Faculty Senate, Tuesday, April 2, 2019, 5:00 PM, continued Tuesday, April 9, 5:00 PM
Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)
Items on which the Faculty Senate voted appear in red.

April 2, 2019

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:11.

2. The minutes from March 5, 2019 were approved.

3. Announcements and Information: Speaker Liz Jurisich reported that Provost McGee was out of town and would give his report on April 9 if the meeting continues (which it did). At the request of Susan Kattwinkel, Chair of the General Education Committee, the Speaker asked that six items be added to the list of course approvals submitted by that committee, without objection. She also noted that items from the Graduate Curriculum Committee would be presented in slightly different order than they were submitted for the agenda, with a few small corrections made by the committee.

4. Reports

   a. Speaker Jurisich thanked committee chairs and everyone on the Senate for their hard work this year, and she recognized Speaker-elect Simon Lewis. Speaker Jurisich attested to the need to preserve and strengthen shared governance. She also expressed her gratitude to President Osborne for being an involved and effective president.

   b. Interim President Steve Osborne thanked Speaker Jurisich and congratulated Speaker-elect Lewis. He highlighted many of the College’s recent accomplishments and provided a number of updates in his report:

      Budget and State Appropriations: The current state budget includes $26.7 million for the College. We lost close to 44% of our state appropriations during the recession; we’ve recovered some of those funds but we’re still not back to the $33 million we were receiving from the state prior to the recession. The College recently asked the House Ways and Means Subcommittee and Senate Education Committee to appropriate an additional $2.5 million in recurring funds and $8 million in non-recurring funds for capital projects. We have received about $5.25 million for major renovation projects already. In the House budget, we received $2.65 million in recurring funds from ways and means and $7 million for the Stern Center renovation. The budget that includes this funding has made it through the House but not the Senate at this point.

      The College will have to absorb much of the expense of a state-mandated 2% pay increase (for employees making less than $100,000/yr) that passed the SC House (pending action
by the Senate), which will have an impact on our budget. The House budget also limits how much institutions can raise in-state tuition (the calculation is close to 1.75%), which will create additional budgetary pressure for the College.

Facilities Projects: The Sottile Theater renovation ($5.7 million) has a target completion date of Spring 2020. We have received some generous private funding to help with the renovation. Other new projects include digital scholarship studios on first floor of Addlestone library and an international language lab in the J. C. Long building.

Enrollment: Last year’s freshman class larger by 300 than the fall 2017 entering class. We hope to repeat last year’s numbers in Fall 2019; currently the numbers for out-of-state are running close to last year but in-state numbers are “lagging a bit.” We are doing well, but we will probably see about 100 fewer entering first-year students than we did in 2018. We also saw a decrease in transfer students.

Academics: The College was named a Top Producer of Fulbright Students and Fulbright Scholars among masters-level colleges and universities. President Osborne thanked the Senate for passing the engineering degree proposals and the PhD in mathematics with computation.

250th Anniversary: the slogan is “History. Made. Here.” Seven committees are working on various aspects of the celebration. A kickoff event is scheduled for November 2019.

President Osborne concluded by thanking the faculty and expressing hope and confidence that the spirit of collaboration and unity between faculty and administration continues under President Hsu.

Speaker Jurisich asked for and received unanimous consent to allow President Osborne to make the following motion (moved up on the agenda from New Business).

Resolved: The Faculty Senate approves the list of May 2019 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.

The motion to approve the list of degree candidates passed by voice vote.

President Osborne received a standing ovation from the Senate and attendees.

c. Committee on General Education (Susan Kattwinkel, Chair): Discussions with I-CAN student group on diversity in the curriculum. Senator Kattwinkel’s report is attached and included in the appendix of these minutes. PDF

d. Professor Jen Wright, Carnegie Engaged application update: the ad hoc committee is continuing its work toward achieving the Carnegie Engaged classification for the College. It
will signal to students, faculty, staff, and funders that we take seriously our relationship with the community and that we incentivize civic engagement through course credit, financial support, and the promotion process.

e. **Professor Wright**, Taskforce for Student Wellbeing: The taskforce’s goal is to provide more ways for students to encounter information about physical and mental health facilities on campus. Their web page includes suggestions for faculty and staff about interacting with students on these issues.

f. **Professor Wright**, Faculty for Compassionate and Sustainable Living: This year, the focus of the annual series of workshops is food insecurity. The group wants to make sure students know about local food resources, such as Cougar Pantry.

5. New Business

a. **Committee on Nominations and Elections (RoxAnn Stalvey, Chair):**

1. Election of 2019-2020 Senate Committees: Professor Stalvey explained the election process: [Slide Pres.]

The Academic Planning Committee slate of nominees was approved by acclamation. The Budget Committee slate was approved by acclamation. The Committee on the By-laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual slate was approved by acclamation.

2. Call for nominations for the Committee on Nominations and Elections. There were no nominations from the floor.

b. **Curriculum Committee (Chad Galuska, Chair)**


PDFs: 302 314 318 325 333 336 341 342 346 352 362 399 493 494 499
Passed by voice vote.


PDFs: 103 190 190 syll 218 221 222 261 263 290 290 syll 340 340 syll 410 490 BA Passed by voice vote.

4. ASST: Minor change. Minor-ASST PDFs: Cover Letter ASST Minor Passed by voice vote.


6. CBIO/METR/PHYS: Program changes. Remove HONS 390 from elective lists.
    Computational Neuroscience Concentration, Required Courses-METR, Physics, Atmospheric Physics Concentration, B.S. PDFs: Program Changes Concentration Required Courses Passed by voice vote.

7. Chemistry, Teacher Education Program (Grades 9-12). Program change BA-EDCH PDF Passed by voice vote.


PDFs: 350 395 399 BA-ARTM BA-PHIL BA-POLI Minor-PHIL Minor-POLI PPLW Change Passed by voice vote.

9. EDEE: Course change: EDEE 425 PDF Passed by voice vote.

10. ENGL: New courses: ENGL 300: Special Topics: Pre-1800 Literature, Culture, and Rhetoric, ENGL 373: Reading for Writers. Program changes: English Core-ENGL, BA-ENGL-ENCW, BA-EDEN, BA-ENGL-EWRP. New concentration: BA-ENGL-ELFC
PDFs: 300 373 Core ENCW EDEN EWRP ELFC Passed by voice vote.


12. FINC: Course change: Change REAL 380 to FINC 380: Real Estate Investment Analysis. Program change: BS-FINC PDFs: 380 BS

Senator Richard Nunan asked for clarification on the purpose of the change. Senator Daniel Huerta-Sanchez (Finance) replied that the intention was to prevent finance students from taking all of their electives in real estate. Passed by voice vote.


Senator Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre and Dance) asked how many times a student would have failed a first-year-experience course before enrolling in FYEX 101. She was particularly concerned about students who enter in Spring. Professor Sarah Owens (First-Year Experience) replied that students who had not completed the FYE requirement by the summer after their first year would enroll in FYEX in the Fall of their second year. Passed by voice vote.


16. **HPCP: Minor change**: Minor-HPCP  PDF  **Passed by voice vote.**

17. **INFS: Minor change**: Minor-INFS  PDF  **Passed by voice vote.**

18. **INTB: Major change**: BS-INTB  PDF  **Passed by voice vote.**


   PDFs: Req Courses  BA-INAF  BA—INAS  BA—INEU  BA-INCL  BA-INLA  INST Minor  **Passed by voice vote.**

20. **LTIT: Course changes**: LTIT 250: Special Topics in Italian Literature in (English) Translation, LTIT 350: Special Topics in Italian Literature in (English) Translation

   PDFs: 250  350  **Passed by voice vote.**


   PDFs: 200  400  495  Minor  **Passed by voice vote.**

22. **MEIW: Minor change**: Minor-MEIW  PDF  **Passed by voice vote.**


   PDFs: 348  345  BS-MKTG  **Passed by voice vote.**


   PDFs: 225  241  240  **Passed by voice vote.**

25. **NSCI: Minor change**: Minor-NSCI  PDF  **Passed by voice vote.**

26. **PBHL: Program changes**: BS-PBHL  PDF  **Passed by voice vote.**


   PDFs: 261  267  268  266  BA-POLI  Req Courses  **Passed by voice vote.**

29. **REAL: Program changes:** BS-BADM-REAL. **Minor change:** REAL minor. PDFs: BS Minor Passed by voice vote.


PDFs: 321 322 323 324 325 326 334 335 336 390 391 394 490 340 341 330 CMGT QLRM MKAC LGST OMD PMGM Sustainability

[During the discussion of the Professional Studies proposals, the Speaker divided the question. Prior to the April 9 meeting, Prof. Galuska provided an outline School of Professional Studies proposals to facilitate further discussion. PDF The minutes below reflect the order in which the various Professional Studies proposals were considered. The discussion and voting on the Professional Studies proposals continues in the April 9 minutes.]

**Items for Senate Consideration and Vote: Professional Studies**

**Applied Marketing Communication Concentration BPS-APCP (modified concentration)**

I. **New courses (Required or Electives):** PRST 324: Fundamentals of Coaching


III. Course change: PRST 330: Professional Writing and Presentations.

Professor Rhonda Mack, Chair of Management and Marketing, reported that her department has concerns about the courses PRST 390, 391, and 394. They also object to the use of the word “marketing” in the title of the modified concentration. Many of the courses in the concentration, she said, are not marketing courses, and the program is not coherent. Meanwhile, she said, she is in charge of a marketing major that just turned five years old and she is worried that the name of the Professional Studies concentration will confuse students and affect the reputation of the marketing major. Her department had supplied a letter of support, which stated some concerns; but in light of the discussion at the Curriculum Committee meeting in which this proposal was considered, the department is withdrawing its support.

Addressing Professor Mack’s points, Dean Godfrey Gibbison (School of Professional Studies) said that there had been at least 20 communications about this proposal between his school and the School of Business. He read from their letter of support and said that he objected to their withdrawing that support at the last minute. He described the School of Professional Studies’ efforts to create more coherence within concentrations based on competency profiles. He also described the difficulty he has faced over the years in getting roster faculty to teach in the BPS program. He said that Marketing has not been a willing partner, and that it’s not fair to BPS students not to have the curriculum they need.

Professor Gia Quesada (Guest, Supply Chain and Information Management) defended Marketing’s decision to withdraw support, saying that when there are proposed changes that will affect the School of Business, they have an obligation to speak up. In this case, she objects to having two sets of courses from the same institution both labeled “marketing.”

Dean Gibbison responded that the BPS students would not be taking courses on the
main campus; they are not competing.

Professor Larry Krasnoff (Guest, Philosophy) asked if removing the word “Marketing” from the title of the concentration would resolve the issue. Dean Gibbison explained that the current title of the concentration is “Applied Communication,” so it would simply be a matter of not adding the word “Marketing.” He said he was willing to drop the word “Marketing” from the proposed changes, but he was not willing to drop any courses from the proposed curriculum.

Professor Mack expressed support for deleting “Marketing” from the title of the concentration. She reiterated that she has concerns about some of the courses. She also noted that faculty from her department had taught Principles of Marketing at the North Campus, and she said that they are willing to teach marketing courses online to support the BPS.

Senator Jolanda van Arnhem (Library) moved that the word “Marketing” be removed from the title of the Applied Marketing Communication concentration in the proposal. The motion was seconded.

Discussion of motion to remove “Marketing” from the title in the proposed changes to the concentration:

Professor Wayne Smith (Hospitality and Tourism Management) asked if a letter of support from Communication was required, since “Communication” is in the title. Professor Graeme Coetzer (Guest, Director of BPS) replied that they already had a letter of support from the Communication Department. He also described the process of arriving at the set of competencies needed for the concentration, one of which was marketing. He said that previously, BPS had proposed calling the concentration “Marketing and Communication,” but the School of Business had objected to the word “and.” He said that he did not mind removing “Marketing” from the name of the concentration, but he wanted to assure everyone present that the BPS had done a proper job of mapping the competencies for the concentration.

The motion to remove the word “Marketing” from the title in the proposed modifications to the concentration passed by voice vote. The modifications themselves were not put to a vote on April 2; discussion proceeded to other proposals within the Professional Studies package.

Legal Studies Concentration BPS-PRST-LGST (modified concentration)

i. New courses (Required): PRST 335: Managing Internal and External Stakeholder Relationships

iii. Course change: PRST 330: Professional Writing and Presentations.

Senator Richard Nunan (Philosophy) asked if the Legal Studies concentration is essentially the same as the paralegal program at Trident Technical College. He wondered about the fact that there are numerous management courses in a program called “Legal Studies.”

Dean Gibbison replied that, according to law firms, good writing, research, and management skills are what paralegals need. Therefore, the concentration tends to be heavier on the management, research, and writing side as opposed to law courses.

Professor Carrie Messal (Guest, Management) expressed support for this part of the proposal. Professor Smith noted that the BPS program does “so much with so little” in terms of resources. He asked whom the program would partner with, for legal studies, in terms of hiring and evaluation of adjunct faculty.

Dean Gibbison replied that sometimes they partner with departments and sometimes they don’t. In those latter cases, which would include Legal Studies, they hire a Concentration Coordinator, typically an adjunct with administrative experience. He said that in cases when adjuncts did not perform well, they tended to have been sent to BPS by departments on the main campus. He added that he and Prof. Coetzer evaluated adjunct faculty, and that students reliably let them know when an instructor fails to perform.

Senator Julia Eichelberger (HSS) reported that the Faculty Budget Committee had reviewed the proposal and found it sound from a budget standpoint. Expressing concern about adjunct reliance, she asked if Dean Gibbison would be pursuing line faculty or possibly working with departments to hire line faculty. He replied that he had made the request for Instructor lines, alluded to in previous Senate reports by the Provost.

Speaker Jurisich asked if there were any new courses associated with the proposed changes to Legal Studies, and Dean Gibbison and Professor Galuska confirmed that there were not. Senator Nunan asked for confirmation that these were changes to an existing concentration and not a new concentration, and Speaker Jurisich and Professor Galuska replied that these are changes to an existing concentration.

The modifications to the Legal Studies concentration passed by voice vote.

Construction Management Concentration BPS-CMGT (New concentration)


Senator Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism Management) said that, considering the level of “angst” over the recent approval of two engineering degrees, he would expect some discussion of adding a Construction Management concentration.

Professor Graeme Coetzer (Director, BPS) said that construction management was at the top of the list of programs desired by Trident Technical College and the Chambers of Commerce, and they specifically wanted a management-oriented (as opposed to an engineering-oriented) program. The program BPS has developed meets all the criteria set by the Council of Construction Educators.

In response to Senator Litvin, Senator Nunan said that this proposal from Professional Studies is different from the engineering proposal because the BPS has a different purpose from and serves a different population than the main campus. This proposal is more about serving the community, and it’s consistent with the established mission of the BPS, so he does not object to it as he did the engineering majors.

Speaker Jurisich divided the question for separate votes: one on new courses --- CMGT 340 and 341 --- and another on the concentration itself.

The motion to create CMGT 340 and CMGT 341 passed by voice vote. The motion to create the concentration in Construction Management passed by voice vote.

Organization Management and Development Concentration BPS-PRST-OMD (modified concentration)

Relationships and Teams in Organizations, PRST 326: Fundamentals of Organizational Change and Development


III. Course change: PRST 330: Professional Writing and Presentations.

Professor Simon Lewis (Guest, English) asked about staffing such a large number of new courses. Professor Coetzer replied that they have a staffing plan. If they could get full-time faculty to teach the courses, they would, but the courses will be taught by well-qualified people who have taught at the College before.

**Senator Eichelberger called the question, which was seconded and passed by voice vote.**

The modifications to the Organizational Management and Development concentration passed by voice vote.

Quality and Risk Management Concentration BPS-QLRM (New concentration)


III. Course change: PRST 330: Professional Writing and Presentations.

[There was no discussion of the Quality and Risk Management concentration, which includes no new courses.]

**The creation of the Quality and Risk Management concentration passed by voice vote.**
Project Management Minor PMGM (new minor)

I. New course (Required): PRST 321: Fundamentals of Strategic Planning


III. Course change: PRST 330: Professional Writing and Presentations.

Senator Litvin asked if anyone on the main campus may pursue this minor, and Dean Gibbison replied, yes. Senator Litvin asked Dean Gibbison if he has worked with Professor Messal on this proposal, because it sounds like something that might belong in Management, in the School of Business. Dean Gibbison replied that when they first discussed it, the Management and Marketing faculty didn’t think the program was something they could do, so BPS proceeded to create the curriculum.

Senator Nunan called for a quorum. There were not enough Senators present to constitute a quorum, so at 7:30 the meeting adjourned until April 9.
Continuation of Meeting, April 9, 2010

1. Call to Order: Speaker Jurisich called the meeting to order at 5:06 PM.

2. Announcements and Information: Speaker Jurisich reminded everyone of the Celebration of Faculty event to be held April 24 at 3:15 PM. Next year’s Senate meeting dates are posted on the Senate website.

3. Reports: Provost Brian McGee updated the Senate on several items he had addressed at previous meetings:

   The Executive Order on campus free speech was issued since the last Senate meeting; the Provost reiterated that he sees no threats to free speech or academic freedom on our campus and regards the order as unnecessary.

   Regarding the School of Professional Studies and the Honors College hiring instructors: there is no proposal on his desk at present for a line dedicated to one of these schools, but it does seem plausible that we could make visiting instructor appointments in consultation with departments that might be affected. As for multi-year appointments, the Provost said “we’re not there yet.”

   The Provost referred to a table (see presentation slides) with statistics on tenure and promotion cases and thanked everyone who devoted time and effort to the process. He said that each year he and the deans discuss how the process might be improved.

   Following up on South Carolina Senate Bill 35, which would add a three-hour course or the equivalent to fulfill the “founding documents” requirement, the Provost reported that there has not been much progress on passing the bill in the past month, but it seems fairly likely that it will pass. If it does pass, he said, it will certainly have consequences for the College.

   Work is continuing on integrating diversity education (from diversity.edu) into the FYE curriculum, and the Provost thanked everyone who has been part of that effort.

   Regarding the agenda, he expressed hope that the Senate would address the grade redemption issue, which “has some urgency.”

   Finally, Provost McGee reflected on the various roles he has had at the College, thanked the Speakers of the Faculty and others he had worked with, and expressed confidence in President-Elect Hsu and in the future of the institution. He closed by saying how pleased he was that his own children chose the College because it gave them the opportunity to work with our faculty. PDF
4. New Business (continued from 4/2/19):

a. Curriculum Committee (Chad Galuska, Chair):

Remaining Professional Studies proposals (#30 on the list of Curriculum Committee items):

1. Applied Marketing Communication Concentration BPS-APCP (modified concentration)


   III. Course change: PRST 330: Professional Writing and Presentations.

Professor Rhonda Mack (Guest; Chair, Management and Marketing) said that her department was withdrawing their objections from the previous meeting since the word “Marketing” was removed from the title of the concentration.

*The motion to create the new courses (PRST 390 and PRST 391) associated with the modification to the Applied Communication Concentration passed by voice vote.*

*The motion to modify the concentration by adding new and revised courses passed by voice vote.*

2. Project Management Minor PMGM (new minor)

   I. New course (Required): PRST 321: Fundamentals of Strategic Planning

III. Course change: PRST 330: Professional Writing and Presentations.

Professor Carrie Messal (Guest, Marketing and Management) affirmed that her department does teach a course in project management but does not teach a sequence like the one being proposed.

Senator Renée McCauley (Computer Science) asked if the minor would be available to all students or only to students in Professional Studies. Registrar Mary Bergstrom replied that all undergraduate minors are open to all students.

The proposed minor passed by voice vote.


New course (Required): PRST 490: Applying Sustainable Business Solutions

The proposed new certificate program and associated course passed by voice vote.

Two additional votes were taken on the Professional Studies package of proposals:

Changes to PRST 330 passed by voice vote.

New course PRST 394 passed by voice vote.


PDFs: 200 Minor Passed by voice vote.

32. SCIM: Course change: SCIM 333: Purchasing and Supply Chain Management. Major change: BS-SCIM. PDFs: 333 BS Passed by voice vote.

34. TEDU: Course change: TEDU 325 PDF Passed by voice vote.

35. THLR: Course changes: THTR 320: Creative Drama, THTR 421: Community and the Theatrical Classroom, THTR 422: Theatre for Youth Literature PDFs: 320 421 422 Passed by voice vote.

b. Committee on Graduate Education (Sandra Slater, Chair)

[Note: the proposals were lightly revised and re-ordered for clarity between the publication of the agenda and the Senate meeting. They are presented below as revised by the committee.]

1. Public Administration, M.P.A.


   B. PUBA 519: Course Creation https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1140/form PDF


   D. PUBA 701: Public Administration Capstone. Updating the course description to reflect current trends and the current capstone experience https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1620/form PDF

   E. The MPA program is proposing a degree credit hour decrease from 39 hours to 33 hours. https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1092/form PDF

   F. Eliminate one core course (PUBA 603) from the curriculum and reduce the number of required approved electives from 15 hours to 12 hours. PUBA 600: update course description. This curriculum change is in response to four interrelated data points and observations. https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:985/form PDF

Passed by voice vote.

2. Environmental and Sustainability Studies, M.S. and Public Administration, M.P.A. Concurrent Master's Degree Program - MS-ENSS-MPA-PUBA

   A. The MPA program is proposing a total credit hour change from 39 hours to 33 hours. As a result, PUBA 603 has been removed from the MPA core and replaced with an elective. Additional change to clarify that students are required to complete either
the Environmental Studies thesis or internship. The MPA internship is an elective option. [https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1092/form](https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1092/form) **PDF**

Passed by voice vote.

3. Notice of Termination of the MPA + URST combined bachelor’s/master’s

4. Environmental and Sustainability Studies
   A. EVSS 595: Special Topics in Environmental and Sustainability Studies. New course being proposed as an elective class [https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1555/form](https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1555/form) **PDF**
   

Passed by voice vote.

5. Community Planning, Policy, and Design
   
   B. CPAD 690: Restrict students to only 6 total credit hours for degree [https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1517/form](https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1517/form) PDF

Passed by voice vote.

6. MAT Performing Arts
   

Passed by voice vote.

e. Committee on General Education  (Susan Kattwinkel, Chair)

Approval of three courses for General Education—Humanities.


All three passed by voice vote.
On April 2, without objection, the following courses were added to the agenda for approval as General Education courses:

DCSP 350 for Humanities credit  

ENGL 300 for Humanities credit  

HONS 174 for Humanities credit  

HONS 217 for Mathematics credit  

MUSC 225 for Humanities credit  

RUST 200 for Humanities credit  

f. Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid  (Ricard Viñas de Puig, Chair):

1. Proposal to rescind the current grade redemption policy  PDF

   Professor Viñas de Puig explained the rationale for rescinding the policy, using this presentation.

   Senator Litvin asked if it was dangerous to rescind this policy before voting on a replacement.

   Lynne Ford (Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) provided background. A task force of faculty and staff attempted to reconcile the grade redemption policy with existing policies. In the process, they discovered that our course repetition policy is indecipherable, so they decided to tackle the course repetition policy first.

   Senator Kattwinkel asked if the new course repetition policy will preclude the old one. Professor Ford replied “not quite,” pointing out that the repeat-exclude provision had been excluded in the proposal.

   Senator Nunan asked how the repeat would count. Registrar Bergstrom answered: a student can earn credit once for a course unless otherwise specified. “Repeat-include” means that when a student repeats a course, the new grade is
averaged into the student's GPA but the student does not receive additional credit hours.

Speaker Jurisich reminded the Senate that the motion being discussed was the motion to rescind the current grade redemption policy.

Provost McGee explained that the course repetition policy is complex; we tried to attach a redemption policy to it, but it did not work to students’ benefit. He encouraged the Senate to pass the motion to rescind the redemption policy first.

Tripp Keeffe, SGA President, said that members of SGA have met with AVP Ford and Provost McGee; the SGA passed a resolution in favor of rescinding the 2017 grade redemption policy and revising the course repetition policy.

The motion to rescind the grade redemption policy passed by voice vote.

2. Proposal to revise the current course repetition policy  PDF

Professor Viñas de Puig explained the rationale for the revision (see attached presentation above). Senator Idee Winfield asked why the policy says “in which a D- or higher grade has been earned OR for which credit has been awarded.” Professor Ford replied that the second condition applies to transfer credits or any situation where the student received a “P” instead of a grade. She also clarified that when a student fails a course, they may retake it, but that is not the same repeating it.

Senator Joe Carson (SSM) said that zero-credit courses hurt poor students, not wealthy students. Mr. Keeffe said that was a big issue for students, then added that students who are not well off, who are on financial aid, still favor this change.

Professor Jon Hakkila (Graduate School, Physics and Astronomy) asked if a student, toward the end of their academic career, took only repeated courses, would they still pay tuition? Prof. Ford said yes, they would, because the courses they’re taking are not designed as zero-credit courses.

Professor Galuska (Psychology) asked, what’s to stop a student from repeating a course they got an A in, just to get another A? Prof. Ford replied that department chair can stop the student, since the policy requires departmental approval for a student to repeat a course.

Senator Nunan said that the language of the policy doesn’t make clear how the grades will be averaged into the GPA.
Senator Litvin cited overall GPAs for students at Clemson (3.4), USC-Columbia (3.2) and C of C (2.9) and said that we need to do something that will help our students compete with students from those and other schools. He asked why we are getting rid of the 12-hour limitation. Prof. Ford and Registrar Bergstrom replied that the 12-hour limitation had never been enforced and is in fact unenforceable.

Senator Litvin expressed concern about inconsistencies among departments in permitting repeats and the possibility of appealing a chair’s decision. In response, Prof. Ford, Prof. Dan Greenberg (Chair of Psychology), and Registrar Bergstrom pointed out that students may appeal any department-level decision to the dean of their school, and then the provost; and that this policy adds an important advising component to students’ decisions regarding repeats.

Senator Kattwinkel argued that the language does not make it clear that some courses are repeatable for credit. That information can be found in catalog descriptions of courses, but students might not understand that when they see this policy; they might panic when they read that courses are not repeatable. Registrar Bergstrom and SGA Pres. Keeffe said that the current repeat policy contains similar language and that students look to course descriptions in the catalog to see if courses are repeatable.

In response to a comment by Professor Hakkila concerning GPA calculation, Professor Ford and Registrar Bergstrom asserted that this policy does not change the way we calculate GPA. Registrar Bergstrom added that all repeated courses would now be treated as “repeat-include,” which we have been calculating into GPAs all along. The policy does away with “repeat-exclude.”

Professor Jen Wright asked whether there could be any reason other than improving one’s GPA that would lead to repeating a course. If not, she suggested, we might consider adding “for Grade Redemption” to the name of the policy, for clarity. Prof. Ford responded that students might also repeat courses to improve their skills or refresh their memories. Professor Brooke Van Horn (Chemistry) said that her department had discussed this policy and had decided they approve of students repeating courses in order to solidify skills, and she suggested that other departments have that conversation.

**The proposal to revise the course repetition policy passed by voice vote.**

3. Proposal to revise the current minor residency requirements [PDF]

Provost McGee thanked the committee and endorsed the proposal.
4. Proposal to modify Dance 100-level course and Dance degree requirements

Senator Tom Carroll (EHHP, PEAC Coordinator) objected to the implication, in the proposal memo, that physical activity courses are strictly movement and participation courses. They also include cognitive and writing components. Professor Gretchen McClain (Dance) apologized and said that they did not mean to suggest that physical activity courses were less rigorous or that grades were based solely on movement and participation.

