Faculty Senate, Tuesday, April 5, 2022 5:00 PM
Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the March 1, 2022 minutes

3. Announcements and Information

4. Reports
   A. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
   B. Provost Suzanne Austin
   C. Knudt Flor (Senior Vice President for Innovation and Industry Engagement)
   D. REACH Act (Ad Hoc Committee, Barry Stiefel and Jason Coy, Co-chairs)
   E. Campus Interpretive Signage (Committee on Commemoration and Landscapes, Julia Eichelberger and Anthony Greene, Co-chairs)
   F. Intellectual Property Policy (Ad Hoc Committee, Annette Watson, Chair)
   G. Anti-Gun Violence (Ad Hoc Committee, Sarah Maness, Chair)

5. New Business
   A. Approval of degree candidates for Spring 2022 Commencement (Provost Austin)
   B. Election of Senate Standing Committees’ Members (Committee on Nominations and Elections, Laura Penny, Chair)
   C. REI Motion (Irina Gigova)
   D. Transfer Credit Policy Revisions (Faculty Committee on Academic Standards, Lynn Cherry, Chair)
   E. Faculty Resolution re: Pending Legislation (Chris Day)
   F. Curriculum Committee (Xi Cui, Chair)
      i. English
         a. ENGL - 464 - Senior Seminar in Difference and Literary Tradition – Deactivate – Curriculog link – Timothy Carens
         b. ENGL - 465 - Senior Seminar in Cultural Studies – Deactivate – Curriculog link – Timothy Carens
c. ENGL - 470 - Senior Seminar in Major Literary Genres – Deactivate – [Curriculog link] – Timothy Carens

ii. Sociology
   a. Cultural Sustainability Certificate - UCER-CECS - Add ANTH 347, BIOL 204, 211 to electives. Add ANTH 201, 202 which are already listed as "OR" in required courses to electives so both can be counted toward program when taken [Curriculog link] – Christine Finnan
   b. Sociology, B.S. - BS-SOCY Allow PSYC 211 or 250 as alternatives to SOCY 272; allow COMM 301 as an alternative to SOCY 271 [Curriculog link] – Christine Finnan

iii. Political Science
   b. Politics, Philosophy, and Law Concentration - PPLW Add POLI 381 to Political Science BA - PPLW concentration [Curriculog link] - Jordan Ragusa

iv. Arts Management
   a. ARTM - 325 - The Art of Creativity Change course title and description. [Curriculog link] - Kate Keeney

v. Environmental and Sustainability
   a. Environmental and Sustainability Studies Minor - ENSS Add three courses to two modules of electives. [Curriculog link] – Allison Welch

vi. Religious Studies
   a. Religious Studies Minor - RELS Add new courses to two buckets of courses [Curriculog link] Zeff Bjerken
   b. Religious Studies, B.A. - BA-RELS Add new courses and change names of electives categories [Curriculog link] Zeff Bjerken

vii. LACS
   a. Latin American and Caribbean Studies Minor - LACS Add SPAN 312 to the electives list [Curriculog link] Nadia Avendano
   b. Latin American and Caribbean Studies, B.A. - BA-LACS Add SPAN 312 to the electives list [Curriculog link] Nadia Avendano

viii. Computer Science
   a. Computer Information Systems, B.S. - BS-INFS Change courses included in GPA calculation [Curriculog link] Renee McCauley
   b. Computer Science, B.A. - BA-CSCI Change courses included in GPA calculation [Curriculog link] Renee McCauley
   c. Computer Science, B.S. - BS-CSCI Change courses included in GPA calculation [Curriculog link] Renee McCauley
   d. Computing in the Arts, Art Concentration, B.A. - BA-CITA-CIAR Change courses included in GPA calculation [Curriculog link] Renee McCauley
   e. Computing in the Arts, Dance Concentration, B.A. - BA-CITA-CIDN New concentration [Curriculog link] Renee McCauley
   f. Computing in the Arts, Digital Media Concentration, B.A. - BA-CITA-CIDM Change courses included in GPA calculation [Curriculog link] Renee McCauley
   g. Computing in the Arts, Game Development and Interaction Concentration, B.A. - BA-CITA-CIGD Change courses included in GPA calculation [Curriculog link] Renee McCauley
h. Computing in the Arts, Music Concentration, B.A. - BA-CITA-CIMU  
   Change courses included in GPA calculation [Curriculog link] Renee McCauley
i. Computing in the Arts, Theatre Concentration, B.A. - BA-CITA-CITH  
   Change courses included in GPA calculation [Curriculog link] Renee McCauley

G. General Education Committee (Suanne Ansari, Chair)
   i. HIST 213 American Jewish History: Colonial Times to the Present for General Education Humanities - This course is cross listed with JWST 260 a General Education Humanities course. - HIST 213 is listed in curriculog inadvertently as a GenEd History course, when the intent of the originators is that it be offered as GenEd Humanities

   Curriculog listing: HIST - 213 - American Jewish History: Colonial Times to the Present; General Education : History – Modern [https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3659/form]

   Curriculog listing JWST 260 American Jewish History: Colonial to the Present; General Education : Humanities [https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3439/form]

H. Committee on Graduate Education (Shawn Morrison)
   i. Environmental and Sustainability Studies, MS
      a. EVSS 627 – Marine Tetrapod Biology: course change (remove cross-listing BIOL 627) [EVSS - 627 - Marine Tetrapod Biology | Curriculog]
      b. EVSS 671L – Biodiversity Management Lab: new course [EVSS - 671L - Biodiversity Management Laboratory | Curriculog]
      c. EVSS 722 – Marine Invertebrate Zoology: course change (remove cross-listing BIOL 630) [EVSS - 722 - Marine Invertebrate Zoology | Curriculog]
      d. EVSS 724 – Ichthyology: course change (remove cross-listing BIOL 632) [EVSS - 724 - Ichthyology | Curriculog]
      e. EVSS 725 – Marine Botany: course change (remove cross-listing BIOL 635) [EVSS - 725 - Marine Botany | Curriculog]
   ii. Languages, MED
      a. LALE 690 – Special Topics in Language Education: course change (make repeatable) [LALE - 690 - Special Topics in Language Education | Curriculog]
   iii. Public Administration, MPA
      a. Program change: change to internship requirement, reformat elective courses [Public Administration, M.P.A. - MPA-PUBA | Curriculog]

5. Constituents’ General Concerns

6. Adjournment
Faculty Senate Meeting Dates
2022-23

Fall
Tuesday, September 6th
Tuesday, October 11th [Yom Kippur begins on Oct 4]
Tuesday, November 1st
Tuesday, December 6th

Spring
Tuesday, January 17th
Tuesday, February 7th
Tuesday, March 14th [Mar 7 is during Spring Break]
Tuesday, April 4th
(Tuesday, April 11th - if needed)

Posted online: https://facultysenate.cofc.edu/about-faculty-senate/meeting-schedule.php
Ad Hoc Committee Charge:

Following the passage of a Faculty Senate Resolution in October of 2021 that expressed the Senate’s “grave concern” with the implementation of the REACH Act, an ad hoc committee was formed to further explore how the College might better comply with the provisions of the Act.


Ad Hoc Committee Findings:

The ad hoc committee held several meetings and examined how other public institutions in our state are dealing with the requirements of the REACH Act. Based on the information collected, the committee discussed several options for how College of Charleston might better comply with the requirements of the REACH Act. Since it mandates that students must complete a three-hour course that assigns the required “Founding Documents” in order to graduate, the committee decided not to propose any changes to the current curricular requirement in place at CofC pertaining to the REACH Act. Given our current student headcount, however, the committee determined that our existing instructional resources are not adequate to meet projected enrollment demand.
Projected REACH Act Staffing Requirements:
The institution’s annual recruiting goal is to admit 2,300 new students each year. After subtracting students who enter with AP credit that counts for the REACH Act, we will still need to accommodate approximately 1,670 incoming students per year. At 35 students per section, we will need 48 sections per year to provide these courses (24 per semester). In the current academic year (2021-22), our campus offered 25 REACH Act compliant course sections. Subtracting these 25 sections leaves 23 additional sections per year (12 per semester) that would still need to be staffed.

Proposed Staffing Plans and Required Resources:
The ad hoc committee proposed two potential staffing plans to the administration to meet this projected enrollment demand: one proposed the hiring of visiting assistant professors to cover the required 12 courses per semester and the other proposed that the required courses be taught by adjuncts.

After discussing these recommendations with the ad hoc committee, Provost Austin affirmed her commitment to providing adequate resources to fund teaching the necessary number of REACH Act-compliant courses that our students need to graduate. She also shared with the committee her intention to include a request for two REACH Act visiting assistant professor positions in her budget proposal for next year and to allocate additional adjunct funding as needed.
Committee on Commemoration and Landscapes

An Update - “Learning From the Past”
Discovering Our Past: College of Charleston Histories

A project by College of Charleston

This project, a part of the College of Charleston’s 250th anniversary, explores many of the diverse pasts and presences that are part of our storied campus. Just as we embrace inclusivity in our present, this project seeks to share the stories of all people who were part of our past, whose presences linger on the land and in our buildings, and whose contributions and stories enrich the narrative that emerges as the unfolding epic tale of the College of Charleston.
CO-CHAIRS
JULIA EICHELBERGER
ANTHONY GREENE

Committee Membership

- Mark Berry
- Zora Brewster (Student)
- Morgan Brown-Walker (Student)
- Tamara Butler
- Hayden Clement
- Eileen Collins (Student)
- Jason Coy
- Rachel Donaldson
- Bryan Ganaway

- Grant Gilmore
- Joanna Gilmore
- Harlan Greene
- Alfred Hall (Creative Team)
- Susan Hallatt
- Mikyra Joines (Student)
- Joe Kelly
- Richard Kilpatrick
- Fanio King
- Todd LeVasseur
- Todd McNerney

- Amy Mercer
- Ivana Milosevic
- Ralph Muldrow
- Jim Newhard
- Verneil Phillips
- Bob Podolsky
- Anne Looper Pryor
- Jared Seay
- Barry Stiefel
- Brad Thompson
- Michael Turner

- Nathaniel Walker
- Leah Worthington
- Noelle Zeiner-Carmicheal

COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON
Efforts To Date

1. Creation of Emblem
EDISTO NATCHEZ-KUSSO TRIBE / SUN

ENSLAVED AFRICANS / SANKOFA

CofC / PORTER’S LODGE GATE

GULLAH GEECHEE / BASKET

ELEMENTS
1. 63 ½ Coming - Solar Pavilion – slave tag

2. 9 College Way - Book Basement - John Zeigler and Edwin Peacock

3. 14 Green Way - Albert Osceola Jones

4. Grice Marine Lab - George D. Grice

5. Grice Marine Lab - Civil War Monument
Potential Interpretive Signs Color Options
3. Creation of Interpretive “Centers”

First two locations to be focused in...

