.

Richard Nunan spoke in favor of the more flexible minor, but spoke of the larger issue threatening liberal arts education.

Provost McGee said the catalog does not reflect recent definitions of what constitutes majors or minors and encouraged the Senate in the next academic year to examine the definitions, with the help of the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid.

Beatriz Maldonado Bird, Senator (at-large, LCWA) asked how many total classes do the students take that are affected by the double-counting rule?

Triblehorn said Psychology, 3, and Biology, 5. He said that input from many departments and faculty supported eliminating the double-counting role.

There was discussion of numbers of classes and double-counting.
Irina Gigova asked if there was discussion about reducing the minor.

Triblehorn said no, everyone is happy with the minor and with the success of students completing the minor.

**Tom Kunkle, Senator** (at-large, SSM) pointed out that the neuroscience minors used as an example by Gigova did not list the pre-requisites, so the comparison is not accurate. Kunkle spoke in favor of the minor, and did not think large science majors and minors are sucking the life out of liberal arts and sciences.

Changes to the Neuroscience minor passed.

x. **Professional Studies: Revise the core of the major** ([PRST program change](#)). ([pdf](#))

- Most existing core courses will be deactivated (PRST 220, 300, 301, 303, 400). ([pdf](#)) ([pdf](#)) ([pdf](#)) ([pdf](#)) ([pdf](#))
- New courses are being created to take their place:
  - PRST 310: Leading Oneself and Others in the 21st Century ([pdf](#))
  - PRST 311: Critical Thinking, Use of Research and Decision Making in the 21st Century ([pdf](#))
  - PRST 312: Creativity and Innovation in the 21st Century ([pdf](#))
  - PRST 313: Global Society in the 21st Century ([pdf](#))
  - PRST 314: Ethics, Social Responsibility and Sustainability in the 21st Century ([pdf](#))
  - PRST 315: 21st Century Life and Work Skills ([pdf](#))
  - PRST 410: BPS Capstone ([pdf](#))

Susan Kattwinkel, Senator (Theatre) asked when the program was first offered?

Godfrey Gibbison, Guest (Dean, School of Professional Studies) said the program was designed in 2011-2012, and the first class was offered in Fall 2013, so the program is approaching the fifth year.
Larry Krasnoff asked for an example comparing an old course with a revised course.

Gibbison used the example of Global Issues in the 21st century. The original course was conceived of how countries relate to each other, but there was not much about how the global economy functions. Student are now expected to understand that the fundamental economic arrangement of the 21st century is globalizations, and that capital, goods and services, move globally, and students are part of the global system.

Much of their lives are driven by forces that are not local, even though their understanding is primarily local. Gibbison said students are expected to shift their thinking to understand the global dynamics.

Krasnoff pointed out that the different emphasis in curriculum also allows for interdisciplinary interpretation, opening up teaching duties across departments.

Gibbison agreed that was a consideration.

The Professional Studies revisions passed.

xi. Psychology: Create two new courses and add them as electives to the B.S., B.A., and minor.

- PSYC 312: Adverse Child Experiences (pdf)
- PSYC 435: Advanced Topics in Positive Psychology (pdf)
- BS-PSYC, BA-PSYC, PSYC-Minor (pdf) (pdf)

xii. Religious Studies:

Create three new courses:

- RELS 103: Death and the Afterlife (pdf)
- RELS 247: The Daoist Tradition (pdf)
- RELS 253: Religions of Charleston (pdf)

- Add these new courses and RELS 223 (Religions of the Ancient Near East) to the RELS-Minor. (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

xiii. Southern Studies: Add ARTH 396 as an elective in the SOST-Minor and provide flexibility to allow the program to use exemption management to include other kinds of electives (FYSE, independent study, tutorials) on a case-by-case basis. (pdf)
Curriculum approved with no discussion.

xiv. Studio Art: Create a new course (ARTS 318: Themes and Practice) (pdf) and add it to the major requirements (BA-ARTS). (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

xv. Supply Chain and Information Management: Create a new course (INFM 340: Innovation Technology). (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

xvi. Teacher Education:

- Renumber the following EDFS courses to facilitate cross-listing with graduate courses: EDFS 401 (pdf) (from 345), 410 (pdf) (from 353), 420 (pdf) (from 352), 430 (pdf) (from 351), 450 (pdf) (from 330).

- Cross-list with graduate courses, but not renumber, the following courses: 412 (pdf), 413 (pdf), 422 (pdf), 425 (pdf), 437 (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

Provost McGee said the work involved in curricular matters is significant and he appreciates all who work on curriculum matters, the various committees, Academic Affairs, the Registrar's office, and the work is at the very core of what we do as faculty. Provost McGee reminded faculty to make use of the Barnes and Noble campus bookstore, who we have a contract to work with. Proceeds from that campus bookstore feed back into student scholarships. If anyone has concerns about Barnes and Noble, please bring them to the Provost's attention, but please don't push students away from working with the bookstore.

Godfrey Gibbison urged faculty to take time to examine the rapid changes occurring in higher education. He suggested putting together a task force in the next academic year to examine how higher education is changing in the United States and to examine how the College of Charleston could respond to those changes. He said there are probably procedures in place left over “from when mules took messages to Columbia.” When the new president is hired, we can suggest proposals based on research into the changing nature of the higher education landscape.

8. Adjournment, 6:20 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Jannette Finch  
Faculty Secretary  
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Provost’s Report
Major Topics
April 10, 2018

- Latin Gate
- Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review
- Classroom Scheduling
- Resolution on Degree Recipients
- Comments on Today’s Senate Agenda
Provost’s Report

Faculty Senate
April 10, 2018
### Tenure, Promotion, Third-Year Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Category</th>
<th>2017-18 Cases</th>
<th>2017-18 Successful cases</th>
<th>2016-17 Cases</th>
<th>2016-17 Successful cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure or promotion to Librarian III</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Professor or Librarian IV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Instructor promotion or renewal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-Year Review</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Tenure Review (superior cases only)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (including third-year and superior post-tenure review cases)</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classroom Scheduling

- Scheduled for April and May Discussion in Academic Council
- Current Course Scheduling Policy, Effective Oct. 2006:

Course Scheduling Policies
- No more than 70% of each department’s course offerings can be offered at meeting times beginning between 9:00am and 3:00pm.
- Departments must adhere to Approved Meeting Pattern Times.
- All Conversation Sections must be offered outside of prime-time meeting times (either before 9:00am or after 3:00pm).
- All Express sections must begin after 3:00pm.
Classroom Scheduling

- For Fall 2018, LCWA, SB, EHHP, SSM below 72% “Prime Time” Utilization
- For Fall 2018, HSS and SOTA above 72%
- Over 380 Sections Required Classroom Scheduling Assistance for Fall 2018
- Equity Issues for Faculty and Students
- Nov. 2015 Classroom Assignment Study Suggested Need for First Classroom Reallocation Since 2005
- Discussion of 70/30 Rule Will Include Classroom Reallocation
Resolution on Degree Recipients

Resolved: The Faculty Senate approves the list of May 2018 degree candidates for graduation, as certified by the Office of the Registrar, subject to review and determination by the College of Charleston Board of Trustees.
Comments

- Institutional Identity and Vision
  - Compensation
  - Clarity of Vision
  - Distance Education
- Universities Studying Slavery
- Celebration of Faculty, April 24 at 4:00 p.m., Stern Center Ballroom
Senate Budget Committee Report
Members

- William Veal, Chair
- Irina Gigova
- Todd McNemey
- Scott Harris
- Julia Eichelberger
- Pam Riggs-Gelasco
- Jeff Yost
What is our Charge?

- To review College policies relating to long-range financial planning, budget preparation and the allocation of funds within budget categories, and to recommend policy changes. To review in particular the projected costs of proposals for new College programs and initiatives, and to inform the Senate, before these proposals are put to a vote, of the Committee’s evaluation of their potential budgetary impact...To review each annual College budget...
What have we done this year?

- Curriculog
- Met with Deans
- Met with Executive Vice President for Business Affairs, Paul Patrick,
- Met regularly with Provost, Brian McGee
Recommendations

- **Curriculog** - The Departments of origin and the Curriculum Committee need to articulate more clearly and honestly how the addition of a program or courses will impact student enrollment, faculty allocation, and costs.

- **Future Budget Committees** - Request and review data from Provost’s office about the current economical state of new programs, certificates, minors, majors, and degrees. Compare these to the proposals from 4-5 years earlier.
Deans’ Presentations

- Evolved from an open Budget Discussion to a presentation
- We need to keep these going
- Handouts are attached to committee minutes
- Positive participation
Results of Discussions with Deans

- Office of Academic Experience - This entity receives unfunded mandates from the President, Board of Trustees, and various Vice Presidents.
- Various Schools have money for lines but cannot get them approved through the Business Affairs office.
- Study Abroad using affiliated programs is “leaving money on the table” and must be collected.
- Why do we use Bottom Line Budgeting?
- Faculty/Staff turnover is in need of a resupply.
- Can we establish a method for carrying over money not spent each year, or at least a percentage?
Meeting with Paul Patrick

- Open to having faculty representative in the budget development process.
- Budget workshop should include a discussion about re-evaluating priorities.
- The process for budget development should be more transparent.
- He supports flexibility with Ledger 3 “carry-forward”
How did the Budget “crisis” begin?

2015-16 Budget/fiscal Year

- Massive cuts due to low enrollment and fewer out of state students
  - $1.05 mil in the Fall 2015
  - $0.632 mil in the Spring 2016

- Many programs were reduced
- Staff and instructor lines were frozen.

- [http://budgetingandpayroll.cofc.edu/reports/index.php](http://budgetingandpayroll.cofc.edu/reports/index.php)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016-2017 ($ millions)</th>
<th>2017-18 ($ millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB and SSM Fees</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition (3.5 % &amp; 2.75%, 2.08%)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandated New Spending</strong></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25% pay increase</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Dental Ins.</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflationary</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Action Items</strong></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Cuts</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional Budget Cuts</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process is Ongoing

- Deans’ requests to Provost in April
- Provost submits budget to CFO and President
- Budget Workshop with BoT in May
- Discussions that may lead to changes in budget
- BoT meets to vote in June
Mission Statement: The Office for the Academic Experience provides students with educationally purposeful opportunities that lead to deep learning, integrated social and intellectual development, and engagement with local and global communities.

Goals: 1) To promote student engagement in transformative learning experiences both in and out of the classroom. 2) To assure student success by challenging all students to overcome obstacles in order to do their best work.

AEX Departments and Staffing (8 departments; 59 staff; 400+ student employees)

Academic Experience (Lynne Ford, AVP; 1 FT program coordinator)
- Convocation
- The College Reads!
- Founding Documents Requirement
- General Education Curriculum and Assessment (Faculty Coordinator, Gia Quesada)

Academic Advising and Planning Center (Karen Hauschild, Director; 12 FT Advisors, 1 FTT, 2 PTT)

Center for Academic Performance and Persistence (Michelle Futrell, Director; 2 FT Staff; 1 PTT)
- Provisional Students, IMPACT Scholars (Celia Dennison, Director; 2 FTT vacant)

Center for Excellence in Peer Education (Page Keller, Director; Jennifer Bradley, Asst. Director)

Center for Student Learning (Lindy Colman, Director; 5 FT Staff, 4 Lab Directors)

First Year Experience (Sarah Owens, Director; Liza Wood, Asst. Director)

New Student Programs (Mindy Miley, Asst. VP for First Year and Bridge Student Services)
- Orientation (Stephanie Auwaerter, Director; 1 FT Staff)
- Charleston Bridge (Mindy Miley, Director)
- First Year International and Experiential Programs (Director, Bruce Fleming)
  - iCharleston (3 FTT Site Directors for London, Kelowna, Dublin)
  - HSS Scholars

REACH (Edie Cusack, Director; 4 FT Staff, 2 FTT Staff, 1 FTT Admin)

Veteran & Military Student Services (Jessica McMahan, Director—FTT)

Annually AEX employs over 400 students as peer educators providing students with training, supervision and professional development, and financial support.

- Peer educator roles include Summer Orientation interns, FYE Peer Facilitators and Team Leaders, Honors BGS Peer Facilitators, iCharleston Peer Mentors, Peer Academic Coaches (PACS), EDLS Peer Leaders, CSL lab consultants and tutors, Supplemental Instructors and SI leaders, REACH tutors, REACH fitness mentors, REACH social mentors, and REACH job (internship) coaches. In 2017-18, we added Peer Advisors in AAPC.
- Serving as a Peer Educator is a high impact learning practice. National research confirms the efficacy of being mentored to retention, academic performance, graduation and career success.
- The Peer Educator pay scale ranges from $8.50 (first-time summer orientation interns) to $11.00 (SI Leaders).
New Program Areas

- Charleston Bridge (fall only, 200 students, residential, collaboration with TTC)
- HSS Scholars—high achieving FY students, fall on-campus, spring @ Franklin University Lugano
- Transfer Resource Center—a collaboration between AEX and Registrar to create a one-stop for transfer students.
- Expansion of Gallup Strengths programming—all FY students in 2017-18 completed assessment—academic success habits, choice of major, campus engagement, career planning.
- Expansion of online tutoring support in CSL.
- Expansion of advising through Peer Advisors, Quick-Question Drop-in, and Mobile advising.

Unrestored Budget Cuts

2015-16 Recurring Budget Cut: $ 53,000 ($28K FYE, $25K AEX) Resulted in loss of FYE faculty professional development, loss of funds for FYE activities outside of class with students, loss of AEX staff and student employee professional development and conference travel. Eliminated ability to fund new program ideas.

Continuing Budget Challenges:

- Addition of academic support programs without funding or a plan for recurring funding (e.g. provisional/Impact/Top Ten Percent, Veteran & Military Student Services, Charleston Bridge).
- Increased demand on existing and new support programs as student profile changes without corresponding increase to budgets or in new staff positions.
- Low staff salaries and few opportunities for advancement means high turnover in critical student support roles (e.g. academic advising). Several critical staff remain temporary employees, including the Director of VMSS.
- Loss of FYE funds and fewer regular faculty (lost lines, replacement with adjuncts) threatens the quality of this academic program. FYE is a degree requirement for all incoming students with less than one year of college. FYE also provides significant faculty development opportunities not available otherwise.
- Significant budget losses in 2015-16 reduced professional development opportunities for faculty, staff, and students. No funds to support student conference participation. No other sources of institutional staff professional development fund (eliminated by president’s office).

FY 18 Progress: Last year, converted 5 temporary employees to permanent staff (CEPE, FYE, Impact, 2 in REACH). New space in the basement of Lightsey to promote collaboration and coherence in student experience, the addition of commuter student lockers and study spaces, and new collaborative study spaces in the basement and second floor lobbies.

FY 19 Budget Requests: Restore lost AEX and FYE operating funds; provide and fund line for VMSS Director ($37,050 + fringe) and provide recurring operating budget for VMSS ($4,000); provide recurring funding for Provisional/Impact program ($140,000); provide recurring funding for Charleston Bridge ($50,000). Provide funds to address low staff salaries and salary compression.
The School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs
Finance Committee Report

**Mission Statement:** The School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs prepares students to become discerning, knowledgeable, and engaged citizens in an ever changing, interconnected global world.

**Vision Statement:** Through rigorous language education, a broad range of interdisciplinary programs, and numerous study abroad and co-curricular activities, students develop high level language competency, cultural intelligence, and in-depth appreciation of the global issues that confront humankind in the 21st century. The School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs, therefore, is the place within the College of Charleston where disciplines merge, the realities of the world are confronted, and where knowledgeable, engaged citizens of that world come of age.

**Direction:** Our core purpose is teaching global fluency: high linguistic competency; cultural intelligence; world-engagement. Working in partnership with all of the schools of the College, we maintain a curriculum that prepares students to engage with and comprehend diverse cultures. In keeping with our understanding of the traditions of liberal arts education at the College of Charleston, we expect our majors:
- To achieve language proficiency sufficient to communicate effectively with native speakers or to read and understand texts in an ancient language
- To acquire an understanding of cultures that is multi-disciplinary and diachronic
- To comprehend the interconnected socio-economic, political and cultural dimensions of global transformation

**Composition:** LCWA houses 118 faculty: 66 full-time roster and 52 part-time adjunct. Total student enrollments over the past five academic years have been relatively stable with slight growth (2012F: 6,546; 2013F: 6,867; 2014F: 6,463; 2015F: 6,361; 2016F: 6,742). This is compared to national averages that report decreases of up to 20%. Over the past five years LCWA has produced the highest amount of minors of all the Schools.

**International Programming:** The Institute of International Education ranked the College of Charleston third among US master’s level institutions for students participating in study abroad, and participation of LCWA faculty and students in study-abroad, for periods up to a year, and international internships continues to grow.

**Initiatives:**

- **Career/Business Expos:** LCWA departments and programs are working together with regional international businesses to provide recruitment opportunities for our students. On February 8th, the German program, together with the German America Chamber of Commerce of the Southeastern US, the School of Business, and the Career Center, hosted the second annual CofC German-American Business Summit. Nearly 200 students and over 100 community members attended the job fair, keynotes, and panel discussion on workforce needs. The event was followed by a reception hosted by main sponsor Mercedes-Benz Vans.

- **On-line Programming:** on-line summer courses are available in cultural literacy and intermediate languages and these are being expanded into Fall/Spring options. M.Ed. in Language/ESOL emphasis is scheduled to go to a fully on-line mode of delivery starting this fall.
- **International Scholars**: Under the general direction of LCWA and the Honors College, the International Scholars program combines honors study with the B.A. in International Studies, Hispanic Studies, or Jewish Studies with a second major in selected areas. The program customizes the Honors College experience, emphasizing language study, mentored relationships, and study abroad. International Scholars develop a curricular program and an undergraduate research agenda that reflects an understanding of global issues and international perspectives.

- **Community Outreach**: LCWA is infusing throughout the School curricular-enrichment programming in cooperation with community partners, for example: The World Affairs Colloquium Series; The World Affairs Signatures Series; The Center for Southern Jewish History; The Program in Carolina Lowcountry and Atlantic World.

- **Global Fluency Exchange**: GFE will be the center-point for international experiential learning required to fulfill the College’s and LCWA’s mission by connecting our students with opportunities to involve themselves in thinking about and working on real-world challenges both within our community and abroad. The GFE would also house such programs as a (1) Global Fluency Training Center, which would connect the College with the business community at large, as well as (2) “Globally Speaking” classes. These specially designated courses would feature on-line collaboration between students and students abroad, and other international experiential learning. (3) A Fellows and Student Ambassadors Program would provide a coordinated collaboration between faculty, students, and international business partners.

**Budget Implications:**

- Given the above growth patterns, especially in regards to internationalism, years of flat-budgets have caused critical challenges in basic resources.

  We are dependent on adjuncts, who in areas such as Classics, Chinese, Arabic, Russian, and Japanese cannot be found locally. These most often require national if not international searches, and therefore the baseline adjunct salaries are not competitive enough to recruit qualified instructors. We find ourselves struggling to finance plus-up salaries and handle immigration status for temporary appointments.

  For this coming year, due to budget constraints, retirements and resignations of roster-faculty were filled with VAPs. This coming year we will need to convert those to permanent positions. Often such rosser-hires now require research and development stipends and increased moving allotments. To remain competitive keeps pushing the limits on the already strained operating budget.

  Funding for support systems, such as basic marketing, coordination of study abroad and internships, and operating budgets are not adequate for current needs. For example, International Studies with over 200 majors and six full-time faculty operate on an operating budget of $13,500. Such shortages place further demands on the operating budget of the School.

  In short, increases to operating budget are not a virtue but rather a necessity.

- **Development**: Since the one constant about State funding is that it is insufficient and will remain predictably so, if the College and LCWA are going to fulfill their mission, then we must cultivate external and independent financial sources for our programming. The LCWA development plan, titled “Go Global” targets raising funds for international programming and is strategically tied to the School’s mission and in the coming year will be diffused throughout its units.
Dean's Presentation to the Budget Committee of the Faculty Senate  
March 27, 2018

What have been and are the biggest challenges in your school due to ongoing budget issues?

- Salary compression
- Reliance upon temporary staff and adjunct faculty
- Research budgets are constrained due to previous years’ budget reductions
- Delayed renovation of the Albert Simons Center for the Arts
- Delayed renovation of the Calhoun Annex
- Need for design studios and computer lab for Historic Preservation and Community Planning
- Securing adequate shop and storage space away from campus
- Inadequate operating budget for the Arts Management Program (300 + majors)
- Need for long-term, on-campus housing for artists/scholars-in-residence

What are your plans for outreach with any new and existing programs?

- Music summer camp
- Graduate Certificate in Arts Management
- Program to facilitate graduates’ transition to the workplace

What are any new plans for the budget process and requests do you have for your school this year?

- Full-time staff to replace temporary staff
  Arts Management
  Projects Assistant
- New line to support Director of Media Relations/Box Office Manager
MEMORANDUM

To: Senate Budget Committee

From: Michael Auerbach, Dean, SSM

Re: 2018-2019 Budget Issues

Date: 26 March 2018

Impact of Prior Budget Cuts: The biggest impact of previous budget cuts has been the inability to fill all open faculty lines. Even if all current faculty searches are successful, we will enter next year with seven open positions: three in math, two in physics & astronomy, one in biology, and one in chemistry. The other significant impact came from the reduction of operating funds ($76,309), which has reduced our ability to fund faculty travel to professional meetings, instructional supplies, and student assistants. The implementation of a school fee in AY2017-18, greatly expanded our ability to support undergraduate research and the SCAMP program.

Proposed New Programs: Two new graduate programs are making their way through the curriculum approval process. A new M.S. in Data Science and Analytics will be reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs of the CHE this week. A proposed Ph.D. in Mathematics with Computation will soon begin curriculum approval. The major new expense in both of these proposed programs is for assistantships. A requested special appropriation request to support the M.S. in Data Science and Analytics was not successful this year. SSM is currently discussing support from private sector companies for both proposed new programs.

Outreach: SSM conducts informal science and outreach events that impact thousands of local school children each year. Some are facility based (e.g., Natural History Museum), some are written into the broader impacts sections of grants, and many others, including the Lowcountry Science Fair, various STEM festivals, and STEM day with the Lady Cougars, are organized through the Lowcountry Hall of Science & Math. While several of these events are supported by extramural grants, the vast majority rely on faculty and staff volunteering their time and effort. SSM also contributes to several of the larger STEM events.
**Process for Budget Development:** The SSM dean solicits budget needs and special requests from departmental chairs. The dean then prioritizes these requests, while adding in school-wide needs and initiatives. Dean and chairs then discuss the emerging priorities before they are requested by memo from the provost. A committee comprised of the Dean, Associate Dean, and six undergraduates (one from each of the SSM departments) oversees the allocation of funds derived from the school fee.

**New Budget Requests:** SSM’s greatest need is to restore funding for faculty lines and operating expenses lost to prior cuts. SSM also needs matching funding to construct a new building at Ft Johnson.
Findings of the Ad Hoc Committee on Institutional Identity and Vision (4/20/2018)

Purpose and Mission:
The Faculty Senate formed this ad hoc committee to solicit input from the College community about the identity and vision for the College. The reported findings will inform future Faculty Senate deliberations and be shared with the college community, Board of Trustees, and Presidential Search Committee.

Survey Process:
The process began with an initial online survey that received responses from 440 individuals, who were asked to respond to six main issues presented by the committee. In addition to the six main questions the Committee identified, 198 respondents brought up several additional questions that became the main themes for the six discussion sessions held between January 31st through February 14th.

The questions of the second online survey reflect themes reported from participants of the six discussion sessions and its purpose was to understand how the larger community of College employees felt about these emergent themes. This second online survey was open from March 9th through March 28th. This latest online survey collected 606 responses from 43 administrators, 192 tenured faculty, 62 tenure-track faculty, 15 instructors, 4 visiting instructors, 44 adjuncts, 11 full-time permanent staff, 13 full-time temporary staff, 5 part-time permanent staff, 9 part-time temporary staff, and 18 other employees of College of Charleston. More than half of the respondents (56%) reported they have been at the College for 10-years or less, while 27% reported 10-20 years of service, and 18% reported more than 20 years of service. The survey questions consisted of strongly agree – strongly disagree scale (1-7) statements, multiple choice selections, and one open text response question.

Findings
Our findings are presented in the following documents:

a) Tables of multiple choice responses in three different forms - all respondents, by faculty vs staff, by years of service 1-10 vs more than 10. Tables are formatted for Power Point display.
b) Written summary of notable differences in multiple-choice responses between faculty vs staff, by years of service 1-10 vs more than 10.
c) Executive summary of free-text comments grouped by general topic with number of respondents who addressed each topic.

Supplemental Data
d) All text comments separated by general topic. We used Excel to split long responses into single line (or sentences by punctuation), then grouped them by general topic (26-pages). This intermediate step was done to make it easier for us to group comments by general topic given that many comments were lengthy and touched upon multiple different topics.
e) Raw open text comments (212 respondents, about 26 pages to print).
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SUMMARY OF SURVEY COMMENTS (Grouped alphabetically by general topic)

These statements represent a paraphrased executive summary of the open-text responses. These statements are not intended as recommendations of the committee. This summary attempts to convey broadly expressed sentiments as well as constructive or insightful comments that may have been stated by only one respondent. They represent the diversity of opinions voiced without giving any indication of their frequencies. The number in parentheses following each topic heading indicates the number of comments on that topic entered by distinct individual survey completions. Verbatim duplicate comments were counted as coming from one individual survey completion.

**ACADEMIC STANDARDS (1)**
- CofC has done a great job at maintaining standards.

**ADJUNCTS (See also PAY) (2)**
- There are concerns about overreliance on adjunct faculty.

**ADMINISTRATION (See also EVALUATION OF SUPERVISORS) (28)**
- Concern expressed regarding faculty evaluation of administration (Deans and above) being ignored
- Goals are not effectively filtering down from the administration to the departments and faculty; overall poor communication between administrators and faculty
- Improvements in transparency (regarding hiring, budgets, decisions) should be made
- Administrators need to improve the incorporation of faculty feedback on strategic issues, including budgeting.
- Administrative bloat has led to the misallocation of resources from faculty/students to the administration
- Local authority needs to be restored.
- Perceived need for new leadership on all levels

**ADMISSION STANDARDS (See also STUDENT QUALITY) (3)**
- Admission standards must be maintained and improved
- Teaching standards may be indirectly and negatively affected by weaker admission standards
- Lower admission standards may lead to poor performances from underprepared students

**ALUMNI (1)**
- Alumni development should begin when students enroll and be fostered throughout their time here.

**ASSESSMENT (1)**
- A lack of appreciation of the value of the current (top down) assessment process by faculty.
- The administration does not incorporate faculty input throughout the assessment process.
- The assessment process would benefit from more autonomy and resources in the development of learning goals.

**BUREAUCRACY (7)**
- Ineffective, bloated, arcane bureaucracy lead to inordinate amount of time required to process curricular changes, grant proposals, hiring approvals...
- Too much faculty time and resources are expended on bureaucratic matters
- Efforts should be made to streamline processes.

**CITY (See also ENVIRONMENTAL, IDENTITY, CIVIC ENGAGEMENT) (4)**
- The College should leverage Charleston’s historical, environmental, commercial (e.g. port), cultural attributes (not simply its beaches) to attract students, employers, etc.

**CIVIC ENGAGEMENT (2)**
- There are opportunities for the College in the heart of the city to become more engaged in the community.
- Students’ academic experiences should incorporate civic engagement.
CLASS SIZE (4)
• Larger class enrollment, particularly for lower-division courses, is concerning.
• It is disingenuous for the College to advertise small class sizes when that does not accurately reflect reality.

COLLABORATION (5)
• More cross-campus collaboration could foster a better sense of campus community.
• It appears the campus operates in “silos” with limited collaborations across divisions/units of the College.
• Better collaboration between the administration, faculty and students may assist the College in moving towards common, strategic goals and serving students better.

COMMUNICATION (21)
• Existing communication systems (i.e., Yammer) do not facilitate communication among the College’s constituents.
• The use of traditional faculty list serves would improve the faculty’s ability to communicate with the administration.
• Better communications channels should be established between the campus community and the Board of Trustees.
• Some feel that they are unaware of what’s taking place throughout the campus community.
• Transparency could be improved with more effective means of communication.

COMMUTING (See also TRAFFIC) (1)
• The College should make efforts to accommodate students who commute to the downtown campus.

COST OF LIVING (1)
• The regional cost of living is placing strains on faculty, staff and students.

CULTURE (3)
• The College’s organizational structure should support a sense of common campus culture.
• Changes in the campus culture should occur at all levels of the College with all involved.

DEGREE PROGRAMS (See also GRADUATE PROGRAMS) (5)
• Some constituents feel that a greater variety of professional degree programs will help the College compete for high-quality students, and regional employment demands.
• Others worry about the cost (and uncertain gain) of professional and Ph.D. degrees.

DIVERSITY (11)
• More effort needs to be made to expand campus racial diversity
• The College suffers from the perception that it caters to white, wealthy students.
• The diversity of the greater Charleston community could be incorporated into the College’s community through local outreach programs.
• Diversity should be a core value of the College and both admissions and scholarship criteria should be adjusted to assist students of underprivileged backgrounds.

EMPLOYEE CONDUCT (6)
• Employees should be held accountable for unethical behavior.
• Administrators should treat subordinates respectfully.

EMPLOYEE RETENTION (2)
• The College should invest in its employees with the goal of retaining quality staff and faculty.
ENVIRONMENTAL (See IDENTITY) (3)
- The unique regional geography provides the College with the opportunity to develop sustainability initiatives that address environmental issues facing our society.

EVALUATION OF SUPERVISORS (See also ADMINISTRATION) (1)
- Staff and faculty of all ranks should be able to provide upward evaluations of their supervisors.

EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING (1)
- Student development could be enhanced by a wider variety of experiential learning programs.

FACULTY ACHIEVEMENT (3)
- Faculty achievements and contributions should be more widely publicized across the campus community.
- Incentives and rewards for faculty achievements should be provided by the administration.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT (1)
- A faculty development center could be used to centralize an array of programs and workshops designed to support faculty regarding innovative teaching techniques, research, assessments, etc.

FACULTY EVALUATION (5)
- Accountability should be more uniformly applied to all types of faculty, including adjuncts.
- Teaching should receive greater weight in the tenure and promotion decision, as it is widely perceived that research is now the driving factor.
- Tenured faculty that perform minimal research should teach additional courses.

FACULTY EXPECTATIONS (5)
- The criteria for tenure and promotion should be more clearly delineated in the FAM.
- There appears to be a significant variation in tenure and promotion requirements across schools and departments.
- Faculty expectations should take into consideration relative strengths of the faculty member (i.e., teaching vs. research).
- Tenure and promotion criteria should be realistic for an institution with high teaching expectations and taking into consideration practices elsewhere (e.g. recognizing first books that come out of dissertations).

FACULTY HIRES (1)
- Insufficient support from the state of South Carolina has led to an overreliance in non-tenure track faculty.

FINANCES (4)
- The state of South Carolina’s economic success seems at odds with the financial struggles consistently faced by the College.
- The greater campus community should receive more training regarding budgeting and financing.
- Administrators should be more accountable for unfavorable budget variances.

GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (2)
- General education requirements could be streamlined (and/or reduced) while maintaining our commitment to liberal arts education.

GRADUATE PROGRAMS (5)
- There are concerns the creation of additional graduate programs without adequate funding may damage faculty cohesion and retention and hurt the traditionally strong focus on undergraduate high-quality education.
- Until the institution has adequate financial resource to sustain strong graduate programs, the focus should be on undergraduate programs.
IDENTITY (33)
- There is strong support for maintaining the College’s liberal arts and science tradition, with the primary focus being on undergraduate teaching.
- There are concerns about the lack of uniformity in the College’s identity across various schools and departments.
- Our identity should more directly reflect a clear commitment to our mission (teaching vs. research)
- The lack of clear identity is reflected in lackluster student involvement and commitment to the institution.
- Some voices for the College changing in order to meet the demands of the marketplace that prioritizes career-oriented majors or specialized majors that prepare students for graduate school.
- Rather than aspiring to be like an entire institution, we should look for exemplary programs/experiences drawn from multiple institutions.
- Identity should incorporate applying liberal arts & sciences skills to solve problems of environmental and socio-economic sustainability situated in our unique location where there are issues of sea level rise, gentrification/affordability, and racism.

INNOVATION (3)
- The College’s traditional culture of innovation has faded and we need to recommit ourselves to aspiring to constantly improve.
- Focus on cheap and efficient delivery of education or on preserving traditions should not replace desire for innovation.

LEADERSHIP (10)
- There are concerns about the quality of the current campus leadership, from the deans to the upper-level administration.
- Deans need to be held to higher performance standards.
- Professional academicians should play a more prominent role in campus leadership.
- Leadership should create a collaborative working space.

LOCAL BUSINESSES (5)
- The liberal arts curriculum and skills should be a foundation upon which to create programs that address the demands of the local business community.
- Expansion of local business and industry provides opportunity for internships and engagement.

MARKETING (9)
- There are areas for improvement regarding the effectiveness of our marketing efforts.
- Many of the events and programs that occur at the College are not well publicized and, therefore, underutilized.
- The College could do a better job promoting the merits of obtaining a liberal arts education.
- Some feel that the College provides misleading information about class sizes and should be more transparent with its messaging to potential students and parents.

MISSION (4)
- The College’s mission should focus on academic excellence rather than a customer satisfaction, business model approach.

MORALE (21)
- Faculty and staff express low morale due to feeling underappreciated and underutilized by an administration that forces strategic decisions onto the campus community without considering the opinion of constituents.

NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENTS (4)
- More efforts are needed to attract and accommodate nontraditional students.
ONLINE EDUCATION (3)
- There is some support for expanding online course offerings, particularly to appeal to non-traditional and working students.
- Some favor face-to-face interaction over online learning.

PARTNERSHIPS (1)
- The College could improve its relationships with local institutions with the goal of improving our financial situation and to expand our program offerings.

PAY (25)
- There are concerns about the inequities in pay levels across departments and schools.
- There is dissatisfaction about salary compression for associate and full professors.
- Inadequate pay is a major contributor to faculty/staff turnover and low employee morale.
- The College’s pay scale is not comparable to similar institutions and inadequate for the region’s rapidly increasing cost of living.
- The discrepancy between administrator and faculty wages is unjustifiable.
- Pay-for-performance models should be considered for teaching and service activities.
- Without any financial rewards many years in a row, it is difficult to do more for the institution.
- There are concerns of pay inequality for women.
- Adjunct/staff wages are unacceptably low. Retaining quality faculty and staff is becoming more difficult without increase in wages.

PRESIDENT (20)
- The next president should not be a political appointee but a product of a transparent search process.
- The president should have an academic background and experience, the ability to articulate a vision, maintain high moral character and effectively communicate with the campus and community constituents.
- Faculty and staff input should be considered throughout the presidential search process.
- Some feel that an external hire would be preferable.
- All else equal, diverse candidates should be given special consideration during the search process; a woman or an African American president could help overcome the College’s historic reputation of elitism and discrimination.

RECRUITMENT OF STUDENTS (1)
- There should be efforts to improve the recruitment of local high school students and overcome perceptions that the College does not seek local students.
- Investment in campus facilities and athletic programs may lead to more interest in the College.

REPUTATION OF THE COLLEGE (1)
- Many local students do not regard the College as prestigious and do not apply.

RESOURCES (7)
- Resources to support faculty research, teaching and service are perceived to be inadequate.
- Resources are not fairly allocated to various campus constituents.
- Many of the physical structures and the infrastructure on campus are in need of maintenance and repair; older buildings need to be more wheel chair accessible.
- More resources should be made available to support incoming students.
- More fundraising efforts should be adopted to support faculty and students.
- There is a perception that scarce institutional resources are diverted to individuals with peripheral or former affiliations with the College.
SATELLITE CAMPUSES (2)

- There is little support for the North Campus.

SIZE OF THE COLLEGE (4)

- If shrinking enrollment continues, a reduction in faculty size through attrition should be considered.
- Excellence, not size, should be the institutional goal.
- The College currently appears to be at a comfortable size.
- The College should try to grow and acquire more space in downtown Charleston.

STAFF RESPECT AND VOICE (7)

- There is a strong sentiment that staff members have no way to express their opinion, voice their concerns and interact with others outside their office.
- The Staff Advisory Committee has not been effective in instituting change and incorporating staff in the overall decision-making. The opinions and feedback provided by staff go largely ignored by their superiors, faculty and administrators.
- The process under which staff are evaluated and promoted should be reconsidered in order to encourage upward mobility.
- Internal applicants should get stronger consideration than external candidates.

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT / EXPERIENCE (5)

- There is a perception that students are not very engaged in the campus community and that many programs are underutilized by students.
- We should encourage more student activism, particularly as it relates to the community.
- Out-of-state students should receive in-state tuition rates for COFC study abroad programs.
- The institution needs to take care better of its current students.
- Initiatives should be designed to build well-rounded education rather than vocational-based programs.
- The liberal arts model needs to be malleable as the demands of the job market evolve.

STUDENT QUALITY (See also ADMISSION STANDARDS) (9)

- The variation in the quality of the students creates challenges for professors who would prefer not to water-down course material to accommodate poorly prepared students.
- There are perceived challenges between maintaining high academic standards and maintaining high retention rates.
- The customer-service model encourages a weakening of academic standards.
- There is the perception that the quality of students has declined in recent years.
- Maintaining high quality students is key to the long-term future of the institution.
- We need to maintain high educational standards, but assist better students who struggle

STUDENT RETENTION (1)

- Retention rates are an ongoing concern for the College.
- The College should provide more support services for students who are at risk of leaving the College.

SURVEY (11)

- Some respondent felt that some of the survey questions were loaded or linked issues that should have been separated.
- While many respondents felt the survey expressed their main concerns and were grateful for the opportunity, others would have liked to see questions related to work loads, diversity and concerns of adjuncts.

TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES (1)

- The institution needs to deal with the problem of having long-time employees under “temporary” designation.
TRAFFIC (1)
- The College can do more to positively impact traffic issues in Charleston (offer telecommuting for employees under clear guidelines; alter the timing of course offerings to spread out traffic and ease demands on parking)

TRAINING (1)
- There is room for improvement for new employee orientation programs as well as ongoing administrator training.

TUITION (3)
- There are concerns that the current tuition-driven budget model is harming the institution in terms of recruitment and deficits.
- Education at the College should be more affordable

UNDERGRADUATE EXPERIENCE (10)
- Parents and students like and appreciate the individualized, committed education the institution offers
- There are students who want to be challenged and are eager to take advantage of the opportunities we offer
- The focus on high-quality undergraduate training is a selling point that distinguishes the institution from others.

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH (3)
- The personal attention given to students by faculty during collaborative research projects is a selling point for the College among both students/parents and faculty.

VISION (3)
- Inadequate leadership has hampered the College’s ability to fulfill its vision as an elite liberal arts institution.
- The College should follow-through on recommendations from past strategic studies such as those on climate, diversity, and accessibility.