The proposal to modify Dance 100-level course and Dance degree requirements passed by voice vote.

g. Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual  (Mike Lee, Chair):

1. Description of Faculty Grievance Committee  PDF

Professor Lee explained that the proposal adds mediation training for members of the Faculty Grievance Committee. Provost McGee said that he supports the motion but cannot bind future provosts to make the financial commitment for the training. Senator Nunan, who is a member of the By-Laws/FAM Committee, said that he sees this provision as setting down a marker that we hope future provosts will comply with.

The motion passed by voice vote.

2. Senate membership change and Senate rules clarification  PDF

The first motion – to add a student representing the C of C Graduate Student Association as a non-voting ex-officio member of the Faculty Senate – passed by voice vote.

Professor Lee explained the second motion, which adds language to the Standing Rules of the Senate: “While ex-officio members of the faculty have full floor privileges at faculty meetings, including the right to make motions, ex-officio members of the Faculty Senate do not have motion privileges at Faculty Senate meetings.”

Senator Slater and Senator Mignone sought clarity regarding the motion, especially regarding the meaning of “motion privileges” and the distinction between membership in the faculty and membership in the Faculty Senate. Prof. Lee, Speaker Jurisich, and Parliamentarian George Pothering explained that
“motion privileges” equates with the right to make motions and that the language is meant to distinguish between full faculty meetings (which are called on rare occasions) and Faculty Senate meetings.

In an effort to clarify the meaning of the rules change, Senator Slater moved to revise the language in the original motion: “Ex-officio members of the faculty have full floor privileges at faculty meetings, including the right to make motions. However, ex-officio members of the Faculty Senate do not have motion privileges at Faculty Senate meetings.”

The motion to amend the proposal passed by voice vote.

The main motion, amended, passed by voice vote.

6. Constituents’ General Concerns

Professor Simon Lewis, Speaker-elect, shared a preliminary list of faculty priorities for incoming President Hsu, and added that he will be available to chat with faculty about their priorities at the Faculty House during these times:

Wednesday, April 24 -- 8:30am - noon
Thursday, April 25 -- noon - 3pm
Friday, April 26 -- 8:30am - 10:00am
Monday, April 29 -- 8:30am - 11:00am
Tuesday, April 30 -- 8:30am - 10:30am
Wednesday, May 1 -- 8:30am - noon
Thursday, May 2 -- 8:30am - noon.

He can also be reached at 3-1920 or at random times in his faculty office at 26 Glebe St., Rm. 102.

Senator Nunan questioned the new procedure for registering auditors who are senior citizens. In the past, they could register during the drop-add period, after “fee-paying customers” had had their opportunity to claim seats. Now senior-citizen auditors can register along with students who have zero credit hours (full-time, first-year students). He was surprised that the SC legislature would be happy with an arrangement that potentially disadvantages “paying customers.”

Registrar Mary Bergstrom explained that by state law, South Carolina residents 60 years or older may take courses at public universities for free. We get a lot of participants – currently close to 350. Managing their registration during drop-add helped with the workflow, but it caused these students to miss the first week of classes, and we are required to treat auditors the same as other students. We have to comply with state
law. She added that instructors may limit the number of auditors who can take any given course.

Senator Carroll (EHHP) asked if auditors count when determining how faculty are compensated for summer courses. Registrar Bergstrom replied that they count the same as other students.

Senator Nunan suggested that we allow senior-citizen auditors to sit in on classes for the first week but continue to register them during drop-add. Registrar Bergstrom responded that no one is allowed to have unregistered students in their classroom --- legally, they must be registered to be in the room.

7. The meeting adjourned at 7:20 PM.

Appendices:

General Education Committee I-CAN report

Nominations and Elections Committee Presentation

School of Professional Studies Proposals

Provost’s Report

Committee on Academic Standards Proposals and Presentation

Committee on By-Laws and the FAM Proposals

Speaker-elect’s List of Priorities
Support of Diversity Initiatives at the College of Charleston  
General Education Committee 2018-19  
Presented to the Faculty Senate April 2, 2019  
Committee: Matthew Cressler, Susan Divine, Allison Jones, Alex Kasman, Susan Kattwinkel (chair), Chris Mothorpe, Emily Skinner, Ryan Thompson (SGA representative), Lynne Ford (ex-officio), Karen Smail (ex-officio)

The I-CAN – Intersectional Cougar Action Network met with the General Education committee on March 1st to present and discuss ideas for incorporating diversity and equity initiatives into the curriculum. Many students are concerned that increased co-curricular diversity initiatives are not sufficient to combat instances of intolerance on campus. The incident that was caught on camera just a week after our meeting is further evidence that the College needs to increase its efforts.

The students suggested a diversity requirement as part of General Education. Ultimately they would like to see a core curriculum course on the history of Charleston, perhaps taught within each major as a way of connecting with students’ interests. Recognizing the logistical difficulties of adding more credits to degree requirements, they suggested that trial courses might be developed in each school and in FYE and the Honors College.

The General Education committee was impressed with the amount of thought and research put into the proposal and agree with the students that the College needs to find more varied ways to infuse the values of diversity and equity into all aspects of campus life. The committee was not unanimous in the belief that such efforts necessarily belong in the general education curriculum, but we were unanimous in the desire to continue research and discussion about the possibility. We will recommend that next year’s committee actively pursue the conversation, and we call on all relevant Senate committees next year to consider what curricular and co-curricular efforts can be initiated by the faculty in pursuit of those goals expressed by I-CAN.
Election of Standing Senate Committees 2019-20

Susan Farrell, Merissa Ferrara, Renée McCauley, Bob Mignone, Jared Seay, Julie Swanson, and RoxAnn Stalvey (chair)
Election Process

For each of the 3 Standing Senate Committees: Academic Planning, Budget, By-Laws/FAM

1. The nominees will be presented.

2. A call for additional nominations will be made.

3. A. If nominations are received:
   a. Voting will happen by paper ballot.
   b. Votes will be counted outside.
   c. I will return later in the meeting with the results.

   B. If no further nominations are received:
      a. Election is by acclamation.
## Academic Planning Nominees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blitt, Mary Ann</td>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowers, Terrence</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg, Daniel</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, David</td>
<td>Management and Marketing</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Linda *</td>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLaine, Gretchen</td>
<td>Theater and Dance</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Amy</td>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates Senator for 2019-20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Scott</td>
<td>Geology &amp; Environmental Geosciences</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNerney, Todd</td>
<td>Theater and Dance</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noland, Thomas</td>
<td>Accounting and Legal Studies</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitts, Robert</td>
<td>Management and Marketing</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravalico, Lauren *</td>
<td>French, Francophone, &amp; Italian Studies</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate, Agnes</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veal, William</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates Senator for 2019-20
Committee on By-Laws & the Faculty/Administration Manual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gibas, Piotr</td>
<td>Asian Studies</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Michael</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Paul *</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates Senator for 2019-20
Thanks!
Provost’s Report

Faculty Senate
April 9, 2019
Major Topics

- Free Speech and Academic Freedom
- Visiting Faculty and Non-Line Schools
- Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review
- Founding Documents Requirement
- Diversity Education at the College
## Tenure, Promotion, Third-Year Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th></th>
<th>2017-2018</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Successful cases</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Successful cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure review, including promotion to Associate Professor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review for promotion to Professor or Librarian IV</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review for Senior Instructor promotion or renewal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-year review</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-tenure review, counting only candidates seeking superior rating</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL including third-year and superior post-tenure review cases</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments

- Grade Redemption and Grade Repetition
- Celebration of Faculty, April 24 at 4:00 p.m., Stern Center Ballroom
Items for Senate Consideration and Vote
Professional Studies

1. Construction Management Concentration BPS-CMGT (New concentration)

2. Quality and Risk Management Concentration BPS-QLRM (New concentration)
   iii) Course change: PRST 330: Professional Writing and Presentations.

3. Applied Communication Concentration BPS-APCP (modified concentration)
   iii) Course change: PRST 330: Professional Writing and Presentations.
4. Legal Studies Concentration BPS-PRST-LGST (modified concentration)
   i) New courses (Required): PRST 335: Managing Internal and External Stakeholder Relationships
   iii) Course change: PRST 330: Professional Writing and Presentations.

5. Organization Management and Development Concentration BPS-PRST-OMD (modified concentration)
   iii) Course change: PRST 330: Professional Writing and Presentations.

6. Project Management Minor PMGM (new minor)
   i) New course (Required): PRST 321: Fundamentals of Strategic Planning
   iii) Course change: PRST 330: Professional Writing and Presentations.

   i) New course (Required): PRST 490: Applying Sustainable Business Solutions
INTRODUCTION

On October 10, 2017, the Committee on Academic Standards presented the Faculty Senate with a motion to adopt a Grade Redemption Policy. The policy reflects the input of the Student Government Association (SGA), Academic Affairs, and the Registrar’s office, in addition to Academic Standards. In the debate that evening, questions by senators identified several pertinent issues including the inherent conflict between the existing Course Repetition policy and the proposed Grade Redemption Policy; the potential risk to students receiving Financial Aid, state scholarship, and veteran’s benefits; the complexity of implementing the policy (Registrar asked for 6-8 months to test and develop business process; Financial Aid had reviewed by not yet worked through the policy); and interest from students in having a grade forgiveness policy with grades removed from the transcript. The summative statement in the minutes reads: “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.” A senator called the question, a vote was taken, and a majority voted in favor of the motion.

Following the affirmative vote, the Office of the Registrar immediately began work on implementation. Once they had a solution, they called together a group to provide feedback. The group included representation from AAPC, CAPP, Financial Aid and VA Benefits, Athletics, AEX, and the Provost’s Office.

Under the policy, in order to redeem a grade, a student must repeat the course. The student has two semesters after the first grade is posted, not including summer, in which to get permission to repeat the course and complete the second attempt. The implementation business process involved creating three new grade types (K, H,Y), with three new grade scales and corresponding transcript notations, to accommodate the temporal aspect of the policy. According to the policy, a student earns credit for the course once. If the student passes the course, the credit remains with the first attempt to comply with Financial Aid rules. A student who wishes to redeem a poor grade, encounters the following:

- **First attempt:** Earned hours (if any) count and grade/GPA is neutralized (new K% grading scale).
- **Second attempt (when the first was failed):** Earned hours count, grade/GPA counts (new H% grading scale).
- **Second attempt (when the first was passed):** Earned hours removed, grade/GPA counts (new Y% grading scale)

Under the policy, the final grade for the course must post before a student can petition for permission to redeem the grade by re-taking (F) or repeating (D- through C-). If approved, the
student must register for the second attempt in the course (first seeking permission if the second attempt is a repeat under the Course Repetition Policy). Between fall/spring and spring/summer time will be very limited in which to gain the approvals and register for a seat, particularly in high demand courses.

This motion to rescind the Grade Redemption Policy will be followed by a motion to approve a revised Course Repetition Policy. A motion to approve a GPA Exclusion Policy will follow.

MOTION:

Strike in its entirety and rescind approval of the Grade Redemption Policy as passed by the Senate on October 10, 2017.

RATIONALE:
The Grade Redemption Policy is overly complex and not student-friendly.

First, the Grade Redemption Policy must co-exist with the Course Repetition Policy (see Course Repetition Policy, 3 catalog pages attached). The existing Course Repetition policy is long and confusing. It begins with a limit on repeated coursework that is unenforceable, followed by types of courses excluded from the policy, followed by two types of transcript coding ("repeat – include" and some are coded as "repeat – exclude"), followed by General Repeat Rules, followed by "Some additional limitations include, but are not limited to:" and 31 bullets of course/program/degree specific limitations. In deciding whether to exercise Grade Redemption, a student must first determine the circumstances under which the course could or could not be repeated (assuming the student had passed the course but performed poorly). Next, the student must consider the implications for state scholarships and financial aid, NCAA eligibility, and/or VA benefits. If any of these conditions apply, the student needs signatures indicating that she/he understands the consequences and potential risk. All of this must be accomplished prior to the last day of drop/add in the semester or part of term in which the course is going to be repeated for redemption. This will require some very intensive, time-sensitive, and accurate faculty advising.

Second, grade redemption (petition for redemption and repeat the course) differs from grade forgiveness (exclude a grade from the GPA calculation without repeating a course). In all cases, the grade from the first attempt remains on the transcript. The SGA wanted a grade forgiveness policy. The Senate passed a grade redemption policy meaning that a student, regardless of circumstances, must re-take (in the case of an F) or repeat (in the case of a passing grade) a course in order to have the first grade neutralized in GPA calculations. This approach does not serve all students equally well. Consider the following two common scenarios: Two students enroll in BIOL 111 intent on medical school and each earns a D-. Student A is still intent on medical school and is committed to mastering the material in BIOL 111 and moving forward in the BIOL major. Student B realizes that medical school and Biology were someone else’s dream,
and changes their path to Art History. Under the current Grade Redemption Policy, both students must repeat BIOL 111 within two semesters in order to redeem the D- grade. Not a problem for student A, but a big problem for student B who no longer needs BIOL 111 and is unlikely to perform better on the second attempt.

Third, requiring a student to repeat a course to redeem a grade means that the student is carrying a full-time course load (at least 12 credits) with one extra zero-credit course (the repeat redemption course) in which they have already performed poorly and may no longer need to meet major/minor/or degree requirements.

For these reasons, Senate approval of the Grade Redemption Policy should be rescinded at this time.
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):

1. Student takes SOCY 101 in Fall 2019 and earns a D.
2. Student applies for redemption to take SOCY 101 again in Spring 2020 and earns a B.
3. The D from Fall 2019 will then be modified to have 3 Earned Hours; 3 At tempted Hours; and 0 Quality Hours/Points (i.e., grade removed).
4. The B from Spring 2020 will have 0 Earned Hours; 3 Attempted Hours; and 3 Quality Hours/Points.
Motion to Approve new Course Repetition Policy

INTRODUCTION

The current Course Repetition Policy published in the Undergraduate Catalog is likely the product of addition over time. In attempting to develop an implementation strategy for Grade Redemption (as passed) or develop alternative means to meet the goals of Grade Redemption, the Course Repetition Policy was a consistent barrier. Therefore, the Provost asked the Grade Redemption Working Group to shift its attention to the Course Repetition Policy. The motion before you is to strike and replace the existing Course Repetition Policy with a simpler approach that more directly benefits all students.

MOTION

Strike in its entirety the current Course Repetition policy (attached).

Replace the current policy with the following:

Undergraduate Course Repetition Policy: “Repeating the Same or Equivalent Courses”

Students may repeat a course in which a D- or higher grade has been earned or for which credit has been awarded. Credit is awarded only once; a repeat of the same or an equivalent course does not earn additional credit. Consult catalog course descriptions for equivalent course information. All grades earned in repeated courses will be included in GPA calculations.

In deciding whether to repeat a course, students should consult with an academic advisor and also consider the potential implications for Financial Aid Satisfactory Academic Progress and NCAA eligibility if applicable.

Permission to enroll in a course being repeated is granted at the discretion of the department.

RATIONALE

The current Course Repetition policy is long, overly complex, and confusing. It begins with a limit on repeated coursework that is unenforceable, “It is the policy of the College of Charleston that students may repeat up to 12 credit hours of passed coursework excluding...”. This statement is followed by types of courses excluded from the policy, followed by two types of transcript coding (“repeat – include” and some are coded as “repeat – exclude”), followed by General Repeat Rules, followed by “Some additional limitations include, but are not limited to:...” and 31 bullets of course/program/degree specific limitations. Several of the courses listed in the “additional limitations” are no longer in the catalog (e.g. PEHD 117, MATH 102) while others are particular course equivalencies covered earlier in the policy (e.g. PHIL 240, JWST 240). There are pending curriculum proposals for other restrictions (e.g. DANC/PEAC, BIOL 101/111, 102/112).

The new Course Repetition Policy would take effect with the 2020-2021 Catalog. This allows time for departments to review existing limits imposed at the course, program, and degree levels and remove any that may no longer be necessary.

The new Course Repetition Policy eliminates “Repeat-Exclude” as a general category meaning that each time a student repeats the same or equivalent courses, all grades are included in the GPA calculation. This provides one way for students to increase their College of Charleston GPA.
2018-2019 Undergraduate Catalog

Course Repetition Policy

It is the policy of the College of Charleston that students may repeat up to 12 credit hours of passed coursework excluding:

- Prerequisite courses for passed courses (Repeat-Exclude)
- Courses which have catalog restrictions due to duplication of subject material (Repeat-Exclude)

There are two types of transcript coding for repeated courses:

- Repeat-Include—Grade will be calculated into total GPA (not averaged with prior grade), but student will not receive earned hours for this course. Courses are graded RA-RF.

- Repeat-Exclude—Grade will not be calculated into GPA nor will earned hours, quality hours, or quality points be awarded. Courses are graded XA-XF.

A passed course may be repeated only once for a grade. A course withdrawal ("W") is not a grade. A subsequent registration will result in a drop. Repetition of passed courses will not increase earned hours, but students will receive quality hours and quality points in order to calculate the grade of the repeated course into the overall GPA. All grades earned will be taken into consideration when the GPA is calculated and all grades earned appear on the student’s transcript. Repeated course grade points will not be used to calculate honors at graduation, and do not replace previously earned grades.

Scholarship students (academic and athletic), financial-aid students, and veterans may repeat courses under this policy; however, they should check with the Departments of Financial Aid or Athletics to see how this will affect their eligibility.

Registration through MyCharleston for repeated duplicate courses can only occur if the student completes and submits a Repeat Course Override Request Form to the Office of the Registrar (found on the Registrar’s Office website under Forms). The Registrar’s Office will process the override and register the student for the course (pending course availability).

General Repeat Rules

- Upper Level Coursework: A student in some cases may not take lower level coursework for credit after completing similar upper level coursework. Students must check the individual course descriptions and/or departments for restrictions.
- Cross-Listed Courses: A student may not take cross-listed courses and receive credit for both courses.
- Special Topics Courses: A student in some cases may have limitations on the credits repeatable in specific special topics courses. See individual department listings and course descriptions for further information.
- Honors and Regular Courses: A student may not take both an Honors course and the regular course equivalent and receive credit for both.
- Please consult your personal degree audit, the specific course descriptions in this catalog, and your advisor for additional information.

Some additional limitations include, but are not limited to:

Physical Education/Theatre activities courses (e.g., yoga, dance, etc.)

- Courses in basic physical education activity theory (100 level) may be taken for elective credit by any student, but no more than eight credit hours total (including PEAC/PEHD/DANC/THTR cross-listed dance/activity courses) may be applied toward a degree. More than eight credit hours will be coded as a repeat-exclude (RF) (up to the maximum allowable hours) whether or not the student has previously taken that exact course.
- Students may not receive credit for PEAC 106 and PEAC 114. Students may not receive credit for PEAC 114 and PEAC 117.

Dance/Theatre courses
• Students who have completed DANC 146 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 145.
• Students who have completed DANC 235 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 135.
• Students who have completed DANC 437 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 337, DANC 237, DANC 138, or DANC 137.
• Students who have completed DANC 337 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 237, DANC 138, or DANC 137.
• Students who have completed DANC 237 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 138, or DANC 137.
• Students who have completed DANC 138 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 137.
• Students who have completed DANC 485 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 385, DANC 285, DANC 186, or DANC 185.
• Students who have completed DANC 385 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 285, DANC 186, or DANC 185.
• Students who have completed DANC 285 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 186 or DANC 185.
• Students who have completed DANC 186 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 185.
• In addition to the above limitations, only fourteen hours from technique classes at the 300 or below level are counted towards graduation. These courses are:

Languages
• Having completed any 101 or 102 language course (i.e., SPAN, GRMN, or LATN), students may not take 150 for credit; conversely, students who complete 150 may not receive credit for 101 or 102. The same rule applies for the 201/202/250 sequence.
• Having completed SPAN 313 or SPAN 314, students may not take SPAN 350 for credit; conversely, students who complete SPAN 350 may not receive credit for either SPAN 313 or SPAN 314.
• For foreign language courses numbered 101-202 and SPAN 101-SPAN 275: Students who have completed a course within this range may not subsequently receive credit for a numerically lower numbered course within the same language. For example, a student who has successfully completed FREN 202 may not take FREN 101, but he or she will not earn credit for the course nor will the grade be included in the GPA. The FREN 101 course will be coded as a repeat exclude (no credit/quality points).
• For foreign language courses numbered above 202 or above SPAN 275: Students who have completed a foreign language course above 102 or SPAN 275 may not subsequently receive credit for a course in the same language within the range of 101-202 or SPAN 101-SPAN 275. For example, a student who has credit for an upper-level course elects to take one of these lower-level courses in the same language, the student will not earn credit for the course nor will the grade be included in the GPA. The lower-level course will be coded as a repeat exclude (no credit/quality points).

Mathematics
• Students who have completed MATH 105, MATH 111, or MATH 120 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for MATH 101 or 102.
• Students who have completed MATH 120 may not subsequently receive credit for MATH 105 or MATH 111.

Business, Economics, Business Law, Accounting, International Business
• Students who have completed ECON 200 or ECON 201 may not subsequently receive credit for ECON 101.
• Students with majors outside of the School of Business may receive a maximum of 30 business school credit hours.
• Students who have completed, or are currently enrolled in, BLAW 205 or BLAW 306 may not subsequently receive credit for BLAW 106.
• Business school majors who have completed, or are concurrently enrolled in, a 300- or 400-level business, international business, economics, or accounting course may not receive credit for MGMT 105.

Art, History, and Music
• Only six credit hours from ARTH 200 and/or ARTH 300 (Selected Topics) may be applied towards the 30 credit hours for the art, history, major (majors only).
• Students may only receive up to 12 credit hours for MUSC 399.
• No more than 8 credit hours from any combination of ensembles or concert choir may be earned and applied towards graduation requirements.

Science and Psychology
• Students who have completed CHEM 111 or CHEM 112 will not subsequently receive credit for CHEM 101.
• Students may not receive credit for both BIOL 101 and BIOL 111, or for both BIOL 102 and BIOL 112, or for both BIOL 111 and BIOL 112 and Honors Biology.
• No more than 6 credit hours of Psychology Independent Study (PSYC 493) or Special Topics II (PSYC 410) may be applied toward the major requirements.

Philosophy
• PHIL 240 may not be taken for credit if credit has been received for JWST 240.
• PHIL 255 may not be taken for credit if credit has been received for RELS 255.

NOTE: This is not a complete list of specific situations resulting in repeated or duplicate coursework. Please consult your personal degree audit, the specific course information in this catalog, and your advisor for additional information.
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 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.
- At least nine credit hours in the minor must be completed at the 200-level or above.
- 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.

PROPOSED REVISION 1/24/19

Rationale:

The changes to the current policy on the residency requirement for minors has three specific targets for improvement: (1) to add clarity to the policy by separating the credits required for residency from upper level credits designed to ensure the integrity of the minor; (2) to simplify the policy by removing the language about a “unique experience,” and therefore to reduce the need for petitions; (3) to allow students completing upper level courses through the College’s study abroad opportunities more access and efficient tracking to complete a minor of their choice.
February 21, 2018

To: Faculty Curriculum Committee

From: Dr. Gretchen McLaine, Dance Program Director

Re: Credit Restrictions

This memo is a formal request to have two proposals considered:

- DANC 100-level classes should no longer be considered as Physical Activity Courses.
- Remove the 14-credit hour restriction from dance technique classes at the 300-level and below.

DANC 100-level classes removed from the Physical Education Activity restriction of 8 credit hours:

Since our meeting in January 2017 with Lynn Cherry, Mary Bergstrom, Jerry Mackeldon, Julie Dahl, and Terri Selbe, the dance faculty have continued to research this issue and tried to formulate the best plan to move forward. Dance faculty member Kristin Alexander talked with Todd McNerney, both as the former Theatre and Dance Chair and current member of the faculty senate, read through archived faculty senate minutes, and began to look into the number of minors versus the number of exceptions made over the past two years. After consulting the faculty and considering all options, we want to move forward with what was discussed in January 2017: removing the DANC 100 level courses from Physical Education Activity designation. Lynn Cherry suggested that while this may not technically be a curricular issue, we should present this to the Faculty Curriculum Committee to take forward to the Faculty Senate.

The 100-level classes were developed before the dance minor or major was instated. Since then the standards, the rigor, and the assessments have changed. When first offered, classes were assessed on attendance and participation in physical activity, and these courses were appropriately listed as Physical Education Activities. Significant curricular changes over the past years have included historical and/or theoretical components, written work, inclusion of aesthetic quality in assessment, creative work, and an increased rigor to the material taught. Students are not only graded on participation, faculty also assess students’ ability to communicate about dance and the ability to perform movement phrases with technical accuracy and an aesthetic quality.

Currently the course catalog reads as follows:

Courses in basic physical education activity theory (100 level) may be taken for elective credit by any student, but no more than eight credit hours total (including PEAC/PEHD/THTR cross-listed dance/activity courses) may be applied toward a degree. More than eight credit hours will be coded as a repeat exclude (RE) (up to the maximum allowable hours) whether or not the student has previously taken that exact course.

Currently, there are four DANC 100 level technique courses required for completion of a dance minor: DANC 135, 137, 185, and 138 or 186. This means that as a dance minor a student meets the Physical Activity limit while completing the minor. The issue that many of our minors have encountered is having taken a PEAC/PEHD or other DANC 100-level class before either starting or completing the minor.
requirements. Many of these students chose to pursue the dance minor because another dance class led them to it.

Irrespective of how PEAC or PEHD courses are structured, every 100-level DANC course has more than just a physical movement component. Students in these classes research dance history, discuss current trends, are tested on terminology, and attend/critique performances. Having reviewed syllabi observing faculty in the classroom, and teaching some of these courses myself, I can assure you that the students enrolled in the classes are challenged physically and aesthetically as they learn new movement vocabulary, and also finish the course with a greater understanding of the dance theory and technique.

We currently have a student who took a semester of Beginning Tap, a class that led her to other dance classes and ultimately the decision to pursue the minor. She is being asked to complete the dance minor technique requirements by taking additional classes because not all of those credits are counting towards graduation. The only other option in this scenario is to take 200-level technique classes. The 200+ level classes are designated for majors-only. Because of our increasing numbers of majors, the minor students are often unable to enroll in 200+ level technique courses. These courses may also be too technically advanced for a minor student, which could lead to injury and/or adversely affect other students and the professor.

Remove the 14-credit hour restriction from dance majors taking dance technique classes at the 300-level and below. Currently the course catalog reads as follows:
In addition to the above limitations, only fourteen hours from technique classes at the 300 or below level are counted towards graduation. These courses are:


Similar to the issue for the dance minors, dance majors are being penalized for taking classes such as Tap (145,146) or African Dance. Currently there are two dance majors who took Tap prior to finishing their Ballet/Modern technique requirements. These students have now completed the technique classes required for the major, but are being asked to take more classes because one of the 300 level classes is being deemed “repeat”. In the past when an exception was requested, it was not to change the major requirements, but to view DANC 385 (ballet) as a fulfillment of the major requirement and DANC 145 (tap) as an elective that does not count towards graduation.