Septima Clark Auditorium (ECTR 118)
Ground floor of Randolph Hall

In both locations museum-style interpretive panels – allowing for more complete information, maps to self-guided campus tour, and direct access to links to the Discovering Our Past website and the full essays and research.
4. Research Discovered – incorrect name of the CALHOUN STREET Annex

At time of College’s original acquisition in 1976, building was called Calhoun Street Annex on campus maps.
2022/2023 and BEYOND

Sign and essay for 105 Wentworth Street, site of first Black Greek organization
Signs and essays in some or all of the following locations:

Native American History and Land Acknowledgment (in Cistern Yard)
African American Labor (in Cistern Yard)
The Ecology of C of C’s Landscape (in Cistern Yard)
History of Cistern Yard
Guenveur Family (57 Coming Street)

Completion of interpretive panels for Septima Clark Auditorium, Randolph Hall
Installation of decorative version of CCL emblem on researched historic houses and other locations
Installation of artwork honoring African-descended people in campus spaces
And much more ... including YOUR IDEAS and/or VOLUNTEER to join the Committee ...

In either instance Contact Julia Eichelberger or Anthony Greene
QUESTIONS and DISCUSSION
REPORT ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICIES AT THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON

Annette Watson, Chair, Political Science/Graduate Director of Environmental and Sustainability Studies
COMMITTEE CHARGE AND COMPOSITION

• Charge: review our current Intellectual Property (IP) policies and to report any recommendations for amendments to the current policies
• Work: began in 2019, paused during pandemic, completed report in Spring 2022

Committee:

• Annette Watson (Chair, Political Science)
• Chris Starr (Chair ex-officio, formerly of Supply Chain and Information Management)
  • William Bares (formerly of Computer Science)
  • Thomas Spade (Accounting and Legal Studies)
    • Jonathan Neufeld (Philosophy)
• David Wyman (Management and Marketing)
• Suanne Ansari (Accounting and Business Law)
  • Joe Carson (Physics and Astronomy)
DATA AND METHODS

• Current CofC IP policy, created in 2016
• Use of IP policy from 2016-present
• Literature from news and academic sources (AAUP, Chronicle of Higher Education).
• Review of IP policies of our peer institutions and additional examples from more research-heavy institutions (MUSC, USC, Harvard): a total list of 16 Universities
FINDINGS 1: LEGAL CONTEXT

• 1980 Bayh-Dole Act: allowed universities to profit off federally-funded research; many R1 schools created “technology transfer offices” to administer IP.

• *Stanford v. Roche* (2011) Supreme Court Case ruled that while the Bayh-Dole Act requires universities to establish a specified structure of ownership of IP, it “does not alter the basic ownership rights granted to inventors by law” (*AAUP Guidebook*, p 49).
FINDINGS 2: COFC IP POLICY USE

• Created in 2016, deployed in only one case, in 2019
• The single case involved a graduate and undergraduate student
  • The case extended over two semesters that included the students retaining a lawyer, and delaying progress on the graduate student thesis
• The time that such negotiations happen at CofC is not compatible with the need for rapid assignation of the ownership of IP for its protection and capture.
• Policy application proceeds through a purpose to “capture” revenue for the College, when a majority of tech transfer offices lose money (86%)
FINDINGS 3: COFC IP PROCESS

- There is no guidance from CofC as to when someone ought to file the “IP Disclosure Form” with the Provost’s Office.
- Based on answers on the form, the Provost may convene the IP Committee:
  - Provost, the “inventor’s” Dean, the Executive VP for Business Affairs, and the General Counsel.
- The policy and process does not account for the variety of situations that might result in creating IP and protecting IP.
RECOMMENDATIONS TO REWRITE THE IP POLICY

• Reimagine from an input-based, inwardly-focused policy with a narrow scope of unlikely revenue generation

• Refine definitions and reorganize to be a better reference for the CofC community; the policy needs to account for individuals who occupy multiple roles in the community (e.g., “student” and “employee”).

• The structure of the IP Committee needs to include representation from the Faculty Senate.

• The process needs to include required communications with “the inventor’s” Chair or Program Director, or direct supervisor.

• The policy as written includes procedures for implementation; these need to be separated for greater flexibility
RECOMMENDATIONS TO REWRITE THE IP POLICY

• “University Resources” need to be better specified in terms beyond “above normal use” or “substantial use;” denote an amount under which no IP capture process will commence (e.g., Elon and JMU). We recommend $10,000—an amount that should be revisited every 3-5 years. This will avoid wasting university resources on negotiating potentially small dollar amounts.

• The next policy needs to be written to better reflect our student-centric core values. With an average debt of $6719 per year at the College, the College should not attempt to make a profit off the back of student work.

• The College needs to provide on its website resources (including legal resources) that all of the CofC community can reference regarding IP.
QUESTIONS?
The Problem

CofC’s IP Process Is An Innovative Student’s Worst Nightmare

- **No Formal Process**
  Students must fend for themselves finding resources, support, and council.

- **Thesis Research Halted**
  Due to this process, Thesis research was halted at fear of IP being automatically forfeited.

- **Staff Unaware of Policy**
  Did not know policy existed, nor did CofC’s legal communicate about the documents.
Total Cost

- Legal: $3.1k (Oct. 2019 – May 2020)
- Rent: $17k (Jan. 2020 – May 2021)
- Tuition: $12.3k (Jan. 2020 – May 2021)
- Total Cost: $32.5k (Oct. 2019 – May 2021)
Our Recommendations

Total Re-Write Of CofC IP Policy

Re-Think CofC Mission
Create a policy that fosters innovation and discovery while empowering students to pursue commercialization. Current policy creates separate classes of students.

Institution
Look at the leading universities in this space and design a policy in-kind. Commonly IP is LOSS generating and unprofitable.
Create a Technology Transfer Office & resources.

Awareness & Education
Create an educational document that all staff, faculty, and students are required to read.
Remove legal jargon where possible.
Charge
To review our current Intellectual Property (IP) policies and to report the committee’s findings, including any recommendations for amendments to the current policies, to the Senate at the April 5, 2022 meeting.

Review Process: The Ad-hoc committee was initially formed in Fall 2019 in response to a constituent concern raised at Faculty Senate, because a graduate student thesis workflow was being affected by the current policy. Until the COVID pandemic, the committee met in person regularly, discussing the relevance of the data and constructing the initial skeleton of the report in Spring 2020. At the start of the pandemic the original Chair of the committee left the College, and the committee’s work went on pause; the committee reconvened in Spring 2022 to complete its charge for the Senate. The individuals who contributed to this review of IP policy are listed in the appendix.

Data
To complete its review, the Ad-Hoc Committee on IP policy generated and discussed the following data:
- Current CofC IP Policy [included in appendix]
- Use of the CofC IP Policy from 2016-2019
- Literature from both news and academic studies regarding the challenges of developing and following IP Policy in ways that benefit the institution and its community (AAUP, Chronicle of Higher Education, journals, etc).
- IP Policies from a list of peer institutions and other examples outside our peers at research institutions that tend to engage more with managing IP. This final list included the following schools:
  - Appalachian State University
  - Boston College
  - Carnegie Mellon University
  - Clemson University
  - Elon University
  - Harvard University
  - James Madison University
  - Miami University
  - MUSC
  - Sewanee College
  - The Citadel
  - University of Tampa
Findings

Legal Background:

The Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 allows Colleges and Universities to profit off of federally-funded research, and this began an era of “technology transfer” for institutions of higher education. Some universities proceed with a claim that this Act requires universities to take ownership rights, but this argument was rejected in the Supreme Court ruling of Stanford v. Roche (2011), while affirming that the university must have a specified structure of ownership (AAUP Guidebook, p 49). The AAUP writes,

“While it is true that Bayh-Dole requires universities to secure faculty agreement to protect and honor the US government’s interest in federally funded inventions, the Court concluded there was nothing in the act that automatically vests title to their own inventions in their university employers. Nor does the Act require faculty to assign their inventions to their universities or any other agent for management.

In its own successful amicus brief, the AAUP elaborated on this very point, arguing that Bayh-Dole does not alter the basic ownership rights granted to inventors by law. Rather it helps bring inventions forward to benefit the public good by clarifying that government agencies are to allow certain assignees of federally funded inventions to retain ownership, if and when they come to accept ownership, provided they meet various requirements to protect the government’s interest, and the public interest. The high court agreed, ruling that US patent law has always favored, and should continue to favor, the rights of individual inventors, and that universities need a written assignment from researchers to establish ownership of their inventions.” (AAUP Guidebook, p 49).

Most Colleges and Universities today have policy guiding IP ownership; the College of Charleston created its IP Policy in 2016.