WORKLOAD (7)
- There is the general feeling that the responsibilities of faculty and staff are always increasing while compensation remains inadequately stable; respondents complained about declining quality of life and inadequate work-life balance.
- The lack of raises for consecutive years has harmed morale.
- There is excessive bureaucracy that contributes to low morale.
- Demands for participation in service activities seems excessive and reduces the time available to invest in teaching and research.
- Course releases and sabbaticals should be more widely available for faculty who wish to develop new courses and programs or simply focus on their research.
FACULTY & STAFF COMPARISON

Who are we?

Faculty more strongly supported the aim to be a liberal arts college; a selective, preeminent national university (example, William and Mary). Both were above the neutral midpoint.

Staff more strongly supported the aim to be a comprehensive university (example, George Mason). Both were above the neutral midpoint.

Faculty more strongly disagreed with the aim to be a research university (example, USC). Both were below the neutral midpoint.

How Do We Do What We Do Well?

Faculty more strongly supported the following statements (both were above the neutral midpoint):

- CofC could attract stronger students than it currently does if only we changed our marketing and admissions strategies.
- Marketing of the College should emphasize that in today’s rapidly changing work environment, a traditional liberal arts education is more important and valuable than ever.
- The college should increase the proportion of out-of-state and international students as a way of addressing ongoing financial constraints.
- Expectations of faculty and staff involvement in new program development should be accompanied by ongoing and incremental support (resources) from the administration.
- The T&P evaluation should be supportive of faculty engagement with students and the larger community outside of the classroom.

Staff more strongly supported the following statements (both were above the neutral midpoint):

- The college should focus on improving student retention and expanding community college transfers as a way of stabilizing or expanding annual tuition revenue.
- Staff and faculty should be more involved in identifying opportunities for operational cost savings.
- The college should expand and diversify its professional programs in order adapt to regional growth and increase enrollment.

Staff supported (above midline), while faculty did not support (below midline), the following statements:

- To survive financially, CofC faculty and staff will need to embrace the customer service model.
- We need more satellite programs (like the BPS) and increased distance education offerings to increase the number of students paying tuition to CofC who will not be on the main campus.
- In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we should have different sets of general education requirements for different programs.
- The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.
- We need to support better our academically weaker students and alter current teaching approaches to service them effectively.
How Do We Create a Healthy Campus Climate?

Staff more strongly supported the following statements (both were above the neutral midpoint):

- The institution needs a more collaborative culture between faculty and staff and among units.
- Certain campus committees (e.g. Welfare, Academic Standards, Budget) should include both faculty and staff as voting members.
- The college needs a general Faculty and Staff Council.

Faculty more strongly disagreed with the following statements (both were below the neutral midpoint):

- Yammer has improved our ability to communicate effectively and efficiently.
- The administration's plans and decision are effectively explained and communicated.
- The current structure of shared governance is effective in giving faculty voice and influence on the institutional development.

Staff more strongly disagreed with the following statements (both were below the neutral midpoint):

- Strategic plans are a waste of time and energy that do not help the institution.
- The structures of shared governance should be restricted to roster faculty.

Faculty supported (above midline), while staff did not support (below midline), the following statements:

- I don't seek more communal engagement as my voice does not matter.

Faculty were more supportive of:
- Undergraduate programs
- Masters programs
- Ph.D. programs

Staff were more supportive of:
- Certificate programs
- Vocational training
- Online programs
EARLIER (less than 10 years) & LATER (10+ years) EMPLOYEES

Earlier employees supported (above midline), while later employees did not support (below midline), the following statements:

- CoF C should aim to be a comprehensive university (example, George Mason).
- We need more satellite programs (like the BPS) and increased distance education offerings to increase the number of students paying tuition to CoFC who will not be on the main campus.
- The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.

Later employees supported (above midline), while earlier employees did not support (below midline), the following statements:

- I understand the work and responsibilities of other departments and offices.

Later employees more strongly disagreed with the following statements (both were below the neutral midpoint):

- CoFC has a well-defined identity that is clearly, and consistently communicated to all employees, students, prospective students, etc.
- CoFC should aim to be a research university (example, USC).
- In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we should have different sets of general education requirements for different programs.
- Yammer has improved our ability to communicate effectively and efficiently.
- The administration's plans and decision are effectively explained and communicated.
- The current structure of shared governance is effective in giving faculty voice and influence on the institutional development.

Earlier employees more strongly disagreed with the following statements (both were below the neutral midpoint):

- Strategic plans are a waste of time and energy that do not help the institution.
- The structures of shared governance should be restricted to roster faculty.

Earlier employees more strongly supported the following statements (both were above the neutral midpoint):

- The college should focus on improving student retention and expanding community college transfers as a way of stabilizing or expanding annual tuition revenue.
- The college should explore ways to subsidize students’ cost of living to make it more financially feasible for students relocating to Charleston for their studies.
- It is acceptable to have different categories of faculty (e.g. teachers, researchers, teacher-scholars) with diverging Tenure and Promotion expectations.
- Certain campus committees (e.g. Welfare, Academic Standards, Budget) should include both faculty and staff as voting members.
- The college needs a general Faculty and Staff Council.
- The college should expand and diversify its professional programs in order adapt to regional growth and increase enrollment.
Later employees more strongly supported the following statements (both were above the neutral midpoint):

- Morale is low among your colleagues (in your school/division).

Earlier employees were more likely to say we should aspire to:
- Researcher
- Facilitator of connections with area businesses
- Facilitator of civic engagement

Later employees were more likely to say we should aspire to:
- Teacher
- Teacher-Scholar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who are We?</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CofC should aim to be a selective, preeminent national university (example, William and Mary).</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CofC should aim to be a comprehensive university (example, George Mason).</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree  7 = Strongly Agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do We Do What We Do Well?</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CofC could attract stronger students than it currently does if only we changed our marketing and admissions strategies.</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing of the College should emphasize that in today's rapidly changing work environment, a traditional liberal arts education is more important and valuable than ever.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To survive financially, CofC faculty and staff will need to embrace the customer service model.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need more satellite programs (like the BPS) and increased distance education offerings to increase the number of students paying tuition to CofC who will not be on the main campus.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we should have different sets of general education requirements for different programs.</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should increase the proportion of out-of-state and international students as a way of addressing ongoing financial constraints.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should focus on improving student retention and expanding community college transfers as a way of stabilizing or expanding annual tuition revenue.</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and faculty should be more involved in identifying opportunities for operational cost savings.</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of faculty and staff involvement in new program development should be accompanied by ongoing and incremental support (resources) from the administration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree  
7 = Strongly Agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do We Do What We Do Well?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should expand and diversify its professional programs in order adapt to regional growth and increase enrollment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The T&amp;P evaluation should be supportive of faculty engagement with students and the larger community outside of the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to support better our academically weaker students and alter current teaching approaches to service them effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree    7 = Strongly Agree
How do we create a healthy climate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do We Create a Healthy Climate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution needs a more collaborative culture between faculty and staff and among units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Faculty | 5.55 | 4.34 | 2.00 | 2.59 | 3.61 | 2.85 | 3.55 | 4.87 | 4.70 |
| Staff   | 6.06 | 3.98 | 2.72 | 3.07 | 3.15 | 3.91 | 2.67 | 5.76 | 5.44 |

1 = most important factor  
7 = least important factor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Should we have multiple campus sites with distinct identities?</th>
<th>How important is clarity of institutional purpose for morale?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>39% YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>56% YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = most important factor</th>
<th>7 = least important factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.41</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.86</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where do I get most of my information about campus events, initiatives, and plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department Chair</th>
<th>Newsletter</th>
<th>SenateComm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yammer</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most frequent source 1.0

Least frequent source 7.0
What should we provide?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Certificate programs</th>
<th>Vocational training</th>
<th>Online programs</th>
<th>Undergraduate programs</th>
<th>Masters programs</th>
<th>Ph.D. programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who should we serve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>transfer students (from tech colleges)</th>
<th>transfer students (from other 4-year colleges)</th>
<th>traditional undergraduates</th>
<th>working professionals</th>
<th>active-duty military</th>
<th>graduate students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What should we aspire to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Teacher-scholar</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Facilitator of connections with area businesses</th>
<th>Facilitator of civic engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# First Choice Selling Point for Marketing the College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st choice for our selling point as a college</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>public liberal arts and sciences institution in the state of SC</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty interactions with individual students (research, mentoring, smaller classes)</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal arts skills - critical thinking, teamwork, writing - equip students to better apply modern technologies in current and future careers</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential campus in the historic and architecturally beautiful city</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies technology and teaching innovations to create exciting in-class experience</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential learning (Internships with companies/non-profits, civic engagement)</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business/entrepreneurship</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston location (architecture, gardens, weather)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size of the College – small classes + opportunity for specialized research</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7 = Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Who are We?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CofC has a well-defined identity that is clearly, and consistently communicated to all employees, students, prospective students, etc.</td>
<td>CofC should aim to be a comprehensive university (example, George Mason).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 yrs</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 yrs</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-10 yrs</td>
<td>&gt; 10 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need more satellite programs (like the BPS) and increased</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance education offerings to increase the number of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paying tuition to CofC who will not be on the main campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should have different sets of general education requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for different programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should focus on improving student retention and</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expanding community college transfers as a way of stabilizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or expanding annual tuition revenue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should explore ways to subsidize students’</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost of living to make it more financially feasible for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students relocating to Charleston for their studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should invest more in student amenities on campus</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to increase enrollment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should expand and diversify its professional</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs in order adapt to regional growth and increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrollment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is acceptable to have different categories of faculty (e.g.</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers, researchers, teacher-scholars) with diverging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure and Promotion expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree    7 = Strongly Agree
How do we create a healthy climate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morale is low among your colleagues (in your school/division).</th>
<th>I understand the work and responsibilities of other departments and offices.</th>
<th>Yammer has improved our ability to communicate effectively and efficiently.</th>
<th>The administration's plans and decision are effectively explained and communicated.</th>
<th>Strategic plans are a waste of time and energy that do not help the institution.</th>
<th>The current structure of shared governance is effective in giving faculty voice and influence on the institutional development.</th>
<th>The structures of shared governance should be restricted to roster faculty.</th>
<th>Certain campus committees (e.g. Welfare, Academic Standards, Budget) should include both faculty and staff as voting members.</th>
<th>The college needs a general Faculty and Staff Council.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10 yrs</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 yrs</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = most important factor
7 = least important factor
### How do We Create a Healthy Climate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>JobCert</th>
<th>GoodRel</th>
<th>Yammer</th>
<th>SenateComm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10 yrs</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 yrs</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = most important factor  
7 = least important factor
What should we provide?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Certificate programs</th>
<th>Vocational training</th>
<th>Online programs</th>
<th>Undergraduate programs</th>
<th>Masters programs</th>
<th>Ph.D. programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10 yrs</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 yrs</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What should we aspire to?</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher-scholar</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Facilitator of connections with area businesses</td>
<td>Facilitator of civic engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WHO ARE WE?** What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoF C should have a well-defined identity and mission that is consistently communicated to all faculty, staff, students, prospective students, alumni, and local community.</th>
<th>CoF C should focus on quality undergraduate experience.</th>
<th>CoF C should aim to be a liberal arts college.</th>
<th>CoF C should aim to be a selective, preeminent national university (example, William and Mary).</th>
<th>CoF C should aim to be a comprehensive university (example, George Mason).</th>
<th>CoF C's marketing efforts effectively communicate our identity to the outside world.</th>
<th>CoF C should aim to be a research university (example, USC).</th>
<th>CoF C has a well-defined identity that is clearly, and consistently communicated to all employees, students, prospective students, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOW DO WE DO WHAT WE DO WELL?** What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations of faculty and staff involvement in new program development should be accompanied by ongoing and incremental support (resources) from the administration.</th>
<th>Marketing of the College should emphasize that in today's rapidly changing work environment, a traditional liberal arts education is more important and valuable than ever.</th>
<th>The T&amp;P evaluation should be supportive of faculty engagement with students and the larger community outside of the classroom.</th>
<th>Our competitive integrity lies in maintaining individualized support for students.</th>
<th>Staff and faculty should be more involved in identifying opportunities for operational cost savings.</th>
<th>The college should focus on developing a 'culture' attractive to students rather than perfecting recruitment strategies.</th>
<th>The college should focus on improving student retention and expanding community college transfers as a way of stabilizing or expanding annual tuition revenue.</th>
<th>The college should increase the proportion of out-of-state and international students as a way of addressing ongoing financial constraints.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is acceptable to have different categories of faculty (e.g. teachers, researchers, teacher-scholars) with diverging Tenure and Promotion expectations. The college should explore ways to subsidize students’ cost of living to make it more financially feasible for students relocating to Charleston for their studies.

Staff and faculty should be provided incentives for participating in fundraising efforts. CoC could attract stronger students than it currently does if only we changed our marketing and admissions strategies.

The college should expand and diversify its professional programs in order adapt to regional growth and increase enrollment. We need more satellite programs (like the BPS) and increased distance education offerings to increase the number of students paying tuition to CoC who will not be on the main campus.

We need to support better our academically weaker students and alter current teaching approaches to service them effectively.

Staff and faculty should be provided incentives for participating in fund-raising efforts. CofC could attract stronger students than it currently does if only we changed our marketing and admissions strategies.

The college should expand and diversify its professional programs in order adapt to regional growth and increase enrollment. The college should consider shrinking in size (including cutting programs, consolidating offices and reducing employees) in response to budgetary pressures. The college must adjust to the fact that our student body will be weaker in terms of study skills, motivation and academic ability for the foreseeable future.

The College must admit students of lower academic quality than our standards would normally allow to survive this financially difficult period, but only temporarily.

The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.

In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we should have different sets of general education requirements for different programs.

To survive financially, CoC faculty and staff will need to embrace the customer service model. The college should consider shrinking in size (including cutting programs, consolidating offices and reducing employees) in response to budgetary pressures. The College must adjust to the fact that our student body will be weaker in terms of study skills, motivation and academic ability for the foreseeable future.

The College must admit students of lower academic quality than our standards would normally allow to survive this financially difficult period, but only temporarily.

The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is acceptable to have different categories of faculty (e.g. teachers, researchers, teacher-scholars) with diverging Tenure and Promotion expectations.</th>
<th>The college should explore ways to subsidize students’ cost of living to make it more financially feasible for students relocating to Charleston for their studies.</th>
<th>Staff and faculty should be provided incentives for participating in fundraising efforts.</th>
<th>CoC could attract stronger students than it currently does if only we changed our marketing and admissions strategies.</th>
<th>The college should expand and diversify its professional programs in order adapt to regional growth and increase enrollment.</th>
<th>We need more satellite programs (like the BPS) and increased distance education offerings to increase the number of students paying tuition to CoC who will not be on the main campus.</th>
<th>We need to support better our academically weaker students and alter current teaching approaches to service them effectively.</th>
<th>The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we should have different sets of general education requirements for different programs.

To survive financially, CoC faculty and staff will need to embrace the customer service model.

The college should consider shrinking in size (including cutting programs, consolidating offices and reducing employees) in response to budgetary pressures.

The College must adjust to the fact that our student body will be weaker in terms of study skills, motivation and academic ability for the foreseeable future.

The College must admit students of lower academic quality than our standards would normally allow to survive this financially difficult period, but only temporarily.

The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we should have different sets of general education requirements for different programs.</th>
<th>To survive financially, CoC faculty and staff will need to embrace the customer service model.</th>
<th>The college should consider shrinking in size (including cutting programs, consolidating offices and reducing employees) in response to budgetary pressures.</th>
<th>The College must adjust to the fact that our student body will be weaker in terms of study skills, motivation and academic ability for the foreseeable future.</th>
<th>The College must admit students of lower academic quality than our standards would normally allow to survive this financially difficult period, but only temporarily.</th>
<th>The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HOW DO WE CREATE A HEALTHY CAMPUS CLIMATE? What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>We need better leadership from our executive team to improve campus culture and morale.</th>
<th>There should be more direct communication between faculty and staff regarding institutional matters (admissions, retention, academic standards, etc.)</th>
<th>The administration should allow employees more autonomy in decision-making or involve staff and faculty in its decision-making.</th>
<th>The institution needs a more collaborative culture between faculty and staff and among units.</th>
<th>I would like to see more informal opportunities to get to know faculty and staff outside my division.</th>
<th>We need common spaces (e.g. dining halls, clubs, informal drop-ins, sports teams, book clubs) to promote better communication between employees.</th>
<th>Certain campus committees (e.g. Welfare, Academic Standards, Budget) should include both faculty and staff as voting members.</th>
<th>Morale is low among your colleagues (in your school/division).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Collaboration is difficult because departments and programs are pitted against each other for resources and limited funding.</th>
<th>The college needs a general Faculty and Staff Council.</th>
<th>I have ideas about improving the college but have no way to communicate those to others.</th>
<th>For an institution of this size, complexity and diversity, it is fine to target different audiences with different messages.</th>
<th>I don't seek more communal engagement as my voice does not matter.</th>
<th>I understand the work and responsibilities of other departments and offices.</th>
<th>Strategic plans are a waste of time and energy that do not help the institution.</th>
<th>The current structure of shared governance is effective in giving faculty voice and influence on the institutional development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The structures of shared governance should be restricted to roster faculty.

I feel well informed about initiatives on campus outside my division.

The administration’s plans and decision are effectively explained and communicated.

Yammer has improved our ability to communicate effectively and efficiently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank the following as factors for your good morale (1 - most important to 7 - least important). You can click and drag to change the ordering:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary and benefits</th>
<th>Certainty of job status</th>
<th>Voice in decision-making</th>
<th>Good relations with other employees</th>
<th>Clarity of institutional purpose</th>
<th>Institutional organization and collaboration</th>
<th>Institutional financial health/ outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I get the most information about events, initiatives and plans on campus from (rank order: 1 - most frequently to 7 - least frequently). You can click and drag to change the order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-mails</th>
<th>Colleagues</th>
<th>My dept chair/supervisor</th>
<th>Campus newsletters</th>
<th>Local press</th>
<th>Yammer</th>
<th>Senate/committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Which of the following (select one or more) should the College emphasize as its most compelling selling points?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty interactions with individual students (research, mentoring, smaller classes)</th>
<th>78%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal arts skills - critical thinking, teamwork, writing - equip students to better apply modern technologies in</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the College – small classes + opportunity for specialized research</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning (internships with companies/non-profits, civic engagement)</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College location (architecture, gardens, weather)</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public liberal arts and sciences institution in the state of SC</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential campus in the historic and architecturally beautiful city</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies technology and teaching innovations to create exciting in-class experience</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business / entrepreneurship</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## I think the College of Charleston should offer (select one or more):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate programs</th>
<th>82%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters programs</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online programs</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate programs</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. programs</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Which populations of students should the College of Charleston serve (select one or more)?

| Traditional undergraduates | 96% |
| Transfer students (from other 4-year colleges) | 84% |
| Transfer students (from tech colleges) | 75% |
| Graduate students | 70% |
| Working professionals | 60% |
| Active-duty military | 57% |

## If some combinations of the above degree programs or student populations do not make sense for one campus, then we should have multiple campuses with distinct identities?

| 45% |

## How would you describe the size of the College of Charleston?

| Too small | 16% |
| Just right | 75% |
| Too big | 8% |
### Which of the following should faculty aspire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Learning Approach</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-scholar</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>Experiential learning</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Consequential (i.e. applied) learning</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator of civic engage</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Distance education</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator of connections with area businesses</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Student portfolios</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flipped classrooms</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current position at college - Selected Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Years of Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1-5yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6-10yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10-20yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20-30yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>over 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTPerm</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTTemp</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTPerm</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTTerm</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>TOTAL PARTICIPANTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current position at college - Selected Choice</td>
<td>Years of Employment at the College of Charleston:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1-5yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>6-10yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>10-20yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>20-30yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>over 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTPerm</td>
<td>526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTTemp</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTPerm</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTTemp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WHO ARE WE?

What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CofC should have a well-defined identity and mission that is consistently communicated to all faculty, staff, students, prospective students, alumni, and local community.</th>
<th>CofC should focus on quality undergraduate experience.</th>
<th>CofC should aim to be a liberal arts college.</th>
<th>CofC should aim to be a selective, preeminent national university (example, William and Mary).</th>
<th>CofC should aim to be a comprehensive university (example, George Mason).</th>
<th>CofC’s marketing efforts effectively communicate our identity to the outside world.</th>
<th>CofC should aim to be a research university (example, USC).</th>
<th>CofC has a well-defined identity that is clearly, and consistently communicated to all employees, students, prospective students, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HOW DO WE DO WHAT WE DO WELL?
What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations of faculty and staff involvement in new program development should be accompanied by ongoing and incremental support (resources) from the administration.</th>
<th>Marketing of the College should emphasize that in today's rapidly changing work environment, a traditional liberal arts education is more important and valuable than ever.</th>
<th>The T&amp;P evaluation should be supportive of faculty engagement with students and the larger community outside of the classroom.</th>
<th>Our competitive integrity lies in maintaining individualized support for students.</th>
<th>Staff and faculty should be more involved in identifying opportunities for operational cost savings.</th>
<th>The college should focus on developing a 'culture' attractive to students rather than perfecting recruitment strategies.</th>
<th>The college should focus on improving student retention and expanding community college transfers as a way of stabilizing or expanding annual tuition revenue.</th>
<th>The college should increase the proportion of out-of-state and international students as a way of addressing ongoing financial constraints.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW DO WE DO WHAT WE DO WELL? What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is acceptable to have different categories of faculty (e.g., teachers, researchers, teachers-scholars) with diverging Tenure and Promotion expectations.</th>
<th>The college should explore ways to subsidize students' cost of living to make it more financially feasible for students relocating to Charleston for their studies.</th>
<th>Staff and faculty should be provided incentives for participating in fundraising efforts.</th>
<th>CoFSC could attract stronger students than it currently does if only we changed our marketing and admissions strategies.</th>
<th>The college should expand and diversify its professional programs in order adapt to regional growth and increase enrollment.</th>
<th>We need more satellite programs (like the BPS) and increased distance education offerings to increase the number of students paying tuition to CoFSC who will not be on the main campus.</th>
<th>We need to support better our academically weaker students and alter current teaching approaches to service them effectively.</th>
<th>The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we should have ...</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To survive financially, CofC faculty and staff will need to embrace the ...</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should consider shrinking in size (including cutting programs, ...</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College must adjust to the fact that our student body will be weaker ...</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College must admit students of lower academic quality than our standards ...</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW DO WE CREATE A HEALTHY CAMPUS CLIMATE? What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We need better leadership from our executive team to improve campus culture and morale.</th>
<th>There should be more direct communication between faculty and staff regarding institutional matters (admissions, retention, academic standards, etc.)</th>
<th>The administration should allow employees more autonomy in decision-making or involve staff and faculty in its decision-making.</th>
<th>The institution needs a more collaborative culture between faculty and staff and among units.</th>
<th>I would like to see more informal opportunities to get to know faculty and staff outside my division.</th>
<th>We need common spaces (e.g. dining halls, clubs, informal drop-ins, sports teams, book clubs) to promote better communication between employees.</th>
<th>Certain campus committees (e.g. Welfare, Academic Standards, Budget) should include both faculty and staff as voting members.</th>
<th>Morale is low among your colleagues (in your school/division).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration is difficult because departments and programs are pitted</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against each other for resources and limited funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college needs a general Faculty and Staff Council.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have ideas about improving the college but have no way to communicate</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For an institution of this size, complexity and diversity, it is fine</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to target different audiences with different messages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't seek more communal engagement as my voice does not matter.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the work and responsibilities of other departments and</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plans are a waste of time and energy that do not help the</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current structure of shared governance is effective in giving</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty voice and influence on the institutional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average**

- Collaboration: 5.2
- Faculty and Staff Council: 5.0
- Ideas: 4.5
- Target Audience: 4.4
- Voice: 4.3
- Responsibilities: 4.0
- Strategic Plans: 3.5
- Governance: 3.2
HOW DO WE CREATE A HEALTHY CAMPUS CLIMATE? What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The structures of shared governance should be restricted to roster faculty.</th>
<th>I feel well informed about initiatives on campus outside my division.</th>
<th>The administration's plans and decision are effectively explained and communicated.</th>
<th>Yammer has improved our ability to communicate effectively and efficiently.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rank the following as factors for your good morale (1=most important to 7=least important). You can click and drag to change the ordering:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Least</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary and benefits</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty of job status</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice in decision-making</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good relations with other employees</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of institutional purpose</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional organization and collaboration</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional financial health/outlook</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 100%
I get the most information about events, initiatives and plans on campus from (rank order: 1 - most frequently to 7 - least frequently). You can click and drag to move the bars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E-mails</th>
<th>Colleagues</th>
<th>My dept chair/supervisor</th>
<th>Campus newsletters</th>
<th>Local press</th>
<th>Yammer</th>
<th>Senate/committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty interactions with individual students (research, mentoring, smaller classes)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>Undergraduate programs</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>Traditional undergraduates</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal arts skills - critical thinking, teamwork, writing - equip students to better apply modern technologies in</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Masters programs</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Transfer students (from other 4-year colleges)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the College – small classes + opportunity for specialized research</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>Online programs</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Transfer students (from tech colleges)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning (internships with companies/non-profits, civic engagement)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>Certificate programs</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston location (architecture, gardens, weather)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>Ph.D. programs</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Working professionals</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public liberal arts and sciences institution in the state of SC</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Active-duty military</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential campus in the historic and architecturally beautiful city</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies technology and teaching innovations to create exciting in-class experience</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business / entrepreneurship</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If some combinations of the above degree programs or student populations do not make sense for one campus, then we should have multiple campuses with distinct identities?

45%

How would you describe the size of the College of Charleston?

- too small: 16%
- just right: 75%
- too big: 8%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Aspiration</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>College of Charleston Adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-scholar</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator of civic engage</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator of connections with area businesses</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flipped classrooms 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

From: Richard Nunan, Chair
    on behalf of the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
    (George Pothering, Mike Lee, Liz Jurisich, Jannette Finch, Deanna Caveny-Noecker)

To: Faculty Senate

Re: Committee motions concerning Faculty Hearing Committee structure & procedures

The Faculty By-Laws Committee has seven motions to put before the Senate for the March
Senate meeting. The first two are simple language modification motions carried over from last
year, and are set forth in this cover memo. A third, also included in this cover memo, is simple
in concept, but somewhat detailed in execution.

The fourth & fifth motions, concerning the structure and procedures of the Faculty Hearing
Committee and the conduct of hearings, are quite complex, running to 23 pages of text
(attached). Summarizing the content of that document is the main task of this cover memo.

The sixth motion, a follow-up to some of Dr. Chris Fragile’s recommendations on behalf of the
2016-17 Post-Tenure Review Committee, and to some additional related recommendations
from Provost McGee, plus one minor innovation proposed by us, the 2017-18 By-Laws
Committee, isn’t too complicated, but a bit detailed, and also attached separately.

Some uncontroversial elements of the 2016-17 recommendations from last year’s ad hoc
Committee on Hearings, and from last year’s PTR Committee, have already been incorporated
in the Faculty-Administration Manual (FAM hereafter), while Motions 4, 5, & 6 concern the
potentially more controversial recommendations of those two Committees.

Finally, Motion 7 is yet another (more substantive) innovation concerning PTR evaluation stan-
dards language, proposed by the 2017-18 By-Laws Committee. Because this motion functions
quite independently of the other PTR recommendations, we offer it as a separate motion.

Motion 1

FAM 162  VIII.A.9 Class Attendance: Instructors ascertain whether both excused and
unexcused absences count in determining the basis for a grade of “WA,” which
stands for “withdrawn failure due to excessive absences” and is equivalent to a
failing grade.

Request by Mary Bergstrom on behalf of the Office of the Registrar, in order to more accu-
rately reflect what a ‘WA’ grade means, which is an ‘F’, not a ‘W’, with respect to GPA.
While the By-Laws Committee recognizes that this modification is unlikely to eliminate all
confusion that results from conflating ‘W’ grades (which are not ‘F’s) and ‘WA’ grades
(which are), it is a step in the right direction. Changing the grade labels involves complica-
tions which fall well outside the Committee’s authority.
Motion 2

VI. A.11 Final Examinations and Final Course Grades: At the request of the student, a faculty member should make available information and/or an evaluation of the student’s progress prior to the drop date withdrawal deadline.

Request by Lynn Cherry, to comply with current institutional language.

Note that the language in brown is not part of the proposed language for these motions. It is simply explanatory gloss for the Senate’s information. Language in blue is new language proposed (or endorsed) by the 2017-18 By-Laws Committee, in these particular cases to replace strike-through language. That color-coding will apply throughout these motions.

Motion 3

Replace binary-gendered pronouns with gender-neutral substitutes throughout the FAM.

The practical significance of this motion is illustrated throughout the long attached motion on matters governing faculty hearings. Traditional English usage practices are profoundly sexist, a practice which academic institutions have been combatting for some time now. But traditional usage is also profoundly binary with respect to third person gender references such as he/she or her/him. Not everyone subscribes to this dual-valued allocation of genders, and we believe the College should be more inclusive in its official documents. Doing this does sometimes necessitate resorting to plural pronouns in contexts where singular forms would be more traditional. But the practice is becoming more commonplace, and thus our language is arguably evolving, in terms of what is now regarded as grammatically correct.

Although the effects of this motion are already integrated into the attached proposal on hearings, the intent of the motion is much broader, eventually encompassing the entire FAM. Conversely, Motions 4 & 5 below, concerning substantive changes in matters relating to faculty hearings, can be approved with or without passage of Motion 3. The pronoun modification language in the body of the attached document can be reversed again, if needed.

The next two motions are really an integrated unit, but they have been separated out because they involve distinct ratification processes. Motion 4 concerns the By-Laws section of the FAM. As an alteration in the Faculty By-Laws, in addition to securing Senate endorsement, it must be approved also by the Faculty as whole. Motion 5 concerns hearing-related issues which fall outside the By-Laws section of the FAM. Those recommendations, if approved by the Senate, have to then be acceptable also to the Administration.

Motion 4

Modify By-Laws Article V, Section 3 (Standing College Committees), Subsection B.12 (Faculty Hearing Committee), pp. 26 and 27 of current FAM, so as to restructure committee membership as explained in attached detailed motions on hearings (pp. 2-4 of 1st attachment).
This proposal is a variation, with some new innovations, on a recommendation conveyed by the ad hoc Committee on Hearings to the Faculty Senate at the April 2017 meeting. As the ad hoc Committee originally suggested, we have proposed eliminating the distinction between regular and alternate committee members in favor of a committee of the whole. But we have also proposed augmented its size by one member, increased the number of full professors by two, and proposed a different method for selecting individual hearing panels. Our reasoning for these measures is included in the attachment. Red ink indicates language retained (or deleted) from the ad hoc Committee’s original proposal concerning Hearing Committee structure last year. (See page 1 of first attachment for a detailed summary of the color-coding.)

The remaining 19 pp. of the first attachment constitute Motion 5. But for the sake of organizational clarity, the motion is subdivided by its distinctive parts below.

**Motion 5**

A. Clarification of *FAM* language governing the rights of probationary faculty and adjuncts to grieve certain kinds of allegations about the circumstances of their termination or non-renewal before a faculty hearing panel. (*FAM* pp. 72 and 78-80, plus enumeration modifications on 89-91; attachment pp. 5-11)

This is entirely a By-Laws Committee innovation, motivated by concerns about the lack of clarity in *FAM* language governing the grievance rights of Instructor-rank faculty, and adjunct faculty. It’s unrelated to the ad hoc Committee’s recommendations, but nonetheless also relevant to the larger hearing process reform initiative in which the ad hoc Committee and By-Laws Committee have both been engaged.

B. Timing sequence issues with regard to hearing procedures. (*FAM* 125, 126, 149, 181; attachment pp. 12-16) These actually come up throughout the attachment (see summary on p.1)

The By-Laws Committee has made some necessary modifications of timing issues in some locations, but in general, the By-Laws Committee parts company with the ad hoc Committee on the question of shortening timing intervals. The By-Laws Committee’s reasoning for its reversal on this question is laid out in detail on attachment p. 14

C. Conflict of interest findings by faculty hearing panel. (*FAM* p. 182; attachment pp. 17-18)

The proposal offered by the ad hoc Committee concerning conflicts of interest has been both augmented and modified significantly. It has also been moved from the location originally proposed by the ad hoc Committee. Note also the distinction between the hearing *panel* and the Hearing *Committee* (the ‘committee of the whole’). That was intentional.

D. (Mostly) minor repairs of language governing hearing and post-hearing procedures. (FAM 183, 186-188, legendary missing last page of *FAM*; attachment pp. 19-23).

Some of these modifications were devised by the ad hoc Committee last year, others by the By-Laws Committee this year. Note (potentially) limited role of the alternate panel member, whose existence in this proposal is another By-Laws Committee innovation. The last page, discovered in a secret Pentagon storage room near the Ark of the Covenant, was unavailable to the ad hoc Committee last year.
Motion 6

Modify FAM language governing Post-Tenure Review Procedures to clarify timing issues about when a faculty member can come up for a Superior Rating. (Second attachment)

This motion reflects the more substantive elements of the set of recommendations submitted to the Senate by Chris Fragile on behalf of the 2016-17 Post Tenure Review Committee during the April 2017 Senate meeting. The more straightforward details, like the more straightforward details in the ad hoc Committee on Hearings recommendations, were incorporated in the draft 2017-18 FAM over the 2017 summer, and approved then by the 2016-17 and the 2017/18 By-Laws Committees, after which they were ratified by the Senate at the September 2017 Senate meeting. The chief difference between the 2016-17 PTR Committee recommendations and Motion 6 involves a softening of the PTR Committee recommendations concerning deferments.

Motion 7

Insert new FAM language governing Post-Tenure Review standards of evaluation for a Superior Rating. (Third attachment)

This motion is largely self-explanatory. It is offered in the hope of securing both more flexible and more consistent application of the PTR standards for a superior rating.

The By-Laws Committee thanks Senate members in advance for taking the time to read through and deliberate carefully about these detailed and rather complex motions.
By-Laws Committee Partial Affirmation, Proposed Modifications, & Additions to 2017-18 Ad Hoc Committee on Hearings Recommendations  (1 Mar 2018)

Color coding:

Black: Language as currently appears in 2017-18 FAM (includes 09/17 changes ratified by Senate)

Red: Language modifications proposed by ad hoc Committee on Hearings in March 2017

Green strike-through: Old language to be stricken on advice of ad-hoc Committee

Blue: New (or restored) language recommended by the By-Laws Committee

Brown: Explanatory rationales from By-Laws Committee (Ad hoc Committee rationales are available in last year’s Senate archives. By-Laws Committee has not repeated them here.)

In general, strike-through means language proposed to be stricken; thus, red strike-through refers to language proposed by ad hoc Committee, not yet added to FAM, but proposed for replacement by more recent By-Laws Committee language. Black strike-through is By-Laws Committee action applied to existing FAM language.

Pagination & §#s based on current FAM (different from ad hoc Committee FAM pages & §#)

Pages with procedural timing issues (& resolution of a timing conflict):

27  By-Laws V.3.B.12.c  (Hearing Committee meeting within 15 vs. 20 days—eliminated)

125  T&P Procedures (President’s decision within eleven working days instead of 2 weeks)

126  Hearing Procedures (Notice of grievance to be filed w/in 15 vs. 20 working days; President’s decision within 10 working days of receipt of Hearing)

149  Termination Hearing (Notice of grievance to be filed w/in 15 vs. 20 working days)

181  Hearing Procedure (Notice of grievance to be filed w/in 15 vs. 20 working days);

182  Hearing Committee 5 vs. 10 days for jurisdiction decision  (By-Laws recommends 7)
    No more than 15 vs. 20 working days after that meeting to schedule Hearing

187  Resolution of timing conflict between notification by grievant about problems in Hearing and decision by President.

In general, the By-Laws Committee recommends **against** the ad hoc Committee’s proposed reduction of the 20-day windows for the tasks of notifying the Hearing Committee of a grievance and then for scheduling a hearing, out of concern for adequate time for grievant to prepare a case. (See detailed comments at bottom of FAM p. 126 below.)
c. Grievance Procedure:

(1) Any faculty member with a grievance should first report it to her or his Department Chair.

(2) If a faculty member is not satisfied with the settlement provided by the Department Chair, or if the or chair is directly related to the grievance, the faculty member should request in a letter to the Chair of the Grievance Committee a hearing before the Grievance Committee. The letter should state the nature of the grievance.

(3) On receipt of such a written request, the committee Chair will convene the committee to hear the complaint within ten days (normally excluding Christmas, other state holidays, Spring holidays, and from the day after spring Commencement through August 15).

(4) If in the judgment of the committee a grievance is determined to exist, the committee shall attempt to resolve the matter through mediation or other appropriate action.

(5) Grievances unresolved by the Grievance Committee will be referred by the committee Chair to the appropriate authority.

(6) The committee shall supply a faculty member who has brought a grievance before the committee with a written statement of the committee decision in the case.

12. Faculty Hearing Committee

a. Composition: Twelve Eleven (11) tenured faculty members, at least six four of whom shall hold the rank of Professor. Each September the committee Chair will divide the Hearing Committee pool into two panels of six members each, including at least three at the rank of professor, with one of those three designated as a panel alternate. Panels are to be constructed with an eye to broad disciplinary distribution, and submitted by the Chair to the Committee as a whole for majority approval. Each panel will determine its own chair at that time. If a case emerges over the course of the academic year, one of the panels will be assigned randomly to that first case, and the remaining panel to any second case. Any additional cases will be heard by new panels, randomly constituted out of the committee pool, minus any members obliged to recuse themselves for conflicts of interest. In the event of conflicts of interest emerging in the first two panels as initially constituted, members will be swapped as needed, by the Committee Chair, subject to majority approval by the Committee as a whole. Five members will be randomly among those with no conflict of interest, including two members with the rank of Professor. In the event of a second hearing in a given academic year a second committee of five will be constituted. Members of the first committee may elect to not be considered for service in the second Hearing. Each iteration of a group to Hear a case will consist of five members, two of whom must have the rank of Professor. Two years of service is encouraged.
Each Hearing Committee member will normally serve three consecutive academic years. Committee assignments shall be staggered as determined by the Committee on Nominations and Elections. Early each Fall term, committee members will undergo training sessions relevant to Hearing Committee responsibilities, conducted by past committee members or others with relevant expertise. It will be the committee Chair’s responsibility to organize the training sessions.

Composition: Five tenured faculty members, at least two of whom shall hold the rank of Professor, and six tenured alternates, at least two of whom shall have the rank of Professor, who shall be available in case of a conflict of interest involving a member of the committee. In the event of the disqualification of a committee member because of a conflict of interest, a replacement of comparable rank shall be chosen from among the alternates, if possible.