The Registrar's Office is responsible for enforcing the policies and processes regarding student registration, the transcript and the way student registrations are noted on transcripts. The repeat policy is based on when a student takes a course because a student cannot 'repeat' a course until, in this case, the maximum number of credits of 100-level activity or dance courses have been completed. Prior to 2016, when students took a 100-level class as a “repeat”, it did not count towards the 122 credit hour requirement, but still fulfilled the minor/major requirements and the hours within. Associate Provost Dr. Lynn Cherry in Academic Affairs, who is responsible for making exceptions, has also made it clear that it is no longer possible to make these exceptions to this policy. This means that a student who takes the dance minor requirements in order and then takes a tap class does not encounter a problem, but another student who takes the tap class first and then takes the minor curriculum finds his/her self having to take
two additional DANC hours at a higher level to “make up” the hours that don’t count (but yet are required to fulfill the minor).

Final Thought
Regardless of why these restrictions were originally put in place, after the January 2017 meeting and the ongoing conversations throughout this academic year, it seems essential to make changes. Dance majors and minors should be able to receive credit for all required classes, regardless of other classes taken as a part of their liberal arts experience. They should also not be penalized for taking these classes in varying sequences. In our continued commitment to the rigor and aesthetic value of our courses within a liberal arts curriculum, the dance faculty fully supports these proposals.
Proposal to Rescind Grade Redemption Policy

Faculty Committee on Academic Standards (FCAS)

Faculty Senate Meeting
April 2, 2019
1. Proposal:

**Rescission of current Grade Redemption Policy (GRP).**

- GRP was approved by the Faculty Senate on October 10, 2017.
- GRP reflects the input of SGA, Academic Affairs, Registrar’s Office, and FCAS.
- According to GRP:
  1. Student must repeat the course in order to redeem a grade;
  2. Student earns credit for the course once;
  3. Student can only petition for redemption after the grade of initial course has been posted:
     1. If initial course grade is F, student can petition to **re-take** the course;
     2. If initial course grade is D- through C-, student can petition to **repeat** the course.
2. Rationale:

GRP is overly complex and not student-friendly:

i. GRP must co-exist with Course Repetition Policy (CRP):
   a. CRP is long and confusing, with extensive additional limitations;
   b. Student must first determine the circumstances (dis)allowing course repetition;
   c. Student must consider implications for scholarships and other financial aid.

ii. Grade redemption differs from grade forgiveness:
    a. According to GRP, student must re-take or repeat the course.

iii. Implications to require a student to repeat the course:
    a. Student carries a full-time load with an additional zero-credit course in which they have already performed poorly and might not be needed for any requirements.
3. Future actions:

If approved:

i. GRP will be rescinded; and

ii. Motion to approve new CRP.
Proposal to Approve New Course Repetition Policy

Faculty Committee on Academic Standards (FCAS)

Faculty Senate Meeting
April 2, 2019
1. Proposal:

**Approval** of new Course Repetition Policy (CRP).

- Current CRP is product of addition over time;
- Current CRP is a barrier to implement Grade Redemption or to meet the goals of Grade Redemption;
- Provost asked Grade Redemption Working group to focus on CRP.

We propose:

- **Strike** current CRP in its entirety;
- **Replace** current CRP with new language.
2. Proposed language:

*Undergraduate Course Repetition Policy: “Repeating the Same or Equivalent Courses”*

Students may repeat a course in which a D- or higher grade has been earned or for which credit has been awarded. Credit is awarded only once; a repeat of the same or an equivalent course does not earn additional credit. Consult catalog course descriptions for equivalent course information. All grades earned in repeated courses will be included in GPA calculations.

In deciding whether to repeat a course, students should consult with an academic advisor and also consider the potential implications for Financial Aid Satisfactory Academic Progress and NCAA eligibility if applicable.

Permission to enroll in a course being repeated is granted at the discretion of the department.
3. Rationale:

CRP is **long** and overly **complex**:

i. Unenforceable 12-hour limit on course repeats;

ii. Different types of courses excluded from CRP;

iii. Two types of transcript coding:
   a. Repeat-include, and
   b. Repeat-exclude;

iv. General Repeat Rules followed by ‘additional limitations’:
   a. 31 bullets of course/program/degree-specific limitations.
4. Benefits:

i. Simplification of CRP;

ii. Elimination of ‘Repeat-exclude’ coding;

iii. Way for students to increase their CofC GPA (cf. GRP).
5. Future actions:

If approved:

i. CRP will take effect with the 2020-2021 Catalog:
   a. Time for Departments to review existing limits imposed at course, program, and degree levels (and to remove any that may no longer be necessary).
Proposal to Revise Current Minor Residency Requirements

Faculty Committee on Academic Standards (FCAS)

Faculty Senate Meeting
April 2, 2019
1. Proposal:

**Approval** to revise Minor Residency Requirements (MRRs).

- Issues with current MRRs:
  - a. Lack of clarity on the distinction between credits required for residency and credits designed to ensure integrity of the minor;
  - b. Lack of clarity on what constitutes ‘unique experience’;
  - c. Limitation of opportunities for students completing upper level courses through CofC’s study abroad.
2. Current language:

**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.
2. Current language (cont’d.):

- 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.
3. Proposed language:

**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 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.
- At least *nine credit hours in the minor must be completed at the 200-level or above*. 
3. Proposed language (cont’d.):

- **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.**
4. Rationale:

The revised MRRs:

i. Add clarity to the policy by separating credits required for residency and the upper level credits designed to ensure integrity of the minor;

ii. Simplify the policy by removing the language about ‘unique experience’;

iii. Allow students completing upper level courses in CofC’s study abroad programs more access and better tracking to complete a minor.
Proposal to Modify Dance 100-level Course and Dance Degree Requirements

Faculty Committee on Academic Standards (FCAS)

Faculty Senate Meeting
April 2, 2019
1. Proposal:

What we propose:

i. **Remove designation of DANC 100-level courses as physical activity courses:**
   a. Removal of the 8-hour cap for DANC 100-level courses that can be applied toward degree requirements.

ii. **Remove the 14-hour cap on DANC 300-level courses or below** that can be applied to degree requirements.
TO: Quinn Burke, Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid, Chair  
FROM: Chad M. Galuska, Faculty Curriculum Committee, Co-Chair  
DATE: April 13, 2018  
RE: DANC classification as physical activity courses. See memo from Gretchen McLaine  
(Theatre and Dance).

At our March 16 meeting, the Faculty Curriculum Committee considered two proposals from DANC. These are contained in the memo from Gretchen McLaine and summarized here.

- Remove designation of DANC 100-level courses as physical activity courses; this results in the removal of the 8-hour cap for DANC 100-level courses that can be applied toward degree requirements.

- Remove the 14-hour cap on DANC 300-level courses or below that can be applied to degree requirements.

The committee recommended approving the second proposal, as it appears to be a restriction DANC imposed on their own major. We feel that this proposal also needs to be approved by your committee before being presented to the Senate as the language in the course catalog will need to be revised.

The first proposal is a college-wide policy with a long history. While our committee recognized that 100-level DANC courses include content that goes beyond physical activity, our committee does not feel qualified to make a determination on this policy issue. Moreover, we do not have the authority to change it. This appears to be an issue for your committee.

The following is language from the 2017-2018 Undergraduate Academic Catalog with the changes proposed by DANC in red.

Some additional limitations include, but are not limited to:

Physical Education/Theatre activities courses (e.g., yoga, dance, etc.)

Courses in basic physical education activity theory (100 level) may be taken for elective credit by any student, but no more than eight credit hours total (including PEAC/PEHD/DANC/THTR cross-listed dance/activity courses) may be applied toward a degree. More than eight credit hours will be coded as a repeat exclude (RE) (up to the maximum allowable hours) whether or not the student has previously taken that exact course.

Dance/Theatre courses

Students who have completed DANC 146 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 145.
Students who have completed DANC 235 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 135.
Students who have completed DANC 437 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 337, DANC 237, DANC 138 or DANC 137.
Students who have completed DANC 337 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 237, DANC 138 or DANC 137.
Students who have completed DANC 237 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 138 or DANC 137.
Students who have completed DANC 138 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 137.
Students who have completed DANC 485 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 385, DANC 285, DANC 186, or DANC 185.
Students who have completed DANC 385 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 285, DANC 186, or DANC 185.
Students who have completed DANC 285 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 186 or DANC 185.
Students who have completed DANC 186 may not subsequently receive credit towards graduation for DANC 185.

In addition to the above limitations, only fourteen hours from technique classes at the 300 or below level are counted towards graduation. These courses are:


Thank you for considering this issue.
FAM Proposal – Faculty Grievance Committee

Current language
p. 25, Section 3.B.11.a.(1)
Five faculty members, three with tenure and two without tenure. In addition, four alternate members, two with tenure and two without tenure. Each member of the committee and each alternate must have served at least three full years at the College of Charleston.

Proposed language
p. 25, Section 3.B.11.a.(1)
Five faculty members, three with tenure and two without tenure. In addition, four alternate members, two with tenure and two without tenure. Each member of the committee and each alternate must have served at least three full years at the College of Charleston. Early each Fall term, committee members will undergo mediation training sessions relevant to grievance committee responsibilities, conducted by one or more skilled mediation trainers. It will be the committee chair’s responsibility to ensure that a suitable trainer or trainers are identified and that mediation trainings are scheduled.

Rationale

This proposed language mirrors the language discussing relevant training for the Faculty Hearing Committee (p. 27). This is not, however, to suggest that Hearing and Grievance training are identical. The goal is to ensure that Grievance Committee members have some exposure to mediation prior to hearing grievances.
Senate Motions

#1 – *Ex-Officio* Senate Members
Current language (P.9.IV.2.C):
The President of the College, the Provost, a student representing the Student Government Association, and the Faculty Secretary are non-voting *ex-officio* members of the Faculty Senate.

Proposed language:
The President of the College, the Provost, a student representing the CofC Student Government Association, a student representing the CofC Graduate Student Association, and the Faculty Secretary are non-voting *ex-officio* members of the Faculty Senate.

#2 – *Ex-Officio* Standing Rules Clarification
While *ex-officio* members of the faculty have full floor privileges at faculty meetings, including the right to make motions, *ex-officio* members of the Faculty Senate do not have motion privileges at Faculty Senate meetings.

**Rationale:**

Motion 1 adds a representative from the graduate student governance organization that would parallel the already existing representation from the SGA.

Motion 2 clarifies the participatory status of all of the *ex-officio* members. This move is consistent with the manner in which our peer institutions handle such *ex-officio* privileges. It would remain the case that they all have floor speaking privileges, as the currently listed ones do, and as all faculty do, pursuant to Article IV, subsection 4.I. Retaining these *ex-officio* positions is valuable for the purpose of conveying a formal welcome to each of these parties to participate in Senate discussions.

Unlike the modification in Motion 1, which would be located in the Faculty By-Laws, the provision in Motion 2 would be added to the Standing Rules (p. 38, as the new subsection 5) of the Senate, so that the rule prohibiting motions by *ex-officio* members of the Senate may be temporarily suspended by a two-thirds vote in the Senate, when the occasion warrants it (such as the customary Provost’s motions late each Fall and Spring to approve eligible students for graduation).

Finally, Motion 2 should not be construed as any kind of bar to our current practice of permitting Faculty Committee Chairs (or a Committee Chair’s designee) to introduce motions for discussion by the Faculty Senate in the conduct of committee business, without the necessity of a motion or a second by Senate members.
What Faculty Issues Should CofC’s Next President Prioritize?

1. Mission clarification (250th anniversary provides a good opportunity for such assessment)
2. Find ways to reward faculty effort and achievement (e.g., by adding school level awards for teaching, etc.; college-wide awards as salary raises)
3. Seek to achieve gender pay equity
4. Increase number of African American faculty (and students)
5. Use “Great Colleges to Work For” survey as base-line for faculty morale in first year. Work to improve on areas of low morale in subsequent years.
6. Build trust between faculty and administration (e.g., by honoring Faculty request to be represented in budget process; instituting regular evaluation of deans, provost and president by faculty)
7. Provide legal advice resources for faculty
8. Figuring out with Marketing/Communication how to create an effective events-listing
9. Address material issues such as housing, education for children, transport/parking, etc.
10. Co-ordinate with local schools and other SC universities to create common educational purpose of full human development for all SC residents
Faculty Senate, Tuesday, March 5, 2019, 5:00 PM
Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)

Highlights (Full minutes to follow.)

1. Call to Order: 5:04 PM.

2. Approval of the minutes from February 5, 2019: the minutes were approved.

3. Announcements and Information: Speaker pro tempore Bob Mignone introduced himself; he conducted the meeting in Speaker Liz Jurisch’s absence.

4. Reports
   a. Speaker pro tempore Bob Mignone updated the Senate on nominations and elections for Speaker; Faculty Secretariat Megan Gould’s maintenance of Senate archives; the Board of Trustees’ faculty shadowing program; President-Elect Hsu’s arrival on campus; and the date for the annual Celebration of Faculty (April 24).
   b. Provost Brian McGee welcomed Trustee Chuck Baker before giving his report. PDF

In light of the US President’s intention to sign an executive order on campus free speech, the Provost reaffirmed the College’s commitment to free speech and academic freedom, citing his August 2018 op-ed on the topic in the Post and Courier and C of C’s recent reaffirmation with SACSCOC, which found no deficiencies in that area. Like many other college presidents and provosts across the country, he does not believe we need a redundant, bureaucratic federal requirement on campus speech.

The Provost thanked Professor Jason Coy and faculty who have applied for Online Educational Resources grants. He will encourage his successor to continue this project. He introduced Professor Joe Kelly, who is chairing the Transfer Credit Task Force. Prof. Kelly explained that the task force will work with the Academic Planning and Academic Standards committees before reporting back to the Provost, and that a proposal regarding transfer credit hours will come to the Senate next year.

Academic Affairs is considering a proposal to hire visiting faculty in “non-line” schools, and the Provost would like to talk about this possibility with relevant faculty committees this spring if there are concerns that need to be addressed.

The South Carolina Legislature may soon consider new proposals concerning the “Founding Documents” (Declaration of Independence, Constitution, Federalist Papers) requirement. Our Founding Documents requirement, initiated in 2015, has accommodated state law while not creating significant additional challenges to students to complete their degrees. Current proposed legislation would remove the requirement
for graduate students but would have undergraduates fulfill the requirement with 3-credit-hour class. If the legislation passes, we would have one year to figure out how to create a course to meet the new requirement.

The College is working with DiversityEdu to develop a program of non-credit-bearing diversity education modules for students. There is also growing student interest in adding diversity education to our general education program; most US universities have some kind of diversity component in their gen ed curriculum.

Finally, the Provost thanked everyone who worked on tonight’s Senate proposals, especially those who developed the proposal on military transfer credit.

During Q&A, Senator Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre and Dance / Gen Ed Committee) reported that a group of students spoke to the General Education Committee the previous week about diversity education, that the committee was impressed with what they had to say, and that their comments will be included in the committee’s forthcoming minutes. She then asked for the number and name of the bill concerning Founding Documents. Provost McGee said that he could provide a link, and before the end of Q&A Professor Larry Krasnoff announced that it was House Bill 35, accessible through the SC Legislature website.

Senator Richard Nunan (Philosophy) suggested that state legislators should also be required to take a course on founding documents, then asked Provost McGee if there is proposed legislation at the state level concerning free speech on college campuses. The Provost replied that some boilerplate legislation, produced by ALEC (American Legislative Exchange Council), had been filed but did not seem to have much momentum.

5. Old Business

a. Faculty Committee on Academic Standards (Ricard Viñas de Puig, Chair): Proposal to revise criteria for Departmental Honors. [Original Proposal] [Revised Proposal]

Professor Viñas de Puig explained the proposal, which is intended to make the requirements more uniform among departments and to allow more excellent students the opportunity to earn Departmental Honors. The proposal raises the minimum GPA from 3.5 to 3.7, and it allows departments to stipulate additional requirements. His slide presentation can be viewed [here].

Senator Joe Carson (SSM) moved to amend the proposal: “students must have earned a grade point average in the major of at least 3.700” to “students must have earned a grade point average in the major of at least 3.500.” In support, he explained that his department, Physics and Astronomy, has been granted permission in previous years to give Departmental Honors to their best students even when those students had a GPA
below 3.5; this is because Physics and Astronomy is a difficult major. They oppose raising the minimum GPA for departmental honors from 3.5 to 3.7, which would have the effect of unfairly excluding his department’s students from the honor. If other departments wanted to set the bar at 3.7, the proposal allows them to do so. The motion to amend was seconded by Senator Nunan.

Discussion of the amendment: Prof. Seth Pritchard (Guest) spoke in favor; his department, Biology, puts more emphasis on student research portfolios, and they believe 3.5 is a more appropriate minimum. Prof. Krasnoff (Guest), who initiated the original proposal, said that he did not object to the amendment, and that the decision to propose raising the minimum to 3.7 had mainly been to offset potential objections that the proposal was otherwise making it too easy to earn Departmental Honors. Senator Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism Management) added his support for the main motion, noting that the 12-hour requirement is too cumbersome.

The amendment making the minimum GPA 3.500 passed by voice vote. Without further discussion, the amended proposal passed by voice vote.

5. New Business

a. Curriculum Committee (Chad Galuska, Chair):

1. HPCP: Add HPCP 298 and HPCP 325 to the major. Major change: BA-HPCP PDF Approved by voice vote.

2. PHIL: Course name and description change: PHIL 165: Philosophy of Sex and Gender PDF Approved by voice vote.

3. INFS: Add INFM 340 to the major. Major change: Computer Information Systems BS-INFS PDF Approved by voice vote.

4. WGST:

i) New courses: WGST 328: Directed Undergraduate Research; WGST 338: Community-based Learning PDF

ii) Major changes: BA-WGST PDF

iii) Minor changes: Minor-WGST PDF

All approved by voice vote.

6. PRST New courses: PRST 350: Training and Development PDF; PRST 362: Performance Management PDF; PRST 370: Information Technology Management PDF PRST 370 was withdrawn temporarily; others were approved by voice vote.

b. Graduate Curriculum Committee (Sandy Slater, Chair)

1. Computer Science

   i.) CSIS Course Creation and Elective Change: Add the new course (currently being proposed) CSIS 670 as a general elective for students in any of the specializations; add CSIS 632 as a Computer Science elective for the Computer Science specialization. https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1123/form PDF Approved by voice vote.


2. Elementary Education MA/MAT

   i.) EDEE 590 (field course drop) https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1389/form PDF

   Senator Nunan asked if this proposal reduced the total number of hours for the degree, and Professor Kelley White (Teacher Education) replied that it does not. Approved by voice vote.

   ii.) Elementary Education MAT Admission Changes https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1400/form PDF

   Senator Nunan asked if this proposal, because it allows for admission only in the fall, would have a negative impact on the number of potential teachers the program is generating. Senator Slater responded that the proposal streamlines the program, reducing the timeline to a single academic year, so the effect should be to increase the number of teachers being trained; part of the new efficiency is to have each cohort of students enter together in the fall. Approved by voice vote.
3. English to Speakers of Other Languages I Graduate Certificate - ESO1

i.) Add LALE 601 Applied Linguistics
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1434/form PDF
Withdrawn.

ii.) Add EDFS 674 Linguistics for ESOL Teachers for Elective in M.Ed.

4. Marine Biology, M.S.

i.) Course Additions to Elective Requirements

   a. Add 4 core courses (BIOL 600, 601, 610, 611) to electives list.

   b. Add BIOL 650 (Seminar in Marine Biology) to electives list.

   c. Add BIOL 690 (Independent Study) as an alternative to the BIOL 650 (Seminar in Marine Biology) seminar requirement.


ii.) Add note to Catalog about Electives

c. General Education Committee (Susan Kattwinkel, Chair)

1. Approve the following courses for General Education--Humanities credit.

   LACS - 103 - Introduction to Contemporary Cuba
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1419/form PDF

   LACS - 104 - Introduction to Contemporary Chile
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1454/form PDF

   LACS – 105 – Introduction to Contemporary Brazil
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1471/form PDF

   LACS – 106 – Introduction to Contemporary Argentina
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:566/form PDF

All four were approved by voice vote.
d. Faculty Committee on Academic Standards (Ricard Viñas de Puig, Chair): Proposal regarding Military Transfer Credit  Policy  Memo

Professor Viñas de Puig introduced the proposal, explaining that the current catalog explicitly prohibits granting credit for military service. If approved, the policy will go into effect in Spring 2020. (The Policy and Memo above provide details.)

Noting that eligibility requirements refer to honorable discharges or general discharges under honorable conditions, Senator Sandra Slater (History) asked about past practices of dishonorably discharging military personnel for being on the queer spectrum. Provost McGee responded that he had been told years ago that those discharges were not dishonorable. He promised to verify that information, and added that the legislative intent of this proposal was not to exclude anyone who had been discharged for reasons of sexual orientation.

Senator Nunan asked why the existing policy (prohibiting the awarding of credit for military training) was implemented in the first place. Provost McGee replied that he tried unsuccessfilly to find an answer to that very question; it’s hard to know why, partly because the minutes from that time period are incomplete.

Senator Litvin asked if military transfer credit hours have specific course equivalencies in our catalog. Interim Dean Godfrey Gibbison (Graduate School) explained that with the exception of the PEAC credit, military transfer credits would be evaluated the same way other courses for transfer credit are evaluated. Interim Dean Sebastian Van Delden (SSM) added that he likes the fact that department chairs make the decisions about military transfer credits, just as they do for other transfer credits, and they are provided with sufficient information to make those decisions.

Professor Carrie Messall (Management and Marketing) agreed with Dean Van Delden; noting that many of the credits fall under Computer Science and Management, she said that they believe they have sufficient information from the database to award appropriate credit.

The proposal passed by voice vote.

6. Constituents’ General Concerns:

Senator Jolanda van Arnhem relayed a constituent’s objection to the new warning message displayed on all emails that come from off campus; the constituent complained of having to remove the warning banner from reply emails and not being able to prioritize unread emails based on the first line of text. Senator Nunan and Dean Gibbison offered examples of the warning text’s ineffectiveness. Provost McGee said
that the caution messages are not uncommon among other institutions, and that the intention of the message was to protect against identity theft. He promised to convey the concerns expressed by Sen. van Arnhem and others to the Chief Information Officer.

Professor Simon Lewis (Guest, English) announced a chapter meeting of the American Association of University Professors on March 30; he said that President-Elect Hsu would attend and would give a welcome at 10:00 AM.

7. Adjournment at 6:08.
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Proposal to Modify the Requirements for Departmental Honors

Approved by HSS Chairs, 10/4/18
Circulated for comment to all chairs, 10/18/18
Approved by Faculty Committee on Academic Standards, 11/16/18

Background

The current requirements for departmental honors are set out in the Undergraduate Catalog:

Designed for mature individuals who are capable of sustained and independent work, the program of departmental honors is designed to give upperclassmen of exceptional ability an opportunity to explore intensively a field of their particular interest. Students take the initiative in outlining their proposed research, experiment, or special study; in enlisting the support of a faculty advisor; and in securing the approval of the department. At the conclusion of the program, departmental honors can be awarded only with the approval of the department. To be eligible, students must have earned a grade point average in the major of at least 3.500 and completed a minimum of 12 credit hours of exceptionally fine work in any combination of seminar, independent study, tutorial, and bachelor’s essay. Whichever format is chosen, the project should develop the student’s proficiency in library research or laboratory methodology, and the finished composition should be distinguished by its organization, reasoning, and expression.

The recommended capstone for earning departmental honors is the bachelor’s essay. Students must seek one of the professors in their major department to supervise the undertaking and must submit in writing a proposal for the project. Once the plan is accepted, students must work closely with their advisor. Since researching and writing the essay extends over both semesters of the senior year, students should submit one or more preliminary drafts for critical examination in order to allow time for proper revision of the essay. The department may also prescribe additional requirements for ensuring the quality of the work. Satisfactory completion of the bachelor’s essay entitles the candidate to six credit hours.

In reviewing the current practice of departments, we have observed the following:

- There is great inconsistency between departments in what counts for the 12 hours. Some departments regard internships as forms of independent study, which then count; others regard internships as quite different from independent studies, and do not count them. Some departments count capstone seminars, or even other small, advanced classes, toward the 12 hours; others do not. There is no clear definition, in the catalog or in campus practice, of what a “seminar” even is.
• In many cases, departments report that their very best students, even those who compete excellent bachelor’s essays, are not eligible for departmental honors, because they have not taken two independent studies. Some departments have even reported that almost no one ever receives departmental honors in their programs, because the 12-hour requirement (at least as interpreted by those programs) is too onerous.

• Some departments have reported that students sometimes seek out faculty for independent studies not because they have a particular motivation to study a particular topic, but because they “need” another independent study for departmental honors. While faculty can and should resist such unmotivated independent studies, such resistance can be difficult, and we do not want to incentivize students to pursue independent study without independent motivation.

Proposal

We therefore propose that the requirements for departmental honors be made simpler and more uniform, to require just:

• A grade point average in the major of at least 3.7

• A bachelor’s essay (or two independent studies with comparable research expectations)

This proposal builds on the most important feature of the current catalog language, which lists the bachelor’s essay as the “recommended” capstone experience. The proposal then eliminates the potentially ambiguous language, and inconsistent practice, about other forms of independent work. At the same time, the proposal also strengthens the requirements for departmental honors, by raising the GPA requirement to 3.7, an A- average in the major.

The basic principle behind the proposal is: an outstanding student in a major who completes a quality bachelor’s essay should be able to receive departmental honors. Under our current rules, such a student is often (and in some programs, usually) ineligible. Under the proposed new rules, such a student would always be eligible.

Proposed New Catalog Language

Accordingly, we propose that the current catalog language be modified as follows:

Designed for mature individuals who are capable of sustained and independent work, the program of departmental honors is designed to give advanced students of
exceptional ability an opportunity to explore intensively a field of their particular interest. Students take the initiative in outlining their proposed research, experiment, or special study; in enlisting the support of a faculty advisor; and in securing the approval of the department. At the conclusion of the program, departmental honors may be awarded only with the approval of the department. To be eligible, students must have earned a grade point average in the major of at least 3.700 and completed a bachelor’s essay (or two independent studies with disciplinary expectations comparable to those of a bachelor’s essay).

Students intending to write a bachelor’s essay must seek one of the professors in their major department to supervise and must submit in writing a proposal for the project. Once the plan is accepted, students must work closely with their advisor. Since researching and writing the essay extends over both semesters of the senior year, students should submit one or more preliminary drafts for critical examination in order to allow time for proper revision of the essay. Satisfactory completion of the bachelor’s essay entitles the candidate to six credit hours. If a department permits two independent studies in place of a bachelor’s essay, those independent studies, like a successful bachelor’s essay, should develop the student’s proficiency in research as understood by the discipline, and the finished composition(s) should be distinguished by their organization, reasoning, and expression. The department may also prescribe additional requirements for ensuring the quality of the work.
Faculty Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (FCAS)

Proposal to revise Departmental Honors

Designed for mature individuals who are capable of sustained and independent work, the program of departmental honors is designed to give advanced students of exceptional ability an opportunity to explore intensively a field of their particular interest. Students take the initiative in outlining their proposed research, experiment, or special study; in enlisting the support of a faculty advisor; and in securing the approval of the department. At the conclusion of the program, departmental honors may be awarded only with the approval of the department. To be eligible, students must have earned a grade point average in the major of at least 3.700 and completed a bachelor’s essay, or two independent studies with disciplinary expectations comparable to those of a bachelor’s essay. If a department permits two independent studies in place of a bachelor’s essay, those independent studies, like a successful bachelor’s essay, should develop the student’s proficiency in research as understood by the discipline, and the finished composition(s) should be distinguished by their organization, reasoning, and expression. The department may also prescribe additional requirements for ensuring the quality of the work.
Proposed changes to Departmental Honors

Faculty Committee on Academic Standards (FCAS)

Faculty Senate Meeting
March 5, 2019
1. What we propose:

i. Simplification of the criteria to award Departmental Honors.

ii. Elimination of the ‘12-hour rule’.

iii. Consistent criteria across Departments.

iv. Main aspects of the proposed change:

- Average major GPA of 3.700;
- Completion of Bachelor’s Essay or two (2) independent studies with comparable disciplinary expectations.
- Departments retain discretion (e.g., additional requirements) to award Departmental Honors.
2. Current language:

Designed for mature individuals who are capable of sustained and independent work, the program of departmental honors is designed to give upperclassmen of exceptional ability an opportunity to explore intensively a field of their particular interest. Students take the initiative in outlining their proposed research, experiment, or special study; in enlisting the support of a faculty advisor; and in securing the approval of the department. At the conclusion of the program, departmental honors can be awarded only with the approval of the department. To be eligible, students must have earned a grade point average in the major of at least 3.500 and completed a minimum of 12 credit hours of exceptionally fine work in any combination of seminar, independent study, tutorial, and bachelor’s essay. Whichever format is chosen, the project should develop the student’s proficiency in library research or laboratory methodology, and the finished composition should be distinguished by its organization, reasoning, and expression.