Unfortunately, there is no history of successfully employing the CofC IP policy to the satisfaction of all parties. Since becoming policy in 2016, the CofC IP policy lay dormant until 2019—the first and only time this policy was referenced for action by the College. But it was this single case involving a graduate student that caused the concerns that prompted this review of the policy. In that case, the implementation of the policy led to a period of negotiation and contestations of fact that took approximately two semesters to resolve, with the student retaining a lawyer to negotiate with the College while he also paid tuition during that time. The result of the application of the existing IP Policy
was an extended timeline for the graduate student thesis, almost twice the usual time to complete, in addition to financial burdens placed upon the student. At the conclusion of the case, the College elected to retain the IP created from the graduate student thesis, not commercialize the product, and set the terms on the naming of future products that the student might produce from the business he began as a result of his thesis research and generated IP.

**How the CofC Policy and Process Works, Compared with Peers and with the Literature:**

A key point raised in reviewing the current IP policy is that as written, both policy and procedures for implementation are included in this one document, treating all potential cases of IP exactly the same even though the facts of every case will be different, potentially requiring different kinds of procedures to follow.

As written, the CofC IP policy assumes that the College can and should “capture” revenue created by the College community of researchers, called “technology transfer.” After 1980 many Universities elected to create a technology transfer office to manage IP; the College of Charleston does not have a tech transfer office more common at research universities such as MUSC, USC and Clemson in SC, so there is no guiding mission included in our current Policy that outlines the goals of managing IP except for capturing revenue. However, other institutions’ tech transfer offices have mission statements that guide their management of IP with goals that are not solely to maximize profits. These other missions include to support students and faculty to develop new ideas, support job creation, contribute to a better society, encourage partnerships with industry, attract research funding, and other benefits. Therefore, some of these offices are structured to lose money regardless of their success in transferring technologies.

Indeed, the literature indicates that managing IP is often a money-losing endeavor for Universities, with 84% of these offices operating in deficit. The “unicorns” making money are a few select R1 Institutions (Brookings 2016).

Attached to the College’s IP Policy is the Intellectual Property Disclosure Form, that “inventors” might choose to fill out and submit to the College; this form is the formal trigger for the IP Review by the College. The Intellectual Property Disclosure Form asks what the creation is, what it is used for, whether and what kinds of College resources were used, and other questions on the creation of the IP. There is no written guidance from the College or its offices on when someone ought to file this form; in the only case dealt with by the College, the graduate student came across the Intellectual Property Disclosure Form, and independently thought he was doing his due diligence by filing that form with the Provost’s Office.

Once this form is filed, IP at the College under the current policy is adjudicated by an internal IP Committee (IPC), composed of the “inventor’s” Dean, the Provost, the Executive VP for Business Affairs, and the General Counsel or their designees, though the “inventor” may suggest other parties to advise the panel in a non-voting capacity, and these suggestions are to be considered by the Provost. Once the provost determines a panel discussion is needed, she/he will convene the IPC to determine ownership of
the IP, and further appeals can be made to be heard by a three-person panel, including one representative chosen by the “inventor” and two chosen by the College.

A policy comparison with other universities revealed that the CofC IP Policy as currently written is vague, with few key definitions, and not useful for the variety of situations that could arise involving faculty and students. Importantly, the policy does not fully recognize the differing situations in which IP is produced: through faculty research, in the classroom, or by our undergraduate and graduate students (who may also be employees). The language used in the policy does not provide the kinds of protections accomplished by the IP policy of the comparable peer institutions, and the current policy is not well-aligned with the College’s core values.

Faculty, employees, and students at CofC need clearer guidance on the issue of IP ownership in order to foster and encourage creative and innovative activities on campus. It was clear from the Ad-hoc Committee reviewing IP Policy that other institutions have presented better models that take a more collaborative approach to incentivize innovation, to the benefit of both the individuals and the institution. CofC’s policy would serve the campus community better if it were written with less legalese and in a less ambiguous manner. Some statements in the current policy leave too much room for interpretation by the IP Committee, which by our current policy is composed of those individuals least familiar with the field in which the IP is generated.

Other institutions utilize clearer definitions that recognize the multiplicity of roles and conditions that generate IP. The current CofC policy does not address students and the creation of projects as part of class work versus their own outside work; likewise, for faculty and staff, or students who are also employees of the College. For student work done in classes, or for bachelor essays or thesis projects, there is also the issue of how much the faculty member might have contributed to the student’s work. In patent law, this issue relates to the claims that were derived from ideas contributed by each person involved; such situations common in the university setting are not considered in the current policy.

Other institutions also do better at defining what constitutes “substantial use of resources;” JMU and Elon for example set baselines of $5,000 or $10,000, an amount below which no IP capture process would commence. As written the CofC policy does not provide reliable guidance on this important factor to determine IP ownership rights. Furthermore, MUSC has a policy where the first $10,000 in profit goes to the inventor, even when the University owns a significant fraction of the IP. The goal of such policies is to help avoid wasting university time and resources in arguing over small dollar amounts, and to help incentivise inventors to generate initial revenue. These schools each have a different way to approach determination of “substantial use of resources” that is more supportive of a creative environment. The ownership rights in the policy of other institutions more clearly describes the rights of the College, Employees/Faculty, and Students. They also often separately address patents and copyrights, when the CofC policy does not.

The AAUP states that faculty should be involved in setting policy for IP and corporate/university actions; the faculty should have a policy voice in issues at the center of academic freedom and the determination
of their own freedom of expression (Part 1, Principle 1, *Recommended Principles to Guide Academy-Industry Relationships*, (Washington, DC, AAUP Foundation 2014), pp 118-120). Other institutions provide a more significant role for faculty participation in IP; Clemson has 9 faculty members on their IP committee, but our current Policy at CofC does not include any faculty representation. In many of our peer institutions, department Chairs are automatically involved if an author/inventor’s IP is being evaluated; the current CofC policy does not involve the Department Chair or Program Director unless they are requested to be the additional representative by the applicant. In the only case handled through the current policy, the student unsurprisingly chose to bring their retained legal counsel as their representative.

The current CofC Policy does not allow the determination of ownership to happen in a rapid enough manner to be practicable. Often, the speed of filing patents is essential in any IP capture at all, and so a capture process at the college level needs to happen at later stages of innovation, so as to not hinder innovation with the College process that requires determination of ownership first. In most instances of technology transfer, whether it is from federally funded research or not, there is a need for a university representative to sign a legal document confirming the university’s position on the particular IP. Potential investors will not be satisfied with the current lengthy document describing CofC’s general IP policy. If no one at the university is willing to sign that legal document in a reasonably timely manner, including complying with any potential requirements of the Bayh-Dole Act, the university’s official IP policy is practically meaningless and the IP is effectively dead. For CofC’s IP Policy to be anything other than a death sentence for IP, a practical plan for addressing timeliness is absolutely critical.

But the literature also indicates that a focus on licensing, which is what the current policy does, is part of an outdated model of managing IP, as it requires time and effort that will discourage rather than incentivize entrepreneurship, and more likely than not result in a loss of revenue to the College.

Another model to consider includes the Strategic Corporate Alliance (SCA); this “is a formal, comprehensive, university-managed research collaboration with one or more outside company sponsors, centered around a major, multi-year financial commitment involving research, programmatic interactions, “first rights to license” intellectual property, and other services. An SCA is frequently negotiated through a central university development office in tandem with a group of faculty members, an entire academic department, or many different departments in unison. In broad SCA agreements, it is customary for universities, in each new grant cycle, to issue a formal request for faculty research proposals (RFP) on behalf of the outside corporate sponsor(s). In narrow SCA agreements, by contrast, all faculty members eligible for SCA funding and their projects are named and identified in advance, so a university- led RFP and research-selection process is not required.” (AAUP Academy-Industry Summary p17)

Regardless of exactly the model chosen to manage IP, our committee came to consensus on the need for a new or revised IP policy that can better support faculty, staff and students in their capture, protection and sharing (open source licensing, commercial licensing, startup company formation) for one of many
purposes, not just revenue generation. We recommend that the College of Charleston do more to encourage creative endeavors. These recommendations are specified below.

**Recommendations**

The committee finds that opportunities exist to make changes to the College of Charleston IP Policy of 2016 (Policy) to encourage creative endeavors by faculty, staff and students and to support the intellectual output thereof for potential commercial purposes, or other just desserts in support of the mission of the university and our Strategic Plan. The following is the Ad-Hoc Committee’s specific recommendations on kinds of changes to consider when reforming the College’s IP Policy:

1. Reimagine the IP Policy from an input-based, inwardly-focused policy of capturing IP created by the faculty and students for unlikely promises of revenue generation through future licensing. We recommend the elimination of IP capture through disclosures and cumbersome processes involving people who are not experts in the research area technology transfer, entrepreneurship, company startup and growth, which likely discourages stakeholders from participation or cooperation. Create a new IP policy that has an explicit mission to encourage inventors and innovation.

2. With a goal to improve the readability and interpretability of the Policy, a number of definitions and references could be specified, and organized to become a better reference point to guide our community on issues of IP. The policy needs to clearly describe ‘employees’ and ‘faculty’ and ‘student’ and the scenarios in which IP is potentially created by individuals occupying multiple roles. Patents and copyrights need to be separated, and corporate-university partnerships need to be independently addressed.

3. “University resources” need to be specified in the policy as “above the normal use” or “substantial use” through creating a baseline below which no IP capture process would commence. The committee recommends that any discovery made on campus using $10,000 or less in university resources above ordinary use will be exempt from any IP policy consideration. For IP generated with funds above $10,000, a process involving the notification of the Provost would follow the inventor’s filing of a provisional patent, copyright or other protection as elected by the inventor alone. The amount of this baseline should be revisited every 3-5 years.

4. The structure of the IP Committee should include representation from Faculty Senate. Determining ownership rights and royalty distribution needs to at least include communication with the individual’s department Chair or Program Director or direct supervisor.