The recommendation to assign the committee Chair the novel task of selecting panel members early in the year is a By-Laws Committee attempt to apply AAUP best practices advice to the task of designating hearing panel membership, by doing it prior to the emergence of any particular grievant, so as to minimize the possibility of conflict of interest issues that might otherwise arise in panel selection. The additional suggestion about swapping out panel members is an acknowledgment of the possibility that conflicts of interest could arise nonetheless, depending on the identity of a particular grievant and the constitution of a particular panel. The panel member swapping policy is the By-Laws Committee’s proposed solution to that contingency.

The innovation of adding an alternate to each panel is a By-Laws Committee addition to the ad hoc Committee’s novel recommendation to reconstitute the previous mix of regular and alternate Hearing Committee members as a collective panel pool. This additional new element was devised to render it less likely that a panel’s full complement of members might be disrupted if a panel member is unpredictably unable to complete panel duties. If such a contingency appears unlikely at the close of a hearing, the alternate could then be excused from participation in post-hearing deliberations, and merely be “on call” for participation if a regular panel member abruptly becomes unable to participate at some later point in the panel’s post-hearing deliberations. This proposal does necessitate adding a twelfth member to the Hearing Committee, one at the rank of Professor. The total number of members at the rank of Professor would increase from four to six, compared to the existing policy, and from five to six, compared to the ad hoc Committee’s recommendations. This undeniably poses a new challenge for the Nominations Committee.

Concerning proposed addition in blue at top of this page (bottom of what is now FAM page 26), advising training sessions for Hearing Committee members, the ad hoc Committee did not address the issue in their proposal to the Senate, although they did discuss the topic. This language serves to put both the Faculty and the Administration on notice that training sessions should be conducted, while leaving open the details by precisely whom, or on what topics training sessions would be conducted, prior to the emergence of specific cases. The general idea is to try to insure, in part, that Hearing Committee members are reasonably conversant with hearing process regulations in FAM, but also that they are familiar with the specific nature of the substantive rights possessed by grievants, and with the nature of committee members’ quasi-judicial responsibilities, and authority, within hearings. Case studies would be an appropriate vehicle to use in training sessions.
b. Duties:

(1) To hear the cases of tenured faculty members against whom the College has made formal, written allegations of a nature that, if substantiated, could lead to their dismissal for cause.

(2) To hear cases of non-tenured faculty members against whom the College has made formal, written allegations of a nature that, if substantiated, could lead to their dismissal during the course of a contract year.

(3) To hear cases involving alleged discrimination in denial of tenure, dismissal at the end of the contract term, promotion, compensation, or work assignment.

(4) To hear cases involving alleged violation of academic freedom.

(5) To hear cases involving alleged violation of due process.

(6) To hear election appeals.

(7) To hear other matters referred by the President to the Committee where a due process hearing is necessary.

c. Grievance Procedure:

On receipt of a written request, the committee Chair will normally convene the Committee within thirty days (normally to exclude all College holidays and from the day after spring commencement through August 15) fifteen working days in accordance with procedures for the committee outlined in the Faculty Hearing Committee Faculty/Administration Manual, Appendix E, Article X, Section I, the section laying out the procedures governing “Grievances Before the Faculty Hearing Committee.” In addition to the procedures set forth in X.I, the Committee will also follow pertinent policies located in Articles IV Conduct of Faculty and Administrators, V Terms and Records of Faculty and Unclassified Administrators, VI Evaluation of Faculty, and VII Faculty Discipline, Misconduct, and Termination, which details the Hearing Committee’s procedure.

13. Faculty Research and Development Committee

1. Composition: Nine faculty members. The Provost, or a representative selected by the Provost, shall serve as ex-officio member without a vote.

2. Duties:

(1) To support and encourage faculty research, professional advancement, and development at the College.
b. All members of the faculty, whether tenured or not, are entitled to protection against illegal or unconstitutional discrimination by the institution, or discrimination on a basis not demonstrably related to the faculty member’s professional performance, including but not limited to gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, race, color, religion, national origin, veterans’ status, genetic information, or disability, as proscribed by law and described in the College’s policy *Prohibition of Discrimination and Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment and Abuse*.

4. Complaints of Violation of Academic Freedom or of Discrimination in Non-reappointment

If a faculty member on probationary or other non-tenured appointment (including adjuncts) alleges that a decision against reappointment was based significantly on considerations violative of academic freedom or governing policies concerning illegal or institutional discrimination by the institution based on, but not limited to gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, race, color, religion, national origin, veterans’ status, genetic information, or disability, he or she may file a grievance with the Faculty Hearing Committee. (See Art. X.I. for procedures.)

5. Academic Freedom for Administrative Personnel Holding Faculty Status

The foregoing regulations apply to administrative personnel who hold faculty status and rank, but only in their capacity as faculty members. All other unclassified academic administrators who allege that a violation of academic freedom or improper discrimination contributed to a decision to terminate their appointment to an administrative post, or not to reappoint them, are entitled to the procedures set forth in Section IV.A.

6. Political Activities of Faculty Members

As responsible and interested citizens in their community, faculty, staff and unclassified administrators of the College should fulfill their civic responsibilities and are free to engage in political activities.

The College policy related to such matters is that the holding of county, municipal and other local offices is generally permitted. However, the holding of such an office must not conflict with the performance of the faculty member’s assigned College duties. If, at any time, it appears that there is a conflict or substantial interference with assigned duties, the College has the right to claim a conflict of interest or substantial interference and request that the faculty member either resign the political post or take leave without pay from the College. Further, this also applies if any of the political duties give the officeholder an exercise of control.
over the College or any of its activities through financial support, direction of academic research, extension functions or employment of personnel.

Where a faculty or staff member seeks county, state or federal government political office, he or she must discuss said candidacy with the Provost before becoming a candidate. The purpose of this discussion is to try to determine, in advance, whether a conflict of interest or substantial interference with assigned duties would result. If it is determined it would, the Provost will recommend to the President that the candidate be granted leave without pay for the duration of an election campaign and/or term of office before the date of officially taking office. The terms of such leave of absence will be set forth in writing and the leave will not affect unfavorably the tenure status of a faculty member, except that time spent on such leave will not count as probationary service unless otherwise agreed to. (See “Statement on Professors and Political Activity,” AAUP Bulletin 55 [Autumn 1969]: pp. 388-89.) The President has the sole discretion to accept or reject the request for a leave of absence.

7. Academic Freedom for Graduate Students

In no case will a graduate or teaching assistant be dismissed without having been provided with a statement of reasons and an opportunity to be heard before a duly constituted committee. (A dismissal is a termination before the end of the period of appointment.) A graduate or teaching assistant who establishes a prima facie case to the satisfaction of a duly constituted committee that a decision against reappointment was based significantly on considerations violative of academic freedom, or of governing policies against improper discrimination as stated in Section IV.A (above), will be given a statement of reasons by those responsible for the non-reappointment and an opportunity to be heard by the Faculty Grievance Committee.

8. Other Academic Staff

1. In no case will a member of the academic staff who is not otherwise protected by the preceding regulations which relate to dismissal proceedings be dismissed without having been provided with a statement of reasons and an opportunity to be heard before a duly constituted committee. (A dismissal is a termination before the end of the period of appointment.)

2. When a member of the academic staff feels that his/her non-reappointment is the result of a violation of academic freedom or discrimination (see Sections IV.A and IV. C), the individual may bring the matter before the Faculty Hearing Committee. If the committee finds that the facts, as preliminarily stated in the

No changes are proposed for p. 73. It’s included here (along with p. 72) for reference, to aid understanding of subsequent modifications on FAM pp. 78, 79, & 80 (immediately below).
2. Evidence of accuracy of the curriculum vitae (academic credentials validated by appropriate documentation);
3. Contract and/or letter of initial employment;
4. Job description for unclassified administrators;
5. Letter authorizing sabbaticals or other leaves of absence;
6. Copies of recommendations and action on tenure, promotion, and third-year evaluation;
7. Copies of annual salary letters;

The appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries will maintain copies of annual and third-year evaluations and correspondence relating to professional development, honors and College employment.

D. Probationary Appointments for Tenure-track Faculty and Instructors

Any appointment of a faculty member to a tenure-track position, or at the Instructor rank, is considered probationary since the individual has not yet fulfilled the required conditions to be considered by his or her peers and the administration for continuous appointment; i.e., for tenure or promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor.

1. Crediting of Prior Experience Toward Fulfillment of Probationary Period

At the College of Charleston probationary appointments are for one year, subject to renewal. Unless stated otherwise in the initial contractual letter of appointment to any rank sent to an instructional faculty member or librarian, the probationary period before the individual is considered for tenure is six years. Credit may be granted for a faculty member’s full-time service at other institutions of higher learning. The number of years of credit for prior service normally will not exceed two years even though the faculty member’s total probationary period in the academic profession is thereby extended beyond the normal maximum of six years. The initial letter of appointment will state the years of prior service that will be counted toward fulfillment of the probationary period and the year in which he/she will be considered for tenure.

(Rev. April 2007)

Librarians appointed to the College Library with three or more years of service in other libraries but who do not yet evidence appropriate records of activity in professional growth and development and/or institutional or

23 This section is based directly upon and quotes extensively from the 1982 RIR, 2. Probationary Appointments, p.22

Modification of the section heading and insertion of the ‘Instructor’ rank in the opening paragraph in section D are designed to insure that faculty at Instructor rank are covered by the same protections as probationary T-T faculty. The Committee surmises that the reference to ‘Instructors’ in subsection 3 (next page) may have been intended to expand this coverage accordingly.
community service will be given less than maximum credit in order to have more time to prepare for tenure review.

A period of scholarly leave of absence up to one year may count as part of the probationary period as if it were prior service at another institution. The faculty member, the Department Chair, the Dean, the Provost and the President will agree in writing to this provision at the time the leave is granted.

2. Information Relating to Standards and Procedures of Renewal, Tenure and Promotion

The instructional faculty member or librarian will be advised at the time of the initial appointment to review the sections of this Faculty/Administration Manual describing the substantive institutional standards and procedures generally employed in decisions affecting renewal and the granting of tenure and to discuss these with the Department Chair (or Dean of Libraries). Any special standards adopted by the faculty member’s department will be transmitted by the Department Chair (or Dean of Libraries) at the time of appointment and be reviewed, together with the institutional standards, during the annual evaluation of the member by the Chair. The faculty member will be advised of the time when decisions affecting renewal or tenure are ordinarily made, and will be expected to submit material that he or she believes will be informative.

3. Procedure for Considering Non-Renewal of a Faculty Member (Including Instructors) in First or Second Year of Probationary Appointment

From time to time it is important to the welfare of students or faculty in a department for a faculty member to be terminated at the end of a first-year or second-year appointment. Since state legislation (South Carolina Code of Laws, Section 8-17-380) provides that non-renewal of a one-year contract at the end of the contract period is not grievable, such terminations are not in violation of the terms of employment. Nonetheless, since terminations based on discriminatory intent, violations of academic freedom, or inadequate consideration are all grievable under other provisions of the South Carolina Code, federal law, and/or this Manual, all decisions to terminate probationary appointments at the end of the first or second year must be accompanied by written notification of cause. Such notification is necessary to establish that the grounds for termination are indeed not grievable.

If the Chair or any other tenured member believes that non-renewal is appropriate, the Chair should convene the tenured faculty for a discussion of the chair’s proposed action, and seek to reach group agreement. If a consensus cannot be reached, the Chair will present in writing to the Dean

Subsection 3 heading has been modified by the insertion of parentheses around the expression ‘Including Instructors’ for purposes of clarification of intent of subsection. By-Laws Committee assumes this language was added shortly after Instructor and Senior Instructor ranks were created. Deleted last line of Subsection 3’s first ¶ is replaced by a new line at end of section (next page).
the various positions represented by the group within the department as well as his/her position. The decision on whether to terminate or continue will rest with the Chair unless the Dean has serious reservations. In such a situation, the Provost will review all of the pertinent information and, after discussing the case with the Chair and the Dean, will rule on which action is to be taken.

In the case of individuals in their first (second) year of probationary appointment, individuals must be notified by March 15 (December 15) if their contract will not be renewed at the end of the contract year. Except under exceptional circumstances, a new faculty member credited with two years or more probationary time should be given at least one year’s notice in the event his or her contract is to be terminated.

After a decision has been reached, the Chair should notify the Provost at least two weeks before the dates specified in the Faculty/Administration Manual so that the Provost can inform a first or second year faculty member that he/she will not be given a contract for the following year.

The College is under no obligation to reappoint any untenured faculty member at the expiration of the contract year. But termination decisions for probationary faculty must be accompanied by written notification of the reasons for termination. If the probationary faculty member finds that explanation unpersuasive with respect to grievable allegations (see first paragraph of subsection), they may file a grievance with the Faculty Hearing Committee. (See Article X.I for procedures.)

4. Employment of Faculty Who are Not United States Citizens

All faculty members who are not United States citizens must hold a valid visa or permanent alien registration card at all times while employed by the College of Charleston. This is a condition of employment and faculty members who do not comply with this condition are subject to termination.

E. Adjunct Faculty Appointments

Adjunct faculty and adjunct library faculty appointments are typically for a single semester, and never for longer than a year’s duration, although they may be renewed at the discretion of the relevant administrative authority. Since adjunct faculty are temporary appointments, no obligation exists on the part of the College to evaluate such a special appointee with a view to continued employment past the end of the fixed term, nor to give any notice in respect of such an intention.

In no case will an adjunct faculty member be dismissed without having been provided with a statement of reasons and an opportunity to be heard before a duly constituted committee. (A dismissal is a termination before the end of the period of appointment.)

Last sentence in Subsection 3 is intended to clarify the purpose of the written notice of cause.
Since state legislation (South Carolina Code of Laws, Section 8-17-380) provides that non-renewal of a temporary adjunct contract at the end of the contract period is not grievable, such terminations are not in violation of the terms of employment, and therefore require no written justification. Nonetheless, non-renewals based on discriminatory intent, violations of academic freedom, or inadequate consideration are all grievable, even for adjunct faculty, under other provisions of the South Carolina Code, federal law, and/or this Manual. Therefore, when an adjunct faculty member alleges a violation in their non-reappointment on any of these three grounds, they may request written notification of cause. If the adjunct faculty member finds that explanation unpersuasive with respect to grievable allegations (as listed above), they may file a grievance with the Faculty Hearing Committee. (See Article X.I for procedures.)

F. Unclassified Administrators

1. Annual Evaluation of Administrators: The evaluation of College of Charleston unclassified administrators takes place annually. Evaluation processes vary depending on the nature and conditions of the administrative appointment. The President is evaluated by the Board of Trustees.

2. Dismissal for Cause: Dismissal of an administrator prior to the end of an employment contract term shall be only for adequate reason (cause) and may be grieved using the procedure in Section 3 which follows below. The following adequate reasons for termination of a contract before the end of a contract term are the same as those described for faculty in Art. VII.C.

Modify Sections V.F (p. 89), V.G (p. 89), V.H & V.I (p. 90), V.J (p. 91) to V.G through V.K.

Rationale for proposed insertions governing adjunct faculty rights:

At present, there are express protections of the sort inserted here for dismissals or non-reappointments of tenure-track faculty in their first or second year of appointment, and (the By-Laws Committee assumes), similar protections for faculty occupying probationary Instructor lines.

Similarly, in IV.C.5 “Academic Freedom for Administrative Personnel Holding Faculty Status” (p. 72 of the current FAM), IV.C.7 “Academic Freedom for Graduate Students” and IV.C.8 “Other Academic Staff” (p. 73 of current FAM), such protections are provided for administrators acting in faculty capacity, for graduate students, and for non-faculty academic staff, possibly with some pedagogical duties. (The nature of the classification is somewhat unclear.) There is also more general protection of “all members of the faculty, whether tenured or not,” against discrimination and violation of academic freedom, in IV.C.3.a (p. 71), IV.C.3.b, and IV.C.4 (p. 72). But adjunct faculty are nowhere explicitly included in comparable language.

More specifically, while the first two groups, probationary tenure track faculty and probationary instructors, can be terminated without cause under SC law, cause must nonetheless be provided in order to vindicate those faculty members’ rights against terminations that were discriminatory or violations of academic freedom. (See V.D.3 on p. 79 above.) In the case of faculty occupying Instructor lines, the By-Laws Committees changes recommended on pp. 78 & 79 are designed to
make it explicit that Instructor lines are included under that form of protection. But the same is not expressly true for adjunct faculty terminated either through dismissal or through non-renewal.

The absence of the proposed insertions is seriously problematic with respect to adjunct faculty rights with regard to academic freedom and non-discrimination. If an adjunct faculty member at risk of termination *never* has to be given any reasons for the termination, how can that individual pursue an action through the Hearing Committee in an effective way? At present, it appears that administrators acting in faculty roles, graduate students, non-faculty academic staff, probationary faculty in tenure-track and Instructor lines, all have that opportunity. (Tenured faculty and Senior Instructors can only be fired for cause—the latter during their contracted employment period.) Adjunct faculty, regardless of number of years appointment, are not expressly covered. Yet adjunct faculty, too, are entitled to non-discriminatory treatment & protection of academic freedom.

Note that the language governing non-renewals of adjuncts does not require universal notifications of reasons for non-renewals, but it does enable protesting adjuncts to compel such explanations.
12. Provost’s Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion Candidates

After the Advisory Committee has made its written recommendation to the President, the Provost may interview the candidate as part of his/her independent evaluation of the candidate. The Provost’s recommendation shall be submitted in writing to the President by the announced deadlines. In all cases in which the Provost’s recommendation is negative or reverses an earlier decision, the Provost will provide a copy of his/her recommendation to the candidate, chair, Dean, and chair of the Advisory Committee simultaneously with notice to the candidate of the President’s decision. (Rev. Apr. 2009; Rev. Apr. 2012)

13. President’s Decision

The President shall make a final determination within 2 weeks after she/he receives recommendations from all of the following: the department evaluation panel, the appropriate Dean, the Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Provost. All such recommendations shall be submitted to the President no later than March 1 of each year. In addition to these recommendations, the President shall also have access to, and may consider, other materials used by any or all of the foregoing during the course of their respective evaluations. Once a final decision is made by the President, and within the 2 weeks after the last recommendation is received by her/him, the President shall inform the candidate, the Provost, the Dean, and the evaluation panel chair in writing, of her/his decision. (Rev. Apr. 2009)

13. Appeal to the Faculty Hearing Committee

a. A denial may only be appealed to the Faculty Hearing Committee when the faculty member alleges that the denial was based upon any of the following three grounds:

i. Discrimination, defined as differential treatment based upon gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, race, color, religion, national origin, veterans’ status, genetic information, or disability; or,

ii. Violation of academic freedom, as it relates to freedom of expression; or,

36 Deadlines for earlier stages of the review process are prior to March 1 and are announced by Academic Affairs each year.

37 This list was revised in August 2017 to reflect the College’s policy Prohibition of Discrimination and Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment and Abuse.
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iii. Violation of due process, as provided in the College’s published rules, regulations, policies and procedures.

b. The appeal shall be heard as a grievance before the Faculty Hearing Committee, and the faculty member should follow the procedures of that committee in requesting a hearing. The notice requesting a hearing before that committee must be filed within twenty fifteen working days of receipt of the President’s written decision.

c. The President’s decision will be made within ten working days after he/she reviews receipt of the recommendation of the Faculty Hearing Committee, and receipt of any objections about the conduct of the hearing or correction of errors of fact from the grievant, or notice of waiver of that right by the grievant.

14. Discretionary Appeal to College of Charleston Board of Trustees

a. The President’s decision in cases heard by the Faculty Hearing Committee may be appealed to the College of Charleston Board of Trustees. The decision as to whether or not to accept the appeal is within the sole discretion of the Board.

b. When an appeal to the College of Charleston Board of Trustees is sought, the faculty member must file a Notice of Appeal within 10 working days of receipt of the President’s decision. This Notice must be in writing and sent to the Chair of the Board, with a copy to the President. The Notice of Appeal must identify the issues to be raised in the appeal and the grounds for the appeal.

c. If the Board decides to hear the appeal, the Chair of the Board will establish a reasonable timetable for disposition of the appeal, which will be communicated to all parties.

d. At the Chair’s discretion, appeals will be heard by the entire Board or by a committee of not less than three Board members appointed by the Chair for that purpose.

e. Appeals will be heard on the record established in the Faculty Hearing Committee. The Board shall have available for its review all tape recordings, statements, documents and evidence accumulated during the appeal process. Briefs and oral arguments will be permitted but are not required. Oral arguments may be made by the parties or by their attorneys.

f. The Board shall submit its decision in writing to the President and the faculty member. The decision of the Board is final.

38 The College of Charleston Board of Trustees passed this policy concerning appeals by faculty members in January 1985. This list was revised in August 2017 to reflect the College’s policy Prohibition of Discrimination and Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment and Abuse.

IV.D.13.b includes first of several ad hoc Comm. recommendations to shorten Hearing deadlines.
This series of proposals revolved around the idea that, by reducing the statute of limitations in which to file a complaint, and the interval from filing to a scheduled hearing, from 20 working days to 15, the ad hoc Committee on Hearings hoped to increase the likelihood that the work of a hearing panel in a tenure or promotion denial case, or denial of a superior PTR rating case, might stand a reasonable chance of completion prior to the May 15th end-of-contracted annual ‘regular duties’ of faculty.

In the view of the By-Laws Committee, this move toward contraction of the time frames fails to take account of the hardships already experienced by grievants faced with the prospect of composing a case in a very short time period, largely on their own, without any prior experience in such a project, and often when they are immersed in routine pedagogical duties which already consume a lot of their time on a daily basis. Making that interval even briefer for the convenience of faculty serving on a Hearing Committee panel just does not seem a compelling justification for eroding the due process rights of grievants.

Part of the thinking of the ad hoc Committee appears to have been that prospective grievants are, or should be, already aware of the likelihood, or at least risk, of a negative outcome in their tenure, promotion, or PTR evaluation, and should be undertaking preliminary preparations well before the President’s final decision is issued. This may be true in many cases of these types, although perhaps not all, but this argument loses sight of the fact that prospective grievants may emerge from other administrative processes which take them much more by surprise. Not all grievances are about tenure decisions.

The emendation suggested in blue in 13.c is newly proposed to conform with the (already existing) requirements of the Post-Hearing language in the last two pages of the FAM (included below). Time has to be allowed for the grievant to file notice with the President about any procedural concerns about the manner in which the Hearing was conducted, or about any alleged errors of fact upon which the hearing panel, or the President, may otherwise be relying in coming to their respective judgments in the case.
C. Termination of Tenured Faculty Members “For Cause” and Termination Procedure

1. Conditions Under Which A Tenured Faculty Member’s Contract Can Be Terminated

Until the retirement of the faculty member and subject to the procedure stated hereinafter, an appointment with tenure may be terminated by the College only for adequate cause. The following will be considered adequate cause for the termination of tenure:

a. Demonstrably bona fide institutional contingencies such as curtailment or discontinuance of programs or departments;

b. Financial exigencies that are demonstrably bona fide but only after giving the faculty member 12 months’ notice;

c. Physical or mental inability to fulfill the terms and conditions of the appointment;

d. Incompetence, neglect of duty, immorality, dishonesty, including but not limited to plagiarism, falsification of academic credentials or vitae, conduct unbecoming a faculty member, conviction of violating the criminal laws of any state or the United States, willful and repeated violations of College rules, regulations or policies.

(Faculty Responsibilities to Students, Code of Professional Conduct, Faculty/Administration Manual Art. VIII.A, and Statement of Professional Ethics, Faculty/Administration Manual Art. IV.B.)

Termination Procedure

a. Termination for cause of a tenure appointment shall be preceded by a written notice of proposed dismissal which states the reasons for the proposed dismissal and gives the faculty member an opportunity to be heard by the Faculty Hearing Committee. Formal written notice may be preceded by discussions between the faculty member and appropriate administrative officers looking toward a mutual settlement.

b. If the faculty member elects to have a hearing before the Committee, he/she must file a Notice of Grievance with the Chair of the Committee, with a copy to the President, within twenty fifteen working days (normally to exclude all College holidays and from the day after spring commencement through August 15) of receipt of the notice of proposed dismissal. The procedures followed by the Faculty

[continues on p. 150…]

For reasons stated at bottom of FAM p. 126 above, the By-Laws Committee takes the view that the ad hoc Committee recommendation in the last ¶ above is a bad idea. The By-Laws Committee suggests retaining the 20-day period.
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h. Other matters referred by the President to the committee where a due process hearing is necessary.

2. Requesting a Hearing

a. A Notice of Grievance must be filed by the grievant faculty member with the Chair of the Faculty Hearing Committee, with copies to the President, Provost and the grievant’s Department Chair and Dean, within twenty fifteen working days of the act complained of and shall contain the following information:

(1) the date of the act complained of and the name of the person or persons alleged to have been responsible for the act;{49}

(2) a clear, detailed statement of why the grievance falls within the jurisdiction of the Faculty Hearing Committee;

(3) a detailed description of evidence in support of the position of the grievant;

(4) the names of potential witnesses for the grievant, with a short statement of the subject matter of their potential testimony;

(5) the specific remedial action or relief sought;

(6) a brief summary of the results of previous discussions on the issues involved which the grievant has had with the person or persons responsible for the action complained of, if such discussions have been held; and

(7) a preference as to whether a hearing, if held, is to be open to the public or closed to all except the committee and those involved in the hearing.\footnote{50}

Failure to file a Notice containing this information within the specified time limitation shall be a waiver of grievance and of all rights under these procedures, absent a finding of good cause for a reasonable delay, as determined by the Hearing Committee.

\footnote{49} If the grievance is based upon a Notice of Dismissal, a copy of the Notice or letter giving notice should be attached to the Notice of Grievance.

\footnote{50} The President and Provost may also express a preference for an open or closed hearing by informing the chair of the committee of the preference before the committee’s first meeting.

For reasons stated at bottom of \textit{FAM} p. 126 above, the By-Laws Committee takes the view that the ad hoc Committee recommendation in 2.a above is a bad idea. The By-Laws Committee suggests retaining the 20-day period.
b. The committee assigned hearing panel will meet within five ten seven working days after receipt of the Notice of Grievance by the Chair in order to determine whether the grievance has been properly and timely filed and whether the nature of the grievance is within the jurisdiction of the Hearing Committee. If the committee hearing panel decides that the grievance should be heard, it shall set a date for the hearing, which must be held within twenty fifteen working days of the committee panel meeting. The committee panel shall also decide, taking into account the preferences expressed, whether the hearing will be open or closed.

c. Within two working days after the committee panel determines the matters set out in (b) above, the panel chair shall notify in writing the grievant, the President; the Provost; the Dean; and, where applicable, the Department Chair of the decision of the committee as to whether or not the grievance will be heard.

(1) If the decision is negative, the committee panel chair will specify the committee’s reasons for not hearing the grievance.

(2) If the decision is positive, the committee panel chair shall include in this written notice the date, time and place of the hearing and the committee’s decision as to whether or not the hearing will be open or closed.

d. Within two working days of receipt of the committee panel’s decision as to whether or not a hearing will be held, the Provost shall give written notice to the committee panel and the grievant of the name of the representative who will be representing the College at the hearing. The college representative may be any of the following persons, so long as he/she is not an attorney and has no conflict of interest in the proceeding: the Provost, a Vice President, a Dean, a Department Chair or any other member of the College community deemed appropriate by the Provost.

3. Pre-Hearing Procedures

a. If the grievant intends to have counsel at the hearing, the grievant shall notify the committee hearing panel and the college representative at least ten (10) working days prior to the date of the hearing. Failure to so advise within this time period may result in a delay of the hearing.

b. The Hearing Committee assigned hearing panel has the authority to determine whether there are conflicts of interest among proceeding participants. If the conflict of interest involves a hearing panel member, that individual will be asked to step down from that particular panel, and another committee member will be appointed to substitute by the Chair of the Hearing Committee, subject to the approval of the Hearing Committee as a whole. If the conflict of interest involves the college’s representative, that individual and the Provost will be so advised, although a decision about recusal in that case rests ultimately with the Provost.
Other perceived conflicts of interest will be dealt with as the hearing panel deems appropriate. Such determinations may be appealed to the Hearing Committee by the grievant, the college’s representative, or any other affected party, for reconsideration.

At a mutually convenient time, but at least three working days prior to the hearing, the committee panel chair shall hold a pre-hearing meeting with the parties in order to:

In X.I.2.b, the ad hoc Committee recommends lengthening the time period for a jurisdictional decision by the Hearing Committee to ten days. Five days does seem a little short, even for a jurisdictional decision which does not seriously assess the substantive merits of the grievant’s complaint. The simple logistics of scheduling a meeting involving six faculty members may take a week on its own. Seven working days seems a good compromise to the By-Laws Committee.

For reasons stated at bottom of FAM p. 126 above, the By-Laws Committee takes the view that the ad hoc Committee recommendation to reduce the time between the hearing panel’s jurisdictional decision and the scheduling of the hearing (also in paragraph X.I.2.b) is unwise. The By-Laws Committee suggests retaining the 20-day period.

Paragraph X.I.3.b is new, inserted here to signal that deliberation in which the panel may engage concerning conflict of interest questions is normally a pre-hearing matter. (Of course that might not always be the case.) It has been moved from the original location proposed by the ad hoc Committee on Hearings, which would have inserted it in the activities to be conducted at the pre-hearing meeting. In the view of the By-Laws Committee, that is rather late in the day to be making decisions about some conflict of interest issues. More importantly, the deletion of red language in X.I.2.d, and the added blue language in X.I.3.b represent substantive modifications, additions, and elaboration of last year’s recommendation from the ad hoc Committee on Hearings.

In the view of the By-Laws Committee, the language proposed to be stricken from the ad hoc Committee on Hearings’ recommendation concerning X.I.2.d reflects the By-Laws Committee’s conviction that, however desirable and prudent such a policy might be, the Faculty Hearing Committee does not have the statutory authority to compel the Provost to reverse a decision on who has been appointed as college representative. Perhaps more to the point, the current Provost is unlikely to concede that authority to the Faculty Hearing Committee. Quite possibly, the same may be true of future provosts, as a matter of respecting statutory lines of authority.

On the other hand, the By-Laws Committee does recognize, and agree with, the ad hoc Committee’s observation that it is on occasion important for a hearing panel to speak out on what it perceives to be various sorts of conflicts of interest, including ones concerning potential conflicts of interest involving the college representative. A Provost can of course ignore such advice on grounds of honest disagreement with the judgment, but once that judgment becomes a matter of a hearing record, the Provost may be doing so at the institution’s peril. In other respects the X.I.3.b blue language is designed to give some executable force to the ad hoc Committee’s proposal.
(1) exchange the names of witnesses to be called at the hearing;

(2) exchange documents and other evidence to be used at the hearing;

(3) enter into stipulations of fact;

(4) achieve other appropriate pre-hearing objectives to ensure a fair, effective, and expeditious hearing.

Witnesses and evidence not exchanged at this meeting will not be allowed to be presented at the hearing except for good cause shown, as determined by the committee.

4. The Hearing
   a. Attendance

   (1) If the hearing is to be closed, attendance shall be limited to:

      (a) members of the committee hearing panel, including the alternate

      (b) the grievant

      (c) the grievant’s advisor or lawyer, if desired

      (d) the college representative

      (e) the college’s General Counsel

      (f) witnesses while giving evidence

      (g) AAUP observer, if requested by either party or the committee

      (h) recording equipment operator and/or court reporter, if any.

   All participants in a closed hearing will be asked to maintain the confidentiality of the hearing to the extent reasonably possible.

   1. (2) If the hearing is to be open, the only parties to be excluded will be the witnesses, who may not attend the hearing.
may withdraw any portion or all of the grievance, with the consent of the Committee hearing panel. In all cases of withdrawal with consent, the grievant shall not have the privilege of reopening the same grievance at any time in the future.

c. Sequence of Events

(1) Grievant may make an opening statement.

(2) College representative may make an opening statement.

(3) Grievant presents witnesses and evidence on his or her behalf, subject to cross-examination by the college representative, and members of the Committee panel, including the panel alternate.

(4) College representative may request the committee to rule against the grievant and terminate the hearing because the grievance is not supported by the evidence presented by the grievant. The grievant may argue against this request. If the request is granted, the committee shall terminate the hearing and prepare its report. If the request is denied, the hearing proceeds to the next stage.

(5) College representative presents witnesses and evidence, subject to cross-examination by the grievant, and members of the Committee panel, including the panel alternate.

(6) The committee panel may call new witnesses, or recall previous ones, whose testimony it deems relevant or helpful. New witnesses are subject to cross-examination by the grievant and the college representative.

(7) Rebuttal evidence (either testimony or documents) may be presented by either party, the grievant doing so first.

(8) The grievant may make a closing argument, followed by the college representative. The grievant may rebut the closing argument of the college representative if he/she so desires.

(9) If the committee panel would find them helpful, it may request that additional written arguments be filed by both parties, with a copy furnished to the opposing party, within a reasonable period of time stipulated by the Committee panel.

5. Post-Hearing Procedures

The panel alternate has been added in (3) and (5), on the theory that we would want to allow that individual to participate in questioning witnesses, because of the possibility of being involved in subsequent deliberations. Normally, the alternate would step down after the completion of the hearing, as reflected in X.I.5.a on p. 187 (next page).
Following the hearing, the committee assigned hearing panel, exclusive of any remaining alternate, shall meet in closed executive session with all other persons excluded. In this session, the committee panel shall prepare its report, based upon the evidence presented at the hearing. The written report shall contain:

1. Statement of purpose of the hearing;
2. The issues considered by the committee;
3. Findings of fact as to each major issue raised by the parties; and
4. Recommendations, if desired.

The committee panel’s report shall be forwarded to the President, the grievant and the College representative within ten working days of the conclusion of the hearing, as soon as reasonably possible after the conclusion of the hearing, normally within fifteen working days. The findings and recommendations, if any, of the committee are advisory only and shall in no way bind or commit the President to any suggested course of action. The report must have the concurrence of a majority of the committee panel. A minority position may be expressed either in a section of the committee panel’s report or as a separate report.

If the findings and/or recommendations are adverse to the grievant, he/she they shall have ten working days from the date the report is submitted to the President within which to submit in writing to the President for consideration any specific objections he/she they may have regarding the conduct of the hearing or alleged errors in the findings of fact. A copy of these objections must be furnished to the committee panel and to the college representative.

Within ten working days after receipt of the committee panel’s report, and receipt of any objections about the conduct of the hearing or correction of errors of fact from the grievant, or notice of waiver of that right by the grievant, the President shall either submit to the grievant, the committee panel and the college representative his/her their written decision on the case or refer the matter back to the committee for further response and recommendation before rendering a final decision.

The President will not be bound by the findings or recommendations contained within the committee’s report, which are advisory only.

The President may request that the committee make available to him the a recording and/or transcripts of the hearing and any all other evidence presented.

Concerning the reference to the alternate in X.I.5.a., if the alternate had to replace a regular panel member, there is no “remaining alternate”. Otherwise, this is when the alternate steps down.
If the President’s decision is contrary to the recommendations of the Committee panel, the President will include within his/her decision a statement of his/her reasons for not accepting the recommendations of the committee.

If the President’s decision is adverse to the grievant, he/she the President shall give written notice to the grievant of his/her their right to appeal the decision to the College of Charleston State Board of Trustees, when applicable.
VI.J. APPEAL TO STATE COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Appeal to the College of Charleston Board of Trustees

A. The State College of Charleston Board of Trustees will hear appeals of grievances on the grounds specified in I.A., B and C X.I.1.a through f, listed at the beginning of this the previous section (on “Grievances Before the Faculty Hearing Committee”). In their sole discretion, they may choose to hear appeals of other matters.

B. When an appeal to the State College of Charleston Board of Trustees is sought, the grievant must file a Notice of Appeal within ten working days of receipt of the President’s final decision. This Notice must be in writing and sent to the Chair of the Board, with copies to the President, the committee panel chair and the college representative. The Notice of Appeal must identify the issues to be raised in the appeal and the grounds for the appeal. Upon receipt of the Notice of Appeal, if he/she the panel chair has not already done so, the chair of the committee shall transmit to the President, for presentation to the Board, the tape recording of the hearing, as well as all documentary evidence introduced at the hearing.

C. If the appeal must be heard by the Board, or if the Board decides to hear a discretionary appeal, the Chair of the Board will establish a reasonable timetable for disposition of the appeal which will be communicated to all parties.

D. At the Chair’s discretion, appeals will be heard by the entire Board or by a committee of not less than three Board members appointed by the Chair for that purpose.

E. Appeals will be heard on the record established in the grievance procedure at the College. The Board shall have available for its review the tape recording of the hearing, the evidence submitted at the hearing, the report of the Committee panel and any subsequent decisions or recommendations which followed the Committee panel’s report. Briefs and oral arguments will be permitted but are not required. Oral arguments may be made by the parties or by their attorneys. The Board shall submit its decision in writing to the grievant, the President, the chair of the committee panel and the college representative. The decision of the Board is final.

VII.K. PROHIBITION AGAINST RETALIATION

Prohibition Against Retaliation

A grievant shall not be harassed, intimidated, or otherwise penalized for utilizing these grievance procedures.

1 The State College Board of Trustees passed this policy concerning appeals by faculty members in January 1985.
Section VI.H.5.a.6 (FAM 139); similar language appears in VI.H.3.b (FAM 137)

H.5 Preparation and Submission of…Packet for Superior Rating

a.(6) Candidates seeking a superior rating must also furnish clear evidence that they continue to perform at the level expected for the promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the criteria of the Faculty/Administration Manual, as indicated in Sect VI.A.4.c. for instructional faculty and VI.C.4.d for library faculty.

Insert new subsection VI.H.6 (following discussion of PTR packet preparation for Superior rating, and preceding current sections 6 Dept. Chair’s & Dean’s Recommendations, 7 PTR Committee’s & Provost’s Recommendations), 8 Remediation Plans, & 9 Appeals). All those remaining subsections are to be renumbered as 7, 8, 9, and 10, respectively:

6. Specific Criteria for a Superior Rating

Awarding of a superior rating to a faculty member who has previously achieved the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, requires clear evidence that the candidate has continued to perform at the level expected for that earlier promotion, in accordance with the criteria set forth for such promotions in the Faculty/Administration Manual, as indicated in Section VI.A.4.c. for instructional faculty and VI.C.4.d for library faculty.

It should be noted, however, that the somewhat streamlined review process for a Superior Rating at this career level reflects the recognition that, having once satisfied the standard for promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, expectations for sustaining this level of achievement might be met in a variety of ways. While sustaining an active research record, including scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professional evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts), is still a critical element in any successful application for a superior rating, it may be recognized that, while specific departmental policies governing publication standards may exceed the College-wide norm for tenure and for promotion (preamble of Sect. VI.A.4), application of such higher standards may not always be appropriate to require for a superior rating, unless a departmental policy explicitly states that they are. Faculty at the rank of Professor are occasionally called upon to fulfill time-consuming leadership roles in professional service, sometimes for lengthy periods, either within the College or in their larger professional community. They are also occasionally called upon to shoulder teaching duties outside of customary expectations because of departmental or institutional needs. Such responsibilities can make the fulfillment of higher departmental publication standards for tenure and promotion quite onerous, and evaluators at the various levels of PTR review may be mindful of those realities in the cycle of academic careers. There are multiple avenues to the fulfillment of exemplary performance in one of the specified competency areas and satisfactory performance in the other two, or to performance at the level of significant achievement in all three areas.