(...)

The recommended capstone for earning departmental honors is the bachelor’s essay. Students must seek one of the professors in their major department to supervise the undertaking and must submit in writing a proposal for the project. Once the plan is accepted, students must work closely with their advisor. Since researching and writing the essay extends over both semesters of the senior year, students should submit one or more preliminary drafts for critical examination in order to allow time for proper revision of the essay. The department may also prescribe additional requirements for ensuring the quality of the work. Satisfactory completion of the bachelor’s essay entitles the candidate to six credit hours.
3. Observed issues with current language:

i. Inconsistency among departments regarding the ‘12-hour rule’
   ☑ Internships?
   ☑ Capstone seminars? Other advanced courses?

ii. Onerous criteria, even for excellent students.
    ☑ Excellent students with excellent Bachelor’s Essay may not meet
      the ‘12-hour rule’.

iii. Students’ requests for independent studies out of need to comply with
     ‘12-hour rule’.
    ☑ Not for motivation to study a specific research topic.
4. Proposed language:

Designed for mature individuals who are capable of sustained and independent work, the program of departmental honors is designed to give advanced students of exceptional ability an opportunity to explore intensively a field of their particular interest. Students take the initiative in outlining their proposed research, experiment, or special study; in enlisting the support of a faculty advisor; and in securing the approval of the department. At the conclusion of the program, departmental honors may be awarded only with the approval of the department. To be eligible, students must have earned a grade point average in the major of at least 3.700 and completed a bachelor’s essay, or two independent studies with disciplinary expectations comparable to those of a bachelor’s essay. If a department permits two independent studies in place of a bachelor’s essay, those independent studies, like a successful bachelor’s essay, should develop the student’s proficiency in research as understood by the discipline, and the finished composition(s) should be distinguished by their organization, reasoning, and expression. The department may also prescribe additional requirements for ensuring the quality of the work.
4. Proposal history:

i. Proposal spearheaded by Dr. Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy).

ii. Approved by the School of Humanities and Social Sciences.

iii. Approved by Department chairs.

iv. Approved by FCAS (November 2018).

v. Presented before Faculty Senate (December 2018, January 2019).
   ✓ Sent back for discussion.

vi. Discussion with Honors College Committee & Registrar:
   ✓ Drafting of revised proposal.
   ✓ Language on the nature of a bachelor’s essay moved to separate proposal.

vii. Approval by Honors College Committee & FCAS (February 2019).
Military Transfer Credit Policy

The College of Charleston awards transfer credit to undergraduate military students in recognition of their military training in accordance with the criteria below.

Eligibility

Students must meet the following eligibility criteria to be considered for transfer credit under this policy:

- Students must be a veteran with an honorable discharge or general discharge under honorable conditions, an active service member, or a member of the Reserves/National Guard who has completed required trainings. All veterans are required to provide their original DD-214 along with their official transcript.
- The Joint Services Transcript (JST) from the issuing agency is required for current and former Army, Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard students.
- The Community College of the Air Force (CCAF) official transcript is required for all students who have attended this institution.

Transfer Credit

The College of Charleston requires the relevant academic department chair (or chair’s designee) or program director (or director’s designee) to determine the suitability of course credit earned through military training for transfer to the College. The College of Charleston uses the American Council on Education (ACE) credit recommendations and university transfer credit policies to assess U.S. military training credit for undergraduate students. The College reserves the right to accept ACE recommendations as a guideline, but will retain and exercise responsibility for assuring that the military training credits accepted are at the collegiate level and have resulted in learning outcomes comparable to those students would achieve through the College’s own instruction.

- All College of Charleston transfer credit policies apply to the process of evaluating and awarding military training for academic credit.
- Students may earn up to 30 transfer credit hours from their Joint Services Transcript. Only courses which have American Council on Education (ACE) course recommendations are eligible for evaluation. These 30 credit hours count toward the maximum of 60 transfer credit hours earned at a two-year institution that may be applied to the requirements for all College of Charleston bachelor’s degrees (A.B., B.A., B.S., B.G.S., B.P.S.).
- Students who have completed 1 year of military service in the United States military will be awarded 4 credit hours of elective transfer credit for the physical education activity
course PEAC 1EE. These credit hours are included in the 30 credit hour maximum referenced above.

- The maximum number of transfer hours earned at a two-year institution that may be applied to the requirements for all College of Charleston bachelor’s degrees (A.B., B.A., B.S., B.G.S., B.P.S.) is sixty (60) credit hours. This includes the Community College of the Air Force.
MEMORANDUM

TO:       FACULTY SENATE
FROM:     GODFREY GIBBISON, DEAN PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
SUBJECT: AWARD OF CREDIT FROM JST AND CCAF TRANSCRIPT
DATE:     FEBRUARY 18, 2019
CC:       MARY BERGSTROM, REGISTRAR

The College of Charleston has a robust population of transfer students. Transfer students essentially began their post-secondary experience elsewhere, wish to complete a degree at the College and seek academic credit at College of Charleston for the credits earned elsewhere. Nearly one-fourth of College of Charleston students are transfer students. Some of the credits earned elsewhere are earned in traditional colleges and universities, and the College has in place a mechanism to evaluate and award credits based on the presentation of a traditional transcript and other material that departments or programs may wish to review. However, whenever students present an unconventional transcript or evidence of other post-secondary learning experiences, the College currently has no universal mechanism for evaluation and credit determination.

In 2014, former Provost George Hynd charged a committee to study and deliver a plan for award of credit for prior learning at the College. The task force was to focus specifically on award credits to students who have completed college-level learning in a setting other than a traditional, regionally accredited college or university. The task force made several recommendations on this issue, after careful study of national trends, and urge the College to move purposefully in this direction.

The members of the task force anticipated expeditious action on the recommendation that the College pursued the award of credit to individuals who have served or are currently serving in the United States armed services, who present a Joint Services Transcript (JST) or a Community College of the Air force (CCAF) Transcript. The JST is a record of all coursework completed while serving in any branch of the US armed forces. CCAF is a regionally accredited institution and the CCAF Transcript is akin to transcripts provided by other accredited institutions. The task force further recommended that the American Council on Education (ACE) recommendations for college level equivalency guide the award of credit for military school courses and occupations.

The American Council on Education performs faculty-panel reviews of the military school curriculum and occupational training on a continuous basis, and provides recommendations for college-level credit equivalency that appear on the JST. This is a long-standing practice by the ACE, the practice is highly respected and is followed by many colleges and universities. Currently the College's policy, as outlined in the catalog, prevents the award of credit to individuals who have completed these learning experiences and trainings, many of whom are student veterans. The language below is what appears in our catalog now.

“Credits awarded at another institution as a result of placement testing are not acceptable. In addition, the College of Charleston does not award transfer credit for life experience, work experience gained prior to
admission, **military training**, and/or non-credit bearing coursework completed toward a professional certificate. The College of Charleston does not give academic credit for noncredit course work and does not accept non-credit coursework, certificates or continuing education units for credit.”

Going back to the work of the 2014 task force, and working with the Registrar and Office of Admissions, a proposal to amend the undergraduate catalog, focusing specifically on prior learning while in military service, is attached. This proposal has the approval of the Department of Health and Human Performance for the award of PEAC credits. Both the Academic Planning Committee and the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid have considered and approved this policy change. This proposal preserves our credit award structures and processes while expanding opportunity for active duty military and veteran students.

If the Faculty Senate approves this new policy, its effective date will be Spring semester 2020. During Fall 2019, Academic Affairs will provide opportunities for College of Charleston faculty reviewers to become more familiar with the JST and CCAF Transcript through a series of workshops delivered by the ACE. ACE has provided this service for several decades, with faculty colleagues at other institutions providing instruction and guidance to other faculty on how to perform careful thorough review of these unfamiliar academic records. ACE will also provide information on the process by which military courses and occupations are evaluated and how the faculty review panels are selected.
1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 5:02.

2. **The minutes from January 15, 2019 were approved.**

3. **Announcements and Information:** Speaker Jurisich announced that a microphone was available for use during the meeting.

4. **Reports**

   a. Speaker of the Faculty Elizabeth Jurisich encouraged faculty members to run for Senate, Speaker, and Secretary – and to vote. She recently updated the Board of Trustees on curricular issues and attended some of their committee meetings. She has also met with incoming President Hsu and can report that he is committed to shared governance.

   b. Provost Brian McGee expressed appreciation for Speaker Jurisich’s work over the past two years.

   He reported that work is ongoing to revise credit hour policies for transfer students, and that we now have a Transfer Resource Center. The Academic Planning Committee and the academic leadership team are working on some proposals to better accommodate students who are active duty military, including policies on transfer credit for military experience and training.

   Following up on last semester’s salary adjustment/merit exercise, Provost McGee is working with Interim President Osborne and the deans to make further adjustments to faculty compensation, based on additional data and focused particularly on gender equity. Those adjustments may occur later this semester.

   We have some information regarding the next fiscal year’s state budget, but it is still early in the budget cycle. The Faculty Budget Committee has been more fully engaged in the budget process in recent years, and the process has become more transparent.

   Regarding the agenda, the Provost noted that this would be a historic Senate meeting because we will debate the creation of a doctoral program at the College for the first time. He thanked all who worked on the PhD in Mathematics with Computation proposal.

   Finally, the Provost thanked Senator Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism Management) for his work as Fulbright Ambassador and noted that a press release is forthcoming announcing the College’s status as a top producer of Fulbright Scholars and Fulbright Students among masters-level colleges and universities. [PDF]
c. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual (Mike Lee, Chair): The committee has reviewed and endorsed Academic Affairs’ revision of FAM language to avoid gender binaries.

5. New Business

a. Curriculum Committee (Chad Galuska, Chair): All proposals passed unanimously by voice vote.

   1. AAST
      1. New course: AAST 333 PDF
      2. Change course: AAST 401 PDF

   2. ARTM
      1. New courses: ARTM 205 PDF, 209 PDF
      2. Course changes: ARTM 200 PDF, 240 PDF, 255 PDF, 310 PDF, 321 PDF, 340 PDF, 380 PDF, 400 PDF, 401 PDF, 420 PDF
      3. Course deactivation: ARTM 352 PDF

   3. BIOL: Course changes: BIOL 101 PDF, 101L PDF, 102 PDF, 102L PDF, 447 PDF

   4. CHEM (Riggs-Gelasco): Major change BA-CHEM PDF

   5. CITA:
      1. Course change: CITA 495 PDF
      2. Concentration change: CITA-Game Development and Interaction Concentration PDF
      3. Program change: Computing in the Arts-CITA PDF

   6. ENVT: Course changes: ENVT 350 PDF, 352 PDF, 355 PDF, 395 PDF

   7. EUST: Minor change: European Studies Minor-EUST PDF

   8. EXSC:
1. New courses: EXSC 211 PDF, 250 PDF, 340L PDF, 350 PDF, 360 PDF, 402 PDF, 420 PDF, 424 PDF
2. Course changes: EXSC 201 PDF, 210 PDF, 235 PDF, 330 PDF, 333 PDF, 340 PDF, 345 PDF, 355 PDF, 440 PDF, 458 PDF, 465 PDF
3. Major change: BS-EXSC PDF

9. GEOL:
   1. New course: GEOL 402 PDF
   2. Course changes: GEOL 449 PDF, 469 PDF

10. HNDI: Course deactivations: HNDI 101 PDF, 101C PDF, 102 PDF, 102C PDF, 201 PDF, 201C PDF, 202 PDF, 202C PDF

11. HONS: Course changes: HONS 226 PDF, 227 PDF, 230 PDF, 240 PDF, 245 PDF, 380 PDF, 381 PDF, 382 PDF

12. HPCP
   1. New course: HPCP 325 PDF
   2. Change course: HPCP 298 PDF

13. LING: Minor change: Linguistics Minor-LING PDF

14. MATH: Course changes: MATH 101 PDF, 103 PDF, 104 PDF, 105 PDF

15. PSYC
   1. Course change: PSYC 464 PDF
   2. New course: PSYC 337 PDF and associated major changes: BA-PSYC PDF, BS-PSYC PDF

16. SOST: Minor change: Southern Studies Minor-SOST PDF

17. Teacher Education
   1. EDCG program change PDF
2. **EDEE 384** course change  PDF

18. WGST

1. New courses: WGST 321 PDF, 322 PDF, 323 PDF, 324 PDF, 333 PDF

2. Change course: **WGST 350 PDF**

b. Graduate Curriculum Committee (Sandy Slater, Chair) **The first five proposals passed unanimously by voice vote.**

1. CSIS 641 Advanced Cybersecurity (require CSIS 632 as PreReq)  
   [https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1114/form](https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1114/form)  PDF

2. Operations Research Graduate Certificate  
   Class changes [https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1071/form](https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1071/form)  PDF

3. ENGL MA Elective Changes  

4. Environmental and Sustainability Studies  
   1. EVSS 611- Change in Course Title  
   2. EVSS 640- Change in Course Description  

5. Mathematics (separate from Doctoral program creation and changes)  
   MATH 604 Course Description Change  
   [https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:948/form](https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:948/form)  PDF

6. Doctoral Program in Mathematics with Computation  

Senator Pam Riggs-Gelasco (SSM) cited the work of the ad hoc Committee for Institutional Identity, which surveyed about 500 faculty and staff, approximately two-thirds of whom were faculty. While 89% gave a high ranking to the statement “The College of Charleston should have a well-defined identity,” only 11% responded that we do have a well-defined identity. Moreover, only 25% agreed that C of C should have PhD programs. She contended that we need to have a broader discussion about institutional identity, along with the Board of Trustees and incoming President Hsu, before considering a PhD proposal. The Chemistry Department is unanimously opposed to this program for that reason,
especially given the current transitions taking place (outgoing provost, incoming president, and two schools without permanent deans).

Professor Jon Hakkila (Guest) noted that four years ago there was a series of faculty forums on the future of masters programs, at which response was very positive for the creation of targeted PhD programs and expanded masters programs. The programs that have been launched since then have been faculty driven and consistent with our identity, including the MFA in Creative Writing and the MA in Community Planning, Policy, and Design. The Mathematics PhD program is a small, targeted program that fits with the goals of faculty in that department. The planners have made an effort to vet the proposal with all stakeholders on campus.

Senator Bob Mignone (SSM) said that the model for the current proposal came from Bryn Mawr College, a liberal arts institution that has had a mathematics PhD program for decades. It hasn’t affected their identity as a primarily undergraduate, liberal arts school. He also cited William & Mary as a liberal arts institution that is focused on undergraduate education but also has PhD programs. Finally, he asserted that the Senate’s job was to make its decision independent of Academic Affairs or the President’s Office, so the timing in terms of changes in the administration should not be of concern.

Senator Patricia Williams Lessane (Library) said that the survey Sen. Riggs-Gelasco cited was more recent than the graduate faculty forums, and reiterated that the College is in a transitional moment, perhaps not the best time to take this step. She noted that thanks to alumni giving, colleges such as Dartmouth, William & Mary, and Bryn Mawr have greater financial resources to support graduate programs than the College does. She asked if the vote could be postponed until the next Senate meeting. Speaker Jurisich replied that postponing the vote would require a motion from the floor.

Senator Julia Eichelberger (HSS) reported that the Faculty Budget Committee has discussed the proposal at three different meetings this year and they support it. She stated that she would not have expected herself to support a PhD program because they are generally expensive to the institution, but this one is not. It’s small, with two or three students per year, and applicants are less likely to need funding because they might receive financial support from their employers. Furthermore, the program fits well with the undergraduate and masters programs in mathematics. Some people might worry that this program is the “thin edge of the wedge” that will lead to more PhD programs here, but if other programs are proposed, we will examine them one-by-one, on their own merits.

Senator Oleg Smirnov (SSM) responded to Sen. Riggs-Gelasco’s comments, noting the difference between the abstract question about PhD programs and
the consideration of a specific proposal. He said that the question should not be whether we should have PhD programs at all but whether we should approve this program brought by the Mathematics department.

Interim Dean Godfrey Gibbison (Graduate School) commented that if the Senate decides to postpone the vote, the Mathematics Department needs to be told what changes would be required in order for the proposal to pass. He noted that the proposal has been in the works for quite a while.

Senator Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre and Dance) asked if there is anything built into the proposal to ensure that it will stay small. Professor Anaalisa Calini replied that the program will be highly selective and targeted, and that it will draw students mostly from the community. She expects that there will not be very many qualified students applying. Senator Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism Management) said that adding an enrollment cap of two or three students per year to the proposal would answer the concern raised by Sen. Kattwinkel. Prof. Calini asserted that the programs on which this proposal is modeled have remained quite small, and that’s what the Mathematics Department envisions.

Senator Mignone stated that the budget for the program is modest and will come out of the Mathematics operating budget. That’s a key difference between this proposal and PhD programs in the sciences, which would require new state funding, which we probably wouldn’t get. He added that there is a memo from the Provost stating that this program will not jeopardize our designation as a primarily undergraduate institution. The projected total number of students in the program at any time is eight.

Senator Stephen Short (HSS) asked how the program would enhance the undergraduate experience. Prof. Calini described vertical integrated projects, which allow for undergraduate participation. Undergraduates will have the opportunity to work for a relatively short time on more advanced, long-term integrated projects alongside PhD students. Thus, they will be able to tackle larger questions in mathematics.

Senator Lauren Ravalico (LCWA), noting Senator Mignone’s claim that the program would offer an opportunity for more women to earn PhDs in Mathematics, asked how the proposers have strategized about bringing women into the program. Senator Mignone replied that having a significant number of women in the department helps, and added that simply having a local program increases the likelihood that women living in Charleston would be able to pursue PhDs. Prof. Calini added that some of our top undergraduate students in mathematics are women, and the current graduate program is about 50-50 men and women.
Senator Smirnov introduced a current masters student in mathematics, Colin Alstad, who described his ties to the city and said that he would stay in Charleston if he could earn a PhD here, but if he has to leave the state to pursue the degree, he will leave forever.

Senator Robert Sapp (French and Francophone Studies) asked Senator Riggs-Gelasco what specific objections the Chemistry Department has to the proposal. She replied that having PhD programs changes the nature of the institution and the perception of the institution. As a department chair, she presents the College to prospective students as an undergraduate institution, and she and her departmental colleagues want to maintain that commitment to undergraduate teaching. She believes that departments with PhD programs inevitably spend less time and attention on undergraduates. She reiterated that having a PhD program changes our identity without our having deliberately decided what our identity should be.

Senator Sarah Hatteburg (Sociology and Anthropology) noted that there are many academic fields where no PhD is available in Charleston; she questioned the validity of the argument that because people living in Charleston would have to go elsewhere for a PhD in a given field, we should establish a program here.

Professor Dinesh Sarvate (Mathematics) said that the proposed PhD program would help recruit better faculty and better undergraduate students, and reiterated that it would enhance undergraduate research in mathematics.

Interim Dean Gibbison noted that some of our aspirational peers, such as Miami of Ohio, have PhD programs but are still known for undergraduate teaching. He asked, are we going to provide programs that meet the needs of the region, or are we going to back away and let someone else do it?

Senator Brooke Van Horn (Chemistry and Biochemistry) said that her concern with the proposal was that it could keep undergraduate students here for their graduate work when they might flourish by pursuing a PhD at a larger institution with significant networking opportunities. Senator Mignone responded that the Mathematics Department has about 90 majors, very few of whom would stay here for a PhD. He said that supporting this program, which is small and consistent with our liberal arts mission, does not mean one would support every PhD proposal. Professor Calini added that while some students who enroll in the PhD program might be C of C undergraduates, that’s not the population they are planning to draw from, primarily.

The proposal passed by voice vote.
7. New Classes for Doctoral Program in Mathematics with Computation: **passed unanimously by voice vote.**

MATH 630 Theory of Probability

MATH 803 Algebra III

MATH 811 Functional Analysis

MATH 823 Partial Differential Equations III

MATH 824 Advanced Dynamical Systems
[https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:945/form PDF](https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:945/form)

MATH 830 Theory of Stochastic Processes
[https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:946/form PDF](https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:946/form)

MATH 845 Advanced Scientific Computing

MATH 880 Advanced Special Topics

MATH 999 Doctoral Dissertation Research
[https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:950/form PDF](https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:950/form)

c. General Education Committee (Susan Kattwinkel, Chair)

Deactivate the following courses from the General Education language requirement:

- [HNDI - 101 - Elementary Hindi I PDF](https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:951/form)
- [HNDI – 102 – Elementary Hindi II PDF](https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:952/form)
- [HNDI - 201 - Intermediate Hindi I PDF](https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:953/form)
- [HNDI - 202 - Intermediate Hindi II PDF](https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:954/form)

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

d. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual (Mike Lee, Chair):
Proposal to revise the composition of the Adjunct Oversight Committee in the By-Laws.
[PDF](https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:955/form)  Professor Lee explained that the revision is intended to make it easier to find people
to serve on the Adjunct Oversight Committee by loosening the restrictions. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

6. Constituents’ General Concerns: There were none.

7. The meeting adjourned at 6:22.
Faculty Senate, Tuesday, January 15, 2019, 5:00 PM
Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:05.

2. The minutes from December 4, 2018 were approved.

3. Announcements and Information/Reports

   a. **Speaker of the Faculty Elizabeth Jurisich** announced that she will not seek another term because she will be starting a new appointment as Chair of Mathematics. She asked Senators to encourage colleagues to consider running for the position of Speaker.

   Incoming President Andrew Hsu will be on campus January 23; he will address the campus community and attend a reception with faculty, staff, and students. Speaker Jurisich thanked Provost Brian McGee for being an effective academic consultant and “academic voice” in the administration. Provost McGee has accepted the position of President of Quincy University.

   The grade redemption policy that was passed by the Senate last year has not been implemented yet, but the Registrar and Academic Affairs are working on it, making sure that it does not contradict existing policy.

   Curriculog forms will be deactivated on March 1. The Speaker recommended working offline after March 1 on any curriculum changes you might be planning for next year; you can cut-and-paste when the new forms are available. Associate Vice Provost for the Academic Experience Lynne Ford added that March 1 is the last date on which a proposal can be considered for next year’s catalog. The forms will change next year because the catalog will have changed.

   b. **Provost Brian McGee** reported on leadership transitions, divisional policy development, budget proposals for the next fiscal year, and classroom re-allocation.

   He thanked Speaker Jurisich for her service over the past two years; announced that Associate Provost Lynn Cherry has returned to campus but that, in the interest of continuity, Lynne Ford will continue temporarily to manage some of the responsibilities she assumed during Lynn Cherry’s absence.

   Regarding the naming of an Interim Provost and Dean searches, Provost McGee reported the President-Elect Hsu was aware of these situations; he (McGee) is confident we will get it right.
The College is dealing with over 100 filed or pre-filed state legislature bills that could affect us. At the federal level, there is a possibility that the credit-hour policy for colleges and universities, put in place in 2010, might be eliminated.

The Division of Academic Affairs is considering creating or changing policies on password security, reading days, and revocation of degrees.

The possibility, raised by Governor McMaster, that South Carolina could freeze tuition for next year while increasing funding for state institutions might affect our budgeting process this spring.

The Academic Council will consider a draft of classroom reallocation at its February meeting. The goal is to make the allocation of classrooms for priority scheduling fairer and more equitable.

Regarding the Senate agenda: the Provost has invited faculty and student leaders to discuss the issue of Honor Code sanctions in February, so if the new policy is not settled at tonight’s meeting, the discussion will continue there and come back to the Senate. PDF

c. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual (Mike Lee, Chair): Gender-neutral language in faculty by-laws. The report was deferred by unanimous consent.

d. Committee on Graduate Education (Sandy Slater, Chair): Update on PhD in Math and Data Computation (report only, but the proposal in its current form is accessible at https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:899/form PDF)

Prof. Slater clarified that the proposal has passed the graduate curriculum committee and that it will come before the Senate at the next meeting. There have been some changes as the proposal has moved through Curriculog, and there are numerous new course proposals associated with it.

Senator Richard Nunan (Philosophy) asked if the proposal is facing a deadline that would require getting Senate approval at the February meeting. Prof. Slater responded that the program will be implemented in Fall 2020 if approved, so there is no immediate deadline.

Senator Steve Short (HSS) asked how the new program would affect the math department’s adjunct dependence, percentage-wise.

Professors Annalisa Calini and Sandra Shields responded that the effect will be marginal. The department’s adjunct dependence is large, and the program will allow some sections to be taught by well-qualified TA’s rather than adjuncts.
e. **Committee on Nominations and Elections** (RoxAnn Stalvey, Chair): Senate Reapportionment. Prof. Stalvey explained that the FAM requires the Nominations and Elections Committee to reapportion Senate seats every three years. The committee used the Huntington-Hill method for apportioning seats. The main result is that the School of Education, Health, and Human Performance and the School of Humanities and Social Sciences each lose an at-large seat, and the School of Business and the School of Sciences and Mathematics each gain a seat. Details can be found in the presentation: [PDF](#).

5. **Old Business**

a. **Faculty Committee on Academic Standards** (Ricard Viñas de Puig, Chair): Proposal to revised criteria for Departmental Honors. [PDF](#) The proposal was withdrawn by unanimous consent.

6. **New Business**

a. **Curriculum Committee** (Chad Galuska, Chair)

All motions from the Curriculum Committee were approved by unanimous voice vote, with no discussion.

1. ARTS:
   i. **ARTS 235: Special Topics in Studio Practice**: New course proposal. [PDF](#)
   ii. **ARTS 335: Special Topics in Advanced Studio Practice**: Course title, description, and prerequisite changes [PDF](#)

2. COMM: Credit-hour change for **COMM-BA** [PDF](#)

3. COMP: **Terminate the Computational Thinking Minor** [PDF](#)

4. PSYC:
   i. **PSYC 216: Sensation and Perception**: Course description change [PDF](#)
   ii. **PSYC 318: Comparative Animal Psychology**: Course title change [PDF](#)
   iii. **PSYC 447: Seminar in Neuroscience**: Course description and prerequisite changes [PDF](#)

b. **Dean of Students Jeri Cabot, Committee on Student on Student Affairs and Athletics (Allison Sterrett-Krause, Chair), and Faculty Committee on Academic Standards (Ricard Viñas de Puig, Chair)**: Proposed Revisions to Honor Code Sanctions.
Using the attached slide presentation, Dean Cabot and Profs. Sterrett-Krause and Viñas de Puig provided an overview of the issue and the proposal. They emphasized the goals of the proposal, which are to provide more flexibility in regard to sanctions and to provide more opportunity to educate students in the process. They noted that other South Carolina schools and peer institutions use various approaches to sanctions for Honor Code violations. Dean Cabot also clarified that this policy resides in the student handbook; that’s where any approved changes will appear.