5. The Policy as written currently includes the procedure for implementation. The separation of these two concerns may lead to both an improvement in the policy and the ability to change the one without impacting the other for an increasingly agile approach to policy and process improvements.
6. The next policy written needs to better reflect our student-centric core values and the College’s recent Strategic Plan. With average student debt of $6719 per year (“College of Charleston,” College Factual, accessed March 4, 2022, https://tinyurl.com/63h66mub), under no circumstance should the university attempt to make a profit on the back student-generated IP. Any policy should be fostering growth for our students, not solely to create potential revenue sources for the college. The College needs to clearly post on its website resources for our community of students, faculty, and staff that they can reference regarding IP, including external legal resources.

Appendices

Committee Membership
IP Policy
Declaration of Invention Form
Relevant literature
Membership of the Ad-Hoc Committee to Review IP Policy

Annette Watson (Chair, Political Science)
Chris Starr (Chair ex-officio, formerly of Supply Chain and Information Management)
William Bares (formerly of Computer Science)
Thomas Spade (Accounting and Legal Studies)
Jonathan Neufeld (Philosophy)
David Wyman (Management and Marketing)
Suanne Ansari (Accounting and Business Law)
Joe Carson (Physics and Astronomy)
Policy Statement

This Policy addresses the ownership, disposition, and use of Intellectual Property which includes, but is not limited to, patents and/or inventions, copyrights (including computer software), and trademarks/services marks relating to the College of Charleston (hereinafter “College”), its faculty, staff, students and others using College Resources as defined below:

Policy Manager and Responsible Department or Office

This Policy will be managed and maintained by the Office of the Provost in consultation with the Office of Legal Affairs.

Purpose/Reason for the Policy

To create an environment that encourages research resulting in the generation of intellectual property and to promote use of the intellectual property for the public good;

To encourage development and commercialization by facilitating access to methods of protection for Intellectual Property and the protection of producers of scholarly activity that may have commercial value.

To acknowledge the traditional right of faculty members to disseminate products of their work, research and creative activity for scholarly purposes;

To promote the identification and disclosure of all products of work having commercial value; except those exempted from intellectual property inclusion herein or not covered or defined herein as intellectual property.

To ensure compliance with applicable laws and regulations.
POLICY

Going forward from the effective date of this Policy, all parties and individuals employed by the College of Charleston, including, but not limited to all faculty and staff, are required to comply with the terms and conditions of this policy as a condition of their employment and/or continued employment with the College.

This Intellectual Property Policy applies to:

A. All parties and individuals employed by, paid by or under any personal services agreement with the College, including full and part-time faculty and staff, adjunct faculty, visiting faculty and researchers, and graduate and undergraduate students, unless expressly exempted by a written agreement, properly executed.

B. Anyone using College Resources, as defined below.

Definitions

Intellectual Property

The term “Intellectual Property,” as used in this policy is broadly defined as property protectable by patent rights and copyrights, including machines, articles of manufacture, compositions of matter, and any method for making or using these; and works of authorship.

College

College of Charleston and University of Charleston, South Carolina.

College Resources

College funds or external funds administered through the College, College facilities, space, equipment, personnel, tangible or intangible research materials, information and/or materials that are not freely available to the public. “College Resources” does not include the use of ordinary office space, library facilities, and ordinary access to personal computers and networks.

Copyright

Exclusive rights, as set forth in Title 17 U.S.C. Section 106, in the original works of authorship when those works are reduced to a tangible medium of expression. Works of authorship are literary works, pictorial works, graphic works, musical works, dramatic works, sound recordings, audiovisual works, motion pictures, pantomimes, choreographic works, sculptural works and architectural works.

Course

All educational objectives included in the syllabus created for and provided to College students by an instructor or under the supervision of an instructor.

Course Content

All educational or instructional materials provided by an instructor to College students as part
of a Course. Course Content does not include personal notes created for an instructor’s personal use.

Institutional Works

University ownership of works that are supported by a specific allocation of either college resources or funds or that are created at the specific direction of the College of Charleston and/or the University of Charleston, S.C., for a specific purpose of either. Also, the mere fact that multiple individuals have contributed to the creation of a work shall not make the work an institutional work. Rather, institutional works are those in which authorship cannot be attributed to one or a discrete number of authors, but rather result from simultaneous or sequential contributions over time by multiple faculty members and students. Institutional works belong to the College of Charleston and/or the University of Charleston, S.C., as appropriate.

Inventor

The individual who invented or discovered the subject matter of an invention.

Digital Course Content

All educational or instructional materials created by an instructor for use in a College Course taught to students online, in whole or in part.

Originator

The individual who created an original work of authorship.

Owner

The Owner is the entity, whether a person or organization, that owns the Intellectual Property. The Owner may be the Inventor or an organizational entity that supported the particular work by providing resources, facilities or compensation.

Patent rights

Exclusive rights, as set forth in Title 35 U.S.C. Section 271, in inventions which are new, useful and nonobvious machines, articles of manufacture, compositions of matter and method for making and using these.

Royalties

Compensation for rights in intellectual property and are usually a percentage of revenue received by the licensee from sales of the product or service.

Scope of Employment

The range of activities encompassed by one’s employment, (i.e., acts done while performing one’s job).

Substantial Use of College Resources or facilities

College resources are: funds, programs, equipment, space, grounds, facilities or other physical
assets that go above and beyond those customarily and currently provided to employees as part of their ordinary conditions of employment. So, in general, the use of University funds or external funds administered through the University, the use of students or employees as support staff to develop work or the use of specialized or unique facilities, laboratories, and equipment or other special subventions provided by the University, would be constructed as “substantial use” unless specifically accepted by agreement. However, the University does not construe the use of ordinary office space, library facilities, ordinary access to computers and networks or salary as “substantial use.”

Trademark/Service Marks

A Trademark or a Service Mark is a word, phrase, symbol or design (or any combination thereof) that identifies and distinguishes the source of goods or services.

Trade Secret

Information kept secret by a business to maintain an advantage over competitors.

University

College of Charleston and University of Charleston, S. C.

Intellectual Property Committee (“IPC”)

The Intellectual Property Committee (“IPC”) is a committee at the College comprised of the inventor’s Dean, the Provost, the Executive V.P. for Business Affairs and the General Counsel or their respective designees. In addition, the Provost may appoint additional non-voting individuals to serve on or advise the IPC as appropriate. [The inventor or originator may suggest additional members for the IPC subject to the discretion of the Provost.] The College recognizes the IPC as an advisory body to the Office of Research and Grants Administration and the Provost on all matters involving Intellectual Property.

Ownership Rights of the College in Intellectual Property

1. The College shall generally have rights to Intellectual Property conceived, created, developed, fixed or first actually reduced to practice by College employees, including faculty and staff, or students:

   a. Within the scope of their employment or official association and/or appointment with the College, inclusive of summer months and holidays; or

   b. Pursuant to research at the College, whether funded internally or externally, or pursuant to a sponsored research agreement or contract of any type, including gifts between the College and a third party; or research data or results created by an employee are owned by the University, unless the University has contractually assigned or licensed it to a third party. The creator will have a non-exclusive, but permanent license to use the data for nonprofit educational research and scholarly purposes within the scope of the employee’s employment, but subject to other provisions of this policy; or

   c. By or with substantial use of College Resources or facilities;
2. **Except** that the College acknowledges:

   a. Copyrights are owned by the originator, unless created as a “work-made-for-hire” as that phrase is defined in Title 17 U.S.C. Section 101 and copyright materials’ ownership and control shall remain with the creator unless the work is: (a) commissioned by the College of Charleston and/or University of Charleston, S.C.; (b) supported by a direct allocation of funds from the College of Charleston and/or the University of Charleston, S.C., for a specific project; (c) is a work for hire; or (d) is otherwise subject to contractual obligations. Pedagogical, scholarly or artistic books, articles and similar works including non-patentable software are not subject to university claims of ownership unless specifically for hire. Such works include those of students created in the course of their education, such as dissertations, papers and articles. Additionally, the University claims no ownership in novels, textbooks, nonfiction books, poems, musical compositions, non-patentable software or other artistic imagined works, unless created using institutional works or the services of University non-faculty employees working within the scope of their employment.

   b. Inventions owned by the inventor, unless assigned by the inventor or result from the inventor being hired by the College to invent in addition to other job duties.

   c. Traditional Teaching Material, excepting the syllabus, to include faculty lectures, audio files, databases and various forms of digital media created for instructional purposes by faculty shall not be intellectual property for which the College has rights, unless specifically and voluntarily created as works made for hire or for which a stipend has been paid. The syllabus to a course remains the property of the Institution.

   d. Distance Education Teaching Material developed without a stipend from the Institution or without substantial use of College resources or facilities would have all rights retained by the course author, with the College holding rights to the use of the materials only for one year following the conclusion of the author’s employment at the College. Said courses can be treated as intellectual property if the faculty member agreed to treat the course as a work made for hire with such ownership rights residing in the institution. No online course can be assigned in whole to another instructor without the consent of the faculty member who created it, unless the faculty member agreed to treat the course as a work for hire for the institution, was paid a stipend for its development, or it was developed by an employee hired as a part of his or her job duty to create Distance Education Teaching Material. For clarification purposes, the College/University shall retain rights to classes and course work developed at the College/University, including the syllabus, which are software, digital material in any media, videotaped or recorded using any other media or used for distance education, when the College/University has paid a stipend to the faculty member for such development or recording or it was developed with substantial use of College resources or facilities.

3. The College acknowledges a general right of students of the College to have ownership rights in Intellectual Property developed by them independently as part of their coursework, except for any “work-made-for-hire” as that phrase is defined in Title 17 U.S.C. Section 101 or under an agreement requiring the College and/or student to assign rights to the College or a third-party. Students have a duty to disclose any agreement entered into with a third party to the IPC, and, such agreement shall be valid only upon IPC approval.
4. No transfer of ownership rights in any other Intellectual Property owned by the College shall be transferred from the College to any employee of the College, whether faculty or staff, any student, or any other person making use of College Resources, unless the College expressly and specifically grants the ownership rights, in whole or in part, to the employee by means of a signed written agreement.