We have had issues in the past with different PTR Committees focusing in some years on the potential implications of the streamlined PTR standards, and in other years on a more literal interpretation of the language about mirroring precisely the perceived expectations for the initial promotion to the rank of Professor. This attempts to clarify the superior rating standard, with an eye to reducing such inconsistencies of interpretation from one PTR committee to the next.
Memorandum

From: Deanna M. Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and Richard Nunan, Chair, Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual on behalf of the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual (George Pothering, Mike Lee, Liz Jurisich, Jannette Finch, Deanna Caveny-Noecker)

To: Faculty Senate

Date: March 5, 2018

Re: proposed revisions to Section VI.H, Post-Tenure Review, of the Faculty/Administration Manual

Colleagues,

The attached text outlines proposed changes to the Faculty/Administration Manual language on post-tenure review, addressing several matters.

During the Fall 2016 semester, the 2016-17 Post-Tenure Review Committee discussed post-tenure review schedules and deferrals. Their deliberations resulted in four recommended clarifications or revisions to the post-tenure review process, which were subsequently communicated to Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker via email by Chris Fragile, Chair. The proposed revisions to Articles VI.H.1, 4a, and 9b in the attached are intended to operationalize the 2016-17 Post-Tenure Review Committee’s recommendations. A copy of their recommendations is attached for your convenience.

Additionally, in January 2017, Provost McGee communicated to the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review some possible reforms to the tenure and promotion process that had been identified by him and our dean colleagues. His memorandum included a recommendation on the frequency of promotion applications, suggesting that faculty members be limited to two unsuccessful promotion applications in a row and “precluded from applying for promotion for a third consecutive year, though another application or applications could be filed after the ‘off’ year.” While that has not been implemented for reviews for promotion to Professor, item (2) in Article VI.H.1 below is intended to introduce a parallel notion for post-tenure review.

With the last major revisions to our post-tenure review process, effective with the 2014-2015 academic year, we collaboratively sought to streamline the post-tenure review process for candidates seeking a satisfactory rating. The proposed changes in Article VI.H.6 are intended to further streamline reviews in the case where a department chair is seeking a satisfactory rating, while maintaining the role of the department chair for other post-tenure review candidates in their department in that case.
Deanna,

Thank you for coming to our PTR meeting today. I felt like it was a productive discussion. Based upon our conversation with you and further discussions by the committee, we would like to suggest the following clarifications/revisions be made to the PTR process:

1. Clarification should be made that all tenured faculty must go up for either promotion or some sort of post-tenure review at least once every 6 years. With the new, streamlined process for getting a satisfactory PTR, we see few reasons (see #4 below) for this not to be standard practice.

2. Faculty at the rank of professor should be eligible to seek a superior ranking on post-tenure review in any year, starting 6 years after their promotion and not more frequently than once every 6 years, irrespective of when their last satisfactory PTR occurred. This is to clarify that the “clock” for superior is not tied to the “clock” for satisfactory. To us, this seems fair given that someone who goes up for superior one year and only gets a satisfactory is eligible to go up for superior again the next year. That same option, of going up for a superior the year after a satisfactory (or any other year), should be available to all faculty.

3. The period of review for either type of PTR should be the period since promotion or the last review OF THAT TYPE. So, a satisfactory review period should never exceed 6 years, though for a superior, the period could be much longer.

4. With these clarifications/revisions, we do not feel there is any need to retain the deferral option, except possibly in the case of faculty approaching retirement. If a faculty member is not ready to seek a superior rating, they should still be reviewed for satisfactory.

We have not tried to propose specific language as it would probably be best to sit down and carefully revise the whole PTR section of the FAM. We’d be happy to work with you and other committees on campus, as necessary, to pursue these revisions.

Regards,
Chris Fragile
for the PTR committee
VI. EVALUATION OF FACULTY

H. Post-Tenure Review

1. Post-Tenure Review Schedule

Each tenured faculty member must undergo post-tenure review at least once every sixth year, except that a tenured Associate Professor or Librarian III may elect to undergo review for promotion to Professor or Librarian IV, respectively, instead, with the understanding that the post-tenure review clock is reset by the promotion review.

Faculty members holding the rank of Professor or Librarian IV are eligible to seek a superior post-tenure review rating in their sixth year in rank at the College or any subsequent year, provided the faculty member does not receive a superior post-tenure review rating more often than every sixth year subject to two conditions: (1) A faculty member may not receive a superior post-tenure review rating more often than every sixth year, and (2) A faculty member who makes an unsuccessful application for a superior rating may seek a superior again the next year but may not apply for a superior rating more than two years in a row. A Professor or Librarian IV who seeks a superior rating but receives a satisfactory may seek a superior rating in a subsequent year, without waiting another six years. Similarly, a Professor of Librarian IV who seeks a satisfactory rating may subsequently seek a superior without waiting six years from the satisfactory review. Additionally, a faculty member seeking a satisfactory rating is eligible to pursue a superior rating the following year and the subsequent year should his or her initial application for superior be unsuccessful.


The restriction to coming up no more than two years in a row came from the Provost in consultation with the deans, not from the 2016-17 PTR Committee. The same principle has not been applied to the case of standing for promotion to Professor. Under our current policy, upon failure to achieve promotion, a candidate may continue to request such a review in repeat years.
4. Deferments

a. Faculty members may petition the Post-Tenure Review Committee for the postponement of their post-tenure reviews based on extenuating personal circumstances, exceptional professional commitments, or valid medical reasons which must be documented in the petition. Petitions must be endorsed by the faculty member's Chair and Dean. Postponements will be approved only under extraordinary circumstances and will not normally extend more than one academic year. Decisions by the Post-Tenure Review Committee regarding deferments shall be communicated in writing. Decisions by the Committee may be appealed to the Provost within one (1) week of the candidate's notification. The Provost's decision shall be final.

(Rev. Aug. 2018)

This modification constitutes a modest move in the direction of the 2016-17 PTR Committee’s recommendation, which was to eliminate all deferments of the six-year PTR cycle other than pending retirement cases. That recommendation seemed a little too uncompromising to the 2017-18 By-Laws Committee. This was our compromise with that particular recommendation.
Recommendations by the Department Chair or Panel and the Dean

Post-tenure review is normally conducted by the Department Chair. A departmental post-tenure review panel will be convened only in the case of post-tenure review of the Department Chair seeking a superior post-tenure rating. When the Department Chair herself or himself is up for post-tenure review and is seeking a superior rating, the most senior tenured member of the department (other than the Chair) will convene, and normally chair, a departmental post-tenure review panel consisting of three tenured faculty members (including the panel chair). Panel members will normally be drawn from the home department according to seniority. When necessary to complete the panel, additions will be drawn, following the same criteria, from departments with related areas of study. The panel may not include Department Chairs from external departments. No tenured faculty member concurrently subject to post-tenure review may serve on this panel. The panel will exercise the same responsibility with respect to the Department Chair’s candidacy that the Chair exercises in all other cases of faculty seeking a superior post-tenure rating. This departmental panel will also review all other cases of faculty seeking a superior post-tenure rating coming up for post-tenure review at the same time as the Department Chair. The Department Chair or departmental panel will recommend a rating for each such candidate’s performance. The Department Chair will handle all cases of candidates seeking a satisfactory post-tenure rating, except his or her own, which will be handled by the Dean, acting in the capacity of both the Chair and the Dean in such cases.

In the case of a candidate requesting a superior rating, the Department Chair (or the departmental panel) shall forward to the candidate’s Dean by the announced deadline the candidate’s packet with a letter justifying the Chair’s (or panel’s) concurrence or failure to concur with the candidate’s self-evaluation. At this time a copy of the letter shall be forwarded to the candidate. Should the rating of the Chair (or departmental panel) be satisfactory rather than superior, the candidate may forward a letter of rebuttal to his or her dean and his or her Department Chair no later than five (5) days before the first day of the beginning of the Spring Semester.
The Deans will review packets and forward written recommendations to the Office of the Provost.

In the case of a candidate being considered for a satisfactory rating, the Department Chair (or the departmental panel) shall meet with the Dean to discuss a summary of the candidate’s annual performance evaluations. In addition, the Chair or panel will forward to the candidate’s Dean a written statement that the candidate meets the criteria for a satisfactory rating or a brief summary of the ratings received on annual performance evaluations in the area of teaching and a statement that the candidate receives an unsatisfactory rating. At this time a copy of the letter shall be forwarded to the candidate, the Provost, and the Post-Tenure Review Committee. (Rev. Apr. 2009, Aug 2018)

This set of recommendations, designed to minimize the work of the departmental panel, by limiting the panel’s responsibility to encompass only cases where a department chair under evaluation has a potential conflict of interest, is an innovation proposed by the By-Laws Committee rather than the 2016-17 PTR Committee or the Provost. (Hence the blue color-coding instead of red.) The word ‘normally’ is inserted in the first paragraph to provide for the possibility that someone other than the most senior member of the evaluating department might occasionally be called upon to chair the departmental PTR evaluation panel, depending on the circumstances at the time.
9. Appeals

a. Appeal of decision on completion or remediation plan

…

b. Appealing a Satisfactory Rating

A candidate who receives a satisfactory rating after having sought a superior rating and who alleges that the rating was based upon
discrimination, violation of academic freedom or violation of due
process may follow the appeals procedure outlined in Art. X.I.
If the candidate feels that the satisfactory rating received is
incorrect for reasons other than those listed in the preceding
paragraph, a formal appeal is not allowed. However, the faculty
member may remain eligible to undergo review for a superior
rating in the subsequent years or the following year, as outlined
above, without waiting six years for the next scheduled review.

To make the language of this paragraph consistent with the modifications suggested earlier.
(See p. 135 above.)
Honors College Reformed Curriculum: The Basics

Logistical Matters:

1) Goal of this proposal is to establish a new structure for the honors curriculum. We can support the curriculum with current courses that are in the catalog. However, once the structure is approved, we plan to work across departments to add courses, to review and refine current course descriptions, and in some cases, to delete current catalog courses.

2) The Honors curriculum will work like the general education curriculum in that the structure will be tied to the catalog year in which it is implemented (presumably fall 2018), but the courses that count toward each category will not. In other words, as we add/revise/delete courses, they will count in a given category both retrospectively and prospectively.

Curriculum Structure:

Students must accrue 25 HONS credits (honors-specific courses) to satisfy the Honors Core

Students must complete 9 hrs of Honors Directed (3 hr independent study/internship and 6 hr Bachelor’s Essay). These do not need to be HONS; can be completed under a departmental course number.

In the first year, students must complete: Honors Academic Writing (4 credit hours), Beyond George Street (Honors 1-credit FYE), Honors Engaged (year-long service learning project)

Students must complete courses in the following categories:

1) Honors Foundations (at least one course; 100/200 level; 3-5 credit hrs each)
   a. Grounded in disciplinary thinking and methodology
   b. Expose students to essential ideas/concepts in a discipline, the methodologies to address them, and tools to understand them.
   c. Encourage students to make connections between theory and practice through active/hands-on learning, exposure to primary sources, and analytical writing assignments.
   d. Courses are accelerated, contextualized or applied in a way that is distinct from non-honors course offering in same area.

2) Quantitative Literacy
   a. Math 120 (or AP credit) OR Honors Calculus OR Honors Conceptual Tour of Mathematics
   b. Honors Statistics will be added to course options

3) Exploring Complexity and Diversity Colloquia (at least two courses; 200/300 level; 3-4 credit hrs each; prerequisite - at least one Honors Foundations course)
   a. Focus on central and enduring question
   b. Courses offered within interdisciplinary themes (Foundations of Western Civilization, Values and Traditions in the Non-Western World, Elements of Human Culture and Expression, Ethics, History and Philosophy of Science, Diversity and Sustainability, Self, Other and Society, Inquiry, Discovery and Innovation
   c. Critical dialogue in small group setting
   d. Encourage rigorous approach to processing information and deepening understanding
   e. Study of foundational texts/sources that have shaped thinking on focal question

4) Advanced Studies (at least one course, 300-level Honors Special Topics or 200- or 300-level Honors Disciplinary; 3-4 credit hours; prerequisite - one Honors Foundations, one Honors Colloquia, others according to needs of course)
a. Deep analysis of subject matter in a particular discipline or across disciplines
b. Focus on advancing ability to synthesize information from divergent sources to derive novel conclusions and innovative solutions.
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 13 March 2018

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 13 March 2018 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order 5:05 PM

2. Minutes of the 13 February 2018 regular Senate meeting were approved as posted.

3. There were no Announcements and information.

4. Reports
   a. Speaker of the Faculty Elizabeth Jurisich reminded the Chairs of Senate Committees to submit an end of academic year report to Megan Gould (gouldme1@cofc.edu). Speaker Jurisich thanked Julia Eichelberger, Chair of the Adjunct Oversight Committee and William Bares, Chair of the ad hoc Committee on Institutional Identity and Vision for their reports to the Senate. The Speaker reminded the Senate that any chair of a Committee is welcome to make a report to the Senate.

   b. Provost Brian McGee gave recognition to the men’s basketball team for their accomplishments including reaching the NCAA Tournament and noted that CofC student athletes have a high APR (NCAA’s rating of academic progress) and that many student athletes have consistent GPAs over 3.0.

      Provost McGee also thanked those that helped during accepted student weekend. The Provost said that many students made deposits, which will help in projecting and planning for the budget for the next fiscal year. He said a solid projection of student enrollment would not be possible until mid-April.

      Provost McGee said his office is continuing work on the developing budget for FY 2019 with the Budget Committee and Academic Leadership and Executive Leadership. He said it is the priority of his office to improve wage growth for roster and adjunct faculty, despite the lack of state mandates or state funding.

      The Provost commented on newspaper reports of town hall meetings held by the leadership of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. He said their reports on the challenges in higher education are gloomy, as they focus on increasing tuition expenses and budgetary challenges. Provost McGee said although it is distressing to see a decline in public faith in higher education, his outlook is more optimistic and is encouraged by CofC’s efficient direct academic expenditure, as reported last month. The Provost said the value of higher education is self-evident and student who pursue higher education experience benefits in wage-earning potential and in longer, healthier, happier lives for themselves and for their children. He said South Carolina benefits from students attending higher education classrooms.
The Provost noted that letters were released on March 15 for 34 tenure and promotion cases and 33 third year reviews in addition to sabbatical and Post-Tenure review cases. The Provost will offer a report on these outcomes in his April Provost report. He thanked all involved in the critical work of faculty evaluations, including the Tenure and Promotion Committee and departmental evaluation panel members.

The Provost emphasized that many of these faculty will be instructing CofC students for generations to come and it is the faculty who ARE the College of Charleston far more than the beautiful buildings or campus.

The Provost accepted questions.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked about enforcement of the rule stating that no more than 70% of a department's sections may be filled inside of prime time. Krasnoff recognized that the rule has been on the books for a long time, but that scheduling 30% of class sections outside of prime time leads to greatly decreased enrollments.

[Email from Registrar to Secretary: The 70/30 prime time classroom scheduling rule was implemented with the Fall 2007 schedule as part of the Course Scheduling Policies and Approved Meeting Pattern Times initiative that was determined at an October 2006 Deans meeting. No more than 70% of each department’s course offerings can be offered at meeting times beginning between 9:00am and 3:00pm].

Krasnoff said that changing scheduling practices very late in the semester is not fair.

**Provost McGee** said that all schools have been compliant with the rule except for Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS) and deferred to the Registrar for more detail.

Krasnoff said perhaps the populations of the other schools are different and effects on enrollment are not felt as acutely.

**Mary Bergstrom**, (Registrar) said that the rule has been in effect for a long time, and the Office of the Registrar has been enforcing the rule since it was implemented. Bergstrom said HSS has violated the rule, but has complied when asked to do so.

Bergstrom offered additional information about scheduling classrooms and noted that the 70/30 rule allows equitable scheduling of classrooms "owned" by the Registrar and by individual departments and schools.

Provost McGee said it has been a number of years since classrooms were reallocated and may need to be revisited.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) and **Christine Finnan**, Guest, asked for clarification of the 70/30 rule and if online sections were part of the rule?
Bergstrom clarified that only online hybrid courses were included in the 70/30 rule, since those classes did require classroom space. Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) expressed worry that if classes are scheduled outside of prime time for some programs, enrollments will suffer.

Provost McGee said he will take the 70/30 rule to the Deans for discussion.

c. Adjunct Oversight Committee (Julia Eichelberger, Chair) provided a handout and a report (Both are included in Appendix A).

The committee invited all adjunct faculty to complete a Qualtrics survey regarding working conditions other than salary. The committee chose not to address compensation at this time.

Eichelberger said that 118 adjuncts completed the survey, which is about 30% of the 2016-17 adjunct population. Most responses were positive. One question got a 58% negative response. That question reads, "I understand what resources are available to further my professional development."

Eichelberger said that some adjuncts reported that they have very welcoming chairs and departments or supervisors and an inclusive departmental culture. There were also comments reflecting that some adjuncts felt devalued. The committee has provided guidelines to chairs that will help foster an inclusive departmental environment.

Eichelberger also mentioned that adjuncts may join the faculty club (http://facultyclub.cofc.edu/index.php), which could foster collegiality. A form for signup [or follow the link for electronic sign up] is sitting in the dining room of the faculty club, and dues are deducted from your paycheck.

The committee was concerned at some reports of poor working conditions, such as buying their own desk copy of their textbook, or not having a desk, no computer, no access to office space, and no evaluation process. Eichelberger pointed out that these types of working conditions should not exist, and should be corrected. They plan on surveying chairs and program directors to discover more about these possible conditions.

Eichelberger said some good suggestions resulted from the survey such as adjunct faculty should be allowed to take CofC courses tuition-free, ways to reduce parking costs, more mentoring programs, better publicizing for professional development opportunities, and better clarity on benefits, such as health insurance or retirement packages. The committee felt that an adjunct liaison would help field some of the questions. The committee asked Human Resources to create a summary on what benefits are available to adjuncts and will ask for clarity on some questions they still have.

Suggested best practices are included in Appendix A, from a report made to the Senate in 2014 by Faculty Administrative Fellow Eichelberger. Progress or inactivity on each of 11 suggested best practices is indicated by a plus sign.
Eichelberger accepted questions. **Susan Kattwinkel**, Senator (Theatre) asked if the departments were identified and indicated that she always paid for her own desk copies of texts. She made the point that if a department did not pay for supplies for their faculty, then adjuncts of that department would not have access to supplies either.

Eichelberger acknowledged that conditions may vary by department, and pointed out that some adjuncts do not teach on campus (example, Teacher Education), so will not have office space or supplies on campus.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about the slide referring to hiring practices.

Eichelberger said that it referred to hiring adjunct faculty using a structure similar to hiring tenure-track faculty. This would involve more departmental faculty input than the Chair in the hiring decision, and in letting the adjunct faculty member know what the evaluation process would be.

**Mark Del Mastro**, Senator (Hispanic Studies) pointed out that for Chairs, it is common to hire adjuncts shortly before the semester starts, when roster faculty are absent. He said it is virtually impossible to put together a more traditional search committee structure. Del Mastro said that Chairs also lose adjunct hires when better opportunities come along, requiring a quick search for another. He said it is not always feasible to follow the same hiring practices used in hiring tenure-track faculty.

Eichelberger said that best practices suggest hiring more people in advance, so filling sections at the last minute would happen fewer times.

Del Mastro said that scenario is not feasible, even if an adjunct has taught for several years. If they are a great adjunct faculty member, then they might get a better opportunity.

**Provost McGee** asked if anyone has to buy their own instructional materials, to please let him know.

5. There was no **Old Business**.

6. **New Business**
   a. **ad hoc Committee on Institutional Identity and Vision (William Bares, Chair)** (Appendix B)

   Bares reported that in January, the committee released an online survey soliciting input on the College's identity and vision. In February, Bares said the committee hosted six discussion sessions addressing broader issues that were revealed in the online survey.
Highlights of the online surveys were issues of identity of the College, operational details and climate and communication. The topic of climate and communication was one the community felt strongly about. At the February 22, 2018 ordinary meeting, Bares read a statement reflecting the views of the College community revealed in the survey and discussions [http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2017-2018/feb-2018/OrdinaryFacultyMeeting/minutes_Ordinary_Faculty_Meeting.pdf].

Bares encouraged faculty, staff, and all colleagues to participate in the survey. He said the committee will present their findings to the Presidential Search Committee, the Board of Trustees, and to the next president of the College.

Bares said the committee hopes to present a full report at the April 10 Faculty Senate meeting.

A motion to extend the work of the ad hoc committee was presented and passed with a unanimous vote.

Provost McGee commended the committee on its good work facilitating the series of discussions.

b. General Education Committee (Lisa Covert, Chair) introduced the following curriculum items.

   i. For approval for the Gen Ed Social Sciences requirement:
      
      COMM 215 (pdf)
      INTL 290 (pdf)

      Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked for and received clarification that these are not new courses, but courses proposed for Gen Ed credit.

      The courses were approved.

   ii. For approval for the Gen Ed Humanities requirement:
      
      FREN 334 (pdf)
      FREN 335 (pdf)
      FREN 336 (pdf)
      FREN 337 (pdf)

      The proposals passed.

c. Committee on Graduate Education (Christine Finnan, Chair) introduced one proposal.

      MTLA (pdf)

      The proposal passed with no discussion.
d. Curriculum Committee (Chad Galuska, Co-Chair) introduced the following proposals:

   i. Communication: Change minor from requiring both COMM 214 and 215, to requiring two of COMM 214, 215, 216.
      COMM minor change (pdf)

      The proposal passed with no discussion.

   ii. English: Create a new concentration in Writing, Rhetoric, and Publication
       ENGL-WRIT (pdf)

       Create six new courses to support the concentration.
       ENGL 225: Introduction to Writing Studies (pdf)
       ENGL 316: Writing and Literacy(pdf)
       ENGL 322: Writing across Contexts (pdf)
       ENGL 369: Writing for the Web (pdf)
       ENGL 372: Rhetoric in a Digital Age (pdf)
       ENGL 379: Usability and Document Design (pdf)

       Modify three other courses to support the concentration.
       ENGL 305 (pdf)
       ENGL 310 (pdf)
       ENGL 334 (pdf)

       Add the new courses to the major, the ENCW concentration, and the EDEN cognate.
       ENGL (pdf)
       ENGL-ENCW (pdf)
       EDEN (pdf)

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked for clarification on which of the current regular English requirements are exempted.

Julia Eichelberger, Senator (at-large, HSS) answered that there is a concentration in Creative Writing that has separate requirements and a degree that is for the secondary education certification students, so the proposal would be a fourth variation on it.

Additional clarification was offered by Chris Warnick, Guest (English).

Krasnoff asked if there was still a senior seminar.

Eichelberger said that in the certification track, their practicum is their capstone.

Betsy Baker, Senator (English) said that Creative Writing includes a capstone.
Krasnoff asked if there was a general rule that the committee follows for how many courses make a concentration.

**Lynn Cherry** (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources) said that concentrations have to be at least 18 hours.

**Galuska, Krasnoff, and Warnick** discussed adding up courses and developing concentrations.

The proposals passed.

iii. French, Francophone, and Italian Studies: Add repeatability to **FREN 383** (pdf)

The proposal passed with no discussion

iv. Library: Create new special topics course.
   **LIBR 106: Special Topics in Library and Information Science (new course)** (pdf)

The proposal passed with no discussion

v. Physical Education Activity Courses (PEAC): Create four new courses and deactivate one course.
   **PEAC 114: Badminton & Pickleball** (new course) (pdf)
   **PEAC 142: Beginning Surfing** (new course) (pdf)
   **PEAC 150: Disc Sports: Golf & Ultimate** (new course) (pdf)
   **PEAC 160: Introduction to Tai Chi** (new course) (pdf)
   **PEAC 117: Badminton & Racquetball** (deactivate course) (pdf)

The proposals passed with no discussion.

vi. Studio Art: Add restrictions to **ARTS 119**. (pdf)
   Add repeatability to **ARTS 331** (pdf), **332** (pdf), **333** (pdf), and **334**. (pdf)

**Susan Kattwinkel**, Senator (Theatre) asked what is the purpose of adding the restrictions? Could sections be added for non-majors? Kattwinkel said that she was concerned about separate expectations for the course.

**Sara Frankel**, Guest (Studio Art) said it is the same course and the same content. She said since it is the feeder course for all other courses, they wished to reserve one section so that Freshmen and Sophomores could enroll, since it was a popular course for many outside the major.

Kattwinkel asked why is this necessary to do through Curriculog since it is logistical and not curricular.
Galuska said since the department is adding a statement that will appear in the catalog, it needed to go through Curriculog.

Kattwinkel mentioned that restricting sections to certain groups would solve several problems in any department, and foresees an avalanche.

The proposals passed.

vii. Teacher Education
   Elementary Education: Renumber courses to facilitate cross listing with graduate courses.
   EDEE 425 (from 325) (pdf)
   EDEE 435 (from 378) (pdf)
   EDEE 445 (from 333) (pdf)
   EDEE 468 (from 368) (pdf)
   EDEE 490 (from 382) (pdf)
   EDEE 495 (from 416) (pdf)

   Early Childhood Education: Renumber courses to facilitate cross listing with graduate courses.
   EDEE 420 (from 380) (pdf)
   EDEE 429 (from 375) (pdf)
   EDEE 438 (from 331) (pdf)
   EDEE 488 (from 415) (pdf)

   These courses are not being renumbered but will be cross-listed:
   EDEE 403 (pdf)
   EDEE 407 (pdf)
   EDEE 409 (pdf)

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) and Provost McGee discussed the understanding that the proposals need to be presented by the Graduate Curriculum Committee and approved by the Senate before being completely passed.

All proposals passed with the understanding that the proposals will be presented next Senate meeting by the Graduate Curriculum Committee.

viii. Professional Studies: Create a new concentration in Legal Studies.
   PRST-LGST (pdf)

   Create seven new courses to support this concentration.
   LGST 301: Advanced Legal Research and Writing (pdf)
   LGST 306: Personal Injury Pleading and Practice (pdf)
   LGST 307: Workers' Compensation Law (pdf)
   LGST 308: Social Security Disability Law (pdf)
   LGST 309: Immigration Law (pdf)
Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked if there was a possible conflict with Trident Tech's paralegal program?

Godfrey Gibbison, Guest (Dean of Professional Studies) clarified that the program was developed as a result of conversations with Trident Tech, who expressed a need for their students to have a pathway to a bachelor’s degree. Gibbison said the courses were developed with feedback from lawyers and law firms across the state, and in conjunction with Trident Tech.

Gibbison affirmed that the courses are designed to complement Trident Tech's paralegal degree, and to offer a pathway towards a bachelor’s degree.

The proposal passed.

ix. Urban Studies: Add HIST 251 as an alternative to HIST 211 in both the major and minor
   URST major change (pdf)
   URST minor change (pdf)

   Add POLI 397 to the Sustainable Urbanism concentration.
   URST-URSU concentration change (pdf)

The proposals passed with no discussion.

e. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual (Richard Nunan, Chair) introduced seven motion proposals. Cover Memo for the seven motion proposals (Appendix C)

Nunan explained that the first three proposals from the By-Laws committee are simple, and the last four are more complex.

i. Motion 1 FAM 162 VIII.A.9 Class Attendance: Instructors ascertain whether both excused and unexcused absences count in determining the basis for a grade of “WA,” which stands for “withdrawn failure due to excessive absences” and is equivalent to a failing grade.

Motion 1 was explained and discussed.

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) said that the proposal had been seen by Academic Affairs and the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid and is to solve confusion about the WA between students and faculty on withdrawing from a course, and failure due to excessive absences.
Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) objected to the language, "stands for," and proposed language, "means."

The wording change was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Motion 1 passed unanimously.

ii. **Motion 2: FAM 164 VIII.A.11** Final Examinations and Final Course Grades: At the request of the student, a faculty member should make available information and/or an evaluation of the student’s progress prior to the drop date withdrawal deadline.

Motion 2 passed unanimously.

iii. **Motion 3: Replace binary-gendered pronouns with gender-neutral substitutes throughout the FAM.**

Susan Kattwinkel, Senator (Theatre) supported non-binary gender neutral pronouns, but asked if the change was merely cosmetic.

Provost McGee said the last major gender-sensitive revision of the FAM took place in 2005-2006, where in the Administrative section of the FAM, there was an attempt to replace the pronoun he with alternate uses of he or she, then considered best practice in gender-neutral writing.

Provost McGee said that managerially, the pronoun change would require a major rewrite of some portions of the FAM, and would take some time and multiple revisions.

The Provost said care would have to be taken not to change the meaning of the FAM inadvertently.

Provost McGee said that the By-Laws and Administrative sections of the FAM should be revised separately, with By-Laws requiring a separate motion for each change, or it would require an amendment authorizing a universal strike and replace. Gender-neutral language changes require additional approval by Faculty before it can be implemented.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) addressed Susan Kattwinkel's question as pertaining to the use of pronouns on campus generally. Caveny-Noecker said there is a project called the Preferred Name project, which began as a way to identify preferred first names for students. The project has now grown into first names preferred by employees and restoring preferred pronouns to all on campus, particularly students. The project moves the campus away from using a strict set of binary pronouns and allows for changes in gender identity in CofC systems.

Members of the Preferred Pronouns Project are Lynne Ford, Mary Bergstrom, Deanna Caveny-Noecker, and two colleagues from IT: Eileen Raney and Mary Person. An update
and timeline will be released soon. Caveny-Noecker said that Data Governance Council approved a list of name usages and definitions and usage guidelines.

Motion 3 passed.

iv. **Motion 4: By-Laws Article V, Section 3**

Nunan said that Motions 4 and 5 are within the same 23 page document [Appendix C]. Motion 4 concerns the structure of the Hearing Committee. The structure is separated out from the work of the committee.

Nunan gave an explanation of the Motion and explained that selection of the panels would be done before hearings are convened or requested. The By-Laws committee also suggested adding two additional full professors which, together with the recommendation to consolidate the Hearing Committee regular and alternate members, would increase the size of the Hearing Committee to twelve.

**Irina Gigova**, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked how busy is the Hearing Committee?

Nunan replied that it varies dramatically, depending on if there are grievances that lead to termination of a faculty member.

Multiple people said it could be zero to two or three, and the cases might be spread over the year, or all come up in May.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) said as Chair of Nominations and Elections, he does not think it would be difficult to fill the extra seats. Kunkle asked for clarification on before there are any hearings, the Chair of the Hearing Committee divides the Hearing Committee into two panels of six. Should there be other new panels, those will be randomly selected. He asked if By-Laws was concerned about randomly selecting the first two panels?

Nunan said the Hearing Committee would attempt to distribute the two panels evenly among schools.

There was discussion of randomness.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator (at-large, SSM) said that it is important for a grievant to know who is on the panel.

Nunan said in the scenario of three people denied tenure who want to have hearings at the same time, that might not be possible in advance of requesting a hearing.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked when does the need for the new panel arise? When a case is filed, or when a case is heard? If a hearing committee says no to hearing a case, is that panel excused and replaced with a different panel? Krasnoff said he
is currently Chair of the Hearing Committee and would not know how to interpret Motion 4 and when a panel serves or is excused.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker** (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) said there was not currently an explanation in the FAM outlining what would happen if there were multiple cases. Caveny-Noecker said the ad hoc committee on Hearings expressed the sense that if they had more cases, they would need more people, since multiple cases would put an undue burden on a single Hearing Committee. The By-Laws/ Fam Committee followed AAUP guidelines in suggesting convening two panels in advance of knowing what the hearings would be for that year. She said there would always be a need to systematically constitute more panels and said it might be appropriate to have the Hearing Committee as a whole constitute new panels, and to determine when an existing panel can be excused.

**Sandi Shields**, Senator (Mathematics) asked if it would be possible to form the third committee in the same way as the first two and noted it is important for all committees to be blind to the cases they will hear.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) said one way to simplify is for all members of the Hearing Committees to hear the question of jurisdiction, then constitute the panel that hears the case.

Krasnoff said as Chair of the Hearing Committee, he would rather have random selection for all panels. He does not think the chair of the Hearing Committee should be responsible for selection that might imply judgement about who should serve.

Krasnoff said he is also concerned about the distinction made for when the Chair of the Hearing Committee acts, and when the Chair of a panel acts and said that must be clear.

**Caveny-Noecker** said she thought that distinction was made clear.

**Tom Kunkle** suggested adding the word randomly one more time.

Nunan pointed out that the panels will not wind up equal, considering distribution across schools, gender, departments, and randomness will not really occur. He said prescribing exactly how the Chair of the Hearing Committee constitutes panels will result in a mess.

**Betsy Baker**, Senator (English) suggested removing all "randomly" and "random" wording.

Nunan pointed out that removing the word empowers the Chair of the Hearing Committee to choose which panel hears a case.

**Several Senators and Guests** supported the suggestion to remove the word randomly and supported constituting panels in a consistent manner.

There was discussion about making a friendly amendment.
George Pothering (Parliamentarian) said that technically, there is no such thing as a friendly amendment. He said in a case such as this, it is better to make the language change as a motion, seconded, then voted on.

Speaker Jurisich recognized a motion on the floor to delete one occurrence of the word, "randomly" [in “any additional cases will be heard by new panels, randomly constituted out of the committee pool”].

That motion was seconded.

Jolanda van Arnhem, Senator (at-large, Library) called for quorum.

A count verified there was no quorum.

The discussion on Motion 4 was tabled. Motions 4, 5, 6, and 7 were tabled until the April Senate meeting.

7. Constituent’s general concerns were not called for.

8. Adjournment, 7:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jannette Finch
Faculty Secretary

[Appendix A: Adjunct Oversight Committee handout and PowerPoint]

[Appendix B: ad hoc Committee on Institutional Identity and Vision]

[Appendix C: Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual cover memo for the seven motion proposals]
We did not address compensation, although we think it should be higher.

Raising salaries from 3K to 4K per semester would require over 1-2M added to budget

- Other employees also eager for raises after years of having none
- Another approach: keep budget same or phase in increases while reducing # of sections taught by adjuncts

Questions covered working conditions other than salary

118 adjuncts completed survey (~30% of 380+ adjunct faculty reported in 2016-17)
QUESTIONS THAT RECEIVED 50%+ POSITIVE RESPONSES

Majority of respondents either Strongly Agree or Agree with these statements.

- “I have the information I need to do my job.”
- “I have the space and materials I need to teach my assigned courses.”
- “I have the space and materials I need to keep office hours.”
- “I feel included in my department or program.”
- “I understand when and how I will be evaluated.”
- “I believe I have been evaluated fairly in the past.”
- “I know whom to contact if I have questions or concerns.”
- “I have the information I need to make decisions about benefits I’m eligible for.”
58% NEGATIVE RESPONSE: AWARE OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES?

- Statement read “I understand what resources are available to further my professional development.”
- Several respondents said they weren’t aware of any resources; some said they didn’t know which resources were available to adjunct faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10.17%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>32.20%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>44.07%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>13.56%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In their comments, some adjuncts reported their department is welcoming and inclusive. Some reported feeling devalued within their home departments:

- Told not to apply for permanent positions
- Not allowed to attend department meetings
- Not recognized on public lists of department faculty

Departments should be as welcoming as possible. In addition, adjuncts may wish to join Faculty Club as a place for collegial interactions.
WORKING CONDITIONS THAT SHOULD NOT EXIST

- Adjuncts having to buy their own desk copies of required textbooks
- Adjuncts without desk or computer equipment
- Adjuncts without access to office space
- Adjuncts who have not been evaluated or believe process was unfair

We’ll survey chairs/program directors to get their perspective as well.
"I UNDERSTAND WHEN AND HOW I WILL BE EVALUATED"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>19.49%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>49.15%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26.27%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5.08%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POTENTIALLY GOOD SUGGESTIONS

- Allow adjuncts to take C of C courses tuition-free
- Look for ways to reduce adjuncts’ parking costs
- Develop more mentoring programs; publicize prof. development opportunities
- Find better ways to share info regarding benefits & other practical matters (a liason?)
INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION ON ADJUNCT BENEFITS?

- “I have the information I need to make decisions about benefits I’m eligible for.”

- Problems also mentioned in several comments

- We asked HR to create a summary of benefits

- We’re working on clarifying some questions before sharing it

- Some benefits not administered by HR (Parking, Faculty Club)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>20.34%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43.22%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>27.12%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9.32%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommended Best Practices for Adjunct Faculty at the College of Charleston

2014 Senate report by Academic Affairs’ Faculty Administrative Fellow. “+” = progress since 2013.

- + 1. Pay & benefits comparable to pay for work done by other roster faculty with similar qualifications
- + 2. Hiring practices for adjunct faculty comparable to those used for TTF—adequate time to prepare a course; duties, expectations, process of performance evaluation clearly communicated when hired
- + 3. Evaluation practices for adjunct faculty comparable to those used for TTF, including clear criteria & timelines, peer review, time to seek other employment if not reappointed
- 4. Career ladder
- + 5. Support for teaching parallels support for TTF: appropriate supplies, equipment, office space; access to campus resources, professional development, mentoring.
- 6. Invited to department meetings, may contribute to curriculum design.
- +7. Proportional representation in faculty governance
- + 8. Respect communicated clearly and consistently
- +9. Support for professional development & scholarly research
- 10. Institution’s staffing plan specifies what ratio of TT/NTT roster faculty/adjunct faculty is desired
- + 11. Institution collects & publishes data tracking its achievement of best practices
COMMITTEE MEMBERS & RESPONSIBILITIES

- One adjunct representative
- Welfare, Budget, Academic Planning, Compensation Committees each send one member
- Academic Affairs sends a representative
- Duties listed in FAM:
  - Receive and analyze reports: from the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Information Management on the number of adjuncts employed by the College, the number of credit hours delivered by adjunct faculty, adjunct faculty members’ rank and status (part-time or full-time), and adjunct faculty compensation; and from the Provost’s office on College policies for adjunct faculty.
  - Solicit additional information on adjunct practices in use in schools, departments, and programs. To obtain this information, the committee may analyze published documents (e.g., department websites or handbooks), interview deans and chairs, conduct surveys of adjunct faculty, and/or do additional research.
  - Receive and respond to information from the Provost’s office and/or senior leadership regarding future plans for the College that will affect the College’s reliance on adjunct faculty or compensation of adjunct faculty.
  - Regularly report to the Faculty Senate, Provost, and adjunct faculty on the College’s adjunct policies and practices; make recommendations to the Faculty Senate and appropriate committees regarding compensation, working conditions, ongoing professional development, and collegiality for adjunct faculty. With the assistance of the Faculty Secretariat, maintain a permanent record of each year’s minutes and annual reports.
  - Meet twice each semester, or more frequently, at the committee’s discretion.
Adjunct Oversight Committee Report: Adjunct Faculty Survey & Other Committee Research
College of Charleston Faculty Senate   13 March 2018

Mary Ann Blitt (Academic Planning), Julia Eichelberger (Chair/Budget Cmttee representative), Phyllis Jestice (Welfare Cmttee), Sorinel Oprisan (Compensation Cmttee), Cheryl Spinner (elected adjunct member)

- 118 adjuncts completed February survey (~30% of the 380+ adjunct faculty reported in 2016-17).
- Survey did not address adjuncts’ compensation, which is low: approximately 3K per course, 24K a year if full-time for 2 semesters/12 hours. We’re concerned about low adjunct pay, yet we know significant increases are unlikely in near term. (Raising pay from 3K to 4K/course would probably require 1-2M added to next year’s budget, without providing raises for other employees.)
- Survey investigated factors other than salary that affect adjuncts’ work. We invited respondents to rate 9 statements (Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree) & leave text comments.
  - “I have the information I need to do my job.”
  - “I have the space and materials I need to teach my assigned courses.”
  - “I have the space and materials I need to keep office hours.”
  - “I feel included in my department or program.”
  - “I understand when and how I will be evaluated.”
  - “I believe I have been evaluated fairly in the past.”
  - “I understand what resources are available to further my professional development.”
  - “I know whom to contact if I have questions or concerns.”
  - “I have the information I need to make decisions about benefits I’m eligible for.”