Senator Lauren Hetrovicz (Adjunct Senator, Hispanic Studies) asked how much education about plagiarism C of C students receive in their first semester.

Dean Cabot replied that in addition to what individual instructors do in class, during orientation, students are read a definition of plagiarism, cheating, and lying; they sign a statement indicating that they understand it.

Senator Jolanda Van Arnhem (Library) added that embedded librarians provide instruction in information literacy for FYE classes and other classes if faculty want them; but in her experience the only students assured of receiving this instruction are SPECTRA students. She pointed out that many students do not take English 110 (where they are likely to receive instruction on documentation practices) until their second semester. There needs to be a remediation policy so that students who plagiarize can learn what they did wrong. Dean Cabot and Prof. Sterrett-Krause said that further education usually accompanies the XXF sanction.

Senator Anthony Bishara (HSS) noted approvingly the ability to assign a variety of grades along with the XX. Faculty often don’t want to turn a case over to the Honor Board when the violation occurred on a minor assignment. He asked if the XX+grade is also a way to address the underreporting problem. Prof. Sterrett-Krause first clarified that the Honor Board does not assign course grades, only the sanction of the XX and a zero on the assignment. She said that while she was not sure that the XX+grade would improve reporting rates, she believes we need a policy that allows for a more developmental approach, with a level of punishment between the extremes of “a slap on the wrist” and “cut[ting] your head off.”

Senator Tom Carroll (EHHP) asked for the percentage of successful petitions to remove the XX from the transcript. Dean Cabot reported that it’s 99.6; nearly every petition to remove the XX is accepted.

Speaker Jurisich displayed a letter from the academic deans, outlining their concerns with the proposal (attached).
Sen. Hetrovicz expressed concern that our students are not being taught adequately about plagiarism and academic integrity, and that they are being punished for violating rules that haven’t been explained to them. Dean Cabot responded that faculty do in fact teach the meaning and importance of academic integrity and include language about it in their syllabi. Prof. Sterrett-Krause added that the revised system would add more opportunity to educate students about these issues.

Registrar Mary Bergstrom pointed out that the transcript is a legal document, and her office will have to answer questions from other institutions about the meaning of the XX+grade on individual transcripts. She also pointed out that the XX-grade will count the same as the same grade without the XX in calculating GPA for awards and honors. She was also concerned about the possibility of having to certify (if asked) that a transcript, from which XXs have been removed, never had any grades affected by cheating. She had already expressed these concerns to the committee working on the proposal.

Prof. Sterrett-Krause acknowledged that the Registrar had shared these concerns previously and that the committee took them seriously. They felt that since the XXs on an XX-F grade can already be removed after two years, the removal of XXs from other grades after one year would not create a significant problem.

Senator Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre and Dance) pointed out that there is a required class session in FYE synthesis seminars on academic integrity. She asked about the deans’ objection to grades changing through the removal of XXs. Since we already do that with XX-Fs, why would doing the same thing for XX+grades (other than F) be problematic? Having the XXs removed from non-failing course grades that were affected by a zero on a single assignment is not significantly different from our current practice, where professors often assign a zero to the assignment on which a student cheated without going to the Honor Board, allowing the student to pass but with a lower grade. She likened it to students who earn lower course grades for laziness or neglect --- there are many reasons a student receives a lower course grade than they are capable of earning.

The discussion turned to the degree of discretion individual faculty members would have in this more flexible system. Sen. Idee Winfield (HSS) expressed concern that the variance among professors’ policies in determining the grade that goes along with the XX could put us back where we are, with a disincentive to report. She added that students might be more willing to risk cheating if they perceive that the penalty is less severe, with the XX stigma disappearing after a year. Prof. Sterrett-Krause pointed out that the XX-F sanction remains a possibility for Class 2 as well as Class 1 violations, but it would be less likely to be imposed on cases involving minor assignments. The XX-F would be a more likely sanction for second offenses.

Prof. Jon Hakkila (Guest) described the gradual process of learning how academic writing works, suggesting that acquiring the skill of responsibly integrating others’ ideas into
one’s own prose is taught over the course of a college career; it’s not something you learn to do with one lesson.

Senator John Huddleston (Religious Studies) questioned the possibility that students might still be getting As and Bs after having cheated even on a small assignment. A professor should be able to take the position that cheating is cheating, that its wrongness is not relative to the magnitude of the assignment.

Senator Julia Eichelberger (HSS) sought clarity on the degree to which a faculty member has control over the grade, specifically the prerogative to assign an F if the policy on the syllabus indicates that the instructor will assign an F to any student who cheats. Members of the committee affirmed that faculty do have that control. Sen. Eichelberger then questioned the deans’ claim that faculty would have inadequate input under the new system; Dean Cabot responded that the deans were concerned about the lack of faculty input when it comes to expunging the XX from the grade.

Senator Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism Mgmt.) asked if this proposal allows for negotiation between instructor and student, whereby the student can either accept the instructor’s penalty without an Honor Board hearing or have the case turned over to the Honor Board and risk receiving a penalty that appears on the transcript. Dean Cabot replied that the power imbalance between the two parties in such cases makes “negotiation” problematic. Sen. Litvin asserted that this practice is happening nonetheless.

Sen. Irina Erman (German and Russian Studies) noted the effectiveness of the Class 3 sanctions, in which the instructor determines the penalty and grade but records the incident with the Honor Board. In light of that, she asked what problem the XX+grade is intended to solve; wouldn’t the kinds of sanctions that would allow a passing grade currently be treated as Class 3 violations? Prof. Sterrett-Krause responded that deliberate acts of dishonesty are Class 2 violations, but some are not as serious as others. Sen. Erman suggested revising the categories rather than having a subcategory of less serious Class 2 violations with less serious sanctions. Defending the current categories, Prof. Sterrett-Krause maintained that there is a distinction to be made between Class 1 and Class 2, and that there is already a range of violations within Class 2.

Provost McGee pointed out that the implementation of the current system twelve years ago was itself controversial; and that many of those present have worked at institutions with policies that allow instructors more discretion than we have here, and others have worked at institutions with policies that allow less discretion. We are not likely to reach unanimity on this issue, but we can improve the system. He suggested that, given the level of discomfort with the current proposal, the committee could meet with him and the deans “to talk about options that go potentially beyond what’s here.” He suggested tabling the proposal until the March meeting and said he would invite committee
members to the February Academic Council meeting to discuss it further with Student Affairs leadership; he would move to table if called on again by the Speaker.

Senator Richard Nunan (Philosophy) objected to the Provost making motions. Speaker Jurisich said that he is allowed to do so under the Senate rules. Sen. Nunan reiterated that it is not a good practice. Responding to an earlier comment, he said he did not think it was a good idea to have faculty assigning XX grades on their own. He also said that the language in the proposal is unclear, making it difficult to answer some earlier questions such as Sen. Winfield’s. He suggested thinking through the language more carefully.

After consulting with the Parliamentarian, Sen. Van Arnhem moved that the Senate postpone indefinitely the motion to adopt the revised Honor Code sanctions. Speaker Jurisich explained that the motion as currently written would be reintroduced at a future meeting, but amendments that had been prepared ahead of time, and possibly approved by the committee, could be introduced at that time. The motion to postpone indefinitely passed by unanimous voice vote.

c. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual (Mike Lee, Chair): Proposal to revise the composition of the Adjunct Oversight Committee in the By-Laws. PDF The proposal was postponed until the February meeting without objection.

6. Constituents’ General Concerns: Sen. Nunan commented on Cougar Mall electronic signage, which had been discussed during CIO Mark Staples’s report to the Senate in December. Mr. Staples had reported that the electronic sign would be updated frequently with useful information. Sen. Nunan said that he has checked the sign a few times since then. He believes it is still ugly and does not contain the substantive information promised by Mr. Staples.

Sen. Nunan’s second comment was one of concern for the state of faculty governance in light of the Senate’s handling of the recent engineering proposal. He said the program was announced at the November meeting and that people were not expecting it to be voted on at the next meeting, where we were told that the CHE deadline made it necessary to decide “now.” It bothered Sen. Nunan that the Senate went along with that; the Senate tends to sign off on anything that the Curriculum Committee has approved. The Senate is capable of thoughtful deliberation, such as the one that had just taken place about Honor Code sanctions, but he did not believe the Senate took its responsibility for the curriculum seriously in regard to the proposal for the engineering majors.

Prof. Bill Olejniczak (Guest) followed up on his request at the October 2018 meeting concerning the Compensation Committee’s update on faculty salaries. The deadline for this report was September 2018. He asked what came of that. Speaker Jurisich promised to follow up with the Compensation Committee.

7. The meeting adjourned at 7:02.
Appendix
Allocation of Faculty Senators for 2019 - 2022

Susan Farrell, Merissa Ferrara, Renée McCauley, Bob Mignone, Jared Seay, Julie Swanson, and RoxAnn Stalvey (chair)
Why and what’s the process?

• “Every three years, beginning in the fall semester of 2015, the Committee on Nominations and Elections shall...report, at the January meeting of the Faculty Senate, the allocation of Faculty Senators for each School to be effective at the start of the next fall semester.” ~ Faculty/Administration Manual

• Process:
  1. Acquire numbers from Academic Affairs
  2. Apply Huntington-Hill method to the data
  3. Determine new senator count for each school
  4. Report at January meeting
The numbers as reported by Academic Affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHHP</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>146.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCWA</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBR</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTA</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>128.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>514</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Huntington-Hill Method

1. Find the divisor
2. Find the school quota
3. Compare the school quota to the geometric mean
4. If the school quota exceeds the geometric mean, give that school an extra seat
5. Adjust the divisor as necessary to make sure all seats are apportioned

https://sites.google.com/site/huntingtonhillmethod/the-huntington-hill-method
Allocated Senators for Fall 2019 – Spring 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>2019-22 Number of Senators</th>
<th>Departmental Senators</th>
<th>At-large Senators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHHP</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>146.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCWA</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTA</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>128.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Resulting Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2019-22 Number of Senators</th>
<th>2015-19 Number of Senators</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHHP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCWA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
To: Jeri Cabot, Dean of Students

From: Sean Stivaletta, Chairperson, Honor Board

Re: Honor Code Review Committee Update

Date: November 15, 2015

Committee Members

Jasmine Gill, SGA and Honor Board
Zachery Sturman, SGA
David Ahnen, Honor Board
Sean Stivaletta, Honor Board
Emily Beck, Honor Board
David Boucher, Faculty
Iana Anguelova, Faculty
John Chadwick, Faculty

After reviewing my notes from the meetings we had last year, I was able to pick up where we left off. There are still several unanswered questions, but we were working toward a consensus on other topics.

To begin, in order to make the new system work, faculty members must be educated about mandatory reporting. Even if the professor and the student agree to their own repercussions (most commonly a 0 on the assignment), the information must be passed along to the Office of Student Affairs for communication purposes so that we can see if there are trends. It is altogether too unlikely that all students would report incidents even if it were school policy, but they need to be educated on upholding the integrity of the College. These educational aspects could be done through orientation, first year experience courses, and letters to department chairs for distribution.

The Honor Code Review Committee had reached a working consensus to recommend the following changes:

1. The Code should now include Faculty / Student “resolutions” for first offenses. This would give professors the opportunity to handle the situation themselves and pass their sanctions along to the Honor Board. Unless the faculty member or a member of the Office of Student Affairs finds that the incident needs additional attention, as would be the case in more serious offenses, the sanctions will likely be upheld or only slightly adjusted to add educational requirements. The language of seriousness of offense, or some similar language, will be put in place to give Faculty members and Student Affairs officials more discretion.

   A. It should be noted that faculty members cannot sanction an XF.
B. If a faculty member chooses to use this new option, but the student disagrees with the recommended sanction, the student has the right to appeal.

C. Prior offenses shall **NOT** be shared with faculty members. In such a case, the Office of Student Affairs will handle the incident as a second offense in accordance with the Student Handbook.

In terms of the XF Policy, the following recommendations had been made in order to make our system more flexible and responsive to mitigating and aggravating circumstances. There would now be two types of XF sanctions:

1. **XF(a):** an XF would be put in place until the completion of additional educational or disciplinary sanctions and then removed upon successful petition.

   **Question:** Does this mean the student fails the course, or could they hypothetically complete the sanctions prior to the end of the semester and be able to complete the course?

2. **XF(b):** The three class system would remain in place, using levels of intent to deceive to determine which class, but additional sanction options would make the Board more flexible for class II violations in particular and occasionally class I incidents as well. XF’s would now be able to be applied for 1 year, 2 years, or three years, before a petition to remove the X would be allowed.

Lingering questions:

1. **Should there be an amnesty policy for students who self report?** Is this problem solved by allowing Faculty / Student resolutions?

2. **Would giving decisional authority to faculty members lead us back to a wide variety of results for similar incidents?** Is this really a problem since faculty members should be trusted to make their own decisions for first offenses?

---

Sean P. Stivaletta ’16
Honor Board Chair
Office of the Dean of Students
Division of Student Affairs
College of Charleston
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Plagiarism</th>
<th>Attempted Cheating/Lying</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class 1 = XF + Suspension; Class 2 = XF + Other sanction; Class 3 = Instructor sets outcome (usually zero on assignment). The totals under Class sanctions do not equal the totals under reports because some students are found not in violation or there is insufficient evidence to charge.
Common Practices at Regional and Peer Institutions
Compiled by members of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics, 2016-2017

Flexible or Mandatory Sanctions

- Faculty work with students to decide penalties for all non-major and/or first offenses. (suspension/expulsion not an option).
  - Coastal Carolina
  - UNC-Greensboro
  - James Madison
  - Maryland
  - William and Mary
  - UNC-Wilmington
  - Hofstra
  - Clemson

- Mandatory sanctions based on nature of cheating/number of violations.
  - UNC-Greensboro (mandatory suspension/expulsion for second offense)
  - James Madison (mandatory suspension for second offense, expulsion for third offense)
  - William and Mary (very structured list of sanctions)
  - Maryland
  - Hofstra
  - Clemson

- List a suite of sanctions and allow honor board to pick and choose.
  - Coastal Carolina
  - UNC-Greensboro (for first offenses decided by the honor board)
  - UC-San Diego
  - UNC-Wilmington
  - South Carolina

Educational/academic integrity workshop.

- List of website
  - Coastal Carolina
  - UNC Greensboro
  - UC-San Diego
  - South Carolina

Transcript notation or not.

- Should there be an “X” on the transcript.
  - Coastal Carolina
  - UC-San Diego
  - James Madison
  - Maryland
  - South Carolina

Additional Sanctions/Considerations

Allow faculty member to recommend sanctions to the honor board.
• Would provide flexibility for honor board. Coastal Carolina does this.

Separate course grade from “X” notation.
• For example, cheating on a homework assignment may result in a “0” for the assignment and an “X” on the transcript but the student may still earn an “XB” for the course. South Carolina does this.

Create an additional offense category that is informally adjudicated between the faculty member and the student for all non-serious, first offense violations.
• Any second offense violation, no matter the severity, would automatically go to the honor board.
Proposed changes to Honor Code violations

Faculty Committees on Academic Standards & Student Affairs and Athletics
Faculty Senate Meeting
15 January 2019
1. What we propose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Possible Sanctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS 1 – Severe</strong>&lt;br&gt;Act involves significant premeditation; conspiracy and/or intent to deceive.</td>
<td>• Buying, or otherwise acquiring, a research paper or unadministered exam.&lt;br&gt;• Cheating on a test with significant premeditation and conspiracy of effort.&lt;br&gt;• Intentional plagiarizing, where majority of submitted work was created by another.&lt;br&gt;• All second Class 2 offenses.</td>
<td>XX-F and expulsion&lt;br&gt;XX-F and suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS 2 – Serious</strong>&lt;br&gt;Act involves deliberate failure to comply with assignment directions, some conspiracy and/or intent to deceive.</td>
<td>• Cheating on a test with minimal premeditation.&lt;br&gt;• Copying, or allowing one to copy, from another’s exam.&lt;br&gt;• Intentional plagiarizing, where a moderate portion of submitted work was created by another.&lt;br&gt;• Unauthorized reuse of previously graded work.&lt;br&gt;• Copying, or allowing one to copy, homework assignments.&lt;br&gt;• Use of internet when explicitly prohibited.&lt;br&gt;• All second Class 3 offenses.</td>
<td>XX-F and disciplinary probation&lt;br&gt;XX-F, probation, and educational sanctions&lt;br&gt;<strong>XX-Grade</strong> with “0” on assignment&lt;br&gt;<strong>XX-Grade</strong> with “0” on assignment and educational sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS 3 – Cautionary</strong>&lt;br&gt;Act mostly due to ignorance, misunderstanding, confusion, and/or poor communication between instructor and class.</td>
<td>• Unintentional violation of class rules on collaboration.&lt;br&gt;• Unintentional possession of a study aid.&lt;br&gt;• Unintentionally failing to cite information from proper source.&lt;br&gt;• Reusing and/or building upon coursework already submitted for another class without permission from the instructor.</td>
<td>Instructor sets penalty and discusses with student. Both instructor and student sign a form, which is forwarded to the Office of the Dean of Students and stored in student’s file.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. What we propose

• Class 1 and Class 3 will effectively remain the same.

• Class 2 violations will have more options. The Honor Board will keep the right to assign XX-F for a Class 2 violation, but will also be able to assign XX-Grade. The student would receive a “zero” on the assignment and the instructor will determine an appropriate grade for the overall course.

• Student can petition to have XX-Grade sanction removed after 1 year.

• We anticipate faculty will be more willing to report minor to moderate infractions if they can have a say in the overall student grade.
2. What are the current sanctions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 1</th>
<th>act involves significant premeditation; conspiracy and/or intent to deceive, e.g., purchasing a research paper.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Penalties:</strong> XX-F and either suspension or expulsion assigned if student found responsible by Honor Board or other decisional authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 2</th>
<th>act involves deliberate failure to comply with assignment directions, some conspiracy and/or intent to deceive, e.g., use of the Internet when prohibited, some fabricated endnotes or data, copying several answers from another student’s test.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Penalties:</strong> XX-F and other sanctions assigned if student found responsible by Honor Board or other decisional authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 3</th>
<th>act mostly due to ignorance, misunderstanding, confusion and/or poor communication between instructor and class, e.g., unintentional violation of the class rules on collaboration or the rules of citation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Penalties:</strong> The instructor sets the penalty and discusses it with the student. Both the instructor and student sign a form. The form is forwarded to the Office of the Dean of Students. See “Class 3 Report Form” on the Honor System website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: XX-F means course failure and “XX” dishonesty mark on transcript for a minimum of 2 years before it can be petitioned.*
2. Why revisit the sanctions?

• Honor Board members report they feel constrained by the severity of the XX-F sanction, particularly for Class 2 violations. Many cases involve low-stakes assignments, but Class 2 violations require a severe penalty.

• There is a hesitancy for instructors to report less-severe violations. Even in situations where the act was intentional, it may have been a spur-of-the-moment decision. Instructors should have a say in the student’s final grade.

• Flexibility for misunderstandings in online courses.
3. Recent data – violation types at CofC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Plagiarism</th>
<th>Attempted Cheating/Cheating</th>
<th>Lying</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most violations are due to plagiarism, but cheating violations are increasing.
### 3. Recent data – sanctions

**XX-F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2011, **10x more** Class 2 XX-Fs than Class 1 XX-Fs

Class 1 = XXF + Suspension; Class 2 = XXF + Other sanction; Class 3 = Instructor sets outcome (usually zero on assignment). The totals under Class sanctions do not equal the totals under reports because some students are found not in violation or there is insufficient evidence to charge.
3. Recent data – Center for Academic Integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Undergrads</th>
<th>Undergraduates*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number responding</td>
<td>~17,000</td>
<td>~71,300</td>
<td>~71,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% who admit cheating on tests:</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% who admit cheating on written assignments:</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% total who admit written or test cheating:</td>
<td>43 %</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding first year students, code schools, and two year schools

This basic dataset was compiled based upon surveys that were conducted between Fall 2002 and Spring 2015, by Dr. Donald McCabe and the International Center for Academic Integrity.
4. Proposal Development Process

- In prior years, the Student Affairs and Athletics Committee looked at common practices at regional and peer institutions:

  - **USC**: already has a policy similar to the XX-Grade policy. A student may receive an “X” on their transcript but can still receive a non-failing grade for the course. The “X” is only given in the most serious cases or if it is a second violation.

  - **Clemson**: severity of sanction depends on the number of offenses. No “X” designations are used whatsoever, and the most extreme sanction for a first-time offender is a “F” final grade for the course. A second offense results in suspension or dismissal.
4. Proposal Development Process

**Other peer institutions**

- **Faculty have complete autonomy over all cases of academic dishonesty.** 
  Inconsistency in penalties for similar offenses; possible unfair treatment/bias.
- **Faculty impose penalty for non-major offenses** 
  Limited/no reporting of minor offenses; lacks developmental-educational approach to academic integrity
- **Range of sanctions/mandatory sanctions** 
  Consistent across offenses; some involve faculty or honor board in decision process; second-third offenses typically incur severe penalties (suspension/expulsion)
  - X-Grade sanction (or similar) available at Coastal Carolina, UC-San Diego, James Madison, Maryland, South Carolina
5. Potential Objections, Considered

• **Grade integrity**
  XX-Grade sanction provides a more transparent means of communication about academic dishonesty and student performance.

  Due to current underreporting, even “clean” grades could mask minor instances of academic dishonesty.

• **Differing treatment of Class 2 infractions**
  XXF grade granted in recent years for assignments worth approximately 3.5% to 30% of total grade.

  XX-Grade sanction allows for more consistent treatment of violations depending on the weight of the assignment.
**Faculty input** – When a faculty member determines a student has committed academic dishonesty, he or she will fill out the appropriate Honor Code Report form. The faculty member has the option of designating whether he/she believes that the offense warrants the grade of XXF.

**Schedule of Sanctions for Violations of Academic Dishonesty**

A. Class 1. The most severe breaches of academic honesty fall into this category, as well as all second or more offenses of any Class 2 violations. Class I violations must be found to involve significant premeditation, conspiracy, and/or intent to deceive.

If the Honor Board or other decisional authority sanctions a student with a status indicator and grade of XXF, and this sanction is not appealed by the student, the Dean of Students and the faculty member shall notify the Registrar to place a grade of XXF for the applicable course on the student's academic record. The grade XXF shall be recorded on the student's transcript with the notation "failure due to academic dishonesty."

Student appeals of the XXF grade follow the procedure for all other appeals of academic dishonesty sanctions, as outlined in the *Student Handbook*. If the Appellate Board denies the right to another hearing, or another hearing is granted and the Honor Board decides to uphold the XXF grade sanction, the dean of students and the faculty member shall notify the Registrar to assign the XXF grade to the student's academic record.

If grades are due but an academic dishonesty hearing is still in progress, a grade of 'I' shall be applied to the course until the hearing process is complete.

An XXF grade shall maintain a quality point value of 0.0. The grade "XXF" shall be treated in the same way as an "F" for the purposes of Grade Point Average, course repeatability, and determination of academic standing.

The XXF must stay on the transcript for at least two years from the date student is found in violation.

After two years, a student may petition the Honor Board to exchange the XXF for an F. The petition must be in written form and provide the reason for removal of the XXF. Additionally, the petitioner must appear before the Honor Board to explain the request (appearance may be through electronic means if necessary). If the student petitions and a majority of the Honor Board agree to remove the XXF, the Honor Board outlines conditions under which the XXF is removed. The conditions may include giving testimony of dishonesty during freshman orientation or other organized Honor Board events, and/or performing specific tasks aimed at increasing the education of the violator and/or campus on the value of academic integrity. When these conditions are met, the XXF is removed entirely from the transcript, leaving no past evidence of the XXF on the transcript. A grade of F is recorded in its place. Evidence of Honor Code violations is maintained in student files of the Office of the Dean of Students in accordance with College document retention procedures.

If a petition to change an XXF grade to an F has been made and denied, another petition may not be made for another year from the date of denial. This stipulation applies after graduation as well.

If the student is/has been found responsible of an additional violation of academic honesty, either in the past or future, the XXF remains. For cases where the XXF was changed to an F and the student is later found responsible of an additional act of academic dishonesty, the XXF grade is restored for the course. In these cases, the XXF remains permanent. The student may not petition for an F in exchange for the XXF in these cases.
A student who has received an XXF in a course and needs to pass the course for a requirement may retake the course. If the student passes the course, the requirement is met, but the original course grade will remain as an XXF unless the XX is removed by an accepted petition for removal.

See listing table of sanctions and examples at the end of this policy.

Sanction options:

— XXF grade and suspension
— XXF grade and expulsion

B. Class 2. This class includes serious acts that are found to involve deliberate failure to comply with assignment(s) directions, some conspiracy, and/or intent to deceive, as well as all second Class 3 offenses.

In determining whether a violation is Class 1 (severe) or Class 2 (serious) and the appropriate sanctions, factors such as the weight of the assignment, the nature of the deception, and student admission of responsibility may be considered.

In cases of a Class 2 (“serious”) violation, the Honor Board or other decisional authority will have the authority to issue a grade of XXF or to issue the XX-indicator as a sanction without assigning a failing grade for the course.

A student receiving the sanction of an XX-marked grade through the Honor process will receive a grade of “0” on the assignment. Faculty will calculate the final course grade according to their published practices and then inform the Dean of Students in writing of the student’s calculated final grade in the course. The Dean of Students will direct the Registrar to assign the appropriate XX-marked grade to the student. Final authority over the student’s calculated grade lies with the faculty member, but only the Office of the Dean of Students may direct the Registrar to place an XX-indicator on the student’s transcript. The XX-indicator shall appear on the transcript with a notation of “responsible for academic dishonesty.”

The XX-marked grade will be treated as a credit- and quality point-bearing grade for the purposes of Grade Point Average, course repeatability, and determination of academic standing. The assignment of the XX-marked grade indicates that, despite the lapse in judgment leading to the Honor violation, the student has demonstrated knowledge and skills in the course commensurate with the assigned grade. The XX-marked grade must stay on the transcript for at least one year from the date student is found in violation.

After one year, a student may petition the Honor Board to exchange the XX-marked grade for an unmarked grade. The petition must be in written form and provide the reason for removal of the XX-indicator and notation of academic dishonesty. Additionally, the petitioner must appear before the Honor Board to explain the request (appearance may be through electronic means if necessary). If the student petitions and a majority of the Honor Board agree to remove the XX-indicator, the Honor Board outlines conditions under which the XX-indicator is removed. The conditions may include giving testimony of dishonesty during freshman orientation or other organized Honor Board events, and/or performing specific tasks aimed at increasing the education of the violator and/or campus on the value of academic integrity. When these conditions are met, the XX-marked grade is removed entirely from the transcript, leaving no past evidence of the XX-indicator. An equivalent unmarked grade is recorded in its place. Evidence of Honor Code violations is maintained in student files of the Office of the Dean of Students in accordance with College document retention procedures.