**DISCLOSURE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY**

All Intellectual Property that emanates from the work of any employee of the College or any other person making use of College Resources not excepted or exempted herein, shall be promptly disclosed to the College, and shall be made prior to any public release of information in any form about the subject matter. All disclosures will be treated confidentially and will not be considered, in and of themselves, a surrender or determination of ownership. Public release in any form may have the effect of consigning the intellectual property to the public domain. This would preclude the College and the inventor from pursuing patent protection. Therefore, prompt disclosure is needed.

Disclosures shall be made by completing the Disclosure Form [attached hereto as Ex. A] and by submitting it to the appropriate office as directed on the form. If it is believed that the Intellectual Property was conceived independently, a written statement of this claim with supporting documentation shall be submitted in addition to the Disclosure Form.

**DETERMINATION OF OWNERSHIP**

Following receipt of a properly completed and signed Disclosure Form, the Provost, in consultation with the IPC, will determine whether the College is entitled to ownership of the Intellectual Property. The College acknowledges the obligation of the IPC to promptly evaluate and provide the requested determination. The College will strive to issue the determination in writing within 15 business days of submission. However, if the College makes, in its sole discretion, a determination that additional time is necessary for review, evaluation and consultation of the requested determination, the College will inform the submitting parties in writing of the expected date of the determination. At any time, the College may request additional information.

The determination issued by the IPC will assert one of the following alternatives:

a. Assertion of sole interest in the Intellectual Property with a recommendation for pursuit of protection; or

b. Waiver or Assignment of the Intellectual Property rights of the College.

In the event that a waiver is indicated, a waiver agreement will be provided by the College within sixty (60) days after the determination is issued. All waivers will include a perpetual, royalty-free right and license retained by the College to use the Intellectual Property for its own purposes, with additional terms as selected by the College. Waivers will only be granted if doing so would be consistent with any external agreements to which the inventor or originator may be a party. The inventor or originator shall make the IPC aware of any such external agreements and shall timely provide, within thirty (30) days, the agreement to the IPC.
COMMERCIALIZATION

Upon any recommendation of the IPC for pursuit of protection of the Intellectual Property, the Provost shall make a determination regarding commercialization in consultation with the inventor or originator and any other parties at the College whose input the Provost or IPC deems appropriate. The Provost’s decision will be based on the objectives of the College according to this policy and the available resources of the College. The College shall have the authority to engage a third-party commercialization or licensing agent on behalf of the College. The College will bear the costs of licensing the intellectual property. If the College cannot, or decides it will not proceed to license and/or patent an invention, the College can enter into an agreement with the inventors or originators for a transfer of all or part of the intellectual property back under an agreement. Said agreement must be subject to the terms of any agreement that supported the related work. If a Research Foundation is created on behalf of the College, such Foundation shall work with the College regarding matters related to commercialization and licensing. In addition, nothing in this Policy shall be interpreted to preclude the College from partnering with other institutions and non-profit organizations for the joint conduct of technological commercialization activities.

The inventor or originator shall work and cooperate, in good faith, with the College throughout the entire commercialization process.

Nothing herein shall prevent the College from entering into license agreements with a third party business entity in which the inventor or originator has a business interest. The option decided on by the College shall be based on what serves the mission and strategic plan of the College in the best way and is fair.

SPECIAL CASES AND UNIQUE SITUATIONS

Any special cases and unique situations relating to Intellectual Property which are not specifically covered by this Policy or which arise because of a conflict of interest, shall be brought to the IPC for consideration and determination.

DISPUTES/APPEALS

Any dispute concerning application of this Policy shall be resolved upon written appeal to the Provost. The appeal will be considered by a three-member panel comprised of a representative selected by the Provost, a representative selected by the inventor or originator, and a representative chosen by the Executive Vice President for Business Affairs. Each representative must be an employee of the College and no third parties will be permitted to participate. A majority decision of the panel shall be final and binding upon both the inventor/originator and the College, unless an appeal is filed with the President within ten days of a decision by the three member panel. The President shall have twenty (20) working days thereafter to render a decision, which shall be final and binding on all parties, including the inventor/originator and the College. A failure to issue a decision shall make the decision of the panel the final and binding decision of the College.

DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUE FROM ROYALTIES OR SALE OF EQUITY INTEREST

The College shall maintain a revenue distribution plan that is comparable to those of other colleges or
universities of equivalent size, nature and scope. After recovery of expenses incurred after disclosure, including those made to obtain protection for the Intellectual Property, and to develop, market and/or license the Intellectual Property, the inventor or originator’s share of aggregate net revenues resulting from royalties and/or sale of equity interests will be 50%. In the event of joint inventors or originators, the 50% net revenue will be shared equally among all inventors or originators absent any written agreement otherwise. The Provost, in consultation with the Executive Vice President of Business Affairs, will determine distribution of the remainder.

_______________________________________________________________

Departments/Offices Affected by the Policy

This policy has campus-wide application.

_______________________________________________________________

Procedures Related to the Policy

_______________________________________________________________

Related Policies, Documents or Forms

A. Disclosure Form
B. 9.1.9 Ethics Policy
Review Schedule

Issue Date: 2/24/2016
Policy Revised Date: 2/24/2016
Next Review: 10/24/2020

POLICY APPROVAL
(For use by the Office of the Board of Trustees or the Office of the President)

Policy Number: 9.1.13
Adopted by the Board of Trustees
2/24/16

President or Chairman, Board of Trustees
Date: 2/24/16

OLA Final 2.24.16
# College of Charleston – Intellectual Property Disclosure Form

Discovery and Invention Disclosure Form Disclosure No. _______

In accordance with the College of Charleston Intellectual Property Policy 9.1.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(for office use only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Received:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Assigned to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Office/Department/Reviewer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emphasis Area:
- Health
- Information Technology
- Energy/Environment
- Sciences
- Other

## I. Discoverer(s) or Inventor(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Telephone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Telephone:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has any discoverer or inventor performed related research at any other institution?  
- [ ] Yes  
- [x] No

If yes, explain:

---
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II. Type and Title of Discovery or Invention:

_____Patent  _____Print (copyright)  _____Software (copyright)  _____Trademark

III. Brief Description of Discovery or Invention:
Describe, in non-technical terms, the nature and key features of your discovery or invention. Use additional sheets as necessary and attach descriptive material (manuscripts, diagrams, data, etc.), if available.

Please describe with specificity the College Resources that assisted you in the development of this creation.

IV. Dates and Records:
A. What is the earliest date of conception of the invention? ________________
   Give reference to substantiate evidence: __________________________________________
   __________________________________________________

B. Do you have laboratory records and data?  ❑ Yes  ❑ No
   If yes, give reference and physical location: _________________________________
   __________________________________________________

C. Have your records been witnessed?  ❑ Yes  ❑ No

V. Disclosures:
A. Has work related to the invention been published or submitted for publication?  ❑ Yes  ❑ No
   If yes:
   Date submitted: ________________
   Date published: ________________
   Reference (attach reprint): ____________
B. Has the work been presented? ☐ Yes ☐ No  
  If yes:  
  Date of abstract submission, if any: ____________________________  
  Date of abstract publication (attach copy): _______________________  
  Date of presentation: ____________________________  
  Place of presentation: ____________________________  

C. Has the work been otherwise publicly disclosed? ☐ Yes ☐ No  
  If yes, give date:  
  Explain circumstances:  

D. Has disclosure been made to any company? ☐ Yes ☐ No  
  If yes:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of Company</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Confidentiality Agreement Signed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Utility:  

A. What are the possible uses of the discovery or invention?  

B. Briefly outline results which suggest usefulness:
VII. Non-Obviousness

From the description provided in Section III, expand on what is different from current technology. If known, give reference(s) to closest current technology.

VIII. Support:

A. Was College time used in work relating to the discovery or invention? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, explain:

B. Other than those persons named in Section I, did any other College staff or students contribute to the discovery or invention? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, explain:

C. Were College facilities or equipment used in work relating to this discovery or invention? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, explain:
D. Was any work relating to the discovery or invention sponsored by non-College funds?  ❑ Yes ❑ No
   If yes:
   1. Was any work relating to the discovery or invention sponsored by federal funds?  ❑ Yes ❑ No
      If yes:
      Name of Agency: ________________________________
      Grant or Contract Number: __________________________
   2. Was any work relating to the discovery or invention sponsored by private funds?  ❑ Yes ❑ No
      If yes:
      Name of Sponsor: ________________________________

IX. Commercial Interest:

A. Has any company shown an interest in the invention?  ❑ Yes ❑ No
   If yes:
   Name of Company  Name of Contact Person  Telephone Number  E-mail Address
   __________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________

B. Do you know any (other) companies that may be interested?  ❑ Yes ❑ No
   If Yes:
   Name of Company  Location of Company  Contact Person  Telephone Number
   __________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________

X. Discoverer’s/Inventor’s Recommendations:

A. Was this discovery or invention made in the course of College activities?  ❑ Yes ❑ No
   If no, please give justification:
B. Does there exist any written agreement among other discoverers/inventors which provides for other than equal division of proceeds among the parties?  ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Firm or Organization</th>
<th>Name of Contact Person</th>
<th>Telephone Number</th>
<th>E-mail Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Do you have any recommendation of a patent attorney or a technology transfer organization (such as Research Corporation Technologies) to manage your discovery or invention?  ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Firm or Organization</th>
<th>Name of Contact Person</th>
<th>Telephone Number</th>
<th>E-mail Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Is this discovery or invention related to class curriculum?  ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, explain:

E. If you claim that the College has no ownership interest in this property, please describe, with specificity, exactly why the College has no interest, and describe which resources, independent or otherwise, that you used in the development of this creation and/or intellectual property and/or invention.