All but one statement received a majority of positive ratings (Strongly Agree, Agree).

- “I understand what resources are available to further my professional development” received 58% negative ratings (Disagree, Strongly Disagree). Several respondents said they were unaware which, if any, professional development opportunities they were eligible for as adjunct faculty.

- Some adjuncts surveyed described very positive department/program culture--supportive and welcoming colleagues and supervisors--while some reported feeling devalued by their departments’ attitude toward their contributions. Examples of non-collegial actions: not listing adjuncts among departmental faculty, not allowing adjuncts to attend department meetings, telling adjunct faculty not to apply for permanent positions in the department. Without fuller context for these comments, we can’t really assess the scope of this problem, but thought we should note it here. Some of these departments may now trying be more welcoming, yet adjuncts still have little contact with other faculty and may have yet to experience proactively collegial actions in these departments.

N.B. Joining the Faculty Club could enable adjuncts to interact with other C of C faculty (sign-up sheets in Faculty House dining room, $5/pay period).

- Adjuncts reported working conditions that should not exist—inadequate equipment or materials, for example. The committee doesn’t know whether these problems reflect a communication breakdown between adjuncts and supervisors or whether some chairs/program directors really are unable to provide their faculty with adequate space and materials needed to do their jobs. Some respondents said they had never been evaluated or that the process did not seem to them to be fair. The committee will survey chairs/program directors to get their perspective, then compile a list of additional recommendations for moving closer to best practices for adjunct faculty (see below for 2014 recommendations).
Survey comments included other suggestions the committee thinks are valuable, including:

- Allow adjuncts to take C of C courses tuition-free
- Look for ways to reduce adjuncts’ parking costs
- Develop more mentoring programs; publicize prof. development opportunities
- Find better ways to share info regarding benefits & other practical matters (a liaison?)

Prior to survey we’d heard concerns re insufficient information on adjunct benefits. We asked HR to create a one-page summary of benefits; we’re now working to clarify this further before sharing it. Some benefits (Parking, Faculty Club) are not provided by HR but by other entities; we want adjuncts to receive the fullest and clearest information possible on what is available to them.

This committee is charged with keeping faculty informed about adjuncts’ benefits & other working conditions; it also can make recommendations (i.e., a stronger adjunct compensation package) that the Senate may endorse or act upon. Committee consists of 1 elected adjunct representative plus one rep each from Budget, Compensation, Welfare, & Academic Planning committees. These committees can be charged with investigating specific adjunct issues identified this year.

Recommended Best Practices for Adjunct Faculty at the College of Charleston

2014 Senate report by Academic Affairs’ Faculty Administrative Fellow. “+” = progress since 2013.

1. Adjunct faculty receive equitable pay and benefits, comparable to the pay earned for comparable work done by tenured and tenure-track faculty or other roster faculty with similar qualifications.

2. Hiring practices for adjunct faculty are comparable to those used to hire tenure-track faculty (TTF); all new adjunct faculty appointments allow adequate time to prepare to teach a course; contracts, handbooks, and other communication from supervisors clearly stipulate duties, expectations, and the process of performance evaluation.

3. Evaluation practices for adjunct faculty are comparable to those used to evaluate TTF, including clearly defined criteria and timelines, peer review, and adequate time for adjunct faculty to seek other employment if not reappointed.

4. Career ladder for adjunct faculty rewards excellent performance and makes adjunct faculty potentially eligible for some form of job security.

5. Support for adjunct faculty teaching parallels support for TTF: appropriate supplies, equipment, office space, and access to campus resources, professional development, & mentoring.

6. Adjunct faculty are invited to participate in department meetings and may contribute to curriculum design.

7. Proportional representation in faculty governance is available to all adjunct faculty.

8. Respect for adjunct faculty is communicated clearly and consistently by administration, chairs, and all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

9. Support is available for all adjunct faculty’s professional development and scholarly research.

10. Institution’s staffing plan specifies the ratio of TT/NTT roster faculty/adjunct faculty that is desirable in order for institution and departments to meet their academic goals.

11. Institution collects and publishes data tracking its achievement of best practices.
In December and January we invited all employees to respond to an online survey designed to determine a set of issues related to the College’s identity that would guide a series of discussion sessions. During the month of February, we hosted six sessions where employees came together to discuss and share responses to the six broad questions that emerged from the online survey. Overall close to 500 employees of the College submitted responses to the online survey and/or participated in the six sessions. Our preliminary analysis found that respondents were most concerned with the following issues:

- Our identity as an institution – liberal arts, vocational training, research
- Operational details of how we realize our identity – business models, academic programs, policies, student recruitment
- Climate and communication – morale, communication between administration, staff, and faculty

The issue of climate and communication was concerning to many – so much so that at the February 22nd ordinary meeting, we presented a statement asserting that “...faculty and staff emphatically desire a higher degree of shared governance and a greater level of campus-wide dialogue.”

We are preparing a report of our findings to present to the Presidential search committee. We are also composing a longer survey of faculty and staff, based on statements and proposals that came up in the course of our February meetings.

We will be requesting time at the April 10th meeting to present a more detailed report of our findings. Our findings will be made available to the College community.

We believe that these discussions have been helpful and will complement the ongoing Presidential search and will be valuable to the new President in their first year guiding the College. Therefore, we ask that the life of the ad hoc committee be extended through the 2018-2019 academic year.
Memorandum

From: Richard Nunan, Chair
on behalf of the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
(George Pothering, Mike Lee, Liz Jurisich, Jannette Finch, Deanna Caveny-Noecker)

To: Faculty Senate

Re: Committee motions concerning Faculty Hearing Committee structure & procedures

The Faculty By-Laws Committee has seven motions to put before the Senate for the March Senate meeting. The first two are simple language modification motions carried over from last year, and are set forth in this cover memo. A third, also included in this cover memo, is simple in concept, but somewhat detailed in execution.

The fourth & fifth motions, concerning the structure and procedures of the Faculty Hearing Committee and the conduct of hearings, are quite complex, running to 23 pages of text (attached). Summarizing the content of that document is the main task of this cover memo.

The sixth motion, a follow-up to some of Dr. Chris Fragile’s recommendations on behalf of the 2016-17 Post-Tenure Review Committee, and to some additional related recommendations from Provost McGee, plus one minor innovation proposed by us, the 2017-18 By-Laws Committee, isn’t too complicated, but a bit detailed, and also attached separately.

Some uncontroversial elements of the 2016-17 recommendations from last year’s ad hoc Committee on Hearings, and from last year’s PTR Committee, have already been incorporated in the Faculty-Administration Manual (FAM hereafter), while Motions 4, 5, & 6 concern the potentially more controversial recommendations of those two Committees.

Finally, Motion 7 is yet another (more substantive) innovation concerning PTR evaluation standards language, proposed by the 2017-18 By-Laws Committee. Because this motion functions quite independently of the other PTR recommendations, we offer it as a separate motion.

Motion 1

FAM 162 VIII.A.9 Class Attendance: Instructors ascertain whether both excused and unexcused absences count in determining the basis for a grade of “WA,” which stands for “withdrawn failure due to excessive absences” and is equivalent to a failing grade.

Request by Mary Bergstrom on behalf of the Office of the Registrar, in order to more accurately reflect what a ‘WA’ grade means, which is an ‘F’, not a ‘W’, with respect to GPA. While the By-Laws Committee recognizes that this modification is unlikely to eliminate all confusion that results from conflating ‘W’ grades (which are not ‘F’s) and ‘WA’ grades (which are), it is a step in the right direction. Changing the grade labels involves complications which fall well outside the Committee’s authority.
Motion 2

**FAM 164** VIII.A.11 Final Examinations and Final Course Grades: At the request of the student, a faculty member should make available information and/or an evaluation of the student’s progress prior to the **drop date** withdrawal deadline.

Request by Lynn Cherry, to comply with current institutional language.

Note that the language in **brown** is **not** part of the proposed language for these motions. It is simply explanatory gloss for the Senate’s information. Language in **blue** is new language proposed (or endorsed) by the 2017-18 By-Laws Committee, in these particular cases to replace strike-through language. That color-coding will apply throughout these motions.

Motion 3

Replace binary-gendered pronouns with gender-neutral substitutes throughout the *FAM*.

The practical significance of this motion is illustrated throughout the long attached motion on matters governing faculty hearings. Traditional English usage practices are profoundly sexist, a practice which academic institutions have been combatting for some time now. But traditional usage is also profoundly binary with respect to third person gender references such as he/she or her/him. Not everyone subscribes to this dual-valued allocation of genders, and we believe the College should be more inclusive in its official documents. Doing this does sometimes necessitate resorting to plural pronouns in contexts where singular forms would be more traditional. But the practice is becoming more commonplace, and thus our language is arguably evolving, in terms of what is now regarded as grammatically correct.

Although the effects of this motion are already integrated into the attached proposal on hearings, the intent of the motion is much broader, eventually encompassing the entire FAM. Conversely, Motions 4 & 5 below, concerning substantive changes in matters relating to faculty hearings, can be approved with or without passage of Motion 3. The pronoun modification language in the body of the attached document can be reversed again, if needed.

The next two motions are really an integrated unit, but they have been separated out because they involve distinct ratification processes. Motion 4 concerns the By-Laws section of the FAM. As an alteration in the Faculty By-Laws, in addition to securing Senate endorsement, it must be approved also by the Faculty as whole. Motion 5 concerns hearing-related issues which fall outside the By-Laws section of the FAM. Those recommendations, if approved by the Senate, have to then be acceptable also to the Administration.

Motion 4

Modify By-Laws Article V, Section 3 (Standing College Committees), Subsection B.12 (Faculty Hearing Committee), pp. 26 and 27 of current FAM, so as to restructure committee membership as explained in attached detailed motions on hearings (pp. 2-4 of 1st attachment).
This proposal is a variation, with some new innovations, on a recommendation conveyed by the ad hoc Committee on Hearings to the Faculty Senate at the April 2017 meeting. As the ad hoc Committee originally suggested, we have proposed eliminating the distinction between regular and alternate committee members in favor of a committee of the whole. But we have also proposed augmented its size by one member, increased the number of full professors by two, and proposed a different method for selecting individual hearing panels. Our reasoning for these measures in included in the attachment. Red ink indicates language retained (or deleted) from the ad hoc Committee’s original proposal concerning Hearing Committee structure last year. (See page 1 of first attachment for a detailed summary of the color-coding.)

The remaining 19 pp. of the first attachment constitute Motion 5. But for the sake of organizational clarity, the motion is subdivided by its distinctive parts below.

**Motion 5**

A. Clarification of *FAM* language governing the rights of probationary faculty and adjuncts to grieve certain kinds of allegations about the circumstances of their termination or non-renewal before a faculty hearing panel. (*FAM* pp. 72 and 78-80, plus enumeration modifications on 89-91; attachment pp. 5-11)

This is entirely a By-Laws Committee innovation, motivated by concerns about the lack of clarity in FAM language governing the grievance rights of Instructor-rank faculty, and adjunct faculty. It’s unrelated to the ad hoc Committee’s recommendations, but nonetheless also relevant to the larger hearing process reform initiative in which the ad hoc Committee and By-Laws Committee have both been engaged.

B. Timing sequence issues with regard to hearing procedures. (*FAM* 125, 126, 149, 181; attachment pp. 12-16) These actually come up throughout the attachment (see summary on p.1)

The By-Laws Committee has made some necessary modifications of timing issues in some locations, but in general, the By-Laws Committee parts company with the ad hoc Committee on the question of shortening timing intervals. The By-Laws Committee’s reasoning for its reversal on this question is laid out in detail on attachment p. 14

C. Conflict of interest findings by faculty hearing panel. (*FAM* p. 182; attachment pp. 17-18)

The proposal offered by the ad hoc Committee concerning conflicts of interest has been both augmented and modified significantly. It has also been moved from the location originally proposed by the ad hoc Committee. Note also the distinction between the hearing panel and the Hearing Committee (the ‘committee of the whole’). That was intentional.

D. (Mostly) minor repairs of language governing hearing and post-hearing procedures. (*FAM* 183, 186-188, legendary missing last page of FAM; attachment pp. 19-23).

Some of these modifications were devised by the ad hoc Committee last year, others by the By-Laws Committee this year. Note (potentially) limited role of the alternate panel member, whose existence in this proposal is another By-Laws Committee innovation. The last page, discovered in a secret Pentagon storage room near the Ark of the Covenant, was unavailable to the ad hoc Committee last year.
Modify FAM language governing Post-Tenure Review Procedures to clarify timing issues about when a faculty member can come up for a Superior Rating. (Second attachment)

This motion reflects the more substantive elements of the set of recommendations submitted to the Senate by Chris Fragile on behalf of the 2016-17 Post Tenure Review Committee during the April 2017 Senate meeting. The more straightforward details, like the more straightforward details in the ad hoc Committee on Hearings recommendations, were incorporated in the draft 2017-18 FAM over the 2017 summer, and approved then by the 2016-17 and the 2017/18 By-Laws Committees, after which they were ratified by the Senate at the September 2017 Senate meeting. The chief difference between the 2016-17 PTR Committee recommendations and Motion 6 involves a softening of the PTR Committee recommendations concerning deferments.

This motion is largely self-explanatory. It is offered in the hope of securing both more flexible and more consistent application of the PTR standards for a superior rating.

The By-Laws Committee thanks Senate members in advance for taking the time to read through and deliberate carefully about these detailed and rather complex motions.
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 13 February 2018

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 13 February 2018 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order, 5:05 PM.

2. The minutes from 16 January 2018 were approved as written.

3. There were no Announcements and information.

4. Reports

   a. Speaker of the Faculty Elizabeth Jurisich announced that the 2018-2019 Senate meeting schedule is posted on the Senate website (http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/about-faculty-senate/meeting-schedule.php). Speaker Jurisich explained that the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM) specifies that Faculty Senate meets on the first Tuesday of every month, which is sometimes not possible, and results in shifting the meeting to the second Tuesday. Please let her know if you see any conflicts in the schedule.

   Speaker Jurisich thanked all who participated in recent elections important for shared faculty governance. Results are in MyCharleston, under the Faculty tab. She is especially grateful to Scott Peeples, who will serve as 2018-19 Faculty Secretary. Please look for the call for faculty committee service from the Committee on Nominations and Elections.

   Jurisich attended the January Board of Trustees meeting and reported on Senate business. The Board approved two new programs approved by Faculty Senate, the Masters in Data Science and the Bachelors in General Studies. She also gave summaries of the reports given in Senate meetings.

   Jurisich addressed the impending search for the next College of Charleston president. President McConnell's retirement will be sometime in the summer, 2018. The Board has appointed Steve Osborne to serve as interim president, starting in July 2018.

   Speaker Jurisich, Dean of Professional Studies and Associate Professor of Economics Godfrey Gibbison, and six Board of Trustees members will serve on the presidential search committee. The chair of the search committee is Trustee Renee Romberger.

   There will be several listening sessions designed to solicit input from four groups of stakeholders; faculty, staff, students, and alumni. The listening sessions provide opportunity for stakeholders to share what qualifications, characteristics and attributes are deemed required in the college president.

   Views will be gathered from the listening sessions and shared with the search firm hired to assist in the national search. An email will be forthcoming announcing the schedule.
An online comment form will be available for those not able to physically attend a listening session. Tim Johnson will serve as the leader of the faculty stakeholder group. Co-leaders are Hollis France, Devon Hanahan, and Denis Keyes.

Speaker Jurisich accepted questions.

**Larry Krasnoff, Senator** (Philosophy) said that many faculty members are concerned with the structure of the search committee. Krasnoff said that there should be more than one faculty member, representing the different disciplines. He said the search committee is incredibly unrepresentative of the stakeholders across campus. He described the search committee as essentially a Board of Trustees sub-committee with a couple of advisors. Krasnoff described a typical search committee as containing multiple faculty members, representatives from offices such as student affairs and athletics, student representatives, representatives from the alumni association, and the Foundation Board. Krasnoff said the search committee only advises the Board of Trustees, so incorporating more stakeholders in the search committee is not usurping the Board's power. Krasnoff offered suggestions for actions the Faculty Senate could take, including:

- issuing a statement from stakeholders supporting including more stakeholders;
- holding a "shadow search committee," which could include holding separate listening sessions and writing a separate advertisement including a description of desired characteristics for the next president;
- issuing reports when candidates visit campus.

Krasnoff said that all of these actions could be posted publicly.

**Speaker Jurisich** commented that the Board of Trustees is aware that the search committee does not resemble previous committees. She said they were determined that the committee remain a small committee. The Chair of the Search Committee, Renee Romberger, has assured the Speaker that the search committee will take the information from the listening sessions very seriously.

**Tom Kunkle, Senator** (at-large, SSM) asked what the Board's response was when Speaker Jurisich proposed more faculty representation on the search committee?

Speaker Jurisich said that the search committee of eight members includes two faculty members and six Trustees and the Board felt that this was adequate faculty representation.

**Julia Eichelberger, Senator** (at-large, HSS) thanked the Speaker for trying to express the faculty's desire to have a greater role in the search committee process. Eichelberger said the listening sessions do provide a chance for faculty to voice their concerns, but there is a strong possibility that those concerns will be disregarded.
Eichelberger said that the people who will decide on the next president are unlikely to be at the listening sessions. She suggested that Speaker Jurisich could request that the listening sessions be recorded and made public.

Speaker Jurisich said that Romberger had assured her that the faculty co-leader and potentially a search committee member would be at each session.

Eichelberger said some remember that the search committee for the previous president made recommendations, but the Board of Trustees took its own vote, which is its right to do.

Speaker Jurisich acknowledged that this past experience causes people to feel their time is wasted, but said that there is a new Chair of the Board of Trustees.

Eichelberger expressed concern that the Board may not be conversant with faculty perspective and with the hopes faculty have for the college, as their perspective is very different. She said that difference is natural, but is so dramatic a difference, it may not be healthy. It would be good to encourage more public access to the listening sessions so that more than one or two search committee members can listen to stakeholder concerns.

Speaker Jurisich said there will be summaries, and some technology available so people can make comments anonymously through a website.

**Brian Lanahan, Senator** (at-large, EHHP) said we owe a more transparent search to our next president. He said the credibility of our institution would improve with public transparency and give the next president the vote of confidence that will allow them to move into the role and to be successful.

**Richard Nunan, Senator** (at-large, HSS) observed that Senator Krasnoff’s proposals would send a negative message to candidates for president, but those presidential candidates are probably already aware of the controversy surrounding the presidential search of four years ago.

Nunan appreciated the Speaker’s positive spin on the search committee, but asserted that the search committee is "just a disaster," since it contains six members of the body that will ultimately make the decision on who to hire, and virtually no one else. Nunan said that as far as he understands, Dean Gibbison is an administrator with a faculty appointment. Nunan quoted from the Presidential Search Committee Guidelines, written by Muriel Poston and posted on the AAUP (American Association of University Professors) website. Poston states, "The involvement of administrators on the search committee is problematic and should be discouraged since they may represent the perspective of the outgoing administration" ([https://www.aaup.org/issues/governance-colleges-universities/presidential-search](https://www.aaup.org/issues/governance-colleges-universities/presidential-search)).

Nunan said the search committee is six Board of Trustees members, one administrator associated with the outgoing administration, and the Speaker of the Faculty. Nunan said it
might be the case that the Board of Trustees does not agree with AAUP views on the presidential search, however, presidential candidates are probably conversant with those views and they wonder why AAUP guidelines are not being followed.

Nunan encouraged the Board of Trustees to reconsider the composition of the search committee and said the AAUP offers two guidelines to assist with reorganizing the search committee:


Nunan said the basic message in both documents is that faculty are an equal voice in the selection of a president for an institution of higher education.

Nunan said if a Board of Trustees ignores AAUP guidelines, the candidates they select is a set of candidates that mirror its own parochial concerns. What they will not get is a candidate who has a deep understanding of academic culture, including what is important and significant about the culture and how to run an institution steeped in that culture.

Nunan said it might be the case that by some miracle, we will get a good president from this process, but that would be a miracle and he wishes the Board would reconsider.

Patricia Williams Lessane, Senator (Library) asked if anything prohibited the Faculty Senate from taking a vote of no confidence in the Board of Trustees in the event they do not listen to faculty concerns?

Speaker Jurisich said there is no policy prohibiting that action.

Williams Lessane said that since there will be a race for governor of South Carolina soon, the atmosphere is ripe for radical action if the Board does not take into account faculty concerns.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) added that the AAUP advises that faculty select their own representatives for the search committee, instead of faculty appointees made by the Board.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) said that listening sessions are not a substitute for broadening the search committee. A broad search committee would commission listening sessions anyway, but they are not a substitute for a representative search committee.

There were no more comments.
b. **Provost Brian McGee**

*The Provost's report is reflected in his PowerPoint [Appendix A].*

**Provost McGee** acknowledged President McConnell’s service and expressed appreciation.

The Provost reminded faculty of the upcoming Sestercentennial celebrating the College of Charleston's 250th anniversary in 2020 and invited faculty to think of proposals. There will be a budget for academically focused disciplinary and interdisciplinary proposals that offer opportunities to explore the College's history, including strengths and weaknesses.

The Provost discussed the Sabbatical calendar and said approximately 34 letters awarding sabbatical proposals are being sent out. Some are contingent on successful tenure and promotion.

Provost McGee gave a brief report on the student complaint system. Over the last twelve months, seventeen complaints have been lodged. The majority of complaints were non-academic and concerned campus dining. The seven academic complaints were spread almost evenly among the Schools.

Eleven student complaints were resolved to the students' satisfaction; three complaints were unresolved because the students did not respond to the proposed resolution. Another three complaints were received recently, and the process has not been completed.

Provost McGee commented on the study on the direct instructional cost. It was first completed in the 2011 academic year using 2009-2010 data. Dr. Bev Diamond has replicated the study completed in 2011 using data from the 2016-2017 academic year. The costs are seen in Appendix A. The Provost said there are various ways to present the data, including a comparison of the revenue received for every dollar in direct instructional costs in FY2010 and FY2017. The Provost pointed out that based on the data, the College is managing its costs responsibly. The Provost said all the schools are producing more revenue than they cost.

The Provost gave a summary of the 2017-2018 Program Cost Study as finding good stability in program costs relative to revenues and as procuring a series of program reports on expenses for both graduate and undergraduate.

The Provost invited Program Directors, Deans, and Chairs to study the data and look for opportunities to create greater efficiencies. He repeated that costs are being managed well, despite having more roster faculty, more senior faculty, and smaller course sections than seven years ago.
Provost McGee said that a study of overhead costs would be valuable, and has expressed that to the Board of Trustees, who have assured him that the College should be doing that.

Provost McGee addressed the College identity conversations, describing them as helpful and wide-reaching, addressing changes at the College and at the national level in areas of resources, faculty lines, student major patterns, student programming, educational preparation of students, and enrollments.

Provost McGee commented on the tenure and promotion packets, and said they reveal inspiring work, amazing research, transformational work done in classroom, interventions and service in the community, and the tremendous work we do for students. He said it serves as a reminder of the excellent and important work of the University, which transforms Charleston, the state, and the nation for the better.

The Provost said at a time when we spend a lot of effort talking about our future and how we work with other stakeholders including the Board, we should not forget the tremendous work we do as an institution and the transformational experiences we give students and the benefits we provide to the community. These things give him full confidence in the future.

There were no questions.

c. **Committee on Graduate Education, Chair Christine Finnan**, gave a report on the Graduate Program Admissions Process [Appendix B].

Finnan said after the change last year separating the Graduate Education Committee from Continuing Education and Special Programs, the Graduate Committee had a chance to revisit their charge in relation to graduate education. One policy area they looked at was streamlining admissions policy for graduate programs. The Committee sought to ensure transparency in admissions decisions and adherence to Graduate School policies.

There were no questions.

5. There was no **Old Business**.

6. **New Business**

   a. **Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (Quinn Burke, Chair). Concentrations and Minors Proposal** [Appendix C].

   Burke said the proposal clarifies the role of the minor as related to the major.

   There were no questions.
The vote was called and the proposal passed.

b. General Education Committee (Lisa Covert, Chair) introduced the following curriculum changes:

   i. ECON 101 (pdf) * note: pre-dates Curriculog
   ii. PHIL 115 (pdf)

The proposals were viewed and discussed separately. The items were approved unanimously.

Covert asked for departments to consider submitting proposals for math/logic alternatives. PHIL 115 is currently the only one.

c. Committee on Graduate Education (Christine Finnan, Chair) brought the following proposals:

   i. English, MA - remove foreign language requirement (pdf)

There was no discussion. The proposal passed.

   ii. Public Administration, MPA - 4+1 program with Urban Studies, Planning and Administration Concentration (pdf)

Although a vote was not needed for Public Administration, Provost McGee felt that a vote was appropriate.

Discussion.

Finnan said the Public Administration proposal allows for strong student to begin their graduate work while still undergraduates.

Jon Hakkila, Guest, spoke in favor of the 4 + 1 programs as a great opportunity to combine undergraduate and graduate programs with the goal of retaining students. Most resources are in place, so no new resources are needed. Hakkila encouraged more departments to think of developing 4 + 1 programs. He also spoke as a parent of a student who is in a 4 + 1 program and can see the advantage for his child.

Kevin Keenan, Guest and Director of the Urban Studies Program spoke to the academic rationale for 4 + 1 programs as opening options for the undergraduate students to curriculum and training in Urban Planning that is not available at the undergraduate student. For students performing at the 3.5 and above level, this program creates a strong academic opportunity for them.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked at what point do student apply?
Keenan said they have to have Junior status, defined as 60 credits completed, 3.5 GPA, a recommendation from the Director of Urban Studies and two additional faculty recommendations.

Keenan said the applications would be reviewed by Masters in Public Administration Admissions.

**Lynn Cherry (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources, Academic Affairs)** said that the undergraduates who participate in the 4 + 1 program are not admitted to the graduate program. They are only admitted to the graduate program after they have completed and earned the undergraduate degree.

Cherry said the opportunity to take graduate courses is available to the undergraduates, but they are not admitted to the graduate program at that time.

**Krasnoff** asked if there are benchmarks that the undergraduates have to meet? It seems like students would need assurances of what they receive if they perform well.

Keenan said the students have to maintain a B in graduate courses. If they fall below that in any of the graduate courses they are dropped from the program. This pathway is communicated with them.

Cherry made the point that any student receiving federal financial aid must remain an undergraduate student—they cannot receive federal financial aid if they are also graduate students.

A vote was taken and the proposal passed.

d. **Faculty Curriculum Committee (Chad Galuska Co-Chair)** introduced the following proposals:

i. **Computer Science**: Program changes to both the BS and the BA degrees ([pdf](#))
   - [Computer Science, B.S. - BS-CSCI (pdf)](#)
   - [Computer Science, B.A. - BA-CSCI (pdf)](#)

ii. **Computer Science/Information Systems**: Program changes to INFS and a prerequisite change to CSCI 462
   - [Computer Information Systems, B.S. - BS-INFS (pdf)](#)
   - [CSCI 462 Course Change (pdf)](#)
iii. French, Francophone, and Italian Studies: Prerequisite changes to the following courses:

- FREN 435 (pdf)
- FREN 453 (pdf)
- FREN 454 (pdf)
- FREN 475 (pdf)
- FREN 476 (pdf)
- FREN 477 (pdf)
- FREN 481 (pdf)
- FREN 490 (pdf)
- FREN 491 (pdf)
- FREN 492 (pdf)
- FREN 496 (pdf)
- FREN 498 (pdf)
- FREN 499 (pdf)

iv. Geology: Create three new field courses and an associated program change.

- Geology, B.S. - BS-GEOL (pdf)
- GEOL 364 (pdf)
- GEOL 365 (pdf)
- GEOL 366 (pdf)

v. International Studies: Change concentrations to reflect added/deactivated FREN courses.

- BA-INTL-INAF (pdf)
- BA-INTL-INCL (pdf)
- BA-INTL-INEU (pdf)
- BA-INTL-INLA (pdf)

vi. International Studies: Make INTL 350 a required course for the major and then delete it from individual concentrations:

- Required Courses - INTL (pdf)
- BA-INTL-INAF (pdf)
- BA-INTL-INA (pdf)
- BA-INTL-INEU (pdf)
- BA-INTL-INCL (pdf)
- BA-INTL-INLA (pdf)
vii. Philosophy, Politics, Philosophy and Law Concentration: Add electives to the concentration for both the philosophy and political science majors. Change the way these major GPAs are calculated.

- PPLW Concentration (pdf)
- BA-PHIL-PPLW (pdf)
- BA-POLI-PPLW (pdf)

viii. Psychology: Changes to the following two courses:

- PSYC 397 Course Change (pdf)
- PSYC 497 Course Change (pdf)

ix. Studio Art: Course description change to ARTS 339 (pdf)

x. MATH: Decouple 400- and 500-level courses. This did not require a vote from the undergraduate curriculum committee.

- MATH 402: Advanced Linear Algebra
- MATH 502: Advanced Linear Algebra
- MATH 415: Complex Analysis
- MATH 515: Complex Analysis
- MATH 423: Partial Differential Equations
- MATH 523: Partial Differential Equations
- MATH 430: Mathematical Statistics I
- MATH 530: Mathematical Statistics I
- MATH 431: Mathematical Statistics II
- MATH 531: Mathematical Statistics II
- MATH 440: Statistical Learning I
- MATH 540: Statistical Learning I
- MATH 441: Statistical Learning II
- MATH 541: Statistical Learning II
- MATH 445: Numerical Analysis
- MATH 545: Numerical Analysis
- MATH 449: Linear Models
- MATH 550: Linear Models
- MATH 451: Linear Programming
- MATH 551: Linear Programming
- MATH 452: Operations Research
- MATH 552: Operations Research
- MATH 455: Bayesian Methods
- MATH 555: Bayesian Methods
- MATH 460: Stochastic Processes
- MATH 560: Stochastic Processes
- MATH 461: Time Series Analysis
- MATH 561: Time Series Analysis

Discussion was invited after each proposal. There was no discussion until the Math proposals.

Provost McGee and Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) wanted to make sure that the Math department understands that it will not be able to offer the courses listed above as cross-listed courses again in the future without going through curriculum approval and coming before the Senate.
Deanna Caveny-Noecker, (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) pointed out a typo, which was corrected.

All curriculum proposals passed.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked for unanimous consent to suspend the rules and add to the agenda a motion to call on the Board of Trustees to expand the Presidential Search Committee. The motion to suspend the rules was seconded. Majority vote suspended the rules.

The motion was introduced and seconded. The motion was discussed.

Some wordsmithing recommendations were offered by Senators Jim Young (at-large SSM) and Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large, HSS). The recommendations were accepted.

Olivia Thompson, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked what is the standard number of representatives on a search committee?

Lynne Ford (Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) gave an example, and said her daughter attends William and Mary and their current presidential search committee contains twenty people, and includes students.

There was some discussion of how many members to suggest.

Iana Anguelova, Senator (at-large, SSM) spoke in favor of specifying a number or a proportion of the search committee consisting of faculty.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) spoke in favor of leaving off a specific number, since it is a resolution and it is up to the Board to interpret the resolution.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) spoke on the importance of adopting AAUP’s suggestions, including faculty selecting their own representatives, instead of faculty appointed by the Board.

Krasnoff agreed, and used the example of the Board going to the Athletic department to ask who that department suggested for the search committee.

Both Nunan and Krasnoff emphasized that the point is that each stakeholder group select their own representatives, instead of the Board “cherry-picking.”

Anguelova spoke in favor of including faculty representatives from each school, as different schools have different viewpoints.

An amendment was introduced to include specific language on faculty from each school. That amendment failed.
Julia Eichelberger, Senator (at-large, HSS) contributed another friendly amendment, which was accepted.

Jolanda van Arnhem, Senator (at-large, Library) looked up AAUP guidelines and verified that the guidelines suggest that there should be nine to twenty on a search committee, which would allow representatives from each school.

There was more discussion about the total number of faculty to include and whether that would encourage the Board to move expediently.

The Faculty Senate voted on the amended motion, which passed with a unanimous vote.

The amended motion is:

**A Resolution to the Board of Trustees from the Faculty Senate**

*Whereas,* the function of a presidential search committee is to advise the Board of Trustees on the selection of a president;

*Whereas,* the Board cannot be properly advised without the direct input of stakeholders throughout the institution;

*Whereas,* the presidential search committee now contains only two members who are not also Board members;

*Whereas,* a strong applicant pool and a successful presidential transition require a transparent and inclusive search process; therefore be it

**Resolved** that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston calls upon the Board of Trustees to add to its presidential search committee additional representatives of the faculty, and representatives of staff, student body, and alumni and Foundation boards.

The Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Faculty Senate returned to regular order.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) introduced concerns about requirements for independent studies and the individual enrollment form. He said in the past, he simply stated
how often the student and professor would meet and how the grade would be determined in a general way, and that was captured on the individual enrollment form.

Nunan said the communication he received from the Registrar’s office indicated that the independent study needed to include a course description, learning outcomes, and grading scale.

Nunan provided an example of the language used on the individual enrollment form, found in Appendix D, below.

Nunan found it surprising that he needed to attach a detailed project description and/or syllabus, and a grading rubric and a plan for assessing a student learning outcome.

Nunan was concerned about the language of assessment and "bureaucratic creep." He said an independent study with a student is an uncompensated overload, and if requirements become too onerous due to assessment requirements, he will no longer do them.

Nunan asked where the language originated from, who ratified the language, why are we doing this, and asked for the appropriate faculty committees to study the language in the Individual Enrollment form.

**Lynne Ford** (Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) explained the history of the language and the need for consistent criteria. Ford said when she was the Associate Provost for Curriculum, she authored much of the language found in the Individual Enrollment form. She said that Nunan in his independent studies probably set meticulously documented student learning outcomes or objectives and planned meetings with students to assure that the student had produced the work to demonstrate that they have met the student learning outcomes. Ford said that faculty conducting independent studies before the language change in the Individual Enrollment form varied widely in how they articulated student performance, from notes on cocktail napkins to twenty-page syllabi. Changes in the language on the form were to design a regular format for departments to use.

**Provost McGee** said that college policy 7.6.10, the Policy of Course Syllabi, requires that every individual enrollment must have a syllabus (section 7.0). The policy was sent through all pertinent committees and vetted extensively.

Nunan spoke about the difference between a grading rubric and detailed project description and asked for the committees to again look at the language.

**Larry Krasnoff, Senator** (Philosophy) asked about a couple of ambiguities in language concerning grading rubric and grading scale. Krasnoff also asked about learning outcomes, and received affirmation that they can be created specifically for Individual Enrollment, instead of set at the departmental level.

Provost McGee said Academic Affairs will examine the Individual Enrollment forms to make sure language is consistent and aligns with the policy that was approved in Spring 2016 and
revised in Fall 2016. The goal is for students to clearly understand how the grade will be assigned.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) and Chair, Committee on Nominations and Elections, called for service on college committees.

8. Adjournment 6:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jannette Finch

Faculty Secretary

[Appendix A: Provost Brian McGee's PowerPoint]

[Appendix B: Report on the Graduate Program Admissions Process, from the Committee on Graduate Education]

[Appendix C: Concentrations and Minors Proposal from the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid]

[Appendix D: Individual Enrollment Registration Form Requirements]
Provost’s Report

Faculty Senate
February 13, 2018
Sabbatical Leaves for 2018-2019

- 25 Awarded
- 9 Awarded Contingent on Favorable Tenure Review
Electronic Submission of Student Complaints

- February 2018 Report Promised in February 2017
- 17 Complaints Filed Over 12 Months
  - 10 Non-Academic Complaints
  - 7 Academic Complaints (1 or 2 complaints per school)
- Complaint Resolution Status
  - 11 Complaints Resolved to Student Satisfaction
  - 3 Complaints Unresolved/No Student Response
  - 3 Complaints Unresolved/Still Under Review
## 2017-2018 Program Cost Study: School Totals (UG and Graduate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>FY17 Cost/SCH</th>
<th>FY10 Cost/SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOTA</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$268</td>
<td>$231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHHP</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>$197</td>
<td>$153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCWA</td>
<td>$195</td>
<td>$143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>$254</td>
<td>$193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>$269</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Total</td>
<td>$226</td>
<td>$176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2017-2018 Program Cost Study: Costs and Revenues

- In FY10, the College of Charleston received $2.18 in revenue for every $1 in direct instructional costs.
- In FY17, the College of Charleston received $2.16 in revenue for every $1 in direct instructional costs.
- In FY17, the College of Charleston generated $143,572,000 in tuition revenues (estimated), with $66,591,000 in total direct instructional costs.
## 2017-2018 Program Cost Study: Ratio of Revenues to Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>FY17 Ratio</th>
<th>FY10 Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOTA</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHHP</td>
<td>2.21*</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>2.47**</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCWA</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>1.91***</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This school generated $1.4m in external funding for FY17.

**This school generated $0.7m in external funding for FY17.

***This school generated $5.7m in external funding for FY17.
Graduate Program Admission Process

The Committee on Graduate Education has approved a process for updating and modifying graduate program admissions requirements. This process is needed because each program sets its own admissions criteria (graduate students apply directly to specific programs whereas undergraduate students apply to the College of Charleston) and the Committee wants to ensure transparency in admissions decisions and adherence to Graduate School policies. In the proposed process, a graduate program will initiate admissions updates to be subsequently sent for approval to the line dean(s), the Graduate School dean or associate dean, the Provost, the Committee on Graduate Education, and the Graduate Council. The Committee on Graduate Education will prepare an annual report to the Senate each spring outlining program admissions changes.

The Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid supports the proposed process.
This text would be added to the 2018-2019 catalog. All students would be eligible to take advantage of this change starting with Fall 2018 readmits.

**Current Catalog Text**

Concentrations and Minors

In addition to completing a major, a degree-seeking student may elect to pursue a program of study organized around a particular theme within the major discipline (a concentration) or outside the major discipline (a minor). A student may not complete a major and a minor in the same subject. Either program must include a minimum of 18 credit hours selected from a formally designated group. At least nine credit hours in the minor at the 200-level or above must be earned in residence at the College of Charleston. Residency is defined as instruction delivered by the College of Charleston, the degree granting institution.