If a petition to change an XX-marked grade to an unmarked grade has been made and denied, another petition may not be made for another year from the date of denial. This stipulation applies after graduation as well.
XX-marked grades are not eligible for grade forgiveness or redemption while the XX-indicator remains on the student’s transcript. XX-marked grades may only be redeemed after a successful petition to remove the XX-indicator.

If grades are due but an academic dishonesty hearing is still in progress, a grade of 'I' shall be applied to the course until the hearing process is complete.

See listing table of sanctions and examples at the end of this policy.

Sanction options:

- XXF grade and disciplinary probation
- XXF grade and disciplinary probation and/or other educational sanctions
- XXF grade and some form of suspension

C. Class 3. This class includes violations for which cautionary action is warranted. The violation may be due to student confusion; ignorance; and/or miscommunication or incomplete communication between the instructor or their designee and the class. Additionally, factors such as the weight of the assignment, the nature of the violation, and student admission of responsibility may be considered. See table of examples at the end of this policy.

Class 1 and 2 Violations

Class 3 Violations

When a faculty member suspects an Honor Code violation is a result of student confusion, ignorance, or miscommunication, they should arrange a conference with the student as soon as possible to discuss the matter.

Together, the faculty member and student review all materials.

The faculty member proposes a response which is discussed with the student, e.g., zero on the assignment, written warning, resubmission of the work, research on relevant topic, etc.

The faculty member and student agree upon a response and commit the agreement to a form provided by the Dean of Students.

A written record of the educational response with the signatures of both the faculty member and the student is forwarded to the Dean of Students. The record will remain in the Dean of Students office until the student graduates.

The record of the educational response for this violation will be introduced in subsequent hearings during the sanctioning phase should the same student be found in violation of the Honor Code at a later point in time.

The student has the right to contest the allegation and/or the suggested response and request that the matter be forwarded immediately to the Dean of Students for adjudication under the procedures outlined in the Student Handbook.
Changes to the operation of the XXF grade as a sanction option within the Honor System must go through the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards and the Faculty Senate.

Sanctions for and examples of violations for Classes 1-3. The example violation lists below are not meant to be comprehensive but illustrative of the types of acts that generally will be before the Honor Board and faculty members.

Examples of Class 1 violations:

All second offences of any class,

cheating on a test which involves significant premeditation and conspiracy of effort,

taking a test for someone else, or permitting someone else to take a test or course in one's place,

intentional plagiarizing, where the majority of the submitted work was written or created by another,

obtaining, stealing, or buying all or a significant part of an unadministered exam,

selling, or giving away all or a significant part of an unadministered test,

bribing, or attempting to bribe any other person to obtain an unadministered test or any information about the test,

buying, or otherwise acquiring, another's course paper and resubmitting it as one's own work, whether altered or not

entering a building, office, or computer for the purpose of changing a grade in a grade book, on a test, or on other work for which a grade is given,

changing, altering, or being an accessory to changing and/or altering a grade in a grade book, on a test, on a "Change of Grade" form, or other official academic college record which relates to grades, and

entering a building, office, or computer for the purpose of obtaining an unadministered test.

Examples of Class 2 violations:

cheating on an exam which involves some premeditation,

copying from another's test or allowing another student to copy from your test, where some plans were made for such collaboration,

intentional plagiarizing, where a moderate portion of the submitted work was written or created by another,

unauthorized reuse of previously graded work,

intentionally failing to cite information from the correct source,
intentionally listing sources in a bibliography/work cited page that were not used in the paper,

copying, or allowing one to copy, homework assignments that are to be submitted for credit, when unauthorized,

intentionally opening an officially sealed envelope containing an exam, test or other class-related material,

unauthorized and intentional collaboration on an assignment, and

unauthorized and intentional use or possession of a study aid.

Examples of Class 3 violations:

record of same offense made on other similar assignments and no feedback provided by the instructor prior to allegation,

reusing and/or building upon coursework already submitted for another class without permission of the professor,

unintentionally failing to cite information from the correct source,

unintentional violation of the class rules on collaboration, and

unintentional possession of a study aid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Possible Sanctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1—Severe</td>
<td>Buying, or otherwise acquiring, a research paper or unadministered exam.</td>
<td>XX-F grade and suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act involves significant</td>
<td>Cheating on a test with significant premeditation and conspiracy of effort.</td>
<td>XX-F grade and expulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>premeditation; conspiracy</td>
<td>Intentional plagiarizing, where majority of submitted work was created by another.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or intent to deceive.</td>
<td>All second Class 2 offences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2—Serious</td>
<td>Cheating on a test with minimal premeditation.</td>
<td>XX-F and disciplinary probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act involves deliberate</td>
<td>Copying, or allowing one to copy, from another’s test.</td>
<td>XX-F and disciplinary probation and other educational sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failure to comply with</td>
<td>Intentional plagiarizing, where a moderate portion of submitted work was created by another.</td>
<td>XX-F and some form of suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assignment directions,</td>
<td>Unauthorized reuse of previously graded work.</td>
<td>XX-marked Grade with “0” on assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some conspiracy and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX-marked Grade with “0” on assignment and other educational sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intent to deceive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Copying, or allowing one to copy, homework assignments.

Use of Internet when prohibited. All second Class 3 offences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class 3 — Cautionary Act</th>
<th>Unintentional violation of the class rules on collaboration.</th>
<th>The instructor sets the penalty and discusses it with the student. Both the instructor and student sign a form. The form is forwarded to the Office of the Dean of Students and stored in student’s file.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act mostly due to ignorance, misunderstanding, confusion, and/or poor communication between instructor and class</td>
<td>Unintentional possession of a study aid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unintentionally failing to cite information from the correct source.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reusing and/or building upon coursework already submitted for another class without permission of the professor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 11, 2019

**TO:** Dr. Elizabeth Jurisich, Speaker of the Faculty Senate  
Members of the Faculty Senate, 2018-2019

**From:** Sebastian van Delden, Interim Dean, School of Sciences and Mathematics  
Trisha Folds-Bennett, Dean, Honors College  
Jerry Hale, Dean, School of Humanities and Social Sciences  
Tim Johnson, Dean, School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs (Moderator Deans’ Council)  
Valerie Morris, Dean, School of the Arts  
Alan Shao, Dean, School of Business  
Fran Welch, Dean, School of Education, Health and Human Performance  
John White, Dean, School of Libraries

We appreciate this opportunity to express our concerns about the proposed revision to the *Schedule of Sanctions for Violations of Academic Dishonesty* that would introduce XX-marked grades for Class 2 violations.

After careful consideration and conversation, we are in unanimous agreement that the proposed measure will result in too many complications to be effective. Our primary concerns are as follows:

Since Class 2 is a serious violation of academic honesty, an XX-marked grade, which could be expunged after one year, does not reflect the gravity of the offense. Further, it is questionable whether the weight/nature of the assignment should be considered in the determination of Class 1 versus Class 2, since the question at hand concerns whether academic dishonesty in fact occurred.

The process of assigning XX-marked grades, as outlined here, does not give the course-instructor adequate input on the expungement.

The potential for XX-A and XX-B grades, when the quality-point granted for the grade is unaffected, sends mixed messages about the value of the grade earned, as if academic dishonesty does not taint student learning.

The transcript is a legal document and must have clarity. An XX-marked grade introduces ambiguity about the value of the grade, and will be subject to varied interpretations by externals who are unused to the designation.

Once externals become aware that XX-grades may have been assigned and then expunged, they will stop trusting the overall grade-value of the transcripts. It is likely, then, that they will begin sending requests to verify whether a student ever had XX-marked grades, raising numerous management issues.

Although we are sympathetic to the Honor Board’s desire for flexibility in assigning punitive yet constructive measures, we think it ill-advised to adopt the proposed measure. We further suggest that any reconsideration of this measure wait until on-going work on the course repeat/grade redemption policy is completed, since they likely will be related.

Highest Regards,

Your Colleagues
Faculty Senate, Tuesday, December 4, 2018, 5:00 PM  
Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:05.

2. The minutes from Nov. 13, 2018 were approved.

3. Announcements and Information: Speaker of the Faculty Liz Jurisich reminded senators and guests that while anyone may attend Senate meetings, only senators are allowed to vote.

4. Reports

   a. Speaker Jurisich noted that, thanks to Faculty Secretariat Megan Gould, an archive of Board of Trustees minutes dating back to 1791 can be accessed through the Faculty Senate website, linked to the Lowcountry Digital Library. The Secretariat is working to make more archival Senate (and pre-Senate faculty governance) documents available, so if anyone has old documents pertaining to faculty governance, please let us know.

   b. Provost Brian McGee began by congratulating President-Elect Andrew T. Hsu. He reported that work continues on the College’s Sestercentennial celebration.

      The Provost reported that he and EVP for Student Affairs Alicia Caudill are working on a process for credential revocation; the College has never had to revoke any graduate’s credentials, but it could become necessary at some point, as it has at some other institutions. He made clear that final authority for degree revocation rests with the Board of Trustees.

      Explaining that he had been asked to go on record, the Provost affirmed that work done by faculty for the Sustainability Literacy Institute (our QEP) is considered part of their teaching and/or service commitment.

      For the past two years, the College has been first among U. S. public master’s institutions in the percentage of students who study abroad, and for the past five years we have been either first or second in that statistic.

      Responding to queries from students, Provost McGee will ask the Academic Planning Committee and the Committee on General Education to consider whether it would be productive and helpful to add a diversity element to our general education program.

      The Provost moved that the list of degree candidates for Winter commencement be approved by unanimous consent, without the reading of the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous consent.
Provost McGee then offered comments on the agenda:

Academic Affairs and Student Affairs have asked for more time to consider and discuss the proposed changes to the Honor Code sanctions; he thanked everyone who has been working on this issue. [n.b.: The proposed changes were removed from the agenda prior to the meeting.]

Regarding the proposed engineering degrees, he addressed some concerns that had been raised in an email from Prof. Pamela Riggs-Gelasco (Chair, Chemistry and Biochemistry). What kinds of students will enroll? He asserted that we will recruit students to a program that will be unique and of high quality, and that interest in engineering and demand for engineering majors is high nationally and in South Carolina. About student retention: he asserted that if we retain and graduate the same percentage of engineering majors as other institutions do, the retention rate will be better than that of the College as a whole. He said that problems faced by the engineering program at Francis Marion University do not necessarily translate to the College because this is a different kind of program and the College has a different student profile, specifically one that includes higher SAT scores. Turning to how we would market the program to prospective students, he noted that over 1100 students who had their SAT scores sent to the College expressed interest in engineering, even though we don’t currently have a major in engineering. He also highlighted the program’s emphasis on designing autonomous vehicles and the College’s liberal arts curriculum, noting that numerous institutions with engineering majors do not have the kind of foreign language requirement for those majors that we will have for engineering. He also pointed to other institutions – the College of New Jersey and Elon University – with student profiles similar to ours who already have engineering programs. He called on Dean Trisha Folds-Bennett of the Honors College, who said that while it would be challenging (very little scheduling flexibility) for students to meet requirements for both Honors and Engineering in four years, it can be done. Provost McGee added that AP credits will add flexibility for some students. He asserted that research indicates that engineering programs experience stable growth initially and then tend to grow more rapidly after about four years. He reiterated the evidence of student interest and local need. Growth in tuition-paying students is expected to pay for new faculty and expenses so that faculty are not taken from other programs. There is philanthropic interest but the funding model does not rely on outside funding or increased state funding. He believes the funding plan for this program is as strong as any he has seen in his time at C of C. PDF Slides

c. Budget Committee (William Veal, Chair): Prof. Veal updated the Senate on policy changes recommended by the committee. They are listed on the slides included as an appendix to these minutes. The examples of a Year 0 column in proposed budgets, calculated tuition revenue (without fees), and a line for institutional costs calculated at 22.98% (and the changes that line would make to total expenses and balance) are highlighted in the tables included in the slide presentation. Slides
d. CIO Mark Staples’s report (The State of IT) was moved down in the agenda by Speaker Jurisich at Mr. Staples’s suggestion, without objection from the Senate. 

5. New Business

a. Graduate Committee (Sandy Slater, Chair)

1. Prof. Slater gave notice that the M.Ed in Languages (SPAN) has moved to completely online modality.

2. English:
   i. ENGL 576 (part of sequence from October meeting) 
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1043/form PDF
   ii. Creative Writing, MFA https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1087/form PDF

   Senator Richard Nunan (Philosophy) asked if the reason for the proposed changes to the MFA-Creative Writing curriculum was the proposed set of changes to the Arts Management program. Prof. Slater answered that the proposals are related and offered to postpone the vote on 2.ii (Creative Writing, MFA) until after the vote had been taken on Arts Management. Proposal 2.i (ENGL 576) then passed by unanimous voice vote and 2.ii was postponed until after a vote was taken on items 3 and 4.

3. Arts Management (Arts and Cultural Management):
   ii. Creation of Arts and Cultural Management (Fine Arts) https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1090/form PDF
   iii. ARCM 560 https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:997/form PDF
   iv. ARCM 561 https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:998/form PDF
   v. ARCM 562 https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:999/form PDF
   vi. ARCM 563 https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1000/form PDF

4. Public Administration (several are simply to reflect the inclusion from Arts Management to Arts and Cultural Management)
   i. Core class deletion https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:985/form PDF
      This proposal was withdrawn from the agenda.
      For Inclusion in ARCM
   ii. PUBA 560 https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1081/form PDF
   iii. PUBA 561 https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1082/form PDF
iv. PUBA 562  https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1083/form PDF
vi. PUBA 564  https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1085/form PDF

On behalf of the committee, Prof. Slater withdrew item 4.i (core class deletion). She corrected the parenthetical explanation for item 4 (Public Administration) on the agenda above: “(several are simply to reflect the inclusion from Arts Management to Arts and Cultural Management)” should read “(several are simply to reflect the exclusion from Arts Management to Arts and Cultural Management).”

The discussion concerned replacing the Arts Management certificate program with an Arts and Cultural Management certificate program, and adding a new course to the new program’s curriculum. Prof. Karen Chandler, the Director of the program, explained that the revised program is an attempt to boost enrollment; the changes in course prefixes also clarify where the program is housed. The new version will reach more students and offer a broader, more robust curriculum; the new program will also allow for more distance learning through both synchronous and asynchronous instruction. The proposed new certificate program increases the required number of credit hours from 12 to 15.

Prof. Mary Beth Heston (Guest, Art and Architectural History, Community Planning) said that her department learned of these changes to the program only yesterday (Dec. 3). Members of her department have some concerns about nomenclature; she also noted that parts of the new program were similar to a program Art and Architectural History had proposed along with Arts Management two years ago. They would like more time to review the program. Prof. Chandler responded that Arts Management had considered proposing a Master’s program about four years ago, but ultimately they decided to strengthen the certificate program, look at it after three years, and then discuss collaborations, such as one with Art and Architectural History. Prof. Heston reiterated that her department would like to have more time to look over the proposal, which could influence how they proceed with their own plans. Prof. James Newhard (Guest, Chair of Classics Dept.) said that he was also surprised by the proposal and noted that he did not see letters of support from other departments or programs in the proposal, as he would normally expect. He added that Archeology faculty members are concerned about how the proposed certificate would affect their programs.

Dean Godfrey Gibbison (Graduate School) pointed out that the arts management certificate already exists and that these changes are mainly matters of clarity, such as having the prefixes reflect the discipline. Prof. Slater added that Arts Management is not trying to impede other programs; they are trying to offer more opportunities to students.

Senator Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre and Dance) said that while she is not opposed to the proposal, it does seem to be doing more than changing an acronym. She suggested
tabling the vote. Speaker Jurisich pointed out that the proper motion would be to “postpone definitely.” Sen. Kattwinkel said that was what she had in mind.

Dean Gibbison added that he would always welcome additional proposals from other departments, and said that discussions about this program should have taken place within the School of the Arts. Prof. Chandler said that normally the discussions with Art and Architectural History would have happened but they didn’t in this case, and that she has talked with Prof. Heston about this situation and other potential collaborations.

Speaker Jurisich asked Sen. Kattwinkel if she was in fact making a motion to postpone definitely, and she replied that she was.

Prof. Slater and Dean Gibbison then pointed out that if the vote were postponed, they would miss the deadline for SACSCOC consideration and would have to wait another year for the changes to go into effect. Sen. Kattwinkel then withdrew the motion to postpone.

Speaker Jurisich and Prof. Slater clarified that item 4.ii-vi (4.i having been withdrawn), the deletion of the PUBA courses, was the motion on the floor.

Sen. Nunan asked if it would be possible to approve the proposal conditionally, so that if the concerned parties were not satisfied after having a few weeks to review and discuss it, they can have the Senate reconsider it in January. Prof. George Pothering (Parliamentarian) and Provost McGee explained that the Senate could revoke its approval through a future vote regardless, so there is no need to make this vote conditional. Provost McGee added that if the Senate reversed its vote, the proposal would then be pulled from SACSCOC consideration.

After further clarification from Prof. Chandler about the difference between the old program and the proposed program --- there is one new course, Managing Arts and Cultural Resources --- Prof. Slater asked Prof. Heston if this new class being added to the program was the point of concern for her department. Prof. Heston said that it was but that she supports withdrawing the motion to postpone.

Prof. Judy Millesen, Director of the Master of Public Administration program, pointed out that it would be wise not to vote to delete courses without having approved the courses that will replace them; consequently the committee moved to approve simultaneously the deletion of the PUBA courses (4.ii-vi) and all of the proposals under (3): the replacement of Arts Management with Arts and Cultural Management, and the five new ARCM courses. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

The committee’s motion to approve changes to the MFA in Creative Writing (2.ii) passed unanimously by voice vote.
b. Curriculum Committee (Chad Galuska, Chair)

1. **AAST**
   
i) Create four new courses:
   
   1. AAST 270: Folklore of the African Diaspora  
   2. AAST 320: Studies in Hip-Hop Culture  
   3. AAST 360: Mass Incarceration and Its Roots  
   4. AAST 370: Afro-Caribbean Literature  

   ii) Add these new courses and three existing courses (HIST 272, HIST 273, PSYC 330) to the BA-AAST and the AAST minor.

Both proposals passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **SOST**

   i) Create a new course: SOST 175: Religions in the U.S. South  

   ii) Add it to the SOST minor.

Both proposals passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **PHYS**

   i) Change course titles and descriptions for the following four courses:

   1. PHYS 403: Introductory Quantum Mechanics I  
   2. PHYS 404: Introductory Quantum Mechanics II  
   3. PHYS 409: Electromagnetism I  
   4. PHYS 410: Electromagnetism II  

Proposal passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **ENGR**

   i) Create a BS in Electrical Engineering  

   ii) Create a BS in Systems Engineering  

   iii) Create new courses associated with these two new programs:

   1. CSCI 218: Engineering Programming  
   2. CSCI 218L: Engineering Programming Lab  
   3. CSCI 250L: Microcontroller and Assembly Programming Lab  
   4. ENGR 103: Fundamentals of Electrical and Systems Engineering  
   5. ENGR 110: Engineering Graphics  
   6. ENGR 200: Introduction to Electrical and Mechanical Systems  
   7. ENGR 210: Circuit Analysis I  
   8. ENGR 210L: Circuit Analysis I Lab  
   9. ENGR 2110: Circuit Analysis II  
   10. ENGR 310L: Circuit Analysis II Lab  
   11. ENGR 321: Human Factors Engineering  
   12. ENGR 341: Electromechanical Energy Conversion and Electric Power
Senator Richard Nunan (Philosophy) began by asking if each Engineering degree required
92 credit hours for the major and a projected 132 hours in order to complete the major,
Nunan cast his remarks in terms of a question he posed to presidential candidates about
whether to describe the College as an undergraduate liberal arts institution or as a
comprehensive master’s-level institution. He cited other majors that have passed in
recent years with large numbers of credit hours; the engineering majors are larger than
any of them. While the argument is always made that these programs must be large in
order to meet the requirements of accreditors, the downside is that there is no room left
in a student’s schedule for the liberal arts. The current general education curriculum
provides breadth of exposure to disciplines but no depth; on its own it does not constitute
a liberal arts education. We should stop saying that we’re providing a liberal arts
education when we’re not, in the case of these kinds of majors. Citing Dartmouth
College’s engineering program, which is a five-year degree that requires students to
complete an AB as well as a BE (Bachelor of Engineering), he asked whether a similar
model had been considered for C of C. Claiming that most students will need five years to
complete this program (especially if they pursue internships, which are encouraged), Sen.
Nunan argued that we should describe it as a five-year program. Finally, he suggested that
our incoming rocket-scientist president might “have some ideas” about the program, so
“What’s the rush?”

Interim Dean Sebastian Van Delden (School of Science and Mathematics) responded to
Sen. Nunan’s concerns. The planners looked at a lot of models and consulted with faculty,
advisory boards, and outside consultants, and the proposal went through many iterations.
We (the faculty members proposing the new majors) believe these proposals are the best fit for the College. For instance, internships will be “right across the street.” It’s not perfect in terms of the liberal arts, but we faced many constraints from accreditors in constructing the program, and it still has a lot of features other engineering programs generally don’t have, including our general education requirements. The total number of hours is similar to Clemson’s and USC’s.

Senator Jessica Streit (Art and Architectural History) expressed appreciation for the hard work that went into the proposal. She said that when the program was presented to the Senate in November, the liberal arts aspect of it was emphasized as a strength, but she’s not really seeing the liberal arts in the program now.

Prof. Narayanan Kuthirummal (NK; Guest, Chair of Physics and Astronomy) reiterated that students in engineering will take all the general education courses that other students take. The planners initially considered a general engineering program similar to Coastal Carolina’s and Elon’s, which would have allowed for more general education, but they opted for electrical engineering and systems engineering because the local market needs “real” engineers. Regarding time-to-graduation, he pointed out that students can take summer classes to make up time. He asserted that the planners did their research and consulted with many constituencies to make sure that the program works with our kind of institution.

Jon Hakkila (Guest, Dept. of Physics and Astronomy) recalled that during the last major general education discussion, some faculty members wanted more depth in natural sciences, but that proposal was defeated because some people thought there was too much depth in the natural sciences already. The issue is, when is some general education enough --- how many credit hours of general education equate with a liberal arts education?

Sen. Nunan answered that students get depth from majors and minors and breadth from the general education requirement. With this proposal, engineering students will not get enough depth. He again suggested a two-degree model (BA and BE) designed and advertised as a five-year course of study, since in reality the proposed program will take five years anyway.

In response, Senator Bob Mignone (School of Science and Mathematics) declared himself flabbergasted, having always believed that the general education curriculum, our “core,” is what we share and what constitutes our liberal arts education. He added that he was sincere about his surprise, having never thought about our liberal arts education extending beyond “gen ed.”

Provost McGee stated that the College has had majors and minors for over a century but has never required a minor or double major; he said it’s “a little odd” to suggest a requirement for something we’ve never required. He went on to say that the designers of
this program made sure that the whole general education program is preserved in it. Granted, there are compromises that come with that, particularly the 132-hour minimum. He takes the “blame” for not designing it as a five-year program; South Carolinians are concerned about cost of college degree, so he wants it to be possible to complete it in four years. Students can choose to take longer than that. There is depth, he said, in the 20 hours of math and science courses (traditional liberal arts disciplines) required for the major.

In support of the proposal, Senator Julia Eichelberger (School of Humanities and Social Sciences) pointed out that the status quo is that students complete the requirements for general education and for a major; what they do with their remaining hours is up to them. There’s no guarantee that our current students will pursue depth in an area outside their major or a broader range of liberal arts courses, so this proposal does not violate any structural principle of our curriculum.

Sen. Kattwinkel relayed a comment from a faculty colleague, that the proposal coming up for a vote tonight was a surprise, since NK’s presentation at the November Senate meeting suggested the beginning of a longer campus-wide discussion. She expressed concern about the impact on other departments. For example, the General Education Committee was recently told by the computer science department that they don’t have the capacity to accommodate approximately ten extra students per year to meet the general education requirement, and this proposal would create more student demand than that.

Prof. Lynne Ford (Guest, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) said that the proposal should not really come as a surprise to anyone. It’s been through all the relevant committees, and NK and Dean Van Delden have made presentations at department meetings. If committee members haven’t reported on the proposal to colleagues in their departments, then the problem is with our process, not the curriculum. She then asserted that liberal arts is not just the general education curriculum; it’s our culture, part of everything we do. She cited the first-year experience and the College Reads! program as examples. She added that the proposed program is unique among engineering programs because its students will take the same general education curriculum as all other students at the College. They will also be exposed to all the other opportunities we provide on campus.

Prof. Newhard, speaking as the person in charge of administering the AB degree, noted that he didn’t see a map of how students could get the AB with the electrical engineering degree. He worked it out, and as with Honors, it can be done but it’s very tight, difficult to do in four years. He stated that coursework for the major will need to be mapped out for both the BS and AB degrees, to satisfy CHE and/or SACS requirements. He noted that the electrical engineering degree needs 45 hours of engineering coursework for accreditation but the proposal includes another twelve hours in business. He asked for a rationale.
Dean Van Delden replied that they believed the business courses were necessary.

NK asserted that all of the courses in the program were necessary.

Prof. Galuska noted that the four-year schedule was “tight” but that the proposal streamlines prerequisites so that it can be done.

Prof. Larry Krasnoff (Chair of Philosophy) said that the spirit behind the liberal arts is that the skills students acquire are not specific to any single job; they acquire a set of skills that prepare them for any or all jobs, including jobs of the future. His objection to the engineering majors is that they are pre-professional, designed to meet specific, current needs in the job market, and that is not the spirit of liberal arts. He is also not pleased with the timing, specifically the lack of institution-wide conversation for a kind of degree we've never had before. In terms of timing, it seems strange to do this right before we get a new president, especially one who might have some thoughts about it as an engineer. We also did not have a search for a Dean of the school that is proposing the program. He added that he would feel more comfortable with the proposal if there were biologists and chemists at the meeting speaking in favor of it. Prof. Krasnoff returned to the question of how many students will be in the program, and how good will they be? More specifically, what would be the minimum math SAT score for students who are likely to succeed in the program, and how many applicants do we have who make that score?

Drawing on his experience in proposing the PhD program in Mathematics, Sen. Mignone addressed the timing and campus-wide discussion issue. He noted that it is difficult to conduct a campus-wide discussion outside the Senate: few people show up. The Senate, he said, is where we have these discussions, and the proposal is on the agenda for all to see. As for the objection to pre-professional programs, he pointed out that we already have a number of them. In response to Prof. Krasnoff’s question, Sen. Mignone added that we expect to attract applicants with high math scores on the SAT, students who would not otherwise come here.

Prof. Hakkila read from a list of learning outcomes for engineering students, written into the accreditation expectations. The list emphasized critical thinking, problem-solving, multidisciplinarity, ethics, communication, and lifelong learning. He concluded that these are attributes we support and want our students to have.

Provost McGee noted that this proposal was under the same SACSCOC deadline as the earlier proposal in Arts and Cultural Management. He called the question. Sen. Mignone seconded. The motion to call the question passed by a show of hands. The motion to approve the electrical engineering major passed on a voice vote. The motion to approve the systems engineering major passed on a voice vote. The motion to approve the courses associated with the two new degree programs passed on a unanimous voice vote.
c. Faculty Committee on Academic Standards (Ricard Viñas de Puig, Chair): Proposal to revised criteria for Departmental Honors [PDF]

Prof. Viñas de Puig reviewed the proposal (see appendix) and explained that the intention is to simplify and make uniform requirements that are currently interpreted differently by various departments.