XI. Signatures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name of Discoverer/Inventor</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Witness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**XII. Endorsement:** (To be completed by Department Chair or Unit Director)

I have reviewed the information provided above with particular reference to “Support,” which addresses source of funds contributing to the discovery or invention. To the best of my knowledge, I believe the above information to be accurate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Recommendations

56 Principles to Guide
Academy-Industry Engagement

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has drafted these principles to encourage universities and their faculties to adopt stronger, more comprehensive rules to guide sponsored research on campus and to manage individual and institutional conflicts of interest more effectively. In issuing this report, the AAUP seeks to ensure that the standards and practices it recommends are consistently applied across the university as a whole. The report contains 56 recommended principles. A majority (35) are closely drawn from previous statements issued by the AAUP or other prominent academic societies and associations (such as the Institute of Medicine, the Association of American Universities, and the Association of American Medical Colleges). The remainder are either adapted from these other associations, or are new recommendations which the AAUP is issuing for the first time. (Appendix B identifies which recommendations fall into each category, along with specific sources.)

The AAUP seeks to promote deeper awareness of how commercial relationships—though often highly beneficial—may have far-reaching consequences for the university, its missions, and its constituents (students, faculty, colleagues, patients, the public) as well as on the academic profession (in areas ranging from research integrity and reliability to knowledge sharing, public health, and public trust). Although the report focuses primarily on academy-industry relationships, it addresses government- and nonprofit-sponsored research when related and appropriate. Because students, graduate assistants,
postdoctoral fellows, and academic professionals often work on sponsored research, the report also addresses their working conditions.

To be effective, academic senates or comparable faculty governing bodies will need to review these 56 principles, adapt them as appropriate, and then recommend their adoption in faculty handbooks, university policy statements, faculty guidelines, or collective bargaining contracts. (Appendix A contains specific suggested policy language that faculty and administrators may employ or adapt in their own written policies and guidelines.) Whenever possible, faculty bodies will benefit from working cooperatively with knowledgeable university administrators to formulate clearer campus guidelines and protocols. Many administrators will be equally interested in developing clear campus guidelines that will provide greater clarity in negotiating agreements with potential sponsors.

Contents: The 56 principles recommended by the AAUP fall into two broad categories:

GENERAL PRINCIPLES, which may be applied university-wide, that cover core academic norms and standards, such as authenticity of authorship, publication rights, and academic autonomy; they also address broad areas of academy-industry engagement, such as student education and training, financial conflicts of interest, and intellectual property management, and

TARGETED PRINCIPLES that address specific types of academy-industry engagement, including strategic corporate alliances (SCAs), industry-sponsored clinical trials, and academy-industry interactions at academic medical centers.

Many of the principles that the AAUP recommends in this report apply to the university generally, not just to sponsored research. A faculty body reviewing these principles might begin by making certain that all relevant campus documents incorporate the fundamental positions on shared governance and academic freedom embodied in Principles 1 and 2, the reinforcement of academic publication and research and data rights in Principles 3 and 5, the protections for recruiting, impartial academic evaluation, and access to grievance procedures in Principles 8–10, the basic intellectual property guarantees in Principles 11–13, and the commitment to conflict of interest disclosure in Principle 22. Reaching consensus about these opening principles will inevitably trigger a continuing discussion of others.

At many institutions, adoption of the full set of intellectual property principles, numbers 11–21—principles that should cover all intellectual
property, not just IP generated by industry-sponsored research—would represent a significant change in recent campus culture. Indeed as universities and their campus administrations become increasingly interested in claiming the rights to faculty IP, the benefit of installing these principles in faculty handbooks and collective bargaining contracts is clear. The goal should be to include appropriate language in both institutional policy guidelines and in all university contracts for funded research.

Similarly, a comprehensive campuswide set of conflict of interest (COI) policies will require consideration of the entire COI subsection, numbers 22–31. Given that sponsored research and paid consultancies occur at all types of academic institutions, reviewing each institution’s existing COI policy statements and regulations—or establishing them, if none exist—should be a high priority. At the same time, Principles 36–47 are salient only for institutions that already have, or contemplate establishing, the large-scale, multi-year research partnerships known as strategic corporate alliances (SCAs). Principles 32–35 and 49–56 (addressing clinical research and conditions in academic medical colleges) are of primary interest to institutions with faculty members or academic units engaged in biomedical research and patient care.

A first step toward implementing these recommendations might be to have an AAUP chapter or a group of concerned faculty introduce a resolution in the faculty senate, or in a comparable campus governing body, to create a committee charged with comparing campus-based policies, practices, and regulations with this report’s recommendations. The committee would research and report on faculty-handbook recommendations, formal university policies, patent and licensing office protocols, and other campus guidance documents. At universities in which faculty engage in collective bargaining, some of the policies could be incorporated into union contracts. In all cases, committees would consult widely with diverse groups of faculty across disciplines and build broad-based consensus around these principles and the language recommended for the destination documents.

In formulating these principles, the AAUP inevitably recognized tensions between the ideal conditions we would like to promote and the realities of contemporary academy-industry relations. We therefore sometimes state a principle first in more ideal terms and then offer qualifications, recognizing the partial compromises that may be necessary. Some faculty, academic senates, administrators, and universities will want to strengthen certain of these 56 principles, while others may wish to weaken them or adapt them in other ways. We aim to strike a realistic balance in proposing them, one flexible enough to stand the test of changing conditions. The primary value of the principles is to reaffirm universities’ core academic and public missions,
uphold professional academic and research standards, and influence contract relationships yet to be written or up for renewal.

**Definition of a “significant” financial interest:** Throughout this report and the following Principles, the AAUP defines a financial interest to be “significant” if it is valued at or above $5,000 per year, and it is not controlled and/or managed by an independent entity, such as a mutual or pension fund. This definition is consistent with the definitions and de minimis threshold for financial disclosure established by the US Department of Health and Human Services in its 2011 conflict of interest disclosure rules (Department of Health and Human Services, DHHS, 42 CFR Part 50, 45 CFR Part 94, “Responsibility of Applicants for Promoting Objectivity in Research for which Public Health Service Funding is Sought and Responsible Prospective Contractors,” Federal Register, Vol. 76, No. 165, August 25, 2011, available at: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2011-08-25/pdf/2011-21633.pdf).

The relevant sections of these DHHS rules are reprinted in full at the end of the Summary of Principles for easy reference. See pages 34-36.

**PART I—GENERAL PRINCIPLES & STANDARDS TO GUIDE ACADEMY-INDUSTRY ENGAGEMENT**

**PRINCIPLE 1—Faculty Governance:** The university must preserve the primacy of shared academic governance in establishing campuswide policies for planning, developing, implementing, monitoring, and assessing all donor agreements and collaborations, whether with private industry, government, or nonprofit groups. Faculty, not outside sponsors, should retain majority control over the campus management of such agreements and collaborations.

**PRINCIPLE 2—Academic Freedom, Autonomy, and Control:** The university must preserve its academic autonomy—including the academic freedom rights of faculty, students, postdoctoral fellows, and academic professionals—in all its relationships with industry and other funding sources by maintaining majority academic control over joint academy-industry committees and exclusive academic control over core academic functions (such as faculty research evaluations, faculty hiring and promotion decisions, classroom teaching, curriculum development, and course content).

**PRINCIPLE 3—Academic Publication Rights:** Academic publication rights must be fully protected, with only limited pre-publication delays (a maximum of 30–60 days*) to remove corporate proprietary or confidential information, or to file for patents and other IP protections prior to
publication. Sponsor efforts to obstruct—or sponsored research agreements that do not permit—the free, timely, and open dissemination of research data, codes, reagents, methods, and results are unacceptable. Sponsor attempts to compel a faculty member, student, postdoctoral fellow, or academic professional to edit, revise, withhold, or delete contents in an academic publication (including a master’s thesis or PhD dissertation) or presentation (beyond legally justified claims to protect explicit trade secrets) must be clearly prohibited in all sponsored research contracts and university policies. A funder is of course free to make editorial suggestions, but academic researchers must be free at all times to accept or reject them.

*This time limit of 30–60 days for delays on publication (for the purpose of securing proprietary protection through a provisional patent or other IP filing) is consistent with recommendations issued by the National Institutes of Health, which are discussed in further detail in the main report.

PRINCIPLE 4—The Authenticity of Academic Authorship: To protect the authenticity of academic publishing, universities and their affiliated academic medical centers should prohibit faculty, students, postdoctoral fellows, medical residents, and other academic professionals from engaging in industry-led “ghostwriting” or “ghost authorship.” Ghostwriting or ghostauthorship occurs when a private firm or an industry group initiates the publication of an “academic” article in a science or medical journal in support of its commercial products or interests, without publicly disclosing that the corporate entity has initiated and also often performed the initial drafting of the article, and then recruited an academic researcher (sometimes referred to as an “academic opinion leader”) to sign on as the nominal “author” (frequently in exchange for a fee). Although ghostwriting has been especially widespread in academic medicine, prohibitions on ghostwriting should be applied university-wide and should cover all faculty and researchers; the practice violates scholarly standards and is unacceptable in any academic setting.

PRINCIPLE 5—Access to Complete Study Data and Independent Academic Analysis: University codes of conduct should prohibit participation in sponsored research that restricts investigators’ ability to access the complete study data related to their sponsored research or that limits investigators’ ability to conduct unfettered, free, and independent analyses of complete data to verify the accuracy and validity of final reported results. Protecting access to complete study data is particularly important in the area of clinical research, where drug trials and other medical investigations are often conducted at multiple institutions simultaneously. If the sponsor
grants only partial access to the study’s complete data sets or withholds other relevant research codes and materials, then the academic investigators and authors will not be able to perform a truly independent analysis of the study’s data and outcomes. Universities should secure these basic academic freedom rights within the legal terms of all sponsored research contracts.