Unique courses, appropriate for the minor, but not otherwise offered at the College of Charleston, may be considered for approval as exceptions to the minor residency policy. Likewise, a set of courses completed elsewhere may be approved as exceptions to the minor residency policy if when considered in the whole they comprise a unique curricular experience not available at the College. Senior-Year Residency policies apply.

Successful completion of such a program of study requires a grade point average of at least 2.000 in all courses taken which comprise it. Credit may be received for up to two minors.

Courses used to satisfy the requirements of a concentration or minor may not be applied toward another concentration or minor.

These courses may be selected from a single department or from several, and interdisciplinary courses may be included. Students must formally declare the concentration area or minor requests online through the Program of Study Management (POSM) channel located on the Academic Services tab in MyCharleston in order to have the degree audit and transcript reflect credit for work done in that concentration or minor.

**Proposed Catalog Text**

Concentrations and Minors

In addition to completing a major, a degree-seeking student may elect to pursue a program of study organized around a particular theme within the major discipline (a concentration) or outside the major discipline (a minor). These courses may be selected from a single department or from several, and interdisciplinary courses may be included. Either program must include a minimum of 18 credit hours selected from a formally designated group. Courses used to satisfy the requirements of a concentration or minor may not be applied toward another concentration or minor.

Earning a Minor

The College of Charleston does not require students to complete a minor. However, a minor allows you to take advantage of the extensive offerings across the College. There are a few rules to keep in mind when pursuing a minor.

- At least nine credit hours in the minor at the 200-level or above must be earned in residence at the College of Charleston. Residency is defined as instruction delivered by the College of Charleston, the degree granting institution.
• Unique courses, appropriate for the minor, but not otherwise offered at the College of Charleston, may be considered for approval as exceptions to the minor residency policy. Likewise, a set of courses completed elsewhere may be approved as exceptions to the minor residency policy if when considered in the whole they comprise a unique curricular experience not available at the College. Senior-Year Residency policies apply.
• Successful completion of a minor or concentration requires a grade point average of at least 2.000 in all courses taken which comprise it.
• Courses used to satisfy the requirements of a concentration or minor may not be applied toward another concentration or minor.
• Students must formally declare a concentration or minor online through the Program of Study Management (POSM) channel located on the Academic Services tab in MyCharleston in order to have the degree audit and transcript reflect credit for work done in that concentration or minor. A concentration or minor must be formally declared before the degree is posted.
• A student may earn a total of two minors from the College of Charleston.

Minors in Relation to Majors

• A student may not concurrently complete a major and a minor in the same subject.
• A student who earns a bachelor’s degree (AB, BA, BS, BPS) from the College of Charleston may return and complete the requirements for an additional major. In this case, credits from a previously earned minor may be used to complete requirements for a major in the same subject. All requirements for the additional major must be met. See applicable sections under Second Bachelor’s Degree or Pursuing an Additional Major After Earning a College of Charleston Degree in the undergraduate catalog for specific details.
• A student returning to complete an additional major may also earn a minor so long as it does not exceed a total of two from the College. At no time may a student earn a subsequent minor in the same subject as a completed major. See applicable sections under Second Bachelor’s Degree or Pursuing an Additional Major After Earning a College of Charleston Degree in the undergraduate catalog for specific details.
• Completion of a minor is designated on the official transcript, but a minor does not appear on the diploma.
What I was first told was missing by a Registrar’s Office staffer in an email response to individual enrollment submission:

*We are unable to process the individual enrollment for ______________ – missing are the course description, learning outcomes, and grading scale.*

Here’s the problematic language that appears on the individual enrollment form used now (dated 09/08/2016), and quoted to me in Registrar’s Office subsequent response (to my expression of mystification)...

From the checklist at the top of the form...
Attach a detailed project description and/or syllabus. Faculty supervisor must provide a grading rubric and a plan for assessing the student learning outcome.

From the list of requirements lower down on the form:
A detailed project description and/or syllabus must accompany all Application for Individual Enrollment forms. The means by which the faculty supervisor will grade the course must be included in the description or syllabus and a plan for assessing the student learning outcome.

New language is italicized.

Language used on the previous individual enrollment form:

From the checklist at the top of the form...
Attach a detailed project description and/or syllabus. The means by which the faculty supervisor will grade the course must be included in the description or syllabus.

From the list of requirements lower down on the form:
A detailed project description and/or syllabus must accompany all Application for Individual Enrollment forms. The means by which the faculty supervisor will grade the course must be included in the description or syllabus.
Minutes, Ordinary Meeting of the Faculty

February 22, 2018

5:00 PM in Alumni Hall

1. Call to Order, 5:05 PM

[Faculty Secretary Finch tried to capture the gist of what was said. The recordings were quite poor due to the unique acoustics of Alumni Hall. The recording is available upon request].

2. Statement from Speaker of the Faculty, Elizabeth Jurisich

Speaker Jurisich (member of Presidential Search Committee) introduced herself, then introduced the Board of Trustees members in attendance, as well as Presidential Search Committee members.

Present were David Hay (Chair, Board of Trustees and member of Presidential Search Committee), Renee Buyck Romberger (Board of Trustees member and Chair, Presidential Search Committee), Cherry Daniel (Board of Trustees member and member of Presidential Search Committee), Ricci Welch (Board of Trustees member and member of Presidential Search Committee), Godfrey Gibbison (Dean of School of Professional Studies and member of Presidential Search Committee), Demetria Clemons (Board of Trustees member and member of Presidential Search Committee), Henrietta Goulding (Board of Trustees member), and Craig Thornton, (Board of Trustees member).

There were approximately 57 faculty, staff, and interested others in attendance.

Speaker Jurisich thanked everyone for attending the meeting on short notice. Speaker Jurisich clarified that the meeting was not a listening session, but a meeting called by the Speaker to discuss the search process.

Speaker Jurisich read the Resolution passed by unanimous vote in the 13 February 2018 Faculty Senate meeting.

A Resolution to the Board of Trustees from the Faculty Senate

Whereas, the function of a Presidential Search Committee is to advise the Board of Trustees on the selection of a president;

Whereas, the Board cannot be properly advised without the direct input of stakeholders throughout the institution;

Whereas, the Presidential Search Committee now contains only two members who are not also Board members;
Whereas, a strong applicant pool and a successful presidential transition require a transparent and inclusive search process; therefore be it

Resolved that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston calls upon the Board of Trustees to add to its Presidential Search Committee additional representatives of the faculty, and representatives of staff, student body, and alumni and Foundation boards.

Speaker Jurisich explained that Chair David Hay and Search Committee chair Renee Romberger expressed a desire to speak directly with the faculty about the search process and the forming of the search committee.

Speaker Jurisich gave some guidelines for speaking.

Speaker Jurisich invited David Hay to speak.

3. Statement from Chair of the College of Charleston Board of Trustees and member of Presidential Search Committee, David Hay

Chairman Hay thanked everyone for attending and spoke of both faculty and Board members present as being deeply committed to the College. Hay said the Board accepted with sadness President McConnell's resignation, and listed some of his accomplishments. Hay said the selection of a president is perhaps the greatest responsibility for the Board of Trustees. The search represents an opportunity for the institution and he wants to make the most of it.

Hay gave a brief biography of Renee Romberger, whom he asked to chair the Presidential Search Committee. He introduced the other members of the search committee, including those who could not be present.

Hay said he and Chair Romberger studied best practices as they determined the structure of the search committee, and spoke with other university boards in the state to learn of the things that worked well and the things that did not work well. A common thread of the best searches was input, and by focusing on input, he expressed hope that the College of Charleston presidential search could serve as a rallying point for the campus community and an affirmation of our shared core values.

Hay said as they were planning the structure of the search committee, they considered several different options, with varying sizes. One possibility that struck both Hay and Romberger as attractive for the College was a two-tiered structure: a smaller presidential search committee made up of trustees and faculty members, augmented by a much larger group of campus members who would facilitate wide-ranging listening sessions in order to solicit input from our many stakeholders. Romberger and Hay saw the two-tiered structure as offering the best of both worlds. Romberger and Hay wanted the search committee to spend significant time up front defining the present condition of the university and determining the challenges. Taking in the themes and feedback from each campus listening session, the Presidential Search Committee will be available to take temperature readings of the campus that will greatly inform the leadership profile. Hay said that the listening sessions are vital to the process. They want to hear stakeholder
thoughts regarding desired characteristics, criteria, and qualifications for the next president. Those listening sessions will allow the Presidential Search Committee to hear more fully from faculty, staff, students, donors, community members, and voluntary leaders of alumni. He emphasized that feedback from these constituent groups is critical to the Presidential Search Committee in shaping a leadership profile.

Hay spoke of the resolution passed by Faculty Senate regarding the composition of the Presidential Search Committee, that there is not enough representation of faculty and other campus groups. Hay said, "I hear you," and said they considered a number of different options, and learned many lessons from their previous presidential search, and will apply those lessons moving forward. He said many of those lessons were reaffirmed in conversations with other boards around the state regarding their recent presidential searches. They learned that a tighter, smaller search committee provides the best chance for protecting the search process’s integrity and confidentiality, which will help attract the strongest candidates possible. Hay said they want to have the best pool of candidates possible. He said all stakeholders and the institution deserves that. Hay said they are committed to keeping the Presidential Search Committee structure as it is. He is optimistic of the shared path forward.

Hay introduced Renee Romberger,

4. **Statement from College of Charleston Board of Trustees member and Chair of Presidential Search Committee, Renee Romberger.**

Romberger said it was an honor to serve on the Board. Romberger said they wanted to learn from the 2013-14 search committee process and recognized that there are hard feelings left from the last process, and they want to use this process to build relationships with the faculty, students, and staff.

Romberger said they are intentionally not hiring a search firm until the listening sessions are complete, because it's very important that the Board receive the messages from the listening sessions, instead of receiving a summary from a search firm. At least two search committee members will attend the listening sessions.

Romberger said there will be around 18 listening sessions.

Romberger said whether search committees are 8 or 10 or 20, you don't include everyone. She said what they search committee does not want to do is to break confidentiality and in the last search, they lost some candidates. She believes confidentiality is paramount.

She again emphasized that listening sessions are for hearing different viewpoints of faculty, staff, students, donors, and alumni.

Romberger described the search timeline [timeline is here: [http://trustees.cofc.edu/presidential-search/timeline/index.php](http://trustees.cofc.edu/presidential-search/timeline/index.php)]. Reports will be generated and shared publicly from the listening sessions, keeping individual names of people confidential.
Romberger said if it takes longer, they will not rush the process.

Speaker Jurisich invited comments and questions.

5. Question and Answer

Simon Lewis (English Department and director of the African Studies program and the Carolina Lowcountry and Atlantic World (CLAW) program) said he had no doubt of the good intentions of the way the search committee is framed. As a member of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Lewis expressed AAUP recommended best practices for presidential search committees as including faculty representation at a much higher level, and of faculty representation selected by the faculty. AAUP guidelines also specify that members of the administration should not be included in the search committee.

Lewis said that if the present search committee claims to have learned from the previous search, then something must be done to show that we have learned from the last presidential search. Stacking the search committee almost entirely of Board members does not show that. Lewis said he is not impugning that the search committee is not intending on doing a good job, but if we want to show that the search is different from the previous presidential search, then we need to show it.

Lewis asserted that candidates from around the country will look at the limited composition of the committee, and that will reduce the number and quality of candidates who apply.

Lewis hopes the Board will reconsider the composition of the search committee and add at least two faculty elected representatives.

Chair of the Presidential Search Committee Romberger responded that the Board has the responsibility and duty to elect the next president of the College. She said they value the input of the faculty, and recognize there are different compositions of search committee. They have looked most recently at Clemson and Converse for presidential search models. In researching different search committee models, they feel that keeping the search committee small will insure confidentiality and remains the best choice.

Board of Trustees Chair David Hay said he was asked last week if they would consider adding another faculty member, and they determined that doing so would just highlight the fact that there was no representation from the other constituent groups. He said that the Board feels that having a smaller group will encourage people to apply, knowing that confidentiality and integrity of the search will be assured.

Patricia Williams Lessane (Avery Research Center and Library) asked if the Board was committed to a small search committee, have they considered changing the composition of the committee? She said it was possible to have a search committee with less Board members, but more constituents, and still keep it small.
Williams Lessane said that while the Board and the search committee emphasizes that they are listening to constituent concerns, she has not seen that the resolution passed by Faculty Senate on 13 February 2018 has made a difference. Lessane Williams asked how much confidence we should have that the listening sessions will be effective in light of disregard shown to the resolution.

Romberger said that the committee knows they will have to earn the trust of everyone, and hopes by the end of the process they can accomplish this.

Adam Domby (History) said he was not at the College of Charleston for the previous presidential search, but he heard about it. He said when he applied for a job at the College, friends in the academic community referred to the College as "the one that doesn't listen to its search committee." Domby said he did not think confidentiality was the issue in the larger academic community, but the vote of no confidence in the Board of Trustees passed by Faculty Senate in 2013-14 was what people remembered and noted.


Domby said emphasizing the issue of confidentiality misses the larger point that qualified candidates may not bother to apply. Domby acknowledged, as emphasized by the Board of Trustees, that they have the authority and legislative mandate to select the next president. He said, "You have the authority and the legislative mandate. That makes it even more important to include more representation." Domby said to the outside world, the composition of the search committee is problematic, and will result in attracting less top-tier applicants.

Henrietta Golding (Board of Trustees) said she is not a member of the search committee, but said the search committee is going to continue to look until they get the best candidate.

David Hay pointed out that despite his reservations, Domby accepted a position at the College of Charleston.

Domby answered that he was in the unique position of being a Civil War historian, so accepting the position worked for him regardless.

Vince Benigni (Communication) advocated for representation from groups who feel like they are not part of the solution or part of the leadership. He strongly believes in including representation of staff members, many of whom work closely with faculty and with the community.

Christine Finnan (Sociology/Anthropology and Teacher Education) appreciated the idea of keeping the search committee small and the opportunities for listening sessions, but expressed worry about the listening part. Finnan teaches language and culture, and said when you listen it is through your own perspective. She said there is one person on the search committee who has the perspective of the faculty. Therefore, there is one person who is able to listen through the ears of faculty. Finnan said that the others on the search committee will hear the listening sessions
through the ears of their perspective, and that is not the same as the faculty perspective. Finnan said she is happy to go to the listening sessions, but she worries about who is listening.

**Romberger** said that there will be scribes at each listening session. Once the report is generated, it will circulate to the leaders who are faculty members to see if it is written in a way that makes sense. Romberger said to Finnan's point, maybe listening session notes need to be translated to "Trustee-ese" or something so that they make sure they are hearing what the different groups are saying.

Romberger said they can think through that process, to make sure what is intended is what is heard.

**William Bares** (Computer Science) is the Chair of the ad hoc Committee on Institutional Identity and Vision. Bares described the ad hoc senate committee formed before the president’s announcement to organize campus wide discussions of faculty and staff on the College’s identity and the shared vision for the future. Bares said in the responses to the online survey and the six discussions (involving close to 500 employees of the College), one thing that has been made clear is that faculty and staff emphatically desire a higher degree of shared governance and a greater level of campus-wide dialogue. Bares said the ad hoc committee believes that this evidence strongly supports the position of the senate in requesting a recomposition of the presidential search committee.

**Romberger** said that in addition to the listening sessions, the Presidential Search Committee has requested a report from the ad hoc Committee on Institutional Identity and Vision.

**Claire Curtis** (Political Science) asked about the decision made regarding the size of the search committee. She appreciated hearing how the committee described the decision as deliberative, and based on research and best practices. Curtis said it worried her that Romberger and Hay talked about reaching out to other Boards only in South Carolina. She said it makes the search somewhat parochial. Curtis said faculty and the Board likes to think of the College as something more than just a school in South Carolina; we are a world-class institution, but part of what that requires is a world class president. Curtis said it might be useful to contact Boards from outside the state of South Carolina. Curtis suggested contacting peer institutions, or aspirational peers [http://irp.cofc.edu/Peer-Institutions/index.php] who have conducted successful presidential searches. Curtis mentioned William and Mary, who just hired an excellent president.

**Romberger** said that was an interesting example, and said they looked at many searches and conducted a lot of research. She said there is no right or wrong answer and said she thinks a presidential search is situational. Romberger said they are trying to be responsive to the previous search for president, and to learn from that process, and she thinks they will learn from the listening sessions. The listening sessions will allow them to be inclusive, but still keep the search committee small to retain the integrity and confidentiality.

**Larry Krasnoff** (Philosophy) said he appreciates that the Board said they looked beyond institutions in South Carolina, but they first said they looked at other institutions only in South Carolina. He said what that means is that the Board considers the College to be more like other
institutions in South Carolina, and if we are only comparing ourselves to schools like Clemson and Converse, that is troubling.

Krasnoff suggested the Presidential Search Committee should be looking more closely at what the College is like. Krasnoff said that what South Carolina institutions have in common is political connections within the same state, and so the outcome of that is that the search committee is interested in politically connected candidates from South Carolina. He said confidentiality or not, that type of selection would produce backlash from the faculty.

Krasnoff said he was concerned that the listening sessions are being offered as substitutes for the kind of search committee that the institution is asking for. He said the resolution does not specify increasing faculty, but makes sure to include all constituents. Krasnoff said any search committee would still include listening sessions and public forums to discuss what constituents want in a president.

Krasnoff said that a closer match to the two-tiered process they describe would be to have the facilitator for each listening session meet as a group with the search committee. He said then the search committee would not be hearing general feedback, but would have to explain their decision to each constituency group in smaller groups. He described this as the advantage the model described in the resolution upholds. He said dialog with each constituent group is what is needed to properly advise the search committee. If the search committee is composed of Board of Trustees members, then it is really advising itself.

Krasnoff said the listening sessions will only be effective if they involve an actual conversation with the stakeholders in one to one fashion, and not just reading reports or general listening.

Bob Mignone (Mathematics) said as former Speaker of the Faculty, he totally supports shared governance, but wanted to offer a different viewpoint from his colleagues. He said that everyone on the search committee essentially has veto power. He said anytime someone is adamantly against someone in the pool, that person is no longer considered. He said good candidates could be struck due to one objection. He is open to a smaller committee if it means having one representative from the faculty chosen by the faculty or the Speaker of the Faculty.

Iana Anguelova (Mathematics) said the problem with a search committee composed mostly of Board members has drawbacks, as it is unlikely to reject their own suggestions.

Jason Coy (History) said the Board referenced lessons about the last presidential search process, but has heard only one lesson mentioned: breach of confidentiality. He asked what other lessons were learned?

Romberger said she was not on the last presidential search committee, and was fairly new to the Board of Trustees. She saw damaged relationships, donors who pulled their money, and people who cared deeply about the College hurt by the process. Romberger said she cares about the school and about faculty. She said we care about the same things, and need to talk with each other, and listen, to make sure we are doing the right thing for the school.
Jannette Finch (Library) asked about confidentiality and said she had already seen a list of possible candidates interested in the presidency listed in the Post and Courier.

Ricci Welch (Board member and Presidential Search Committee) said she knew there were candidates who withdrew from the presidential process in 2013-14 because they felt their information would be leaked. She said that no names of potential candidates have been discussed in the current search.

Romberger said that one of the rules for the present search committee is that no one member can meet individually with potential candidates. She also invited additional suggestions for rules of conduct for the search committee.

Todd Grantham (Philosophy) said that we were all aware of the breakdown in the relationship between the faculty and the Board after the last presidential search and said that this session does not make him feel any better. He said the session was billed as an opportunity to talk and it feels he is not being listened to. Grantham said that it does not feel like the Board and Presidential Search Committee has heard anything we have said. He said he feels like the rift is growing and if the listening sessions are like the one tonight, he is not going to encourage anyone to go.

Speaker Jurisich said that everyone should make their own decisions regarding the listening sessions, but encouraged participation.

Romberger said they will not be talking during the listening sessions and for tonight's session, members of the search committee and Board were asked by the Speaker to answer questions.

Stephen Short (Psychology) asked if a Board member or members could attend the listening sessions.

Speaker Jurisich made concluding remarks and appreciated the attendance and the shared conversation.

6. The meeting adjourned at 6:04 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jannette Finch
Faculty Secretary
1. **Call to Order, 5:04 PM.**
2. **The minutes from 5 December 2017** were approved with one minor correction accepted by unanimous consent.
3. There were no **Announcements and information.**
4. **Reports**
   
a. **Speaker of the Faculty Elizabeth Jurisich** gave a brief report that included notice of an email sent out by Nominations and Elections Chair Tom Kunkle calling for nominations for the 2018-2019 Senate. Needed are nominations for Faculty Secretary and At-Large Senators. The Faculty Speaker has agreed to nomination for a second year. Kunkle’s email included a link to the faculty senate roster, http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/senate-rosters/index.php and a link to self-nominate, https://survey.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6E6KdwG5U4OWax

   Nominations will remain open until the requisite number of nominations have been received and at least until 11:59 pm, Jan 23, 2018.

   Speaker Jurisich plans to attend the January Board of Trustees meeting and will follow up with work completed by former Speaker Todd McNerney about surveys concerning faculty satisfaction with administration.

   The Speaker reminded chairs and secretaries of Senate Committees to check the updated Senate committee webpages. Committees are invited to contact Megan Gould for help in linking to reports, or updating with meeting times. Megan is also making an effort to track down lost links.

b. **Provost Brian McGee** offered a welcome back to the new semester. Provost McGee referred to the national news and stated strongly that The College of Charleston continues to support students, faculty, and staff regardless of the country of their origin. He said we are a diverse and inclusive community as demonstrated in documents consistently created and approved by Board of Trustees, administration, student, faculty, and staff. The Provost extended thanks to all who help make CofC a diverse and inclusive community, regardless of country of origin or immigration status. He expressed belief that the College community will continue to express those values.

   The Provost gave a reminder that if threatened with federal shutdown, some Schools and departments will be affected more than others. Sciences and Mathematics may
have to make contingency plans for the lockdown of federal buildings and the unavailability of regulatory and policy-making agencies.

The Provost thanked Physical Plant and others who worked to make campus safe after the local snowfall and icy conditions known as "Snowmageddon." Because equipment to deal with snow and ice is located in the upstate, it makes for delays in clearing snow and ice. Most faculty, staff, and students could be on campus for the first day back after winter break. The Provost thanked everyone for their patience and good humor in dealing with delays and asked that any lessons learned or suggestions be passed to your Dean or Chair.

The Provost gave updates on task forces and searches, including:

The Task Force on Advising and Mentoring, chaired by Lynne Ford. Requests for people to serve will appear this month. The Provost anticipates the work from this task force may be shared with The Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics, and possibly others.

The Task Force on Transfer Credit and Credit Hours, chaired by Joe Kelly, will be formed this semester. The work completed by this task force will reach Academic Planning and The Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid.

The Search for Dean of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs. Faculty and a student representative eligible to serve on that committee have been contacted and have attended an organizational meeting with Dean Welch, Chair of that committee. The committee will be finalized soon. The Provost said he expects the call for candidates for the position to go out in early February.

The Graduate Dean search will be conducted this semester.

Provost McGee spoke of The Sestercentennial, or 250th year anniversary of the College. The Provost gave the scope as 15-18 months of celebration, including academic events and programs planned by faculty. Models for celebrations include University of Virginia, Brown University, and University of Oxford (recently celebrated 800 year anniversary). The Provost said there will be significant academic focus, purpose, and intent for the celebration. There will be funds available to support special events planned, proposed, and executed by faculty. He expects the celebration will be a great opportunity to learn more about the College of Charleston's past, present, and future. There will be opportunities to engage the process from any disciplinary or interdisciplinary perspective.

The Provost spoke of the growth of Distance Education at the College. The College has moved to a model of inviting faculty to go through distance education training. Over 250 faculty have gone through the training, designed and delivered by Teaching, Learning, and Technology group. The Provost said that the College has a successful
distance education program, essential to summer school revenues. Provost McGee said that for many students, taking at least one summer distance class is correlated with timely degree completion. The Provost said that CofC will continue to be a face to face institution, valuing personal engagement in the class room, but asked faculty to recognize that we might be more intentional in developing online courses for the most popular or common courses, including Gen Ed. Members of Academic Council have discussed this and the Provost and Deans will take the discussion to the Planning Committee to decide how to move forward in the next phase of distance education.

Program cost study. The Provost said that for the last several months, work has been done to replicate a study done in 2010-11 on direct instructional costs of offering academic programs on a program-by-program basis. The Delaware Cost Study has been available for years to Chairs, Deans, and Program Directors to allow for program comparison across multiple universities. Since the Delaware Cost Study has limitations in terms of methodology, the 2010-11 study was designed under former Senior Vice Provost Bev Diamond, the Office of the Provost, Deanna Caveny-Noecker, and the Institutional Research Office. This year, that study will be replicated with Dr. Diamond's help in order to compare against previous years and to gain a more in-depth analysis of how instructional costs are managed. A draft is being reviewed by the Deans. The data will be compiled, aggregated, and made available through reports to Deans, Chairs, and Program Directors, the Board of Trustees, The Committee on Academic Planning, and to the Budget Committee. This work will have consequences and implications for managing resources.

Faculty exit interviews. The Provost said the College will develop a process to gather more rigorous data on faculty leaving before they reach retirement, in consultation with Academic Council.

The Provost commented that he appreciated the report by the Adjunct Oversight committee, appearing in today's agenda.

The Provost accepted questions.

Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about Distance Education classes and expressed a concern that they were not subject to the same evaluation as face-to-face classes. She asked if someone was reviewing offerings online. Gigova said she offered her first distance class last summer. Following a conversation with a colleague who has since left the College, she realized that she would not have been comfortable with that colleague’s class in her department, and wondered if there was oversight over courses offered. Gigova also addressed student perception of online classes as easier, when the reality is that they are harder for both faculty and students, which leads to higher attrition rates.

Provost McGee said the national trend reflects higher drop rates for online courses. He stated that the ultimate responsibility for the rigor of course content belongs to the subject matter experts in each academic program or department. The expectation is
that department chairs and program directors are reviewing syllabi, and reviewing how teaching is done for face-to-face and online delivery. In the initial design phases, more eyes are on the online course. The Provost expressed that he has more confidence in the rigor of the design and delivery of first-time online courses. Provost McGee said that oversight, review and assessment of critical instructional materials belongs to the academic unit. He stated that faculty colleagues are free to express concerns if they think any unit on campus is not doing good work to the faculty in that department or to the program director or department chair.

Gigova asked if there had been any study on what Chairs are finding?

Iana Anguelova, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked about the training for distance education. She mentioned a divide between science classes and non-science classes. Both science and math classes require a final exam which must be taken in person, either on campus or proctored off campus. Anguelova said this is misunderstood by the Registrar's office, by the people teaching the distance education training class, and more. Anguelova suggested that the training for distance education classes is not adequate for the science classes. In her opinion, she believes it is a bad idea to mix the training for Humanities and Science classes, due to differences in styles of teaching. She felt that the usefulness of her training and that of other mathematicians she has spoken with could be quantified as 4%. She said that training for mathematicians and sciences is inadequate and there needs to be more understanding of the teaching needs of distance education science classes.

Provost McGee asked for comments from the people present who were involved in training.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) said that he had been teaching Symbolic Logic, which is basically a math class, online for the last couple of summers. He said he found the training more than 4% helpful to him. He said it is true that there is focus in the training on trying to engage students through online discussions, which may be more important in Humanities classes than in math and science classes. He expressed that there is also a lot of technical training on how to deliver material online. Nunan said he would have been "at sea" if he had not done the training, and he found it quite helpful, and he would defend the people offering the training [the Teaching, Learning, and Technology team].

Anguelova said there were some helpful parts; 4% is bigger than zero. She said that after the training, she asked for help from other IT technologists to find a way to deliver the necessary material.

Zach Hartje, Guest (Director of Teaching, Learning, and Technology) said that online training was designed to be somewhat generic in order to meet the needs of the entire campus and different disciplines with one offering. Much of the training is on pedagogy. The hope is that during and after the training, the professor will engage with their instructional technologist to focus on appropriate solutions.
Anguelova raised the point that the content of the class does not have to be generic, since it is an online class. It could cater to different audiences.

Hartje said that there is one staff member who oversees the entire Distance Ed program, with the help of faculty mentors. He said that the unit does not know who is in the cohort until a few weeks before the course, which adds to the difficulty in designing the course for a specific discipline. Hartje said he is happy to have conversations about making changes or improvements.

**Speaker Jurisich** said if we get more distance ed courses, maybe his team will get another staff member.

**Provost McGee** asserted that he has full confidence that faculty are working hard to deliver good courses, and that department chairs and program directors are providing supervision and oversight.

c. **Todd LeVasseur, Director, Quality Enhancement Plan**, Update on the QEP: “Sustainability Literacy as a Bridge to Addressing 21st Century Problems.”

LeVasseur thanked Divya Bhati and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning for leading the successful SACSCOC accreditation.

LeVasseur thanked faculty for supporting the Sustainability Institute and QEP. He stated that the Institute is here to facilitate faculty interaction with students learning about the triple bottom line of sustainability and giving them the identified learning skills that the QEP is designed to address: thinking and systems, creative problem-solving, analytical reasoning, economic, social, and environmental systems.

LeVasseur announced there will be twenty upcoming events this semester. He mentioned that in the first year, they have offered over 10 sustainability-focused and related courses, given out over 10 SLI min-grants to students, faculty, and staff, and funded 3 research projects. He said they have over 15 student ambassadors, and a robust event structure. They are collecting data for the next assessment cycle. In year two, the theme will be social justice and fair distribution. He asked for faculty to watch for a call for mini-grants for the fall semester for up to $1,000, on themes relating to social justice.

LeVasseur mentioned that they hope to work out of new physical space soon.

He said in the near future, they will offer faculty training on systems thinking and creative problem solving, led by Steve Jaumé. The training will count as faculty development.

Please contact Todd LeVasseur with any questions and concerns and visit the website, [http://sustain.cofc.edu/index.php](http://sustain.cofc.edu/index.php).
Dr. LeVasseur accepted questions.

**Annette Watson, Senator** (Political Science) asked if there was a method to reflect if students are taking QEP courses? She also asked what is student motivation to take the courses?

LeVasseur said that starting next year they plan on offering a sustainability scholarship program. He said there are no curricular requirements for QEP classes. He said that Dean Godfrey Gibbison (School of Professional Studies) plans to offer a sustainability certificate in year three.

**Mary Bergstrom (Registrar)** offered that the Attribute Column that appears [on the right] when looking up courses in MyCharleston or when using the Concise Schedule reflects that a course is a QEP course.

d. **Julia Eichelberger, Chair, Adjunct Oversight Committee** reported that the Committee was formed in the past year. Meeting times and the charge of the committee are on the website: http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/committees/adjunct-oversight/index.php.

Eichelberger explained that the committee functions as a clearinghouse for concerns and questions that arise regarding adjunct welfare and adjunct policies and practices. She said the committee collects and make available information about adjunct policies and practices, including how many adjuncts does the College have in each year, how much are they paid, and how many credit hours are taught by adjuncts. The committee is determining how to collect the data and make it available for study and analysis.

The committee's first activity was to provide a list of recommended best practices for chairs, program directors, and those who supervise and hire adjuncts. Those recommendations include creating a supportive and collegial atmosphere for adjunct faculty members and are available in the appendix at the end of the minutes.

Eichelberger said spring 2018 meetings are scheduled for January 26, February 23, and if there is still work to do, April 6. The committee is charged with meeting twice a semester or more, if appropriate.

Anyone with questions or comments on the committee's work is invited to email Julia Eichelberger.

Dr. Eichelberger accepted questions.

**Robert Frash, Senator** (Hospitality and Tourism Management) commented that since his office is located near the School of Business adjunct office, students often leave assignments with him, or ask him how to meet with their adjunct professors.
He asked if the committee could address office space or mail boxes for adjuncts in order not to disadvantage the students?

Eichelberger said this represents a physical barrier that the committee addressed by making a recommendation to departments that all adjuncts have mailboxes in the same location as their colleagues in the department. She said this demonstrates collegiality and respect, but also reflects the simple student need to turn in their assignments easily, regardless of academic rank. Eichelberger mentioned making use of the dropbox function in Oaks might be useful.

Eichelberger suggested faculty could suggest departmental improvements enhancing a collegial and respectful atmosphere to their Dean or Chairs.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker**, (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) added that adjunct faculty are invited to new faculty orientation. Two items on the agenda at orientation are 1) faculty responsibilities to students (also found in the FAM) which addresses making office hours available to students and, 2) a divisional policy requiring faculty to include in their syllabi information for students on how to contact them. Caveny-Noecker mentioned that funding is available from the Provost office for locally-offered faculty adjunct development. Training on tools specific to each discipline might be valuable. Her office is open to suggestions on items to include in the new faculty orientation specifically helpful for adjuncts. She said adjuncts are paid $25 an hour to attend the orientation and adjunct faculty departmental and program development opportunities. Feedback is welcome to her department and for the Suggested Practices for Adjunct Faculty document.

Eichelberger said she appreciated Caveny-Noecker bringing up the topic since we as faculty collectively own our curriculum, we own our students' learning experience, and part of that includes supporting all of our colleagues to help students access to faculty members when they have questions.

**Richard Nunan, Senator** (at-large, HSS) asked if the Adjunct Oversight Committee had agenda topics?

Eichelberger said so far, they do not have an agenda set for the next meeting, but plan on getting more information from Human Resources on adjunct eligibility for various benefits. They hope to encourage HR to make that information more comprehensible. Eichelberger invited suggestions for agenda items.

Nunan asked if the Adjunct Oversight Committee had any recommendations for the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual?

Eichelberger said it is their purview to make a recommendation, if needed. She invited adjunct faculty to bring any concerns to the committee. Those concerns might be shared with other committees, such as Faculty Welfare and Faculty Compensation, as needed.
Eichelberger pointed out that a report done in April 2016 was available on the website which included recommendations for adjunct practices nationally and benchmarked the state of CofC adjunct faculty at that date.

http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/committees/adjunct-oversight/index.php

5. There was no **Old Business**.
6. There was no **New Business**.
7. **Constituent's General Concerns**

**Tom Kunkle, Senator** (at-large, SSM) and Chair of Nominations and Elections, reminded faculty about open elections and stated that everyone’s vote counts.

**Irina Gigova, Senator** (at-large, HSS) gave an update on the work of the Committee on Institutional Identity. She said that the committee has extended survey invitations through multiple channels. The survey opened December 11, 2017 and closed January 12, 2018. There were 440 participants. 170 expressed interest in the next round of discussions, which Gigova hopes will take place in February.

Gigova said six questions were offered as points of discussion, and between 70% and 80% of respondents validated the questions as important. The questions were on institutional identity, on areas of improvement, on the mission of the university and other big questions.

Gigova said there were a number of other questions that people asked. Gigova grouped these into twenty categories. She reported that the biggest concern was inclusion and diversity on all levels, including students, faculty, and staff. According to Gigova, the second most expressed concern was retention. Gigova named concerns about recruiting faculty and staff due to low wages. Many respondents expressed concern about the importance of research, and the emphasis on research, but not a lot of support. There were concerns about the teaching mission of the College being replaced by the research mission. Gigova reported that there is uncertainty about where funds are distributed between teaching and research. She said a large number of questions were about the tension between claims and aspirations of national pre-eminence and academic excellence and the high admission rates in the last couple of years and the perceived decline in quality and preparation of students who are coming in. She listed inequality of pay as another concern, for female staff members, and for part-time faculty and staff as well as associate professors. Salary compression was a concern. Gigova also said a big concern is increased tuition for our students and what we can do to offset that. Another important concern expressed is what the tuition-driven budget model is doing to our educational mission. She said there are twenty more types of concerns, but she recounted the big ones.

Gigova said she hoped to see many faculty in the discussion groups that will emerge in the next few weeks.

There were no questions.

8. **Adjournment 5:59 PM.**
Respectfully submitted,

Jannette Finch  
Faculty Secretary

Appendix
To: C of C Chairs and Program Directors  
From: 2017-18 Adjunct Oversight Committee (Julia Eichelberger, Chair; Phyllis Jestice, Sorinel Oprisan, Mary Ann Blitt, Cheryl Spinner, Todd McNerney)  
Date: January 12 2018

The Adjunct Oversight Committee offers the following recommendations for chairs and program directors as well as other C of C faculty seeking to use best practices for adjunct faculty.

**Initial Hiring Practices:**

- Request teaching materials and a teaching philosophy statement from applicants.
- If department has a standard syllabus, request that applicants prepare to discuss the syllabus and their teaching practice during their interview.
- Include at least one other (preferably tenured) member of the department besides the chair/program director to provide input when making hiring decisions. Invite those who have helped with hiring to help the chair/director in welcoming and assisting adjunct faculty as they begin teaching.
- When hiring an adjunct faculty member, provide information on how you will be evaluating their teaching and on resources available to help adjunct faculty teach successfully.
- Use the [Academic Affairs guidelines for adjunct faculty appointments](#).

**Evaluation and Rehiring Practices:**

- In addition to the guidelines for evaluations in the FAM, Academic Affairs has provided further guidelines for evaluation and rehiring. Discuss the process with adjunct faculty so that they can ask questions and learn how to be a successful applicant for rehiring within your department or program. Try to invite interested adjuncts to participate in this conversation well before evaluation materials are due.
- Conduct classroom observations within the first half of the semester so that there is a chance for a return visit if the adjunct or supervisor should desire it.
- Share as much information as you are able regarding when you will offer contracts for future semesters and when/why an adjunct’s sections might close due to low enrollments.
- If you wish, ask Academic Affairs for guidance in wording a letter of intent explaining your intention to hire a particular adjunct for both Fall and Spring of the following year if sections prove to be available.

**How to find qualified adjuncts**

- SSM departments & programs can use the C of C’s [job listing page](#) to advertise openings and to invite applicants to submit their materials anytime. Other chairs & program directors should work with their dean to create an adjunct pool posting for their schools.
- Have the department keep a database of previously submitted materials/candidates
  - [The committee welcomes other suggestions from chairs/program directors]
Suggestions for making your department or program as welcoming and collegial as possible for adjunct faculty

Mailboxes and Dept Listings: Make all mailboxes the same for faculty regardless of rank. Integrate the list of adjunct faculty within the overall faculty listings. Invite adjunct faculty to create a web page comparable to other faculty in the department if they wish.

Socializing: Recognize birthdays and achievements (publications, other recognitions) of adjunct faculty in the same way other faculty are recognized. Invite adjuncts to department events and parties. Introduce adjunct faculty to other faculty who may not know them.

Service (Voluntary): Invite adjunct faculty to serve on relevant departmental committees, if they wish to do so. Consult with other faculty about which committees might benefit most from adjunct faculty input. Invite adjunct faculty to attend some or all of your regular department meetings. Consider inviting adjunct faculty to elect a departmental representative to attend all department meetings.