Provost McGee relayed a request from Dean Folds-Bennett that the proposal be postponed until the January meeting so that the Honors College Committee can discuss it before the Senate votes. Prof. Krasnoff, who initiated the proposal, said that he did not see how the proposal could negatively affect Honors students, pointing out that a Bachelor’s Essay, the capstone experience for Honors students, would fulfill the coursework requirement for Departmental Honors. He also noted that Departmental Honors is a departmental award; though most students who earn the distinction are Honors College Students, non-Honors students who choose to write a Bachelor’s Essay and fulfill the other requirements also receive the honor.

Senator Jolanda Van Arnhem (Library) moved that the proposal be postponed definitely to the January meeting.

Sen. Eichelberger asked if the proposal needed to be passed at this meeting in order to go into effect next fall (like the earlier curricular proposals), and Speaker Jurisich replied that it did not.

Prof. Krasnoff asked what effect the proposal could possibly have on Honors, suggesting there was no reason for the postponement.

The vote to postpone definitely consideration of the proposal passed on a voice vote.

d. Dean of Students Jeri Cabot, Committee on Student on Student Affairs and Athletics (Allison Sterrett-Krause, Chair), and Faculty Committee on Academic Standards (Ricard Viñas de Puig, Chair): Proposed Revisions to Honor Code Sanctions [Background] [Revisions]
This proposal was withdrawn from the agenda; the Speaker encouraged Senators to review it before the January meeting.

4. d. (See above: this report was moved down on the agenda.) CIO Mark Staples reported on “The State of IT.” His slide deck, which includes all the major points of his presentation, is included in the appendix. He emphasized promoting digital literacy; efforts to update and upgrade BANNER; and several strategies to improve IT at the College. He reminded faculty and staff to be wary of scam emails. He reported that two-factor identification is coming for off-campus access.
Citing her own recent experience, Sen. Van Arnhem asked about two-factor authentication, the need to download an app onto one’s phone for authentication, and the clarity of the email messaging concerning the authentication requirement.

Mr. Staples replied that Sen. Van Arnhem was actually referring to password self-service rather than two-factor authentication, which so far has been rolled out only to senior leadership and deans. Password self-service enables employees to change their passwords without calling the Helpdesk. He noted that some faculty do not have cell phones or do not have a second email account, and he strongly encouraged setting up a second (personal) email account for one’s own protection. Sen. Van Arnhem questioned the end-of-term timing of the password self-service implementation, and Mr. Staples replied that part of the reason for it is the number of faculty who return after break and have forgotten their passwords; over 50% of Helpdesk calls in January are password resets.

In response to a question, Mr. Staples described two-factor authentication in more detail, and several faculty members spoke up simultaneously, saying that they had in fact gone through that process. Mr. Staples responded that the validation process for password self-service is very similar to the process for two-factor authentication. He acknowledged that the confusion resulted from “bad messaging” on the part of IT.

Mr. Staples added that his unit was down by 15 employees; hiring qualified people is difficult.

He highlighted the effort to centralized computer replacement. A recent inventory showed the inefficiency of computer purchases on campus: there are nearly twice as many computers assigned to employees as there are employees. He wants to prioritize replacing old classroom computers. IT is also augmenting Scantron technology on campus, ultimately making it easier to access results from bubble sheets and to get more detailed information.

On behalf of a constituent, Sen. Nunan asked Mr. Staples about the digital signage on Cougar Mall: the concern is that it’s ugly and inappropriate for the location, and that it only shows pictures. Mr. Staples replied that as of that day, the digital signposts had real messaging/announcements, not just pictures.

Sen. Mignone asked about virtual proctoring, which the Mathematics Dept. is interested in for placement tests. Mr. Staples said we have a temporary solution in place now and we are working on secure authentication. The system we are implementing will work and will be secure.

Sen. Van Arnhem added that the digital signage in the library works well, as does the integration of Turnitin with OAKS. Mr. Staples pointed out that there is a way for students to opt out of Turnitin when they turn in papers.
Mr. Staples reported that My Charleston will be replaced with something more robust within a year.

He closed his presentation by stating that we need to prepare our students to be good digital citizens, which requires us to be good digital citizens. And his job is to provide us with the tools to be digitally literate in support of that goal.

Registrar Mary Bergstrom asked if status.cofc.edu is in working order. Mr. Staples replied that it is up and running but only in BETA.

Senator Dan McGlinn (Biology) said that, regarding communication between IT and faculty, faculty would appreciate being consulted via poll when IT is going to make a big decision. Mr. Staples replied that IT has an advisory council for every school, they meet with the Faculty Educational Technology Committee, and they will come to department meetings if asked. He also said that faculty may contact him directly with questions or concerns.

6. Constituents’ General Concerns – there were none.

7. The meeting adjourned at 7:31.

Appendix: Additional Materials
Brief Updates

- President-elect Andrew Hsu
- Sestercentennial
- Credential Revocation
- Sustainability Literacy Institute and Faculty Engagement
- Study Abroad Participation
Resolution on Degree Recipients

Resolved: The Faculty Senate approves the list of December 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 on Today’s Agenda

- Honor Code Sanctions
- Engineering at the College of Charleston
Student Quality and Recruitment

- Quality Goals for Engineering
- Engineering Student Attrition and Degree Attainment
- Comparison to FMU
- Marketing Plan for CofC Engineering
  - Build on STEM Appeal of CofC
  - Major Program Features
  - Liberal Arts Commitment (TCNJ, Elon)
- Honors College
Program Expense and Contingency

- Enrollment Growth Patterns for Engineering
- Strong Evidence of Interest
- Strong Evidence of Need
- Expenses, Faculty Funded by New Revenues
- Philanthropy and Engineering
- State Support and Engineering
- Institutional Reserve As Funding Contingency
Update from the Budget Committee

William Veal, Chair
New Policy Recommendations

• A column for Year 0 with any associated startup costs,

• Tuition Revenue to reflect only tuition and no fees,

• Expenses would include Institutional Costs of 22.98%, which is a new line item,
• A statement about any known potential attrition, when applicable,

• A change in the wording on the Senate web page indicating that the Budget Committee can be used as an advisory body to help develop Table F of a proposal, and

• Table F numbers should reflect expenses for the year if possible, rather than a semester.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-State</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out-of-State</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-State Tuition</strong></td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out-of-State Tuition</strong></td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition</strong></td>
<td>$282,180</td>
<td>$564,360</td>
<td>$846,540</td>
<td>$1,128,720</td>
<td>$1,410,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$200,500</td>
<td>$341,000</td>
<td>$394,000</td>
<td>$573,500</td>
<td>$537,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td>$27,470</td>
<td>$114,940</td>
<td>$289,910</td>
<td>$338,380</td>
<td>$602,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019-2020 Year 0</td>
<td>2020-2021 Year 1</td>
<td>2021-2022 Year 2</td>
<td>2022-2023 Year 3</td>
<td>2023-2024 Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Tuition</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Tuition</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$282,180</td>
<td>$564,360</td>
<td>$846,540</td>
<td>$1,128,720</td>
<td>$1,410,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$200,500</td>
<td>$341,000</td>
<td>$394,000</td>
<td>$573,500</td>
<td>$537,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>$27,470</td>
<td>$114,940</td>
<td>$289,910</td>
<td>$338,380</td>
<td>$602,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019-2020 Year 0</td>
<td>2020-2021 Year 1</td>
<td>2021-2022 Year 2</td>
<td>2022-2023 Year 3</td>
<td>2023-2024 Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Tuition</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Tuition</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$282,180</td>
<td>$564,360</td>
<td>$846,540</td>
<td>$1,128,720</td>
<td>$1,410,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculated Tuition Revenue</td>
<td>$227,970</td>
<td>$455,940</td>
<td>$683,910</td>
<td>$911,880</td>
<td>$1,139,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$200,500</td>
<td>$341,000</td>
<td>$394,000</td>
<td>$573,500</td>
<td>$537,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>$27,470</td>
<td>$114,940</td>
<td>$289,910</td>
<td>$338,380</td>
<td>$602,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019-2020 Year 0</td>
<td>2020-2021 Year 1</td>
<td>2021-2022 Year 2</td>
<td>2022-2023 Year 3</td>
<td>2023-2024 Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Tuition</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
<td>$4,4402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Tuition</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$282,180</td>
<td>$564,360</td>
<td>$846,540</td>
<td>$1,128,720</td>
<td>$1,410,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculated Tuition Revenue</td>
<td>$227,970</td>
<td>$455,940</td>
<td>$683,910</td>
<td>$911,880</td>
<td>$1,139,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Cost @ 22.98%</td>
<td>$52,388</td>
<td>$104,775</td>
<td>$157,163</td>
<td>$209,550</td>
<td>$261,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$200,500</td>
<td>$341,000</td>
<td>$394,000</td>
<td>$573,500</td>
<td>$537,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$252,888</td>
<td>$370,775</td>
<td>$801,163</td>
<td>$1,011,050</td>
<td>$1,037,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019-2020 Year 0</td>
<td>2020-2021 Year 1</td>
<td>2021-2022 Year 2</td>
<td>2022-2023 Year 3</td>
<td>2023-2024 Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Tuition</td>
<td>$8,808</td>
<td>$8,808</td>
<td>$8,808</td>
<td>$8,808</td>
<td>$8,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Tuition</td>
<td>$27,970</td>
<td>$27,970</td>
<td>$27,970</td>
<td>$27,970</td>
<td>$27,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$282,180</td>
<td>$564,360</td>
<td>$846,540</td>
<td>$1,128,720</td>
<td>$1,410,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculated Tuition Revenue</td>
<td>$227,970</td>
<td>$455,940</td>
<td>$683,910</td>
<td>$911,880</td>
<td>$1,139,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Cost @ 22.98%</td>
<td>$52,388</td>
<td>$104,775</td>
<td>$157,163</td>
<td>$209,550</td>
<td>$261,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$200,500</td>
<td>$341,000</td>
<td>$394,000</td>
<td>$573,500</td>
<td>$537,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Digital Transformation at the College of Charleston

IT Strategic Objective

“Transform the college into a digital workplace, leading to digitally literacy”
Purpose for Digital Transformation

• Improve operational efficiencies;
• Improve human-to-human interactions;
• Improve communications & collaborations;
• Enhance knowledge management;

Digitalization puts people first and reduces barriers and reduces operational friction.
Agenda

• Banner problems
• Strategies
• IT Challenges
• Projects
State of Banner

• Unplanned outages
  – During grade submissions
  – Registration
  – Others

• Causes
  – Outdated hardware & software
  – Poorly configured software

• Fix
  – Upgrade hardware
  – Upgrade/eliminate old software
  – Rearchitect
STRATEGIES
Strategies

• Decision Support
  – Develop an extensible data infrastructure to support campus-wide decision making

• Digital communication and collaboration Ecosystem
  – Develop a personalized and targeted digital communications and collaboration ecosystem that improves stakeholder engagement, information & idea sharing, knowledge management, and more efficient collaboration methodologies.

• Healthy Academic Ecosystem
  – All systems and respective data that support faculty and students are fully integrated minimizing redundant processes, and increases access to information that contributes to the College's recruitment and retention efforts.
Strategies

• Healthy Administrative Ecosystem
  – Ensure that all systems are fully integrated that would improve data flow, automate processes, and reduce manual and redundant workflow.

• Robust/Scalable and secure Infrastructure
  – Provide a robust, scalable, and secure network infrastructure to ensure that all technologies are maintained appropriately to ensure stability and accessibility to network resources, systems, data, and communications modalities.

• Info Security
  – Provide a framework that blends access with security along with providing a blended privacy, physical, and data assurance program.
IT challenges

- Technology foundations are incomplete
- IT staffing
- System and data integration methodologies are obsolete
- TLT resources are limited
"Tomorrow’s illiterate will not be the man who can’t read; he will be the man who has not learned how to learn."

-Herbert Gerjuoy (by way of Alvin Tofler, Future Shock, p414)
Computer replacement by the numbers

• Current Personnel
  – FT Faculty - 522
  – PT Faculty - 356
  – FT Staff – 983
  – PT Staff – 185
  – Total Employees – 2,046

• Current Computer Inventory
  – Faculty and Staff – 3,993
  – Classrooms and Labs – 1,429
  – Total Computer Inventory – 5,177
  – 3,993/2,046 = 1.95/person

• Current Replacement Outlook
  – Annual budget - $900,000
  – 3,993 computers x $1,500 (avg cost per) /900,000 = 6.65 years
Projects & Initiatives

1. Augment Scantron
2. Web conferencing
3. Online education
   1. Secure authentication
   2. Virtual proctoring
4. High performance computing
5. GIS
6. Room scheduling and campus calendar
7. Plagiarism detection (TurnItIn)
8. OAKS grade integration with Banner

Other Projects
1. Replace Kaspersky
2. Digital signage
3. Cougar alert
4. eFax
5. Banner upgrade (v. 8 to 9)
6. Replacement for myCofC
Resources

• Projects
  – http://help.cofc.edu
  – Click on projects tab

• Status
  – http://status.cofc.edu
In the same way a liberal arts education prepares students for service, active citizenship, and community, we should also be preparing our students to be good "digital" citizens in a digital, world economy and prepared for life-long learning.

QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION
Proposal to Modify the Requirements for Departmental Honors

Approved by HSS Chairs, 10/4/18
Circulated for comment to all chairs, 10/18/18
Approved by Faculty Committee on Academic Standards, 11/16/18

Background

The current requirements for departmental honors are set out in the Undergraduate Catalog:

Designed for mature individuals who are capable of sustained and independent work, the program of departmental honors is designed to give upperclassmen of exceptional ability an opportunity to explore intensively a field of their particular interest. Students take the initiative in outlining their proposed research, experiment, or special study; in enlisting the support of a faculty advisor; and in securing the approval of the department. At the conclusion of the program, departmental honors can be awarded only with the approval of the department. To be eligible, students must have earned a grade point average in the major of at least 3.500 and completed a minimum of 12 credit hours of exceptionally fine work in any combination of seminar, independent study, tutorial, and bachelor’s essay. Whichever format is chosen, the project should develop the student’s proficiency in library research or laboratory methodology, and the finished composition should be distinguished by its organization, reasoning, and expression.

The recommended capstone for earning departmental honors is the bachelor’s essay. Students must seek one of the professors in their major department to supervise the undertaking and must submit in writing a proposal for the project. Once the plan is accepted, students must work closely with their advisor. Since researching and writing the essay extends over both semesters of the senior year, students should submit one or more preliminary drafts for critical examination in order to allow time for proper revision of the essay. The department may also prescribe additional requirements for ensuring the quality of the work. Satisfactory completion of the bachelor’s essay entitles the candidate to six credit hours.

In reviewing the current practice of departments, we have observed the following:

- There is great inconsistency between departments in what counts for the 12 hours. Some departments regard internships as forms of independent study, which then count; others regard internships as quite different from independent studies, and do not count them. Some departments count capstone seminars, or even other small, advanced classes, toward the 12 hours; others do not. There is no clear definition, in the catalog or in campus practice, of what a “seminar” even is.
• In many cases, departments report that their very best students, even those who compete excellent bachelor’s essays, are not eligible for departmental honors, because they have not taken two independent studies. Some departments have even reported that almost no one ever receives departmental honors in their programs, because the 12-hour requirement (at least as interpreted by those programs) is too onerous.

• Some departments have reported that students sometimes seek out faculty for independent studies not because they have a particular motivation to study a particular topic, but because they “need” another independent study for departmental honors. While faculty can and should resist such unmotivated independent studies, such resistance can be difficult, and we do not want to incentivize students to pursue independent study without independent motivation.

Proposal

We therefore propose that the requirements for departmental honors be made simpler and more uniform, to require just:

• A grade point average in the major of at least 3.7

• A bachelor’s essay (or two independent studies with comparable research expectations)

This proposal builds on the most important feature of the current catalog language, which lists the bachelor’s essay as the “recommended” capstone experience. The proposal them eliminates the potentially ambiguous language, and inconsistent practice, about other forms of independent work. At the same time, the proposal also strengthens the requirements for departmental honors, by raising the GPA requirement to 3.7, an A- average in the major.

The basic principle behind the proposal is: an outstanding student in a major who completes a quality bachelor’s essay should be able to receive departmental honors. Under our current rules, such a student is often (and in some programs, usually) ineligible. Under the proposed new rules, such a student would always be eligible.

Proposed New Catalog Language

Accordingly, we propose that the current catalog language be modified as follows:

Designed for mature individuals who are capable of sustained and independent work, the program of departmental honors is designed to give advanced students of
exceptional ability an opportunity to explore intensively a field of their particular interest. Students take the initiative in outlining their proposed research, experiment, or special study; in enlisting the support of a faculty advisor; and in securing the approval of the department. At the conclusion of the program, departmental honors may be awarded only with the approval of the department. To be eligible, students must have earned a grade point average in the major of at least 3.700 and completed a bachelor’s essay (or two independent studies with disciplinary expectations comparable to those of a bachelor’s essay).

Students intending to write a bachelor’s essay must seek one of the professors in their major department to supervise and must submit in writing a proposal for the project. Once the plan is accepted, students must work closely with their advisor. Since researching and writing the essay extends over both semesters of the senior year, students should submit one or more preliminary drafts for critical examination in order to allow time for proper revision of the essay. Satisfactory completion of the bachelor’s essay entitles the candidate to six credit hours. If a department permits two independent studies in place of a bachelor’s essay, those independent studies, like a successful bachelor’s essay, should develop the student’s proficiency in research as understood by the discipline, and the finished composition(s) should be distinguished by their organization, reasoning, and expression. The department may also prescribe additional requirements for ensuring the quality of the work.
Faculty Senate, Tuesday, November 13, 2018, 5:00 PM
Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)

Highlights (full minutes to follow)

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:04. Speaker Elizabeth Jurisich welcomed Trustees Renee Romberger and David Hay.

2. The October 2, 2018 minutes were approved.

3. Reports

   a. Speaker of the Faculty Elizabeth Jurisich reported on the October Board of Trustees meeting: enrollment numbers are improving; data on faculty diversity is also encouraging. She thanked faculty who have been involved in student research projects. Trustee and Presidential Search Committee Chair Renee Romberger reported on the search process, thanked faculty members for participating in listening sessions, and encouraged everyone to attend forums with the three finalists this week. She affirmed that faculty priorities --- academic experience; visibility; understanding of and respect for faculty governance --- were given considerable weight in the selection process.

   b. Provost Brian McGee also encouraged faculty to participate in the Presidential Search process this week. He reported that the merit salary exercise is nearly complete. He emphasized that the size of the allocation did not allow for across-the-board raises and that only “top performers” are likely to receive them. Qualifying employees earning less than $50,000 annually will receive a one-time bonus of _____.

The Student Code of Conduct is being revised for clarity and readability; the Provost expects that the work will be completed soon. He also discussed the recent incident involving inappropriate Halloween costumes worn by members of the softball team, which is being investigated under the Student Code of Conduct. We can expect a message from EVP for Student Affairs Alicia Caudill and Chief Diversity Officer Renard Harris soon concerning a commitment to a restorative justice framework in response to the incident, and additional education and training for all members of the campus community.

The Provost introduced Prof. Jason Coy (History), Faculty Administrative Fellow, to talk about Open Educational Resources. He also recognized Tripp Keefe, Student Government Association President, who has been working on this issue. Prof. Coy explained that OER, which are free to students, replace expensive textbooks and
provide flexibility for instructors. The quality of OER materials has increased dramatically in recent years, supported by over a hundred million dollars in grant funding. Having researched the use of OER at other institutions and having worked with Library staff and SGA on how to promote their use here, Prof. Coy proposed the following incentive program. Academic Affairs will offer $750 grants to a limited number of faculty members who agree to use OER over two semesters, starting in Spring 2019. Priority will be given to high-impact courses, such as those that fulfill general education requirements and/or have high enrollments. Provost McGee added that 10 grants will be awarded the first year, 25 the second. He thanked Prof. Coy, Library staff, and the SGA for their work on this initiative.

Senator Jen Wright (HSS) asked whether, to be eligible for the grant, a course would need to adopt OER exclusively, as opposed to, say, replacing four out of five books with OER but retaining one hard-copy book. Prof. Coy replied that those details have not been hammered out, but in his opinion the key criterion would be saving students money, and replacing most (if not all) of a course’s books with OER could accomplish that. Senator Joe Carson (SSM) reported that the Department of Physics and Astronomy has experimented with OER for some time and has found that the quality of the products is uneven. Prof. Coy noted that the Library faculty have been very helpful in identifying the better resources; Provost McGee added that the quality of the educational experience must be maintained.

Senator Dan McGlinn (Biology) asked whether and how multiple instructors using the same OER across sections of the same course would qualify for the grant, specifically whether the grant would be divided among those instructors. Provost McGee replied that the grants are intended to be $750 per faculty member, but proposals involving multiple sections would be treated separately, working with academic deans.

Senator Lauren Hetrovicz (Hispanic Studies, Adjunct Sen.) asked if proposals from adjunct faculty will be considered, and the Provost replied that they would be.

Resuming his report, the Provost referred to Academic Affairs’ recent editing of the Faculty Administration Manual for gender-inclusive language, and encouraged the Faculty Senate to consider making similar adjustments to the By-Laws. He also reported that the College’s 62% four-year graduation rate is among the best among public, urban, comprehensive universities, and probably our best ever. Finally, he thanked Dean Sebastian van Delden, Prof. Narayanan Kuthirummal, and others for their work on the proposed undergraduate programs in engineering. Slides for Report

Sen. Jen Wright (HSS) asked the Provost if he had received an email from the student group I-CAN (Intersectional Cougar Action Network) with recommendations
concerning the Halloween costume incident, and he replied that he had just received it that afternoon.

c. Prof. Narayanan Kuthirummal (NK; Dept. of Physics and Astronomy) previewed proposals for programs in Electrical Engineering and Systems Engineering. He emphasized the local need for engineers, support from the business community, student demand, and competition from other state universities, such as Clemson. Compared to engineering degrees at other institutions, these programs’ strength and uniqueness lie in their being integrated with a liberal arts curriculum and the availability of internships, study abroad opportunities, undergraduate research, and small class size. If the program attracts students who would not otherwise attend the College, it could generate revenue for the institution. Slides for Report

Q&A: Senator Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism Management) pointed out that the program would pay for itself only if the undergraduate population grows as a result of students enrolling for these new majors; if the engineering programs draw students who would otherwise attend the College but major in something else, then it is not paying for itself. Provost McGee replied that we have fewer students now than we would like --- about 9800 as opposed to the targeted 10,000-10,500 --- so there is room to grow, and these programs should allow us to grow with students who are qualified and able to pay full tuition. Paul Patrick, Executive Vice President of Business Affairs, affirmed that the engineering majors need to be new students, additional to our current overall numbers, in order for the math to work. Dean Sebastian Van Delden (SSM) and Prof. NK agreed with the Provost that the program would in fact bring in new, additional students.

Senator Brooke Van Horn (Chemistry/Biochemistry) expressed concern about the quality of our current students’ background in math, in terms of their readiness for an engineering program. NK replied that students who come to the College for these programs are likely to have stronger math backgrounds upon admission than our current students typically do.

d. On behalf of the Curriculum Committee, Chad Galuska (Chair) updated the Senate on the “3 in 5” rule, which states that courses designated as Special Topics cannot be offered more than three times over five years. The rule has never been enforced, and there is currently no enforcement mechanism; the Registrar’s Office is not in a position to make judgment calls about whether a course is new or not. The Curriculum Committee’s research indicates that approximately 17% of Special Topics course offerings appear to be in violation of the “3 in 5” rule. The Committee will remind chairs and deans about the rule, but the Senate might consider forming an ad hoc committee to investigate who should enforce the rule and how. PDF
Sen. Wright (HSS) asked if there was any discussion of getting rid of the rule. Prof. Galuska replied that the committee believes the rule is valuable because it upholds the principle that new courses should be reviewed and voted on by the Senate.

4. New Business

   a. Curriculum Committee (Chad Galuska, Chair): All proposals were approved unanimously, without discussion.

   1. AFST: Add five existing courses (FREN 334, FREN 336, FREN 454, POLI 395, HEAL 230) as electives in the AFST minor. PDF
   2. BRST: Add three courses (HIST 256, HIST 291, HIST 341) as electives to satisfy the history requirement of the BRST minor. PDF
   3. COMM:
      i) Deactivate COMM 214D and reduce the credit hours (from 4 to 3) for COMM 214. PDF PDF
      ii) Reduce the credit hours (from 4 to 3) for COMM 215. PDF
      iii) Change the course description in COMM 410. PDF
      iv) Change the COMM minor
         (1) Add COMM 405 as an elective.
         (2) Change the credit hours associated with the required core courses from 7-8 to 6 to reflect the changes to COMM 214 and COMM 215. PDF
   4. HONS: Add course descriptions to the HONS physics courses: HONS 157, HONS 157L, HONS 158, HONS 158L, PDF 157 PDF 157L PDF 158 PDF 158L
   5. ITST: Change the ITST minor to allow ITAL 300+ courses to count as electives. PDF
   6. LTSP: Deactivate four courses (LTSP 150, 254, 256, and 450) and make changes to the titles and descriptions of three courses (LTSP 250, 252, and 350). PDF 150 PDF 254 PDF 256 PDF 250 PDF 250 PDF 252 PDF 350
   7. PBHL/COMM: Remove the COMM 336/PBHL 336 cross-listing and add prerequisites (HEAL 215, junior or senior standing, or department chair permission) to PBHL 336. PDF 336 COMM PDF PHBL

   b. Graduate Committee (Sandy Slater, Chair): all proposals were approved unanimously, without discussion.

   1. ENSS/EVSS, MES to ENSS
      i. Proposal to change name from Environmental Studies to Environmental and Sustainability Studies to match undergraduate acronym. https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:845/form PDF
ii. Expand electives in EVSS to include PUBA, BIOL, CPAD and other departmental course offering relevant to EVSS curriculum

https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:779/form PDF

Courses: PDF 518  PDF 530  PDF 531  PDF 534  PDF 535  PDF 537  PDF 551  PDF 679

2. Accountancy : Admission Modifications

https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1007/form PDF

English

i. ENGL 574 Pre-Requisite Change  https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:967/form PDF

ii. ENGL 575 Pre-Requisite Change  https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:972/form PDF

iii. ENGL 703 Pre-Requisite Change  https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:969/form PDF

iv. ENGL 704 Pre-Requisite Change  https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:970/form PDF

v. ENGL 705 Pre-Requisite Change  https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:971/form PDF

3. Special Education M.A.T.

Terminate Major  https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:906/form PDF  Sandy explains that the classes for the MAT will still be offered but there has not been enough enrollment in the program.

c. General Education Committee (Susan Kattwinkel, Chair)

Add ENGL 302 to General Education – Humanities. Approved unanimously, without discussion.

https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:960/form PDF

5. Constituents’ General Concerns
Following up on a previous announcement, Sen. Jen Wright (HSS) reported that permission was granted to move forward with a committee to seek Carnegie “Community Engagement” classification for the College. The committee is seeking volunteers.