**PRINCIPLE 6—Confidential and Classified Research:** Classified research, as well as confidential corporate, government, or nonprofit research that cannot be published, is inappropriate on a university campus. Many institutions currently have written policies that ban classified government research on campus; the policies should be reviewed to ensure that they also ban confidential corporate research. Universities employ a variety of mechanisms for moving confidential and classified research off campus, sometimes using governance structures less subject to academic oversight. Sorting through multiple categories of “national security,” “classified,” and “sensitive but unclassified” (SBU) information requires expert monitoring by faculty governance bodies. These faculty bodies should operate with a strong presumption against permitting any confidential, classified, or non-publishable research on campus. Academic analyses and research results should always be publishable absent a compelling case to the contrary. This university commitment to knowledge sharing and openness should govern both the determination of which research will be confidential and thus cannot be performed on campus, as well as any rare exceptions that may be granted. As historical precedent suggests, the special circumstances of a formal congressional declaration of war against a specified nation-state or states may justify exceptions to the policies for the duration of the conflict.

**PRINCIPLE 7—Academic Consulting:** To address the potential for conflicts of commitment* and financial conflicts of interest, all consulting contracts worth $5,000 or more a year should be reported to the university’s standing COI committee(s) charged with reviewing and managing both individual and institutional conflicts of interest (see Principle 24 for discussion of these committees). Neither faculty members nor administrators should sign a consulting contract that undercuts their professional ability to express their own independent expert opinions publicly, except when consulting with industry, government, or other parties on explicitly classified or proprietary matters. All such consulting agreements should be secured in writing.

* A “conflict of commitment” arises whenever a faculty member’s or administrator’s outside consulting and other activities have the potential to interfere with their primary duties, including
teaching, research, time with students, or other service and administrative obligations to the university.

PART II—GENERAL PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE STUDENT EDUCATION AND TRAINING

PRINCIPLE 8—Recruiting and Advising Graduate Students, Medical Residents, and Faculty: The admission of graduate students to degree programs and the appointment of medical residents and faculty should be based on their overall qualifications, not on their potential to work under a particular donor agreement or in a particular collaborative research alliance, whether commercial, governmental, or nonprofit. A PhD student’s main advisor should be free of any significant financial interest, including equity, in a company that is funding or stands to profit from the student’s thesis or dissertation research. Exceptions should evaluate both conflicts of interest and potential conflicts of commitment, all of which should be disclosed to all affected parties and periodically reviewed by an appropriate faculty body.

PRINCIPLE 9—Impartial Academic Evaluation: Students, postdoctoral fellows, academic professionals, and junior colleagues should always be entitled to impartial and fair evaluations of their academic performance. Because of the risk of both real and perceived bias, faculty members with a significant personal financial interest in the outcome of their students’ research should not have sole responsibility for evaluating student progress toward a degree.

PRINCIPLE 10—Grievance Procedures: Universities should establish effective, well-publicized grievance procedures for all students, postdoctoral fellows, academic professionals, and faculty members, tenured and untenured, so they may freely and safely report obstacles encountered while pursuing their research and educational objectives. Obstacles may include but are not limited to inappropriate commercial or other sponsor influence over the conduct or analysis of research, unwarranted delays to degree completion, financial conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment, and conflicts over ownership of intellectual property. Faculty with financial conflicts related to a grievance filing should recuse themselves from its adjudication in formal proceedings. Informal resolution of grievances is often preferable when possible.
PART III—GENERAL PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE MANAGEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (IP)

PRINCIPLE 11—Faculty Inventor Rights and IP Management:
Faculty members’ fundamental rights to direct and control their own research do not terminate with a new invention or research discovery; these rights properly extend to decisions about their intellectual property—including invention management, licensing, commercialization, dissemination, and public use. Faculty assignment of an invention to a management agent* (including the university that hosted the underlying research) should be voluntary and negotiated rather than mandatory, unless federal statutes or previous sponsored research agreements dictate otherwise. Faculty inventors retain a vital interest in the disposition of their research inventions and discoveries and should, therefore, retain rights to negotiate the terms of their disposition. Neither the university nor its management agents should undertake intellectual property decisions or legal actions directly or indirectly affecting a faculty member’s research, inventions, instruction, or public service without the faculty member’s/inventor’s express consent. Of course faculty members, like other campus researchers, may voluntarily undertake specific projects under “work for hire” contracts. When such agreements are truly voluntary and uncoerced, their contracted terms may legitimately narrow faculty IP rights.

*The term “invention management agent,” as used in this report, covers all persons tasked with handling university generated inventions and related intellectual property, including, for example, university technology transfer offices, affiliated research foundations, contract invention management agents, and legal consultants.

PRINCIPLE 12—Shared Governance and the Management of University Inventions: Faculty have a collective interest in how university inventions derived from academic research are managed. Through shared governance, they have a responsibility to participate in the design of university protocols that set the norms, standards, and expectations under which faculty discoveries and inventions will be controlled, distributed, licensed, and commercialized. The faculty senate or an equivalent body should play a primary role in defining the policies and public-interest commitments that will guide university-wide management of inventions and other knowledge assets stemming from campus-based research. These protocols should devote special attention to the academic and public interest obligations covered in these principles. They should also require the formation of a specially assigned faculty committee to review the university’s invention management practices regularly, ensure compliance with these principles, represent the interests of
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faculty investigators and inventors to the campus, and make recommendations for reform when necessary.

PRINCIPLE 13—Adjudicating Disputes Involving Inventor Rights: Just as the right to control research and instruction is integral to academic freedom, so too are faculty members’ rights to control the disposition of their research inventions. Inventions made in the context of university work are the result of scholarship. University policies should direct all invention management agents to represent and protect the expressed interests of faculty inventors, along with the interests of the institution and the broader public. Where the interests diverge insurmountably, the faculty senate or equivalent body should adjudicate the dispute with the aim of promoting the greatest benefit for the research in question, the broader academic community, and the public good. Student and other academic professional inventors should also have access to grievance procedures if they believe their inventor or other intellectual property rights have been violated. Students should never be urged or required to surrender their IP rights in advance to the university as a condition of participating in a degree program.

PRINCIPLE 14—IP Management and Sponsored Research Agreements: In negotiating sponsored research agreements, university administrators should make every effort to inform potentially affected faculty researchers and to involve them meaningfully in early-stage negotiations concerning invention management and intellectual property. In the case of large-scale sponsored research agreements like Strategic Corporate Alliances (SCAs), which can affect large numbers of faculty, not all of whom may be identifiable in advance, a special faculty governance committee should be convened to participate in early-stage negotiations, represent collective faculty interests, and ensure compliance with relevant university protocols. Faculty participation in all institutionally negotiated sponsored-research agreements should always be voluntary.

PRINCIPLE 15—Humanitarian Licensing, Access to Medicines: When lifesaving drugs and other critical public health technologies are developed in academic laboratories with public funding support, universities have a special obligation to license such inventions so as to ensure broad public access in both the developing and the industrialized world. Exclusive university licenses to companies for breakthrough drugs or other critical public good inventions arising in agriculture, health, environmental safety, or other fields should include humanitarian licensing provisions that will
enable distribution of drugs and other inventions in developing countries at affordable prices whenever feasible.

**PRINCIPLE 16—Securing Broad Research Use and Distribution Rights:** All contracts and agreements covering university-generated inventions should include an express reservation of rights—often known as a “research exemption”—to allow for academic, nonprofit, and government use of academic inventions and associated IP for non-commercial research purposes. Research exemptions should be reserved and well publicized prior to assignment or licensing so faculty and other academic researchers can share protected inventions and research results (including related data, reagents, and research tools) with colleagues at the host university or at any nonprofit or government institution. The freedom to share and practice academic discoveries—whether legally protected or not—for educational and research purposes is vital for the advancement of knowledge. It also enables investigators to replicate and verify published results, a practice essential to scientific integrity.

**PRINCIPLE 17—Exclusive and Nonexclusive Licensing:** Universities, their contracted management agents, and faculty should avoid exclusive licensing of patentable inventions, unless such licenses are absolutely necessary to foster follow-on use or to develop an invention that would otherwise languish. Exclusive or monopolistic control of academic knowledge should be sparing, rather than a presumptive default. When exclusive licenses are granted, they should have limited terms (preferably less than eight years), include requirements that the inventions be developed, and prohibit “assert licensing” or “trolling” (aggressively enforcing patents against an alleged infringer, often with no intention of manufacturing, marketing, or making productive use of the product). Exclusive licenses issued in order to permit broad access through reasonable and nondiscriminatory sublicensing, cross-licensing, and dedication of patents to an open standard may be expected to meet public access expectations. However, the preferred methods for disseminating university research are nonexclusive licensing and open dissemination, to protect universities’ public interest mission, open research culture, and commitment to advancing research and inquiry through broad knowledge sharing. To enhance compliance and public accountability, universities should require all invention management agents to promptly and publicly report any exclusive licenses issued, together with written statements detailing why an exclusive license was necessary and why a nonexclusive one would not suffice. The faculty senate or comparable governing body should periodically review exclusive licenses and corresponding statements for consistency with this principle.
PRINCIPLE 18—Upfront Exclusive Licensing Rights for Research Sponsors: Universities should refrain from signing sponsored research agreements, especially multi-year strategic corporate alliance (SCA) agreements, that grant sponsors broad title or exclusive commercial rights to future sponsored research inventions and discoveries—unless such arrangements are narrowly defined and agreed to by all faculty participating in, or foreseeably affected by, the alliance. If this is not feasible, as in the case of larger SCAs, the faculty senate should review and approve the agreement and confirm its compatibility with academic freedom, faculty independence, and the university’s public interest mission. All parties should consider the impact exclusive licenses could have on future uses of technologies. When granted, exclusive rights should be defined as narrowly as possible, restricted to targeted fields of use, and designed to safeguard against abuse of the exclusive position.