To promote adjunct faculty’s professional development

Encourage adjunct faculty to apply for any professional development opportunities that they may be eligible for, including TLT workshops, Writers’ Retreat, and professional development organized by your program or school.

Seek out funding for Adjunct Professional Development opportunities organized by your program or school.

Via a program provided by the Provost’s Office, deans, chairs, or program directors may apply for funding for a variety of local adjunct faculty development activities such as peer observation exchanges with other department faculty, workshops on pedagogical topics, preparing presentations for workshops, and more. These can be department-wide activities that benefit all faculty teaching in your program. You should first apply for funding for a professional development activity, then request pay for adjuncts who participated (a two-step process similar to Travel Authorization followed by Travel Reimbursement). Go here for information.

Please contact a member of the Adjunct Oversight committee if you wish to suggest additional recommendations or have other questions or concerns regarding our adjunct policies and practices.

Spring 2018 Meeting Dates
Fri Jan 26
Fri Feb 23
Fri April 6 (if need be)
Meetings are 4-5:30 PM, History Department Conference Room, MYBK 209
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 5 December 2017

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

1. Call to Order, 5:05 PM
2. The 7 November 2017 minutes were approved as written.
3. There were no Announcements and information.
4. Reports

With unanimous consent of the Faculty Senate, Speaker Jurisich moved the Director of Riley Center for Livable Communities, Kendra Stewart, to the first report.

   a. Director of Riley Center for Livable Communities, Kendra Stewart, Report on Nutrition and Housing Needs of CofC Students (Appendix A)

Director Stewart gave a brief overview of the Riley Center's mission; to make connections between the College of Charleston campus, faculty, staff, and students and communities, working on issues of livable communities.

Stewart introduced Dr. Robert Kahle, Assistant Director of the Riley Center who oversees research and planning. Kahle was the principal researcher of a study conducted in spring 2017 on student nutrition and housing needs. Kahle gave background on the survey method, reporting that the survey was done in Qualtrics, with over 11,000 emails sent to all undergraduate and graduate students in the spring of 2017, two weeks before the end of the semester. Response rate was about 20% with 2200 students responding. Kahle explained they first looked at food and security, measured on a commonly used 10-point scale designed by the USDA. They found 15% of College of Charleston students responding report that they are in the low food security area, with another 15% reporting very low. So about 30% of CofC students surveyed are reporting that they are not getting enough to eat or not getting the variety and balanced diet that they seek. Kahle reported that the numbers are lower among comparable four-year institutions measured by the same scale.

Some students report going an entire day with nothing to eat. Kahle emphasized that based on students' reports, they are not getting enough nutrition to function well. 13% of students surveyed report they are not functioning as well academically as they would if they had a full belly. 12% said they have opted to buy food instead of a textbook.

Kahle said the study found that if students have Pell grants, or Stafford student loans, or other loans specific to room and board, if they are employed full-time or part-time, or if they self-identify as LGBTQ, these characteristics factor directly into food insecurity.

Kahle said he believes for the first time, they have a good random sample of students who self-identify as LGBTQ (18%), which if extrapolated, would yield about 2,025 students.
Moving to the topic of housing insecurity, Kahle said there is not as consistent a scale as there is for food and security, so they created one based on review of the literature. There were sixteen items on the survey, and if students answered yes to any of the questions, they were labeled as housing insecure. About 30% of the students surveyed report housing insecurity. The results include student worry about missing rent payments, to couch surfing, living in overcrowded conditions, or sleeping in their car. 8% of these students report if they had a more consistent place to stay, they would do better in school.

Consequences of food and housing insecurity include dropping out of school, missed study sessions, and absence from other campus activities.

100 students out of those surveyed are couch surfing due to housing insecurity. Another 30 students are sleeping in common areas (Kahle said visit the Stern Center at about 7:30 AM and see how many students are sleeping on the couches).

13 students reported that they tried unsuccessfully to get into a shelter.

Kahle emphasized the importance of the issue, since the mission of the College, to allow students to realize their intellectual and personal potential, is compromised when students don't have enough to eat or a safe place to sleep.

Students who were surveyed think they are alone, and are the only ones experiencing these issues. Kahle stated they are not alone and gave some resources for students, including the Office of the Dean of Students, http://deanofstudents.cofc.edu/index.php

Kahle said that student-led initiatives are most successful at helping those in need, and include normalizing food sharing, teaching students how to buy and prepare meals communally, and support for LGBTQ students.

Kahle suggested faculty include a blurb on their syllabi addressed to students stating that if they have trouble buying textbooks, or do not have enough to eat or aren't getting enough sleep, to see the professor and be directed to support.

Kahle mentioned work conducted by the College to address these issues include a food pantry, and a virtual food pantry allowing students to donate swipes on their cards to a pool. A program started by the Rochester School of Technology that the College is considering replicating is texting students who opt in that there is available food after a banquet or College function.

The Riley Center plans to expand the study to the Charleston county population under 25 years old. The goal will be to provide accurate numbers to the local service providers. Stewart said current information is outdated and underreports homeless youth. The Riley Center is currently looking for volunteers, if anyone knows of students who would be interested in helping with the study.
Kendra Stewart addressed the Senate asking faculty to think of ways they could be involved and said Jeri Cabot, Dean of Students, was present, and has formed a task force to help resolve the issue.

Stewart opened the floor for questions.

**Bob Frash, Senator** (Hospitality & Tourism Management) asked what percentage of the variability did the model represent?

Kahle responded 30% for food insecurity.

Stewart and Kahle said regression equations and full survey information is available through their office or on the website: [http://riley.cofc.edu/index.php](http://riley.cofc.edu/index.php).

b. **Speaker of the Faculty Liz Jurisich** did not give a report.

c. **Provost Brian McGee** thanked the Riley Center for their important work and suggested students having enough to eat and safe housing are a timely reminder at holiday time. Provost McGee reiterated close working relationships with Student Affairs and thanked Alicia Caudill and the Dean of Students for their good work in taking on the issue.

The Provost congratulated all on the conclusion of the fall semester and wished everyone a restful holiday break.

Provost McGee attended the SACSCOC annual meeting at Dallas. The College’s reaffirmation was confirmed, with no reports and no recommendations. The Provost’s comment that it is the cleanest report in at least 40 years was met with applause. He lauded the extraordinary effort of people across campus who made the successful accreditation possible. He stated that the College has been accredited by SACS for 101 years and expects that we are in good shape for the next ten years. Provost McGee said SACSCOC is presently affirming new standards that are expected to be more rigorous. College of Charleston will be expected to be in compliance with the standards as soon as they pass.

The Provost reported there is current work being done on the School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs (LCWA) permanent Dean search, to be continued in the spring and stated the Graduate School Dean search will begin in January 2018.

He spoke of current work on recommendations received from students that the administration is taking seriously. The recommendations include the creation of a bias incident response team. Work on this team is being conducted by the Office of Institutional Diversity, Student Affairs, and Academic Affairs, and he expects President McConnell will implement this team in March 2018.

Provost McGee spoke of a Diversity module that students would be required to complete as Freshmen as a condition of entry. After being created either in-house or with the assistance of a
vendor, the module will be brought before the appropriate Faculty Committees and Faculty Senate, although it is not tied to curriculum.

The Provost mentioned opportunities for collaborative projects for students with Trident Tech, MUSC, and the Citadel. One collaborative project is the 2 + 2 program for entrants to the Bachelor of Professional Studies program with Trident Tech and CofC. Provost McGee congratulated Dean Gibbison and CofC and Trident Tech colleagues who worked to make the program happen.

The Provost accepted questions.

**Larry Krasnoff, Senator** (Philosophy) asked for a more detailed timeline on the Dean Searches.

Provost McGee answered that the LCWA Dean search committee's chair is Dean Fran Welch, and an email would go out the following day asking for Deans, Chairs, and Program Directors asking for nominations or self-nominations to serve on the search committee. The goal is to have the search committee meet in December, and will continue in January with the advertising and call for candidates before the end of January. McGee stated that they expect to conclude the search during the spring 2018 semester.

5. There was no **Old Business.**

6. **New Business**
   a. **Faculty Curriculum Committee (Gayle Goudy, Co-Chair)**

The following proposals were considered. Discussion was invited after each.

   i. **ARTS 430 Independent Study**: remove restriction that limits repeatability to 6 credit hours (Curriculog link: [ARTS 430](#)) (pdf).

There was no discussion. The proposal passed.

   ii. **SOCY 260 Development of Social Thought**: change description (Curriculog link: [SOCY 260](#)) (pdf).

**Larry Krasnoff, Senator** (Philosophy) asked if the phrase Big Ideas, was necessary? He offered the phrases "major concepts" and "major ideas," without capitalization.

**Mark Del Mastro, Senator** (Hispanic Studies) asked if there was discussion of the language in the Curriculum Committee's meeting.

**Gayle Goudy** (Chair, Faculty Curriculum Committee) responded that there was, and the course was originally titled something like, "Big Ideas and Major Thinkers." The intent of the language is to make it easier to understand the emphasis on major philosophers and critical thinkers.
Tracy Burkett, Guest (Chair of Department of Sociology and Anthropology) answered that the intent is to communicate the course is not limited to a certain set of classical thinkers, and thoughts and theories are tied together by moving sociological ideas forward.

Del Mastro offered that the intent of a catalog description is to interest students.

Burkett said the language is a result of thoughtful discussion in the departmental curriculum committee, and ideas introduced early in the major are carried through to the senior capstone, and that the language is consistent with major themes and initiatives conducted by the department.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) said he understands but didn't want the Senate to descend into being too picky.

Brian Lanahan, Senator (at-large, EHHP) said the language is similar in his field to the phrase Critical Pedagogy to describe ideas and constructs they want to move forward in their students. He gave the opinion that we need to respect the colleagues who wrote the description as moving forward important ideas in their field. Taking away the capitalization would remove the ability to convey the construct and the meaning that they are trying to build within their students.

Krasnoff responded that there is a big difference in critical pedagogy and phrases used as marketing devices. He defended his objection as looking out for keeping consistent language in the catalog.

There was no further discussion.

Speaker Jurisich called for the vote. The course description with no changes to the language passed with a majority vote.

iii. Bachelor of General Studies: create a new degree program (Curriculog link: BGST) (pdf) to allow students to earn a degree without completing a major and two new associated courses (Curriculog link: BGST 101 (pdf) and Curriculog link: BGST 400 (pdf).

Speaker Jurisich invited Godfrey Gibbison (Dean, School of Professional Studies) to offer some context for the proposed program.

Dean Gibbison offered an answer to potential questions about the Board of Trustees already approving the program. He explained that the Board approved it conditionally at the October Board of Trustees meeting, provided it passed through the Senate. The reason is the Board will not meet again until January, and Commission on Higher Education (CHE) requires the Board of the institution approve all new programs.

Gibbison stated he has presented twice before Faculty Senate on the General Studies program. He shared that the General Studies task force, representing many areas across campus, spent a year examining the issues and working on the proposal. Gibbison explained that the task force
spent a considerable amount of time understanding how General Studies programs are organized across the country. He said several versions of General Studies exist and organized in several different ways. Gibbison said that the task force worked to represent the best practices of the curriculum they studied, taking into account mistakes those program admittedly made in order to not repeat them.

Gibbison said the Introductory course was designed to be a one credit course, to offer an opportunity for students working with their advisor to determine if the program is the right choice for them. The curriculum is bookended by a final seminar in which students pull together the knowledge they have acquired over the course of their study and apply it to a new and important question. The rest of the curriculum is comprised of existing courses. Students will be allowed to pair minors that will suit their needs. The task force decided on organizing the curriculum around minors because they represent a cohesive body of knowledge.

Gibbison said several members of the task force were attending the Senate meeting and would be available to answer questions and contribute to the discussion.

**Iana Anguelova, Senator** (at-large, SSM) was concerned about the capstone and the synthesis of knowledge of two minors. She asked who are the faculty who will be able to judge this synthesis, especially if the minors are from different schools?

**Daniel Greenberg, Guest** (Psychology Department and member of the General Studies task force) answered that the course as they proposed it is aimed at the minors that they believe are going to be the most popular, mostly in the Social Sciences. Greenberg stated that over time, different versions of the course may develop that would target different minors. In this case, faculty who are more closely associated with those minors would teach the course. One of the advantages of the capstone course, since it comes at the end of the program, faculty are able to see in advance what resources will be needed. Greenberg explained that they have built into the evaluation process an external reviewer to bring disciplinary expertise to the course. He gave the scenario of teaching the course from a Psychology perspective, but if a student's other minor was Economics, the teaching faculty could ask for an external reviewer from Economics to evaluate the student's proposal and portfolio. He averred that the task force felt this would not be onerous, and a rubric to assist the external reviewer would be given to them.

**Richard Nunan, Senator** (at-large, HSS) asked about the logistics of offering the capstone. How often would it be offered, how many students would take it, what would the content be from week to week, and what would the students be doing for four hours a week. He said he understood the proposal to be two minors, and a final project that would require a mentor. Nunan offered that he is not sure he would volunteer for that course.

**Julia Eichelberger, Guest** (English Department and member of the General Studies task force) said the course would include a seminar that would focus on a large question, and activities on the syllabus would provide direction to the students to use assigned readings and reflections from their own program of study to address the large question. In the final project, students will showcase the totality of their learning and will be reviewed by the professor and the external reviewer. In talking with faculty about these types of programs, in which student have multiple
minors, they found that students have a hard time communicating what they’ve learned to external audiences, so the seminar allows them to do that. Eichelberger explained that the fourth hour of the seminar is an opportunity for them to create an electronic portfolio, which they begin to prepare for starting in BGST 101. Eichelberger said students will archive course work, materials and projects they have completed into the electronic portfolio which will showcase their personalized program of study they chose based on their own career goals. They will work collaboratively to help each other design a meaningful e-portfolio.

Eichelberger said the seminar is not designed for students to demonstrate a high level of expertise like you would see in a major, since it is two minors. It should reflect the degree of knowledge students achieve from those two minors and from the General Education curriculum.

**Gayle Goudy** said the Faculty Curriculum Committee discussed whether or not BGST 400 would be a capstone. She said after discussion, they felt senior synthesis seminar more accurately described the course. The direction of the course is not to demonstrate mastery of a specific discipline, but to synthesize the two different minors.

**Daniel Greenberg** said that when the task force spoke to other programs about what the end of their programs looked like, they found that a final synthesis was needed, that students finding their own mentors was not successful as it was too unstructured and varied too much from professor to professor. The synthesis seminar was designed to give much more structure.

**Iana Anguelova, Senator** (at-large, SSM) asked about the six credit hours required at the 300 or higher level.

Julia Eichelberger said that some minors require this already. The task force felt they should not dictate within a departmental minor what students need to complete that minor, but felt that adding the 300 level requirement would lend some additional rigor to the degree.

Eichelberger mentioned that there are some College of Charleston majors that do not require a number of 300 level courses.

Angelova asked again about the rigor offered by 300 level courses.

Godfrey Gibbison said that there are majors at the College which require two or three 300 level courses. The students have an easier path already. He said the task force looked at 15 hours within the two minors, and felt that requiring this would change the minor, making it different for BGST students and for other students. They wanted to keep the minor the same for all students. So 24 hours, or eight courses are required for the entire program of study. Most students will finish this 24 hours within their minor.

Provost McGee noted that the discussion went back to his November 2017 Provost report, and stated that the College of Charleston did not define the difference between 100, 200, and 300 level courses until 2016. In the November Provost report he noted that one major at the College can be completed with nine credit hours at the 300 or 400 level. The Provost said there is no current curriculum rule for BA or BS degrees to require a certain number of 300 or 400 level
courses. He echoed Eichelberger's point that if approved, the BGST program would be the only program to require a certain number of hours at the upper division, and in that way, would be more rigorous than the requirements for the BA and the BS.

Provost McGee also stated that there is no curriculum rule requiring 300 and 400 level courses to have prerequisites, and there are hundreds of 300 and 400 level courses at the College which have no prerequisites.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) expressed concern about the level of depth required for students of the program and the rigor. He predicted they would find the easiest 300 level course on campus regardless of what their minor is. He asked if students had any advising on which two minors they would chose, and gave an example of a physics or mathematics student not necessarily addressing big questions. He asked who the program is serving. He asked if there are easier majors out there, then why are students struggling to graduate and why would they want to do the comparatively rigorous BGST program?

Julia Eichelberger said that the task force discussed who the program would serve and the impetus for creating the program was that the leadership of the College wanted a General Studies degree, and the task force wanted to ensure that the degree be consonant with who we are as an institution. That is why the task force was insistent that the same Gen Ed requirements would be required with this degree.

Eichelberger said conversation with many faculty revealed that allowing students to choose their own course of study reflected who we are as a liberal arts institution. Student choosing this degree will be broadly educated and it will be easier to complete two minors for those students who are working and are interested in two very different things. She expressed that students desiring to be more marketable and attractive to future employers will be thinking about things beyond what the easiest courses will be. Professional advising will be steering them in those directions.

Gibbison said that a lot of advising is built into the program, starting with BGST 101. He also said that schools offering this type of degree advised against requiring students to choose their two minors at the beginning of the program, since they don't know enough about the minors to choose at that early stage and will often change their minds as their studies progress. He said students will talk with faculty, talk with the BGST 101 instructor and meet often with their professional advisors to choose the right course of study.

Carrie Messal, Senator (Management and Marketing) and member of the General Studies task force said that over the last year, she has met with many students who she realized would be good candidates for the BGST degree. She gave the example of one student who has trouble completing a required course in business, but has 117 hours, and a business minor. The BGST option would allow him to add a second minor and graduate on time.

Susan Kattwinkel, Senator (Theatre) expressed that she trusted her colleagues in all departments to design a program that is challenging enough for students. She asked about the BGST 101 course. She thought that the number of students coming into the program had some
experience with college, so why would they need an introduction into something they have almost already finished?

Daniel Greenberg said the task force found in focus groups and in talking with people that there are thousands of reasons why people stop out of College. He said that the course is designed to address significant gaps in college attendance, and to introduce students to what the BGST program actually is and if it is appropriate for them.

**Christa Poparad, Guest** (Library) and member of the General Studies task force reiterated that there is student success support built into the program, and gave the example a student out of school for a short time, but faced with a different learning management system than their former school, that library resources may be significantly different, that there may be need for assistance from the Center for Student Learning, or from the Center for Disability Services. All of those necessary services are part of the Introductory course.

**Jacob Steere-Williams, Senator** (History) asked if there was any stipulation against a student taking the Introduction course and senior seminar at the same time.

Godfrey Gibbison said that BGST 101 and some other course built into the program must occur before student may take the senior seminar. Students cannot do both at the same time.

**Beatriz Maldonado, Senator** (at-large, LCWA) asked how the program plans to staff both the one credit hour Introductory course and the BGST 400 course. She asked if we were building programs that ask adjuncts to bear the brunt of our creativeness? She asked a second question about the residency requirement, that most minors required nine credit hours in the minor at the Junior level of higher at the College of Charleston. Would that be true for both minors at the BGST?

Gibbison acknowledged that staffing courses is always a challenge. The plan is to have both courses taught by roster faculty and explained that the task force conducted a survey that showed faculty desired to be compensated in many different ways. The task force asked the Provost's office to work with Deans and Chairs offering faculty a menu of choices for compensation.

**Mary Bergstrom, Guest** (Registrar) said the rules for completing minors will not change for the BGST students.

**Jeri Cabot, Guest** (Student Affairs) asked if there was any discussion about a pricing differential since the bottom quartile of the state population will be targeted?

Provost McGee said there are many discussions on pricing undergraduate and graduate programs. An initial effort to explore pricing differential has been made in the School of Business and the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. He said at this point, BGST will not be treated any differently than a BA or BS program, but conversations are ongoing.

The Provost said they are looking at financial aid models to get more assistance for students in need.
Susan Kattwinkel brought the discussion back to who is teaching the BGST 101 course and asked for confirmation that roster faculty will teach the course. She highlighted language that implied parallel with other one-hour courses, including the courses like FYE (which is 0 hours) who employ student advisors.

Gibbison said faculty will be teaching the course with peer facilitation. There will be a faculty instructor for each section of the course, along with peer facilitators.

**Irina Gigova, Senator** (at-large, HSS) and member of the General Studies task force asked Provost McGee about budget concerns, since a number of students in the General Studies focus groups suggested that they would not return to school unless there was a financial aid package offered.

Gigova asked if other program or services would suffer to support BGST, since there is a finite number of budgetary resources.

Provost McGee answered that there is uncertainty anytime a new program is launched. He said in the case of BGST, the costs are extremely low, since any BGST students would be taking classes that are offered anyway giving the College an opportunity to serve more students attracted by the program.

The Provost said that considering questions such as staffing benefit from maximum flexibility.

**Lynne Ford, Guest** (Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) asked about plans to offer the curriculum online if the science labs have no plans to go online. She also asked plans for online Gen Ed courses.

Julia Eichelberger said that the way it’s currently envisioned is not 100% online, since Science faculty have not conceived of a way to offer labs online. She said that if students do not have the science requirements, they would have to transfer the credits in from someplace else.

Ford asked how this would be communicated to students interested in the program.

Gibbison said this represent the current situation, and credits are accepted from other institutions that offer less expensive or online options. We cannot ask how they courses are delivered, but we accept the credit. If students cannot go to the main campus, they will have to complete those courses elsewhere.

Gayle Goudy said the Curriculum Committee discussed the program itself-the two minors, the residency requirements and did not consider where the students were taking the courses-online or in class, as part of the requirement for the degree. She clarified that the degree program the Senate is being asked to vote on is not an online degree. She emphasized that the vote is for the credit hours in the program, not the mode of delivery.
Irina Gigova clarified that the School of Sciences and Mathematics do offer a number of lecture courses online, and have offered labs in a more flexible manner; in weekend labs, or compressed labs.

Discussion concluded and Speaker Jurisich asked for a vote on the Bachelor of General Studies proposal.

The proposal passed with majority vote.

b. Committee on Graduate Education (Christine Finnan, Chair)

The following proposals were considered:

i. MED-LALE Changes (Link) (pdf)
ii. LALE 698: Independent Study (Link) (pdf)
iii. LALE 695: Standards-Based Teaching Portfolio (Link) (pdf)

There was no discussion. All motions carried.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) gave an informal report on the outcome of a recent public hearing. He stated there is no formal process for reporting the outcome of public hearings, and that at least 40 people attended Dr. Oksana Ingle's public hearing. He said this is unfortunate with regards to transparency of our processes, and called for a solution.

Nunan reported that Dr. Ingle did not succeed in her case before the Hearing Committee and in appeal to President McConnell.

Senator Nunan wished to thank Dr. Ingle formally before the Senate for her more than nine years of solid service to the College. Nunan said her case serves as confirmation that even long-term adjuncts have no recourse of maintaining employment in the face of an abrupt dismissal.

Nunan stated that it does not matter if enrollments are declining, which is not the case in Russian Studies, as over the last two fall semesters, courses have increased in Elementary Russian language, which are the courses Dr. Ingle teaches. Nunan said this information is publicly available on the Registrar's website, http://registrar.cofc.edu/index.php, and invited people to go back to 2012 and look at the numbers, which reveal a low point in fall 2015, but then climbed back up to the same level as in previous years in fall of 2016 and fall of 2017. He said the fall of 2017's enrollment figures are higher than the administration’s benchmark number, made in the fall of 2012.

Dr. Nunan expressed he thinks this is a very unfortunate incident and appealed for all to think carefully about how we treat long-term adjuncts.
Annette Watson, Senator (Political Science) stated her department is concerned about the congressional tax plan and its impact on graduate education. She asked if there is anything the College is doing to address this.

The Provost offered that leadership continues to work with legislators when they have the opportunity to do so at the state and federal level. At the national level, he said our higher education advocacy organizations are the most effective mechanism to make arguments for our profession. He stated that we can work on individual legislators on their specific votes, and that effort has not been wildly successful.

8. Adjournment 6:37 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Jannette Finch  
Faculty Secretary

Appendix A: Report on Nutrition and Housing Needs of CofC Students
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 7 November 2017

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 7 November 2017 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

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

2. The [10 October 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes](#) were approved as written.

3. **Announcements and information.** The Speaker reminded attendees to sign the roll sheet at each door.

4. **Reports**

   a. **Speaker of the Faculty Elizabeth Jurisich** provided a brief report. She expressed that she hoped everyone had a chance to look through Curriculog. To view supporting documents, viewers might have to click through the proposals. She shared that the Senate website has been re-organized to see all the committees without having to click through. She encouraged Chairs of committees to put their meeting dates up on the website (through Megan Gould).

   b. **Provost Brian McGee** shared remarks on the following topics:

      - Recent episodes of gun violence on campus. USC Upstate and Texas Christian University both went into lockdown. He expressed that there were no fatalities. He thanked facilities first responders for all they do.
      - The Provost will host a brownbag lunch on November 15, noon, located at the School of Education. Watch for announcements.
      - Sestercentennial. One of the first colleges to have an opportunity to celebrate a 250 year anniversary, the celebration will take place in 2020. There will be a Committee planning events and we will be hearing a lot about it for the next several years.
      - Several task forces will be formed to address academic planning and academic policy issues. The task forces will study transfer credit and credit hours. He said there are many reasons for doing so, including accepting 60 hours of transfer credits from two year colleges, a policy that has been in place since 1971. The limits set at that time are not explained. The number of hours required for a Bachelors was set at 122 in 1971. A minimum number of hours was never set. The policies need to be examined to determine whether they make sense.
      - Another task force will concentrate on Faculty advising and student development. How is advising evaluated? Is it service? How is it evaluated for tenure and promotion? Dr. Lynne Ford will chair the task force.
      - Experiential learning. As a member of the Colonial Academic Alliance (http://www.caa-academics.org/) with 9 other colleges, we have an opportunity to learn from sister institutions. There are increased efforts to encourage collaborative research opportunities between colleges.
• The Attendance Policy for undergraduate students was revised in 2014-2015. The revisions made with leadership in Student Affairs and Student Athletics Committee Athletics and Academic Standards improved consistency for attendance for students. It is a student-focused effort.

• Recently, there might be concern for applying the WA grade might not be appropriate for a student after a certain number of absences. The policy didn't include any differential treatment of excused and unexcused absences for the WA grade. Provost McGee has asked the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards and Student Affairs and Athletics to look at this issue again and report back.

• The Provost offered a correction regarding a false campus rumor concerning the decor in President McConnell's office.

• The Provost expressed support for creating Hate and Bias response teams. The Provost is supportive of this effort and set the tentative goal for a team to be established by March 1, 2018.

• The Provost addressed controversial speakers on campus. He stated that as long as safety can be assured, we will create space for invited speakers, even if that speaker is controversial. Presenting content from a neutral position supports a classically liberal position, in which the focus is on a range of viewpoints for dialog.

• The Provost commented on the curriculum proposal for data science and analytics. He expressed support for the launching of the program.

The Provost accepted questions.

Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked if the Provost could provide an update on the investigation concerning the Halloween costume controversy.

The Provost acknowledged news coverage concerning an alleged College of Charleston student who celebrated Halloween in an inappropriate manner. That student is experiencing due process under the student code of conduct.

Scott Poole, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about discussions concerning federal government policy changes affecting DACA students. He asked if those discussions had progressed? He expressed that he detected possible contradiction in the statements offered by the Provost in past Senate meetings that the College would both follow federal law regarding DACA students and would make every effort to protect the students. Poole asked for clarification.

The Provost responded that the College is less affected by federal laws than state laws enacted in 2008. The SC Code of Law makes clear that only student lawfully present in the United States can be students at public colleges and universities in the state. Each semester, the Registrar must confirm that students are lawfully present in the United States. Before DACA, if a student had illegal status, they could not attend the College. DACA allowed these students access. The College now has students who cannot renew their DACA status, but will still have DACA status for a period of time. As long as they have this status, they will be able to matriculate. A legal issue not yet settled by Legal Affairs is what happens to student who are able to attend at the beginning of the semester, but not able to complete the semester.
The Provost stated that his position is that DACA continue in some form, because South Carolina is better off when people get College degrees.

Lisa Covert, Guest (History) asked a follow-up question. She asked if the Provost and President McConnell were committed to communicating with state representatives at the state house level?

The Provost expressed that he felt there was little chance for flexibility on the issue at the state level. He stated that regarding Federal law, every advocacy group in higher education was exerting pressure to preserve DACA.

c. Committee on General Education (Lisa Covert, Chair)

Covert reported on the work being done by the Committee on General Education, listing three main objectives (Appendix A), including improving communication, interpreting certification for the Math Alternative and Gen Ed program more broadly, and the recertification process. As part of the improved communication plan, Covert said with Megan Goudy's help, they are updating their Committee website, and plan to provide meeting schedules and dates. The Committee also hopes to foster a culture of discussion concerning Gen Ed that involves designating February as Gen Ed month. The committee hopes that during Gen Ed month, departments will incorporate discussion about Gen Ed within their monthly meetings, in the hopes of disseminating information more broadly and encouraging qualitative discussions about how Gen Ed is working. Covert suggested departments may invite Committee members to their meetings, or administrators working on Gen Ed, or the Assessment Readers for the Gen Ed program. More information will be shared in the coming weeks.

The Committee also wishes to improve communication with students, garnering feedback and providing information on the role of Gen Ed in students' academic program.

Covert alerted the Senate of the December 1 deadline for the Math/Logic Alternative program. Other GenEd proposals were due November 1. The next deadline is February 1.

The Committee is also planning on looking at recertification, especially concentrating on Special Topics courses to promote consistency across semesters.

There were no questions.

d. Brief Reminder of New System, Curriculog (Associate Provost Lynn Cherry) (pdf)

Associate Provost Cherry walked faculty through logging into Curriculog through MyCharleston, then through viewing course proposals. See the Curriculog Guidebook (http://academicaffairs.cofc.edu/documents/curriculog/CofCCurriculogGuidebook.pdf) for instructions.

Cherry hopes that everyone's experience with Curriculog is trouble-free.
There were no questions.

5. **There was no** Old Business

6. **New Business**

   a. **Faculty Committee for Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid**
      (Quinn Burke, Chair) Revised Transfer Admission Policy, Undergraduate (Appendix B)

      Burke offered a review and summary of the proposed changes to the policy to include
      language concerning undergraduate transfer admission for those students with criminal or
      disciplinary history.

      Burke accepted questions.

      **Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about the new GPA suggested minimums. He
      asked if the language was aspirational, and why is it different for in-state and out-of-state
      students?

      Burke answered that the language is aspirational.

      Provost McGee answered the difference in GPA for in-state and out-of-state students was to
      assure that the College granted access to the citizens of South Carolina first.

      **Julia Eichelberger**, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked for clarification that the proposal is to change
      the wording?

      Speaker Jurisich read out the specific change in wording to add clarity.

      Burke clarified that the wording aligns with Policy 8.1.5 and adds meeting FERPA requirements.

      **Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) stated that the policy already exists, but is a clarification
      of wording.

      **Jimmie Foster** (Guest, Vice President for Admissions and Enrollment Management) explained
      that the big change is to consider students denied for disciplinary reasons.

      Provost McGee explained that he is asking the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards to
      review a variety of academic policy issues, whereas in the past, the committee primarily dealt
      with many student petitions.

      Krasnoff asked where the policy regarding transfer students resides?

      Jimmie Foster said that the policy is 12.1.6, on the College website
      ([http://policy.cofc.edu/policy.php](http://policy.cofc.edu/policy.php)).
Krasnoff broached the larger question: What is the Senate’s role in policies? He asked if the Senate could contribute to decisions regarding policy that was more than advisory.

**Bob Mignone**, Guest (Mathematics) suggested that the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards includes Admissions and Financial Aid.

**Mary Bergstrom** (Guest, Registrar) asked why the Committee added the FERPA statement and commented that under FERPA law transfer student information can be shared freely between schools.

After brief discussion, unanimous consent was granted to add the language, "if applicable."

The Revised Transfer Admission Policy was voted on and passed.

**b. Committee on Graduate Education** (Christine Finnan, Chair)

i. Master’s Degree in Data Science and Analytics

Cover (pdf); Program Proposal (pdf); Courses (combined 1 file, pdf); Letters of Support (combined 1 file, pdf); Memo from Senate Budget Committee (pdf)

There were no questions. The curriculum proposal was voted on and passed.

**c. Faculty Curriculum Committee** (Gayle Goudy and Chad Galuska, Co-Chairs)

*NOTE: This is the first Senate meeting with curriculum in the new Curriculog system. We strongly suggest that all Senators (and CofC faculty) use Curriculog to view the comprehensive proposals (including attached files, such as syllabi) – links to the Curriculog forms are included below. Users without CofC faculty status do not have access to Curriculog, but may view the proposal form (not including attached files) via the PDF link listed in this agenda. If you experience any issues viewing the proposals, or have technical questions, please direct all queries to CurriculogHelp@cofc.edu. If you would like to view the attached files to any of the forms, but do not have Curriculog access, please email CurriculogHelp@cofc.edu
i) **Computing in the Arts, Digital Media Concentration, B.A. - BA-CITA-CIDM** proposal to correct the degree requirements of CITA to align with your original intentions (and not an earlier draft that was mistakenly implemented).

Goudy explained that the curriculum has already been approved, this is just a change. Since it was part of curriculum and in the catalog, needed to correct for clarity.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large) asked if there was a need to vote on this change?

**Lynn Cherry** (Guest, Associate Provost) specified that bringing it to a vote provided clarity on the change.

The change was voted on and passed.

ii) **CSCI - 381 - Internship**: change number from 381 to 281 so that it is not counted as an elective. The **CSCI** curriculum allows any course numbered 300 or higher to count as an elective. ([View in Curriculog: View PDF](#)).

There was no discussion. The change was voted on and passed.

iii) **French**

is proposing to create 4 new courses, replacing 4 existing courses. They also need to modify their various majors and minors to incorporate these new courses. Finally, they're removing their capstone requirement, which will reduce the number of hours in the major.

- New course: FREN 334 ([View in Curriculog: View PDF](#))
- New course: FREN 335 ([View in Curriculog: View PDF](#))
- New course: FREN 336 ([View in Curriculog: View PDF](#))
- New course: FREN 337 ([View in Curriculog: View PDF](#))
- Deactivate course: FREN 320 ([View in Curriculog: View PDF](#))
- Deactivate course: FREN 321 ([View in Curriculog: View PDF](#))
- Deactivate course: FREN 326 ([View in Curriculog: View PDF](#))
- Deactivate course: FREN 327 ([View in Curriculog: View PDF](#))
- Deactivate course: FREN 495 ([View in Curriculog: View PDF](#))
The French proposals were considered as a group. There was no discussion. All proposals were passed.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

Julia Eichelberger, Senator (at-large, HSS) expressed a concern on behalf of a colleague. Police came to a class and removed a student. The colleague wondered if the police officers could wait if it was not a matter of imminent danger.

Not only was it disruptive, but the student was defamed in front of the class. She asked what was appropriate.

Provost McGee stated he would look into it. He is sympathetic to the faculty position, but does not know if there was an urgent matter.

8. Adjournment, 6:16 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Jannette Finch
Faculty Secretary

Appendix A: Committee on General Education report

Appendix B: Faculty Committee for Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, Revised Transfer Admission Policy
General Education Committee Report Overview
November 7, 2017 Senate Meeting

Three main objectives for the remainder of the academic year:
1. Improve communication (with faculty and students) in several ways
   ○ February as “Gen Ed Month”
2. Certification for Math Alternative Program and Gen Ed more broadly
   ○ Deadlines: Dec. 1 for the Math Alternative Program; for other Gen Ed proposals Nov. 1 was our first deadline, our second deadline is Feb. 1
3. Recertification Process
OFFICIAL POLICY FOR APPLICANTS FOR UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSION: Degree and Non-Degree

Transfer Admission (paragraph three):

Transfer applicants to the undergraduate program must be eligible to return to the last institution attended and must not be serving academic or disciplinary suspension at that or any other institution. Transfer admission guidelines strongly suggest a minimum GPA of 2.600 (in-state), 3.000 (out of state) from all previous institutions attended, calculated on a 4.000 scale. Special circumstances are considered and each application is reviewed and evaluated individually by admissions professionals. Freshman credentials (high school record and SAT or ACT scores) are generally required for evaluation unless a student has completed 24 semester hours or more. Some students who have been out of high school for two or more years may have this requirement waived.

Proposed Change - Approved by FCAS (5-0 vote) on 10/4/17:

Transfer applicants to College must be eligible to return to the last institution attended and must not be serving academic suspension at that or any other institution. Students who are on disciplinary suspension or have other disciplinary or criminal violations, including pending charges, will be conditionally considered for admission in accordance with the College of Charleston policy 8.1.5 Admitting Applicants for Enrollment with a Criminal or Disciplinary History. These students as well as other applicants may be required to provide disciplinary records to the College of Charleston and give written consent and FERPA waiver(s) to have College of Charleston officials discuss their disciplinary history and status with officials from their previous institution(s) and other relevant parties, in the sole discretion of the College.

Transfer admission guidelines strongly suggest a minimum GPA of 2.600 (in-state), 3.000 (out of state) from all previous institutions attended, calculated on a 4.000 scale. Special circumstances are considered and each application is reviewed and evaluated individually by admissions professionals. Freshman credentials (high school record and SAT or ACT scores) are generally required for evaluation unless a student has completed 24 semester hours or more. Some students who have been out of high school for two or more years may have this requirement waived.
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 10 October 2017

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 10 October 2017 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to order, 5:05 PM

2. The 26 September 2017 minutes were approved as posted.

3. Announcements and information. There were none.

4. Reports

   a. Speaker Liz Jurisich reported that the Committee on Nominations and Elections is finishing forming the ad hoc committee charged with organizing a campus-wide discussion on the College’s institutional identity and vision. The Speaker explained that the ad hoc committee will be organizing the discussion, and everyone will be encouraged to participate.

      If interested in participating on the ad hoc committee, please speak to Nominations and Election (Tom Kunkle, Chair).

      The Speaker said the Faculty and Board of Trustees shadowing program is ongoing, pairing four Trustees with faculty members. Details of this program are located at: http://trustees.cofc.edu/increasing-board-engagement/index.php .

      Speaker Jurisich said they need one or two more faculty members, and do not have anyone from the lab sciences.

      Speaker Jurisich also mentioned she will be attending the upcoming Board of Trustees meetings October 19 and 20, asked Senators to let her know if they had any concerns, and reminded everyone that all faculty are welcome at Board of Trustee meetings.

      There were no questions.

   b. 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 speak. We got delayed this year by circumstances. It's hard to believe this is week 8 of the semester. I think time moves just a little bit faster when our students are back on campus. Before we all know it, we'll be in December with commencement and the holiday season, then back starting a new semester.
Today, let me begin with the makeup of the Class of 2021. This year, we have another remarkable freshman class. We have over 1,900 freshmen who make up the class. We have 211 students in the Charleston Bridge Program and 63 students in the iCharleston program. We have students representing 38 states around the country as well as students from Washington D.C. and overseas military bases. We also have students from 11 countries, excluding the United States. Our student who lives the farthest away traveled 8,508 miles from Hong Kong to join us at the College.