6. The meeting adjourned at 6:23.

**Appendices:**

Provost’s Report Slides  
ENGR Proposal Slides  
Curriculum Committee Report on 3-in-5 Rule
Faculty Senate
Provost’s Report
Major Topics
November 13, 2018

• Merit Salary Exercise
• Student Conduct
• Online Educational Resources (with Professor Jason Coy)
• Comments on Today’s Senate Agenda
Open Educational Resources (OER)

Background

• Addressing rising textbooks costs (average $1,200 per year/per student)

• OER Solution
  – Online repositories: Rice U OpenStax, MERLOT, OER Commons, BC Campus
  – $100 million in grant funding (to-date) for developing OER projects
  – 60% of US faculty unaware of OER (as of 2017)

• Study: Faculty Incentive Programs on US Campuses
  – Over 20 benchmark institutions examined
CofC Faculty Incentive OER Grants

- Implementation allocation - $750
- Call for applications - late November 2018
- Selection Committee - Faculty and Library Staff
- Requirements and timeline:
  - Commit to teaching grant-supported course at least twice using OER
  - Work with library liaisons to identify OER for courses (spring 2018)
  - Teach high-impact courses with OER (fall 2019)
  - Submit report assessing OER use in their course (spring 2020)
COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON
ENGINEERING

NARAYANAN KUTHIRUMMAL (NK) AND SEBASTIAN VAN DELDEN
**PROPOSED PROGRAMS**

- **Electrical Engineering (EE)**
  - One of the traditional engineering disciplines with some focus on intelligent autonomous vehicle systems (land, water, air). Global market: $54.23B (2019) - $556.67B (2026)

- **Systems Engineering (SE)**
  - A relatively new interdisciplinary engineering discipline covering other traditional engineering disciplines such as industrial engineering, manufacturing engineering, electrical engineering, software engineering, etc. and management. No Systems B.S. degree in SC.

**Why EE and SE?**
- Local needs
- Doesn’t require expensive lab facilities/fancy machine shops
- Some infrastructure/expertise already exists

Growth rate = 39.47% (allied market research, 2018)
WHY OUR OWN ENGINEERING?

- Local Industrial needs – Recent industrial growth in the tri-county area
  - Received strong support letters from Boeing, Bosch, Mercedes-Benz, Charleston Business Community, etc.
- Post & Courier (April 2, 2018): “Growing the tech sector has become an increasing focus for the state’s economic development officials.”
- In polling our incoming freshmen class, engineering is ranked as the 7th most desired major.
- Strong support from the student body
  - Francis Marion and Coastal Carolina recently started their engineering programs. Also, our peer Elon.
- Other universities are setting up their bases in Charleston
  - South Carolina has only 3 engineering schools. Similarly populated Alabama and Louisiana both have 7 engineering schools.
WHAT MAKES OUR ENGINEERING PROGRAM UNIQUE?

- Strong **liberal arts** core curriculum.
- Strong enrollment of **women**.
- Numerous **internship** opportunities with tech/manufacturing companies.
- Extensive **study abroad** program.
- Focus on **undergraduate research**
- **Personalized** educational experience.
### Industry
- John Bobey, Hill-Rom
- Martin Rola, Sapience Automation
- Alan Watson, Bosch
- David Gayle, Boeing
- Don Taylor, AmplifiedAG
- Paul Maday, Benz

### CofC
- Narayanan Kuthirummal, Physics & Astronomy
- Sebastian van Delden, Interim Dean, SSM
- Bob Mignone, Math
- Gia Quesada, Supply Chain
- Brent Munsell, Computer Science
- Brian McGee, Provost

### Consultant
- Chell Roberts, Founding Dean, Shiley-Marcos School of Engineering, University of San Diego.
CURRICULUM DESIGN: THE FOUR DIMENSIONS OF ENGINEERING

“...The key to good design is a combination of empathy and knowledge of the arts and humanities.” Logitech CEO Bracken Darrell

Our liberal arts based education can offer much more to an engineer...
EE CURRICULUM (MEETS ABET* ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS)

Basic Sciences and Math up to Differential Equations (41)
(Two Sciences Required)

Computer Programming (8)

Electrical Engineering (37)
(Intelligent Things)

Engineering Electives (6)
(includes Internship, Tutorial, Research, etc.)

92 in the major
132 total

CLEMSON = 126 || USC = 127 || SC STATE = 131 || BOB JONES = 134

A student can complete HONS Requirements in both programs...

*Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology
SE CURRICULUM (MEETS ABET ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS)

Basic Sciences and Math (36)  
(Two Sciences Required)

Computer Programming (11)

Systems Engineering (27)
Business/Supply Chain (12)

Engineering Electives (6)  
(includes Internship, Tutorial, Research, etc.)

92 in the major  
132 total

A student can complete HONS Requirements in both programs...
FUNDING MODEL - EE

- Tuition revenue pays for this program.
  - Assumes “new” students who otherwise would not come to CoFC.
- Breakeven point at year 5 is 49 students.
- One EE Instructor and two EE Tenure-Tracks (instructor – year 1, tenure-track – year 2, tenure-track – year 4.)
- Accreditation Requirement: The program must demonstrate that the faculty members are of sufficient number and they have the competencies to cover all of the curricular areas of the program.
- Library IEEExplore and CSL support enhance other majors across campus!
- Budgets have been reviewed by Sam Jones and Paul Patrick.
- School fee, Lab fee money, and Indirects from engineering faculty are not factored in.
- Conservative enrollment projections paired with liberal expenditure projections. Calculated Tuition Revenue” is what’s left over after standard carve outs.

Assumes 15 students/year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>1ST</th>
<th>2ND</th>
<th>3RD</th>
<th>4TH</th>
<th>5TH</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Salaries</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Support Personnel</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Resources</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (CSL Support)</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (ABET Fees)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Adjuncts)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Research Start Up)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$199,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$340,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$420,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$599,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$545,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,104,750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCES OF FINANCING BY YEAR**

Calculated Tuition Funding | $227,970 | $455,940 | $683,910 | $911,880 | $1,139,850 | $3,419,550
FUNDING MODEL - SE

- Tuition revenue pays for this program.
  - Assumes “new” students who otherwise would not come to CofC.
  - Breakeven point at year 5 is 49 students.
- One Computer Science Instructor (year 2), One Supply Chain Tenure-Track (year 3), and two SE Tenure-Track (years 3&4).
- Library IEEEExplore and CSL support enhance other majors across campus!
- School fee, Lab fee money, and Indirects from engineering faculty are not factored in.
- Budgets have been reviewed by Sam Jones and Paul Patrick.

- Conservative enrollment projections paired with liberal expenditure projections.
- Calculated Tuition Revenue” is what's left over after standard carve outs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>1ST</th>
<th>2ND</th>
<th>3RD</th>
<th>4TH</th>
<th>5TH</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Salaries</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Support Personnel</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Resources</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (CSL Support)</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (ABET Fees)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Adjuncts)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Research Start Up)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$199,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$265,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$670,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$824,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$770,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,729,750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCES OF FINANCING BY YEAR

Calculated Tuition Funding: $227,970 $455,940 $683,910 $911,880 $1,139,850 $3,419,550
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Year Started</th>
<th>Enrollment - EE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan - EE</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>83, 75, 114, 123, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young - EE</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>181, 204, 262, 264, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern - EE</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>200, 264, 292, 301, 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCC - SE</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>85, 93, 123, 138, 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCC - EE</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>248, 272, 285, 316, 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Marion - IE</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>N/A, 15, 23, 30, 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SE – Systems Engineering  
EE – Electrical Engineering  
IE – Industrial Engineering
## MARKET DEMAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>State Expected Number of Jobs</th>
<th>State Employment Projection</th>
<th>National Expected Number of Jobs</th>
<th>National Employment Projection</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineer</td>
<td>2,350 in 2018</td>
<td>9% growth (2016-26)</td>
<td>183,370 in 2018</td>
<td>9% growth (2016-26)</td>
<td>BLS Occupational Outlook, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production and Mechanical</td>
<td>5,911 in 2018 (Charleston Metro Area Only)</td>
<td>17.9% (2017-22)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Charleston Chamber of Commerce, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,129 in 2018 (Charleston Metro Area Only)</td>
<td>7.4% (2017-22)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Charleston Chamber of Commerce, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>699 in 2018 (Charleston Metro Area Only)</td>
<td>10.2% (2017-22)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Charleston Chamber of Commerce, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THANK YOU!
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT ON THE “3-IN-5 RULE”

Prepared by Chad Galuska

October 31, 2018

Definition and Background

• Definition: The “3-in-5 Rule” states that courses designated as Special Topics (ST) are not to be offered more than three times in any five-year period.

• This guideline is an example of faculty control over our curricular offerings and is not an official college policy. It was originally passed and appears in the November 29, 1994 minutes of the Senate. It was updated in 2002 (February 12, 2002 minutes) to specify that the “Registrar’s Office will monitor the frequency of Special Topics courses. Special topics courses having been taught two times within four years will be reported by the Registrar as such to Department chairs. Special Topics courses offered three times within five years will be reported by the Registrar to Department chairs and the Speaker of the Faculty Senate.”

• In practice, the Registrar’s Office has not performed these oversight functions for many years.

• We believe that all frequently offered courses should be subject to faculty review at the college-wide level.

• In Fall 2018, the Curriculum Committee conducted an initial oversight of ST course offerings.

Analysis and Results

• The Curriculum Committee examined all ST offerings from Spring 2015 to Fall 2018.
  o Note that this period does not cover an entire five-year period.
  o We examined course long titles, and – when data existed – course descriptions. We did not have access to course syllabi.
  o 50 courses (and approximately 17% of all ST sections offered during this period) possibly were in violation of the 3-in-5 rule.

Conclusions and Next Steps

• The “3-in-5 Rule” is frequently violated.

• The Curriculum Committee is in favor of retaining this rule but cannot manage the workload associated with regular oversight of ST courses in addition to our usual responsibilities. Even if we could, we currently do not have the power to actually enforce this rule.

• In an effort to foster better self-policing, we will raise awareness of this rule with faculty, chairs, and deans on a semester basis.

• The Faculty Senate might consider forming a permanent or ad-hoc committee designed to deal exclusively with the oversight of ST courses.
1. The meeting was called to order at 5:05.

2. The September 4, 2018 Minutes were approved.

3. Reports
   a. Speaker of the Faculty Elizabeth Jurisich reported on the Presidential Search. After conducting off-site interviews, the search committee narrowed the field to five candidates and submitted that list to the Board of Trustees. The Board will invite three finalists to campus for interviews in early- to mid-November. Speaker Jurisich complimented the search committee and the search firm R. William Funk and Associates for their professionalism and integrity. She also reported that she plans to return to a project started by previous Speaker Todd McNerney, ensuring faculty participation in the evaluation of administrators.

   b. Provost Brian McGee started by thanking Speaker Jurisich and Dean Godfrey Gibbison for their work on the Presidential Search.

Reminding the Senate that the College is currently celebrating the “Year of Women,” he discussed the dramatic increase in the utilization of victim and survivor services on campus over the past week, coinciding with the Sept. 27 U. S. Senate hearing involving Judge Brett Kavanaugh. He noted that nationally, there was a 201% increase in calls reporting sexual assault on the day of the hearing, relative to a typical day, and that call volumes to survivor support services were up substantially throughout the week of the hearing. Provost McGee made it clear that the College will support members of the campus community who are victims and survivors of sexual violence, and reminded the Senate of a list of Resources for Survivors of Sexual Assault. He appealed to everyone present to help students find assistance if they reveal to you that they have been victims of sexual violence, and reminded us that this is a “deadly serious” matter for our campus and community.

On other topics: The institution’s official policies, which can be found on the Academic Affairs web page, have been updated and should be consulted if you want to get anything significant done on campus. He reminded the Senate that we are a complex institution and therefore we need lots of policies. Deans and Department Chairs can also help guide faculty members seeking answers to policy questions.
The process for distributing merit increases to faculty will be similar to the process used in 2013, with details coming soon to academic deans. The Provost said he will report on faculty compensation matters at the November meeting.

Cande Cook has been hired as project director for the celebration of the College’s Sestercentennial, otherwise known as our 250th Anniversary. The Provost said that our priority is to focus on the academic mission of the institution; look for more information as we get closer to 2020.

Provost McGee closed by complimenting the Mathematics Department on their efforts to develop a PhD program and congratulated all faculty and staff on our handling of the disruption caused by the coastal evacuation a few weeks ago.

Provost Q&A:

Professor Simon Lewis (Guest, English) asked about the College’s policy on reporting knowledge of sexual violence, specifically whether it is mandatory. Provost McGee replied that there is an affirmative duty to report information about sexual violence, and that if a faculty member encounters a case in which there is some question as to whether one has a reporting obligation, assume the answer is yes, but also consult the Policy Page or an Associate Provost.

Senator Lauren Ravalico (LCWA) expressed concern that some students who are victims of sexual violence might fear coming forward because the process and possibility of taking time off from school could result in losing a scholarship or other financial support. Provost McGee replied that his office does all it can to make sure that accommodations are made for students in extraordinary situations (such as being victims of sexual assault) and that students are not penalized academically or financially because they come forward. He said, “We will support them.”

c. The Speaker recognized Senator Bob Mignone (SSM) and guest Annalisa Calini (Mathematics) to report on the upcoming proposal for a PhD program in Mathematics with Computation. Professor Mignone described the proposal as relatively inexpensive, requiring no new faculty lines. It is modeled on programs at primarily undergraduate institutions, such as Bryn Mayr, William and Mary, and Dartmouth. With a very small number of students, it would not threaten the College’s status as a PUI (Primarily Undergraduate Institution) for the purposes of NSF (National Science Foundation) grant funding, nor would it change the character of the College. Prof. Mignone added that they envision options for both full-time and part-time students and that they hope the program will encourage more women to pursue PhDs in Mathematics.
Senator Richard Nunan (Philosophy) asked for assurance that the PUI status of the institution would not be affected for the purpose of grant applications. Senator Mignone replied that the current NSF standard is 20 PhDs over two years (on average) in areas supported by NSF grants. Professor Jon Hakkila (Guest, Physics and Astronomy/Graduate School) read from the NSF’s criteria, which supported Senator Mignone’s answer: one of the qualifications for PUI status is awarding fewer than 10 doctoral degrees per year in all NSF-supported disciplines, averaged over 2-5 years. Prof. Mignone and Provost McGee added that as a matter of policy, no more than 8 students per year can be accepted into all PhD programs in NSF-supported disciplines; the reason for this policy is to ensure that we do not lose PUI status accidentally.

Senator Julia Eichelberger (HSS) said that the Budget Committee has looked at the proposal; they do not have serious concerns, but they have forwarded some suggestions to the planning committee. She recommended that at some point the proposal should clarify how the program will work financially, how students will be financially supported, for instance. Senator Mignone agreed that the committee crafting the proposal should meet with the Budget Committee to work through the budget.

Senator Idee Winfield (HSS) asked about potential need for new faculty lines. Senator Mignone replied that the Mathematics Department will not require new lines to support the program because of the program’s small size and the relatively large number of departmental faculty. Senator Sandi Shields (Mathematics) added that the program will probably only graduate one or two students per year.

Senator Mignone concluded by offering to talk with any departments or individuals who have concerns or questions about the proposal.

5. New Business

a. The Curriculum Committee (Chad Galuska, Chair) brought six motions, all of which were approved unanimously with no discussion.

i. **CHEM 181L: Chemistry and Biochemistry Research Rotation.** New course proposal. [PDF]

ii. **CSCI 370: Mobile Application Development.** New course proposal. [PDF]

iii. **EDFS 301: Introduction to Leadership.** Credit hour change from 1 to 2 credit hours in order to reflect the work associated with the course. [PDF]
iv. **FINC 403: Real Estate Finance.** Rename REAL 410 to FINC 403, and change catalog description. [PDF]

v. **GEOL-B.S.** Program Change. Last year, GEOL expanded the field research options in their degree requirements. Although these expanded options were meant to be added to the field research portion of the BS degree requirement, they were apparently added to the electives. The GEOL-B.S. program would allow students to choose one of the four (GEOL 360, 364, 365, or 366) to satisfy the Geology "Field Studies" core requirement that was previously satisfied by only GEOL 360. [PDF]

vi. **PSYC 356: Behavioral Genetics:** Course deactivation. [PDF]

6. Constituents’ General Concerns

Prof. Bill Olejniczak (Guest, History) asked the Senate to follow up on a directive to the Compensation Committee from 2013, to report – in September 2018 – on faculty salaries relative to those of our peer institutions. The date stipulated for that report has passed. Speaker Jurisich agreed to follow up with the Compensation Committee.

Citing the opportunity offered by the prospect of a new College President, Prof. Simon Lewis (Guest, English) urged Senators to be more assertive on issues such as the one raised by Prof. Olejniczak and (citing another Senate resolution from 2016) the inclusion of the Speaker of the Faculty in the annual budget process. Speaker Jurisich stated that there has been some progress recently on getting faculty input on the budgeting process, but there is room for more input from our budget committee.

Senator Jen Wright (HSS) announced that she and Prof. Kendra Stewart are working on a committee to apply for Carnegie Classification “Community Engagement” for C of C. To earn this classification, the College must document the ways we fulfill our mission to serve the public good and engage productively with our communities. If you would like to be involved in this effort or to contribute information about your department or program’s community engagement, please contact Prof. Wright or Prof. Stewart.

7. The meeting adjourned at 5:53.
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, Tuesday, September 4, 2018, 5:00 PM
Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:05.

2. The April 10-17, 2018 Minutes were approved.

3. Reports
   
a. **Speaker of the Faculty Elizabeth Jurisich** urged faculty to consider participating in the Board of Trustees’ shadowing program. She updated the Senate on the Presidential Search process: approximately ten finalists will soon be interviewed offsite; faculty may still send suggested interview questions to her. She also welcomed two representatives of the Staff Advisory Committee to the President, Rudy Alisauskas and current chair Melantha Ardrey.

b. **Interim President Steve Osborne** began by recognizing Board of Trustees Chair David Hay. Mr. Osborne then reported on his four areas of priority: campus experience, academic experience, philanthropy/stewardship, and the upcoming 250th anniversary of the College’s founding. He highlighted each of these priorities briefly and then provided more detail on related issues.

President Osborne intends to enhance study abroad opportunities. He intends to increase diversity on campus as well. There was a 20% increase in African American students compared to the previous year. Additionally, the “Top 10%” (now Cougar Advantage) initiative to increase diversity in the student body is being expanded from 8 to 15 South Carolina counties.

Priorities concerning the academic experience include ensuring that the Graduate School is on “solid footing,” continuing to promote (and market) undergraduate research, and developing an engineering degree.

Fiscal year 2018 saw our second-highest year of fundraising, as we exceeded $15 million, topped only by the last year of the Boundless Campaign. He thanked faculty and staff, who contributed $350,000 to the Foundation last year, up by $100,000 over previous year.

We had a strong recruitment cycle, producing one of the most diverse entering classes the College has ever had: over 2200 students, up 300 from 2017. The average SAT score was up by eight points. The yield of accepted students was up from 20% to more than 23%. 55% of entering freshmen are from South Carolina; 45% are from out of state. 140 are in the Charleston bridge program, 45 in the iCharleston program. The Honors College has its largest entering class in history with 267 new students, including 29 Aiken Fellows.
This year’s budget is solid. It is helped by the fact that we have more first-year students, though unfortunately we have fewer in-state transfer students than last year. The budget includes $2 million for increasing financial aid, $350,000 for faculty and staff retention, $100,000 to fund opportunity hires for diversity, and $700,000 for merit-based salary increases (currently developing a plan and timeline for distributing those resources). Adjunct faculty will receive a 3% pay increase, and graduate assistants will see an increase of 1%. President Osborne made it clear that the financial stability of the College will be closely guarded during his tenure.

President Osborne has enjoyed meeting many students; he and and Executive Vice President of Student Affairs Alicia Caudill will meet regularly with student leaders.

Dr. Godfrey Gibbison has been appointed Interim Dean of the Graduate School.

The renovation of the Hollings Science Center is complete and the building is open. Work will begin on the Simons Center for the Arts in 2020, pending final approval from the state. The next major renovation after that will be the Silcox Center.

President Osborne will begin meeting with Deans and Department Chairs this fall, starting with the School of Business.

The leadership team has been reviewing comments from last year’s listening sessions on workplace morale and is starting to implement changes.

1. Delegating more authority to streamline travel arrangements.
2. Delegating more authority for hiring and human resources decisions.
3. Funding more campus-connected events for staff.
4. Conducting a gender equity study in order to make corrections and address needs.
5. Creating more professional development opportunities for staff, with funding.
6. Creating new options for faculty and staff fitness classes.

The year-long 250th Anniversary Celebration will include numerous events throughout the year; among its goals are raising the College’s visibility and increasing participation among stakeholders. The College has hired a project director to spearhead this effort.

In closing, President Osborne expressed his hope for a great year and affirmed the transformational role the institution plays in the lives of students.

Q&A:
Senator Julia Eichelberger (HSS) asked, in regard to the budget, if faculty can be part of the process of prioritizing legislative special appropriations requests. Pres. Osborne said yes, and that the process would be taking place soon. Prof. Eichelberger thanked him and said that she would relay the information to the Faculty Budget Committee.
In regard to the expansion of the Top 10% program, Senator Richard Nunan (Philosophy) asked for the reasoning behind expanding to 15 counties as opposed to, say, the entire state. Pres. Osborne replied that the administration had considered expanding the program statewide but that in order to have the most impact on diversity, they chose another seven targeted counties.

Senator Bob Mignone (SSM) asked how quickly departments can expect to begin the recruiting cycle for new hires, given the disadvantage of starting late within a hiring cycle for math and other disciplines. Pres. Osborne referred the question to Provost Brian McGee, who replied that he is already in conversation with deans about hiring cycles and that he expects this year will be more normal than recent years in terms of the timing.

c. **Provost Brian McGee** outlined some of the initiatives his office and various academic units will be focusing on this year, with the help of other offices across campus. They include expanding study abroad and global fluency; increasing student internships; adjusting transfer credit policies; strengthening advising; and revisiting recent policy changes on grade redemption and forgiveness to ensure a student-friendly process. The Provost mentioned the College’s work with institutes and centers of research such as the Riley Center and the recently developed Global Alliance for South Carolina, and he announced “soft launches” of a new Center for Israel Studies and a Center for the Study of Slavery in Charleston.

In regard to curricular initiatives, the College continues to create new opportunities in Distance Education: this fall we are offering 97 sections of DE courses, and we will continue to develop distance and hybrid courses. Academic Affairs has posted on its website a three-year strategic plan for distance education. There are some curricular changes that are more a matter of housekeeping; for instance, the Commission on Higher Education has told us that some changes the Senate approved last year in MAT programs need to come to CHE for full review, so they can’t be implemented this year as originally scheduled. Task forces have been working on two engineering majors (which will not be joint programs with the Citadel) and a possible doctoral program in Mathematics and Computation.

Provost McGee reported that he had seen Associate Provost Lynn Cherry a few days earlier and that, while her recovery from a serious car accident will take some time, she will recover and we look forward to her returning to campus.

Deans Gibbison (School of Professional Studies) and Folds-Bennett (Honors College) have inquired about hiring non-tenure track roster faculty for their units. We will discuss this possibility throughout the year in committees and eventually the Senate.

Publication of 2018-19 Faculty/Administration Manual is imminent. Last year the Senate asked Academic Affairs about reducing references to gender binaries, and a lot of
progress has been made in that regard. They are also working on language concerning the Faculty Hearing Committee and dismissal of faculty.

In closing, the Provost alluded to the cautious, change-resistant tradition of the College, citing specifically the struggle to admit women a century ago. Positive change, he said, does not need to be slow if we work together across campus toward common goals. (PDF)

4. New Business

a. By unanimous consent, a motion to elect a Speaker Pro Tem was added to the agenda, and Senator Bob Mignone was elected unanimously.

b. Curriculum Committee

   i. Chemistry: A new course, CHEM 432: Industrial Chemistry --- PDF was approved unanimously.

   ii. Professional Studies: The following three changes to the curriculum were withdrawn at the request of Dean Gibbison:

      - Deactivate the Organizational Leadership and Management concentration [BPS-PRST-OLMG] --- PDF
      - Replace it with a Management Organizational and Development concentration (BPS-PRST-MNOD) --- PDF
      - Create a new course as part of this new concentration [PRST 320: Fundamentals of Strategic Planning] --- PDF

   iii. Religious Studies: The addition of RELS 103, RELS 247, and RELS 253 to the RELS-MAJOR --- PDF was approved unanimously.

c. Committee on Graduate Education

   i. History Department: the following proposals were approved unanimously.

      | Course | Proposal |
      |-------|---------|
      | HIST MA | Proposal to Create New Graduate Concentration in Public History PDF |
      | HIST MA | Inclusion of Existing Courses into Concentration in Public History PDF |
      | HIST 525 | New Course: Introduction to Public History --- PDF |
      | HIST 750 | New Course: Internship Experience --- PDF |
ii. School of Education, Health, and Human Performance: the following course renumbering was approved unanimously.

Special Education, MAT
EDFS 505  Field I: Assessing and Instruction of Students with Disabilities
Course renumbering to reflect best practices PDF

iii. Environmental Studies Program: the following proposals were approved unanimously.

Renumbering:
EVSS 518  History and Theory of American Urban Planning --- PDF
Course renumbering to reflect best practices
EVSS 530  Natural Resources Law and Policy --- PDF
Course renumbering to reflect best practices
EVSS 531  Administrative Law --- PDF
Course renumbering to reflect best practices
EVSS 534  Environmental Law and Regulatory Policy --- PDF
Course renumbering to reflect best practices
EVSS 535  Land Use Law --- PDF
Course renumbering to reflect best practices
EVSS 537  Wetlands Policy --- PDF
Course renumbering to reflect best practices
EVSS 551  Research and Management in Environmental Organizations PDF
Course renumbering to reflect best practices

Course Creation:
EVSS 679  Cultures, Economies and Environmental Governance --- PDF
Formalizing Existing Course

There was no discussion of any of the curricular proposals.

5. Constituents’ General Concerns: Senator Nunan outlined a pay equity concern in regard to summer teaching contracts and asked that it be taken up by an appropriate faculty committee, possibly Compensation or Faculty Welfare. His handout describing the issue is included below.

Senator Betsy Baker (English) announced a sabbatical lecture by Prof. Simon Lewis that evening.

Prof. Todd McNerney (guest) encouraged senators and guests to promote Faculty and Staff Giving.

6. A motion to adjourn was approved unanimously at 6:13.
Appendix:

Summer Pay Equity Issue
Richard Nunan, Senator (Philosophy), Sept. 2018

Professor A 10 students 7.5% of salary = $7,000+
Professor B 10 students per head (@ $375) = $3,750

Initial Revenue Generated for College by tuition in A’s class:
$500 x 3 x 10 = $15,000 (all in-state tuition payments @ $500 / credit hr)

Initial Revenue Generated for College by tuition in B’s class:
$500 x 3 x 7 = $10,500 (in-state tuition payments @ $500 / credit hr)
$1266 x 3 x 3 = $11,394 (3 out-of-state tuitions @ $1266 / credit hr)

Total revenue from Prof. B’s class: $10,500 + $11,394 = $21,894

Revenue can be reduced by withdrawals subsequent to drop/add period:
1st day following drop/add: 90% reimbursement
2nd & 3rd days following drop/add: 50% reimbursement
4th through 7th days following drop/add: 25% reimbursement
(There were no withdrawals from B’s class, but some from A’s class.)

How does this happen?
Week before May/Summer classes begin (when contracts issued):
Professor A has 13 enrollees
Professor B has 9 enrollees
By beginning of classes, 3 students have withdrawn from A’s class,
and 1 student has added B’s class. But contracts already committed.

Issue for Compensation Committee? Faculty Welfare?