The Class of 2021 also boasts 9 In-state Valedictorians and 13 in-state Salutatorians as well as 4 Out-of-state Valedictorians and 4 out-of-state Salutatorians.

I believe we have a strong freshman class, and I’m excited to see the many great things that they’ll accomplish during the time that they are with us – from athletics wins to entrepreneurial activities to research discoveries to community service which benefits the Lowcountry – their potential here is unlimited.

Switching gears, I want to talk about two national headlines that have generated interest on campus.

First, as we all know, the last days of summer break and the first days of our academic year were ones filled with tough conversations on race, history, and freedom of speech in wake of the events that took place in Charlottesville in August and the ensuing national dialogue that has followed.

I believe we all have had conversations with family members, friends, coworkers, and community leaders about these emotion-laden topics and the deep wounds in this country that we would like to see heal.

I, personally, have taken time to reflect on these issues and have had some thoughtful conversations with members of our campus community about the pain the events of August have unfurled on many Americans and the anxiety it is causing on our campus.

I want to state upfront that the College of Charleston will not provide a platform to people or outside groups whose views and rhetoric seeks to divide and intimidate our campus community.

Believing in freedom of speech does not mean we – as a university – must allow people or outside groups on our campus who will present a major security risk to our campus community.

That being said, as a public university, with a mission to provide students a community in which to engage in original inquiry and creative expression in an atmosphere of intellectual freedom, there is a fine line that we have to walk – between allowing the expression of ideas as safeguarded in the first amendment – and ensuring the safety of our campus community from anyone or group that poses a true threat.
This is not an easy task, and it will only get harder in the months and years ahead as outside groups wage free speech battles at universities – primarily public institutions – across the country. These types of battles have already taken place at Auburn University, The University of California, Berkeley, the University of Washington and others.

As recently as last week, there was a confrontation at William and Mary where an ACLU member was invited to speak and had her remarks interrupted and event cancelled by students who shouted her down.

Sadly, I believe these types of confrontations will not die down, but rather spread across the country to other college campuses.

I affirm to all of you that the College of Charleston will always be an institution where free speech is upheld as a high ideal of this university and country.

We – as a campus community – are at our best when we LEARN from each other, ENGAGE with each other, and WORK with each other.

Having said that, let me reiterate, the safety of our campus community is our top priority, and we will always do everything in our power to protect our campus.

Second, as you probably have seen in the news, the Department of Justice announced plans to end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals also known as the DACA program.

I want our campus community to know that I fully support Congressional action that will provide legal status to those once covered by DACA. That kind of legislation speaks to our own campus core values of diversity and inclusion.

At the College of Charleston, we have only a small number of students who may be affected by the loss of protection of DACA. However, each member of our community plays an integral role in the life of our campus. They deserve to be here, and they deserve a chance to cross our majestic Cistern stage, with a College of Charleston diploma in hand.

Moving on, I would like to talk about Vision 250: MIND, BODY, SPIRIT, and some accomplishments we’ve made in bringing this vision to life over the past year.

Under the MIND section of the vision, we’ve made progress in a number of areas that will help us attain our goal of providing an even more dynamic academic experience.

We updated the College’s organizational structure in a way that makes more sense, streamlines services, results in some cost-savings, and enable us to better serve our students, faculty and staff.
This included creating a Division of Enrollment Planning and separating out the Division of Information Technology.

I also expanded my senior team membership this summer. The team is now made up of Provost and Executive Vice President Brian McGee, Executive Vice President for Business Paul Patrick, Executive Vice President for Student Affairs Alicia Caudill, Interim Executive Vice President of Advancement Chris Tobin, Senior Vice President of Information Technology Mark Staples, Vice President of Enrollment Jimmie Foster, Associate Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer Rénard Harris, Executive Director of Marketing and Communications Mark Berry, General Counsel Angela Mulholland, Athletics Director Matt Roberts, Senior Executive Administrator Debbie Hammond, and Senior Executive Advisor to the President Steve Osborne, who is working at the College part-time.

In addition, I have created an Administrative Council, which will be chaired by me. The council will have a large membership that includes the Senior Team, Deans, Speaker of the Faculty, and a few other members of our campus community.

The council will serve in an advisory capacity to the president’s office and will function to provide a forum for the exchange of information among the university’s various constituency groups on important institutional issues, policies and strategies.

In practice, the council will meet monthly or as my schedule permits. The first meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 16.

The Administrative Council will not replace the Senior Team, which will continue to meet regularly. This is an opportunity for us to face one another, to tell what our concern is in a particular area, or share ideas for improvement, or if something needs to be addressed. This is a way to bring that group together face to face to have a chance to communicate on the direction of the school.

Under MIND, we also increased adjunct faculty compensation, created the Sustainability Literacy Institute, and introduced the Charleston Bridge Program.

Provost McGee has been working over the summer on some innovative academic programing agreements. After working with the Faculty Senate this fall, we hopefully will be able to make some announcements during the 2017-18 academic year.

Lastly, two weeks ago, the College announced a 1.92-million-dollar gift from Noah Leask and his wife to establish the Noah Thomas Leask Distinguished Professorship in Information Management and Innovation — a grant that will fund a faculty position in perpetuity.

This incredible investment in our supply chain and information management program will propel an already strong and growing program to new heights. In addition, it will further the College’s recognition in Silicon Harbor as an institution for talent,
extraordinary research and technological innovation. I’m excited for what this professorship will do for the College’s reputation – nationally and internationally.

While I’m on the MIND section of Vision 250, I want to briefly mention two Dean searches that have come up in conversations some of you have had with Provost McGee and me.

Provost McGee and I expect to launch a search for a permanent Dean of the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs later this month.

We also expect to launch a search for a Dean of the Graduate School in January. We are staggering the searches to ensure that each search has our full attention, and we hire the best candidates for the positions.

Moving on, we’ve made progress in enriching our student experience at the College, which is the focus of our BODY section of Vision 250.

Over the past year, we have hired a permanent Chief Diversity Officer and seen increased energy and engagement in our diversity efforts around campus thanks to Rénard Harris and his team in our Office of Institutional Diversity.

We also invested in our new Crossing the Cistern program, which is a new one-year scholarship program for rising sophomores and juniors that awards up to $4,000.

The program is designed to address financial support and to help foster a sense of community among students, particularly students of color.

We’ve also identified some new recruitment initiatives that we are investing in this year in order to yield a freshman class that meets our enrollment targets, is more diverse, and represents the best and brightest students from around the country and the world.

We are committed to elevating our student experience at the College, and we will do so.

Lastly, we have been working on enhancing the SPIRIT of the College, particularly as it speaks to character and maturity.

Our Collegiate Recovery Program is in its second semester of helping students and is off to a good start. Because of Director Wood Marchant and his team’s efforts, our students feel more at home at the College and supported in their recovery efforts. This is a great, great program for the College.

Student Affairs and Institutional Advancement have been working together to identify more resources for the Career Center.

And Jim Allison, the Executive Director of the Career Center, has been meeting with many campus groups and constituencies to spread the word about all the resources the
Career Center offers and how they are well-positioned to help students attain internships and jobs.

The collective hard work by Jim, his area, and campus colleagues is paying off. Recently, the College was named to The Princeton Review’s list of Best Career Centers in the United States. We were ranked 18th on the list.

There’s increased energy and activity in the Career Center, and our students are certainly the beneficiaries. We are certainly moving in the right direction.

Lastly under SPIRIT, Dr. Caudill has realigned some areas in the Division of Student Affairs, which will better support the student experience. This realignment will lead to more synergy and collaboration among our student affairs professionals, which in turn benefits our students.

Of course, we wouldn’t be the world-class university we are today without the hard work of our faculty and staff.

It’s the dedication and drive of all of you in this room and our colleagues across campus that have enabled the College to continue to receive national and international recognition.

In July, the College was named the winner of Travel + Leisure’s “Most Beautiful College Campus” contest.

I’m thrilled that renowned Travel + Leisure magazine has formally recognized the College with this No. 1 ranking and affirmed to everyone that our world-class beauty matches our world-class institution.

You’ll notice around campus that we have put up banners touting our Beauty and Brains as a way to promote this recognition from Travel + Leisure magazine.

Over the past few months, the College also received more accolades from major publications and organizations.

*The Princeton Review* ranked us on their list of Great Schools for 20 of the Most Popular Undergraduate Majors. We’re on the list because of our accounting, biology, communication, and business/finance majors.

And in August, *The Princeton Review* also named the College to its list of “The Best 382 Colleges” for the fifteenth consecutive year. According to the publication, the College is “the perfect mix of urban and small town,” and “is a place where everyone’s unique [talent] or interest can shine through and be fostered for growth.”

In addition to the aforementioned recognitions, the Shanghai Ranking Consultancy, which ranks the Academic Ranking of World Universities, named the College’s
Hospitality and Tourism Management program just outside the top 50 programs in the world. In terms of the USA, we were ranked in the top 25.

The last rankings that I want to mention come from *U.S. News & World Report*. Recently, the College’s First Year Experience was named as the No. 10 best program in the country. The College beat out every other college and university in South Carolina.

*U.S. News & World Report* also named the College as one of the top schools in the South Region.

In addition, we were ranked by that publication as second among regional public universities in the South for “A Strong Commitment to Teaching.” This category recognizes “schools where the faculty has an unusually strong commitment to undergraduate teaching,” according to the magazine.

These well-deserved national and international recognitions affirm the College’s commitment to holistically educating and caring for our students and are directly correlated to our faculty and staff’s dedication in fostering our student-focused culture. I cannot tell you how many times when I go to other cities and meet with parents, friends, and alumni, they talk about the student-focus here and the fact that the students have a relationship with their professors. It resonates time after time.

While rankings do not necessarily showcase a university’s true value, it’s nice to see this continuing recognition of our excellent academic reputation.

Our academic reputation is the result of your passion, your leadership, and deep subject matter expertise.

I extend my deepest thanks to all of you for your continued hard work. I firmly believe you are some of the best teacher-scholars in the country. It is because of your efforts – and the efforts of our talented staff – that we produce graduates who are ready for career, ready for advanced and graduate studies, and ready to live the life extraordinaire.

It remains a privilege to serve with you. I’m excited to work with you to further enrich our educational mission and strengthen the College.

Jointly, our dedication, energy, and ideas can take the College forward and ensure we are fostering an experience for our students that’s more impactful, more rigorous, more beneficial, and more transformative.

With that, I'll close. One thing I wanted to add last year, we began transferring temporary employees to permamant staff. I found that there were employees who have been here over ten years; some thirteen or eighteen years and had never been transferred into permanent staff. We got permission to move forward with a progressive program of movement and we moved all who were eligible to move those who had worked for over ten years. This year we will move those who have been here 5 - 10 years, then we will
move those who have been here 3-5 years. As you know these employees don't get paid when we shut down the College, so the Winter break is not necessarily a joyous time for some of them.

With that, Madam Speaker, I'll be happy to take some questions.

Thank you.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator (at-large, HSS) and Director of Southern Studies asked about a proposal suggested by Professor Grant Gilmore regarding the signage on our campus. She related her question to the beginning of President McConnell's speech with regards to difficult conversations about race and a shared past as a southern city. She explained that the proposal suggests modifying the signage on historic buildings so that all buildings constructed with the labor of enslaved people or African-American artisans post-Civil War are recognized. Eichelberger asked the President to talk about his thoughts on trying to tell the full story of the history of the College of Charleston with that signage.

President McConnell replied that he received the proposal and asked Dr. Gilmore to gather some additional historical information and documentation. He said he intends to refer the proposal to the working group and the 250th committee, as a project for the 250th anniversary celebration. The President brought up the example of the Sotille Theatre, known in the past as The Gloria. It is being readied for a major renovation, and a gift to the College, which will be announced soon, will launch this project. The President spoke of significant architectural features and reiterated that more research would have to be conducted.

Eichelberger asked for clarification of the committee President McConnell would be turning it over to?

President McConnell said two committees: a working group and a 250th anniversary committee. Co-chairs are Lynn Cherry and Ann Pryor.

Eichelberger explained that there are architectural features of the building that reflect the Jim Crow era, the era of segregation that included our campus. Signs on this building and others would mark that history more explicitly than we have in the past.

President McConnell said he would provide the list of who is on the working group.

**Patricia Williams Lessane**, Senator (Library) asked for an update on the progress on re-acquiring 123 Bull Street building. She has submitted several white papers and prospectus on how Avery Research Center could use the building. She explained that Avery could use that building as part of their interpretation of the Avery experience, or for office space, and for storage.

President McConnell said the main building renovations have been delayed due to contracting problems and asked Paul Patrick for an update.
Paul Patrick (Executive VP for Business Affairs) said that they are clear of Phase 1 and Phase 2 and now are communicating with the state engineer to clear the contract documents. Next, they will get bids, and try to begin work.

Lessane said this pertains to the main building, and asked again about 123 Bull, the former teacher's cottage.

Paul Patrick said that that building remains unprogrammed, as far as he knows.

President McConnell thanked Senator Lessane for bringing it to his attention, and said he will find out about it.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked about failure to authorize faculty searches on a regular timeline. He stated that he is not asking about how many faculty lines are authorized or not, but about the schedule. He explained that every discipline has a national hiring calendar, and the best candidates are available by fixed dates. He said the September 1-15 is a reasonable timeline, but with waiting to advertise, the College is not able to recruit the best candidates. To what extent is the Provost constrained by budget concerns outside his control from returning to some sort of regular timeline?

President McConnell said that any constraints have to do with the budget.

Krasnoff asked if budgets constrain the timeline? Do we have new knowledge on October 15 that we do not know on September 1?

Provost McGee said that he has explained to the Deans that the enrollment levels contribute to uncertainty. He said that in Phase 1, a certain number of searches for instructors and tenure-stream faculty are during the fall semester. A handful of these searches with extremely early conventions have been allowed to go forward. The Provost stated that Deans always have the ability to ask him to speed up the process for early conference disciplines. Phase 2 in the spring is for visitor lines, recognizing that there are some disciplines where visitors are in short supply. There will be other searches that might be allowed to go forward in the 2018-19 year, that are not in the 2017-18 year. The decisions are made through a confluence of enrollment pressures, retirements, and previously unfilled vacancies. The Provost said he is stretching money as far as it can go after multiple years of budget cuts, with a decline in enrollment. The Provost said he realizes the environment is frustrating, and they are trying to make context-specific decisions for each discipline.

There was some discussion between Krasnoff and the Provost about balancing timely searches with conducting fewer searches, with departments taking a faculty line when it is available, even though the national timeline was past.

Roxane DeLaurell (Guest) commented on if a faculty member leaves, some departments are told that line will not be replaced. She offered that puts the department in a difficult position in making quality tenure and promotion decisions.
Provost McGee clarified that they have replaced many faculty colleagues who have resigned, retired, or were not successful in the tenure and promotion process. He said in some cases, shifting enrollments could cause a colleague to not be replaced. Provost McGee said that decisions are not made preferentially, but to meet demands of shifting enrollments within schools and across schools.

Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked for an update on the construction on the Science building, which was due to be completed in the summer. She also asked about the advisory council announced by President McConnell.

President McConnell said the advisory council meetings will be public and will offer opportunities to hear concerns and ideas. President McConnell asked Dean of School of Sciences and Mathematics Mike Auerbach to comment on the Science building's progress.

Mike Auerbach (Guest), Dean of the School of Sciences and Mathematics said that much progress has been made, and is visible in the exterior. He said that the punch list is lengthy, and they are taking time to make sure that work is complete. One delay is elevator inspections, which are delayed due to "county fair season." Dean Auerbach shared that the same people who inspect elevators are also responsible for amusement park ride inspections. Some delay is also due to losing the work force to hurricane repairs in other states.

There were no more questions for President McConnell.

c. Provost Brian McGee

Provost McGee echoed President McConnell's comments about the College administration's commitment to the safety of the College community, while also respecting the Constitution, and the rule of law.

Provost McGee offered comments on the curriculum, and multiple new instructional opportunities being developed. He noted a steady increase in courses offered at a distance, with a record number offered over the summer. The increase in distance courses is significant for programs in development, such as the Bachelor of General Studies. The Provost mentioned that a new Masters is being developed which will be taught primarily at a distance, in English as a Second Language. He mentioned that these efforts are important to meet the needs of our community. Other projects include a Masters in Data and Science analytics and possible undergraduate work with the Citadel. The Provost reminded everyone that any new program will have to be approved by December 2017 to go in the Catalog for Fall 2018.

Provost McGee spoke about the enrollment for Fall 2017 and challenges and changes for financial aid for graduate and undergraduate students. He suggested it would be helpful to look at trends for undergraduate degree-seeking students and shared a PowerPoint (Appendix A) with five-year trend data available from http://irp.cofc.edu/. Provost McGee described a competitive marketplace for undergraduate degree-seeking students, which accounts for some fluctuation in the undergraduate total. As promised in the September Senate meeting, Provost McGee provided
percentages for African-American and minority student enrollment. He repeated that whole numbers are available from the IRP website, listed above.

Provost McGee repeated that enrollment information informs the discussion about faculty member numbers. He said that enrollment numbers drive the ability to recruit and retain faculty and to pay faculty a competitive salary. In order to reach campus levels enjoyed a few years ago, we will have to change recruitment and retention models.

Provost McGee said if we have fewer students, we will have fewer roster faculty, as tuition pays the majority of the bills. Provost McGee stated that there are 21 less roster faculty lines funded now than in 2014, and that is solely due to enrollment fluctuation.

Provost McGee next commented on the proposed Undergraduate Grade Redemption Policy. He commented because he has seen work on this policy by faculty committee and student government for a three year period. He pointed out that the policy has had the support of three student body presidents, and indicated that the proposal matters to the student body. Provost McGee gave information on similar policies at different universities. The forgiveness policy is not simple, and has been debated by faculty, and is complicated by existing software systems. Provost McGee strongly recommended against amending the policy on the Senate floor, because of the many interlocking elements that go into the policy, and suggested any desired changes in wording be remanded back to the Academic Standards Committee. He stated the College would be well-served by moving to a more generous model of academic forgiveness.

The Provost spoke of the good start to the semester, despite weather challenges, and acknowledged excellent student work, including the work done by students from the School of the Arts. He said it is an honor to serve as Chief Academic Officer and it is a pleasure to see the good work of students.

There were no questions for the Provost.

5. There was no Old Business.

6. New Business

   a. Academic Standards Committee (Quinn Burke, Chair) Motion to adopt the Policy, Proposed Undergraduate Grade Redemption (Appendix B).

Burke explained that different colleges refer to similar policies as academic forgiveness or grade redemption. He explained that the Academic Standards Committee found that institutions typically enacted one of two policies: the repetition policy, allowing a student to repeat a course within a certain time period; and grade exclusion, which allows a grade to be struck, and does not require the student to take the course again. The proposal listed above reflects a repetition policy and is the work of Academic Standards, Student Government Association (SGA), Academic Affairs, and the Registrar’s Office. Burke offered that the Academic Standards Committee reviewed 20 peer institutions and Colonial League institutions. They found that 17 of
the 20 had a similar policy, and on average, the number of courses that can be repeated or redeemed is about 3, and the mean eligible grade is 2.46.

Speaker Jurisich asked for discussion of the motion.

**Susan Kattwinkel**, Senator (Theatre) thanked the Committee for clarifying the proposal. She asked the Registrar if the software allowed both grades to appear on the transcript, but only count one grade.

**Mary Bergstrom** (Guest, Registrar) said that the Registrar's Office will need at least six to eight months to test the system and work out the business processes.

Kattwinkel asked the Committee if they had considered counting the grade that was higher, instead of the second grade attempt.

Quinn Burke (Chair, Academic Standards Committee) replied that the Committee decided to give more eligible courses to repeat, but to count the second grade to encourage student exploration and to prevent grade shopping.

Registrar Bergstrom said that the grade repetition policy will remain, and explained that the grades will still appear as repeat/include (RI). The repeat is different from the redemption policy.

**Beatriz Maldonado**, Senator (at-large, LCWA) asked how the policy affects withdrawals (WA), since that is equivalent to F on the transcript? Is there redemption policy for WA?

Bergstrom replied that any C- and below qualifies for redemption.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if a student fails a class, do they get one chance to redeem it?

Burke said the student could apply for redemption for that course instead of repetition.

Registrar Bergstrom spoke about the difference in redemption and repetition. A student can repeat a course as often as they wish, but one time for redemption.

Kunkle then asked when does the student asks for the redemption policy to be applied-before the course or upon completing the course?

Burke said there is a two semester window for the student to apply for redemption, not including summers and clarified that the student has until the end of drop/add to clarify they want the course to be for redemption.

Kunkle asked how the policy will affect scholarships if the GPA changes?

Burke said that Financial Aid and Scholarships has looked at the policy, but the process is being worked out.
Bergstrom acknowledged that there is a risk to a student's financial status when they opt to participate in the redemption policy. She said there is a form Clemson uses that requires the student to sign indicating they understand their financial aid could be jeopardized or they could possibly face a repayment situation. She said a student will have to be advised appropriately before making the choice. She described a workflow involving Athletics, Undergraduate Academic Services, Financial Aid, and Faculty Advising.

Provost McGee said that the policy extends past rules created by the College to the federal government. Financial Aid must sign off for students receiving federal aid to ensure they are clearly counseled.

Blake Stevens, Senator (at-large, SOA) asked if the higher grade was accepted, instead of the second grade earned, then would there be less risk to the student of compromising their financial aid?

Lynne Ford (Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) answered that the question concerns credit in addition to grades, and if credit is removed, the student can fall under the required hours for a grant or financial aid. She clarified that it matters where the credit is applied.

Susan Kattwinkel asked about a class that is offered every other year.

Burke said that this type of course would not be eligible.

Kattwinkel pointed out that the redemption policy may benefit some majors more than others.

Jim Young, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if there was any data from peer institutions indicating how many students used this type of policy?

Burke said he did not have that data.

Young addressed SGA President Alexandra Helfgott, asking her if she knew how many students would use the redemption policy?

Alexandra Helfgott (Guest, SGA President) said that during her spring campaign, every student group she spoke to asked about the grade redemption policy. She said students are asking for the policy and she thinks it will be popular. She said the long three year process of hammering out the policy is painful for students, who operate on an August to May timeline.

Lynn Cherry (Guest, Associate Provost) reported that other institutions see immediate use of this type of policy when implemented, then it levels off significantly after year three.

Jacob Steere-Williams, Senator (History) asked if Special Topics courses are included?

Lynne Ford replied that Special Topics are excluded.
Jimmie Foster (Guest, Vice President for Admissions and Enrollment Management) asked about students losing credit, and gave the example of a student earned credit for a D, then took the course again and earned an F, would the student lose that credit?

Burke said in that situation the credit for the D would still stand, and spoke to the complexity of applying many variations that will occur.

Mark Staples (Guest, CIO, Information Technology) asked how the scenario described above (D to F) affects the GPA?

Bergstrom replied there would be no grade points earned.

Lynne Ford offered that the College has had a forgiveness policy for decades, the three year transfer option. It applies to students who stop out for a period of three years, then returns. If they meet certain qualifications, the student can petition to have grades below a C treated as transfer credits. The student loses the credit, but resets their GPA.

Jolanda Van Arnhem, Senator (at-large, Library) asked SGA President Helfgott why a student would want to do this. She asked about students who are dependent on loans putting themselves in jeopardy.

Alexandra Helfgott (SGA President) answered that high standards at the College of Charleston lead to the expectation that the student will perform better when taking a course a second time. Helfgott answered there is a student demand, and that faculty developing the policy see merit in it.

Bergstrom said the policy that first appeared from SGA allowed students to pick 2-4 courses that would disappear from the transcript, with no repetition.

More discussion ensued concerning prerequisites, workflow, time needed for fairly evaluating situations and advising students, the need for human interaction, and business processes that need to be worked out.

Andrew Alwine, Senator (Classics) called the question. It was seconded. Speaker Jurisich called for a show of hands on the motion to call the question. The majority voted in favor.

Speaker Jurisich called for the vote on the Motion to adopt the Policy, Proposed Undergraduate Grade Redemption. The motion carried.

7. Constituent’s General Concerns

Iana Anguelova, Senator (at-large, SSM) brought a concern on behalf of her department and others on campus affected by the anti-virus program Kasperksy and the many problems associated with it. She listed many of the problems, mainly in slowing the function of computers until they are not usable. She spoke of the frustration on Kaspersky reinstalling itself.
Mark Staples, CIO (Information Technology) said he is aware of performance issues with Kaspersky. He and his staff are exploring alternatives to Kaspersky, recognizing that none of the many security options are problem-free. He offered that Kapsersky is a system-wide issue, not restricted to bad performance on Macs. He invited all to read his comments published on Yammer.

**Jolanda Van Arnhem**, Senator (at-large, Library) asked if the sign-in sheet could be in larger font.

**Alexandra Helfgott**, Guest, SGA President brought forward requests for covered seating for bus stops, free transcripts, and transportation for students to Grice Marine Laboratory.

Provost McGee said her concerns have been discussed in the last twelve months. He stated that charging for transcripts is normal in higher education, and that if they were free, the costs associated with them would appear elsewhere.

**8. Adjournment**, 6:46 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Jannette Finch

Faculty Secretary

Appendix A: Provost McGee PowerPoint

Appendix B: Policy, Proposed Undergraduate Grade Redemption
Overview
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# 10th Day Summary: Undergraduate Degree-Seeking Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree-Seeking</td>
<td>10136</td>
<td>10044</td>
<td>10019</td>
<td>9995</td>
<td>9570*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Total</td>
<td>10381</td>
<td>10338</td>
<td>10373</td>
<td>10247</td>
<td>9796*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes Charleston Bridge Program students.
### 10th Day Summary: Minority Student Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Minority Students</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Undergraduate Grade Redemption Policy
per R.O. Feedback 8/30/17 & FCAS Final Review 9/6/17

A student may elect to retake a course in which a grade of C- or below was earned on a grade redemption basis. There are several restrictions that apply. Grade redemption only applies to courses completed in residence at the College of Charleston; transfer credit or coursework completed elsewhere is not eligible for grade redemption under this policy. A student may apply the Grade Redemption Policy to four (4) courses during their lifetime enrollment at the College, regardless of how many degrees are earned. Grade redemption applies only to the grade earned the first time a course is completed. A “W” is a status indicator and not a grade eligible for redemption. Certain types of courses are not eligible for grade redemption (see below for restrictions). Course grades assigned as a result of an Honor Code violation are not eligible for redemption under this policy.

Under this policy, a student may redeem a course in a subsequent semester with the goal of improving the grade and the grade point average. The grade earned in the first attempt is excluded and replaced by the grade earned in the second attempt, regardless of whether the second grade is higher or lower than the first. Once grade redemption has been applied, the decision is final; the original grade will not be restored. Both grades will appear on the transcript, but credit will only be earned once. Earned credit hours will remain in the semester of the first course attempt. Quality points for the purposes of calculating the cumulative grade point average (and major GPA if appropriate) will be awarded based on the second course grade earned. A student has two semesters, not including summer, in which to redeem a course for grade redemption.

A student who wishes to exercise the grade redemption option must complete the Grade Redemption Form indicating the course(s) to be re-taken. Because redeeming a course may affect Financial Aid, Scholarship, Veterans Benefits, and/or probation status, a student covered by any of these areas must consult in advance with the appropriate staff and gain a signature on the Grade Redemption Form. The form with required signatures must be submitted to the Office of the Registrar by 5:00 pm EST on the last day of Drop/Add for the semester or part of the semester (e.g. Express II) in which the course re-take is scheduled.

A course retaken for grade redemption will only be counted once toward satisfying graduation requirements. Students should be aware that professional schools, graduate programs, and future employers may apply their own criteria that may not recognize the grade redemption option in evaluating credentials for prospective students or employees.

Courses taken prior to Fall 2019 may not be considered for grade redemption.
RESTRICTIONS

• There are several types of courses not eligible for grade redemption. These include First Year Experience seminars, catalog courses that may not be retaken if the content changes (e.g. special topics, variable topics), courses with an individual enrollment (e.g. independent study, tutorial, internship, bachelor’s essay), and courses graded Passed/Not Passed.
• This Grade Redemption Policy does not affect the Course Repetition Policy.

Example (not to be included in the policy verbiage):

• Student takes SOCY 101 in Fall 2019 and earns a D.
• Student applies for redemption to take SOCY 101 again in Spring 2020 and earns a B.
• The D from Fall 2019 will then be modified to have 3 Earned Hours; 3 Attempted Hours; and 0 Quality Hours/Points (i.e. grade removed).
• The B from Spring 2020 will have 0 Earned Hours; 3 Attempted Hours; and 3 Quality Hours/Points.
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 26 September 2017

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 26 September 2017 at 5 PM in Robert Scott Small 235. This meeting was rescheduled from September 12 due to Hurricane Irma.

1. **Call to order**, 5:04 PM

2. The [11 & 18 April 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes were approved as posted](#).

3. **Announcements and information**

   Speaker Liz Jurisich reminded those in attendance of the roll sheet and the rules of speaking, and announced that following the meeting, all are invited to a reception celebrating shared governance, sponsored by the Provost and the Speaker.

4. **Reports**

   a. **Speaker of the Faculty Liz Jurisich** made a brief report and is looking forward to a productive year. She mentioned that the Senate website is being updated.

   b. **Provost Brian McGee**

      Provost McGee thanked the campus community for the safe closure and safe return to campus due to Hurricane Irma.

      He spoke of campus safety in regards to organizations who intend to parade or gather near or on campus. He reminded everyone that groups have a right to voice their ideas, even though we may not agree with them.

      In the case of violent proponents of secession, the campus administration and public safety are committed to protecting the safety of the campus community.

      In a related topic, Provost McGee spoke of DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) students. Since 2008, as a South Carolina public university, the College has been required to determine that each student is lawfully present in the United States as a condition of receiving educational services. The Provost affirmed that the College will obey the law, but hope and advocate for DACA students. The legal review of this complex issue is ongoing.

      Provost McGee spoke of the revised academic calendar due to Hurricane Irma. He stated that they will keep looking for better ways to make up days, but right now, there is little option. The Provost spoke of the resources needed to make a learning environment by opening buildings and turning on power and asked that if make up days are scheduled, please try to use them, in order to avoid wasting resources.

      The Provost reiterated we will use Saturdays and Sundays equally, mindful of different religious views.
Provost McGee reminded the body of changes in personnel. Paul Patrick is now Executive Vice President of Business Affairs. They are seeking to recruit a Vice President to focus on Physical Plant issues. They are preparing to launch a national search for the Dean of the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs in the next month, and a decision will be made soon on the search for a Graduate Dean.

The Provost spoke of changing enrollment patterns in higher education as reported in the trade press. There is a declining traditional undergraduate population. Traditional-age students are often first generation students, middle class purchasing power has not kept pace with increasing college costs. Universities nation-wide are trying to find ways to improve their enrollment and recruitment strategies. At the College of Charleston, the Provost reports that the enrollment numbers are fractionally down for full and part time graduate students. They are more significantly down for the undergraduate population. He mentioned that our Senior class is our largest class of undergraduates. In order to meet the same number next year, we will have to create a new enrollment scheme. Changes in strategies for financial aid, recruitment, and retention are necessary. Declining numbers has consequences for budget and staffing across the institution. The Provost plans to work on these issues with the Budget Committee and with the Senate and any other Senate committees that are charged to work on these issues.

Provost McGee said the updated Faculty Administration Manual is published on the website.

Provost McGee refuted a statement made by United States Attorney General on universities' insufficient commitment to free speech. He offered the statement:

In consideration of our teaching and research commitments, I believe the College of Charleston will defend academic freedom, even when faculty and staff and students make what many would consider serious errors in judgment. On my part, if any member of our community maintains that other interests override free speech or the interests of academic freedom and public debate, I, for one, will call such ideas what they are: illiberal, unwise, and unworthy of a great university. Of course, in our work with students, we will vigorously safeguard their physical safety, but we will recognize that adults in democratic societies must expect to encounter hateful speech and cannot avoid ideas, however unpleasant, with which they do not agree. And that commitment to free speech is particularly useful at times when those ideas come from those in positions of authority, who need to be called out in their own way.

The Provost concluded by noting that the faculty dialog on the institution's identify will prove constructive.

The Provost accepted questions.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large SSM) asked if there were any plans to increase the number of storm makeup days on the calendar next year? Kunkle offered the idea to perhaps increase the reading days to three.
The Provost said there are many challenges to this, including demands on physical plant as well as on faculty and students. It will be studied.

**Jon Hakkila** (Guest) asked about the real possibilities of the flagging event threatened for October 28?

Provost McGee affirmed that the chances this will happen are real.

**Bill Manaris**, Senator (Computer Science) asked about the possibilities of taking Labor Day off in order to be consistent with other schools and to address the issues of faculty and staff who have children out of school on Labor Day.

The Provost explained that there is not a way to easily do this.

**Betsy Baker**, Senator (English) asked for more specific information about the enrollment figures.

The Provost gave unofficial, round numbers from memory as 10,000 as the final undergraduate number for Fall 2017. He said the normative goal is 10,500 students and being off by a few hundred students has real consequences.

**Irina Gigova**, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about the acceptance rate at the College.

The Provost replied that the acceptance rate for this fall's class will be lower than the previous class. He said he has not seen final figures. Several reforms were made to the Fall 2018 recruiting cycle. Between the implementation of an early decision cycle for early applications and some other modifications, their goal is to improve both quality of students they attract and retain and to improve the quantity of students. Jimmie Foster and Provost McGee will be happy to discuss with the Academic Standards Committee, if desired.

**Robert Westerfelhaus**, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about the ratio of instate and out of state students, how that is trending, and what are the economic issues related to that?

The Provost mentioned a progression of accepting out of state students in the high 700s, then increasing to the 1,000s as recently as the 2011-12 academic year. Even though this was helpful for quality indicators and the budget, financial aid packages were not robust enough to compete with financial aid packages from competitors.

He stated that the current numbers of out of state students are in the 800s. The recruitment position is strong, but students are being lost relatively late to competitors' aggressive admission discounting. The financial consequence is millions of dollars.

**Patricia Williams Lessane**, Senator (Library) asked about the number of African American students in the Freshman class of 2017.
Jimmie Foster and the Provost said that the number was about the same as last year, but they will report on that number more precisely in the October Provost report.

c. Richard Nunan, Chair of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual

Chair Nunan provided a report addressing what updates were made to the FAM, which included all the recommendations from the Bylaws and FAM Committee of 2016-17. These changes were approved by the 2016-17 Senate.

Other changes were made based on the recommendations of the Post Tenure Review (PTR) Committee and the Ad Hoc Committee on Hearing Procedures. Most changes suggested by the PTR committee were incorporated, with the exception of deferment requests, which the Bylaws Committee feels needs more discussion.

Changes suggested by the Ad Hoc Committee on Hearing Procedures were substantial, and few items were included in the updated FAM. The Bylaws Committee will bring some of the Ad Hoc Committee's suggestions back to the Senate for more discussion. Some of these issues are: the type of training suggested for members of both Hearing and Grievance committees; the empowerment of the Hearing Committee to rule on possible conflicts of interest; and the date constraints of the hearing process.

This information is provided in the report, appended at the end of these minutes.


Nunan accepted questions.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about the new standing committee, the Adjunct Oversight Committee and when it would be formed.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) and Chair of Nominations and Elections, said they will work on it this fall and issue a call for members.

**John Huddlestun**, Guest, related his work on an investigative panel this past year. In reading the operating procedures, Huddlestun noticed that there was a discrepancy in the operating procedure for filing a grievance are very different from what is in the FAM. This is especially different for students filing a grievance concerning a faculty member. Huddlestun suggested adding language to the FAM to bring it in line with what is stated in the operating procedures.
Provost McGee stated that Huddleston is referring to college policy 9.1.10 (http://policy.cofc.edu/policy.php). He said there is a layer of due process protection not expressly called for in the FAM, and the suggestion to include it is well-taken.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker** (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) took the discussion back to the makeup of committees. She reminded the body that the Adjunct Oversight Committee has only one elected member. The other five members are four regular faculty members named by Committees that have already been seated. One ex-officio member is designated by the Provost. There only needs to be an election of the adjunct faculty member.

**Richard Nunan** reminded members of the Senate to contact members of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual with any concerns.

5. **Old Business.** There was none.

6. **New Business**

   a. **Election of Speaker Pro Tempore.** The Speaker called for nominations. Irina Gigova was nominated. The nominations were closed. Without objection, Irina Gigova was elected as Speaker Pro Tempore.

   b. **Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large, HSS) introduced a Motion to Initiate Conversation about Institutional Identity and Vision.** That motion is amended at the end of the minutes.

Senator Gigova gave background on the motion. She said over the last few years, there have been discussions surrounding many possible changes, including a possible merger with MUSC, satellite campuses, growth of the student body, and the introduction of the possibility of PhD programs. All of these would change the institution as we know it today. Gigova explained the members of the ad hoc discussion group were former Speaker Todd McNerney, current Speaker Liz Jurisich, Lynne Ford, Alex Kasman, and Bob Mignone. She explained the purpose is to ask the Committee on Nominations and Elections to organize an ad hoc committee that represents the campus as a whole to work on this identity matter. She asked for the Senate's endorsement and envisioned the committee having a series of meetings including faculty and staff to discuss where we as an institution are currently and where we would like to be, and what we can do in the future. She said by the end of the academic year, a consensus could be reached about where we are as a body. She stated that decisions involving budget, curriculum, and initiatives should be informed by a common, shared vision.

Gigova accepted questions.

The Speaker called for a second to the motion. The motion was seconded.

**Mark Del Mastro**, Senator (Hispanic Studies) asked if there was any plan to include students? He stated that they have clear vision of the College’s identity, and that vision extends beyond Charleston.
Gigova said they had not discussed it, but that alumni would also need to be included. She is not opposed to including students.

**Speaker Jurisich** called for a vote. The motion carried.

[for information purposes, provided is a link to 2006 College Identity Discussion](#)

c. **Gayle Goudy, Co-Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee** introduced one curriculum change- [Urban Studies concentration in Sustainable Urbanism](#) (pdf).

The change was approved.

7. **Constituent’s general concerns**

**Robert Frash**, Senator (Hospitality and Tourism Management), brought up the active shooter at Virginia’s on King. He said he was teaching when the incident happened and student cell phones went off, and students, seeing the announcement, read it as an active shooter on campus. No one was sure what to do beyond run, hide, fight. He asked if there was a plan and mentioned that the students said there is much clearer procedure outlined at the high school level than the college level.

**Speaker Jurisich** affirmed that we might need a refresher on any protocol, and the comment is timely.

**Provost McGee** commented that emergency procedures are posted in each classroom, and to let Academic Affairs know if the poster is missing. He stated that in high schools, there is a simpler security protocol. For a complex campus, it is hard to devise one solution. He said that campus administration will review procedures for improvement. They are learning from what other institutions do. Should the Senate desire, he will ask for a more thorough briefing.

8. **Adjournment**, 6:06 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Jannette Finch,
Faculty Secretary

Appendix A: Report from Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual

Appendix B: Motion to Initiate Conversation about Institutional Identity and Vision