PRINCIPLE 19—Research Tools and Upstream Platform Research: Universities and their contracted invention management agents should make available and broadly disseminate research tools and other upstream platform inventions in which they have acquired an ownership interest. They should avoid assessing fees beyond those necessary to cover the costs of maintaining the tools and disseminating them, and avoid other constraints that could hamper downstream research and development. No sponsored research agreement should include contractual obligations that prevent outside investigators from accessing data, tools, inventions, and reports relating to scholarly reviews of published research, matters of public health and safety, environmental safety, and urgent public policy decisions.

PRINCIPLE 20—Diverse Licensing Models for Diverse University Inventions: Universities and their invention management agents should develop multiple licensing models appropriate to diverse categories of academic inventions, differing objectives and commitments made by faculty investigators and inventors, varying practices in the wider community and in different industries, and varied conditions that present at different stages in developing a technology. Licensing models commonly used to address opportunities in biotechnology, for example, should not be established as defaults in institutional policies or used indiscriminately across other areas of innovation. Faculty investigators/inventors and their management agents should work cooperatively to identify effective licensing and distribution models for each invention so as to enhance public availability and use. This may include established models (exclusive or nonexclusive licensing) as well as emergent ones (patent pools, open sourcing, and public licensing offered by institutions like Creative Commons for copyright-based work).
PRINCIPLE 21—Rights to “Background Intellectual Property” (BIP): University administrators and their agents should not act unilaterally when granting sponsors’ rights to university-managed background intellectual property (BIP) related to a sponsor’s proposed research area but developed without the sponsor’s funding support. Universities should be mindful of how BIP rights will affect faculty inventors and other investigators who are not party to the sponsored research agreement. Nor should managers obligate the BIP of one set of investigators to another’s sponsored-research project, unless that BIP is already being made available under nonexclusive licensing terms, or the affected faculty members have consented. To do otherwise risks a chilling effect on collegiality and on faculty willingness to work with university licensing agents.

PART IV—GENERAL PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE MANAGEMENT OF FINANCIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (FCOI)

A conflict of interest (COI) is broadly defined as a situation in which an individual or a corporate interest has a tendency to interfere with the proper exercise of judgment on another’s behalf. Those who prefer to distinguish between individual and institutional COI often define the former as a set of circumstances creating a risk that a secondary interest, such as financial gain, may unduly influence professional judgment or actions regarding a primary interest, such as research conduct, teaching, or patient welfare. Correspondingly, an institutional COI occurs when the financial interests of an institution or institutional officials, acting within their authority on behalf of the institution, may affect or appear to affect the research, education, clinical care, business transactions, or other governing activities of the institution. A growing body of empirical research has shown that financial conflicts of interest (FCOI) are associated with decision making, as well as research, bias. (See the Introduction to this report for details.) FCOI may also introduce unreliability into the research process, undermine public trust, and erode respect for institutions of higher education. Disclosure of a COI, even full disclosure of a financial interest with informed consent, fails to resolve or eliminate such problems. However, it is critically important as a first step towards promoting transparency and awareness of the existence of COIs.

PRINCIPLE 22—Comprehensive COI Policies: Every university should have a comprehensive, written COI policy, covering both individual and institutional COI. The policy or its accompanying guidelines should specify how all conflicts of interest (COI) and financial conflicts of interest (FCOI), in particular, will be reported, reviewed, managed, or eliminated. The guidelines should identify which FCOI must be reported, which are
prohibited, and what actions will be taken if faculty members do not comply with COI disclosure and management policies. Enforcement actions for non-compliance may include a faculty-led investigation leading to possible censure, federal-grant agency notification, a temporary hold on interactions with conflicted sponsors, or a temporary ban on receipt of outside research funding.

PRINCIPLE 23—Consistent COI Enforcement across Campus: University COI policies must be adopted consistently across the whole institution, including affiliated medical schools, hospitals, institutes, centers, and other facilities, and they must apply to faculty, students, administrators, and academic professionals.

PRINCIPLE 24—Standing COI Committees: Every university should have one or two standing COI committees to oversee implementation of policies addressing individual and institutional COI. At least one member should be recruited from outside the institution and approved by the faculty governing body. All committee members should be free of COI related to their oversight responsibilities. After faculty COI disclosure statements have been reviewed by an appropriate standing committee, they should be made available to the public, preferably on a readily accessible online database, as the AAUP recommends under Principle 31.

PRINCIPLE 25—Reporting Individual COI: Faculty members and academic professionals should be required to report to the standing campus COI committee all significant outside financial interests relating directly or indirectly to their professional responsibilities (research, teaching, committee work, and other activities), including the dollar amounts involved and the nature of the services compensated. The report must be made regardless of whether or not people believe their financial interests might reasonably affect their current or anticipated university activities. Faculty members should also report family member (spouse, partner, or dependent child) patent royalty income and equity holdings related to their own teaching and research areas. All administrators should report similar financial interests to both their superiors and the COI committee. Presidents and chancellors should also report to the standing committee.

PRINCIPLE 26—Inter-office Reporting and Tracking of Institutional COI: To keep track of institutional COI, every institutional COI committee should have a well-developed, campuswide reporting system that requires the technology transfer office, the office of sponsored programs,
the development office, the grants office, institutional review boards (IRBs), purchasing offices, and corresponding offices at affiliated medical institutions to report to the standing COI committee at least quarterly on situations that might give rise to institutional conflicts.

**PRINCIPLE 27—Strategies for Reviewing, Evaluating, and Addressing COI:** Disclosure of a COI is not a sufficient management strategy. The best course of action is not to acquire COI in the first place. Strategies for addressing individual COI include divesting troublesome assets, terminating consulting arrangements, resigning corporate board seats, and withdrawing from affected projects. Methods for addressing institutional COI include the institution divesting its equity interest in companies connected with campus research, placing conflicted equity holdings in independently managed funds, establishing explicit firewalls to separate financial from academic decisions, recusing conflicted senior administrators from knowledge of, or authority over, affected research projects, and requiring outside committee review or oversight. Some university presidents decline to serve on corporate boards to avoid the appearance of COI. Because of conflicting fiduciary responsibilities, campuses should prohibit senior administrators from receiving compensation for serving on corporate boards during their time in office.

**PRINCIPLE 28—Developing Formal, Written COI Management Plans:** If a university’s standing COI committee finds compelling circumstances for allowing a research project or other professional activity to continue in the presence of a significant FCOI—without the elimination of the conflict—the committee should document the circumstances and write a formal management plan for each case. The plan should detail how the university will manage the FCOI and eliminate or reduce risks to its affected constituents (students, collaborating researchers, faculty, patients), its pertinent missions (research integrity, informed consent, and recruitment of research volunteers), and its reputation and public trust. This recommendation is consistent with the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) National Institutes of Health (NIH) rules implemented in 2011 to address financial conflicts, which require all universities that receive DHHS grants to prepare and enforce such management plans. (Those rules are partially reprinted at the end of the Summary of Principles.)
**PRINCIPLE 29—Oversight and Enforcement of COI Rules:** All university COI policies should have effective oversight procedures and sanctions for noncompliance. These are essential to ensure compliance with university rules and to sustain public trust in the university’s ability to regulate itself.

**PRINCIPLE 30—University-Vendor Relationships and COI:** Universities should ensure that vendor evaluation, selection, and contracting for university products and services are consistent with their academic mission and do not jeopardize the best interests of students. Vendors should never be persuaded or coerced into making financial contributions to the university, either through direct university donations or recruitment of other contributing donors, in exchange for winning university contracts. All university bidding for contracts and services related to such areas as banking and student loans should be conducted through a fair, impartial, and competitive selection process. Many universities currently have ethics policies banning gifts from vendors; the policies should also clearly prohibit institutions from accepting direct remuneration, or kickbacks, from vendors doing business with the university or its students. Such profiteering can undermine public trust in the university and compromise the best interests of the students the university has pledged to serve.

**PRINCIPLE 31—COI Transparency: Public Disclosure of Financial Interests and COI Management Plans:** University COI policies should require faculty, administrators, students, postdoctoral fellows, and academic professionals to disclose to all journal editors all significant personal financial interests that may be directly or indirectly related to the manuscripts they are submitting for consideration. COI disclosure on publications should summarize all related funding sources received during the past five years, not simply for the project at hand. The same COI disclosure requirements should apply to oral presentations delivered in conferences, courts, and legislative chambers. After the university’s standing COI committee reviews faculty conflict of interest disclosure statements, they should be posted to a publicly accessible website, and this information should remain accessible for at least ten years. This is important to address growing demands from Congress, state governments, journal editors, the media, and public interest groups for increased transparency and reporting of faculty COI. It is consistent with DHHS-NIH (2011) rules, which require universities to disclose all significant FCOI (as per the DHHS-NIH definition) related to a faculty member’s DHHS-funded research on a public website or provide the information upon public request within five days. Disclosure of FCOI should also extend to affected patients and human research volunteers. (For details, see Principle 35).
PART V—TARGETED PRINCIPLES: MANAGING COI IN THE CONTEXT OF CLINICAL CARE AND HUMAN SUBJECT RESEARCH

PRINCIPLE 32—Individual and Institutional COI and Human Subject Research: To maximize patient safety and preserve public trust in the integrity of academic research, there should always be a strong presumption against permitting FCOI related to clinical medical research and experimental studies involving human subjects. A “rebuttable presumption” against permitting clinical trial research that may be compromised by FCOI should govern decisions about whether conflicted researchers or institutions are allowed to pursue a particular human subject research protocol or project, unless a compelling case can be made to justify an exception.

PRINCIPLE 33—Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) and COI Management: An IRB should review all proposed human clinical trial protocols to identify all relevant FCOI before research is allowed to proceed. First, institutions should have clear policies, compliant with applicable federal regulations, to address reporting and management of FCOI associated with IRB members themselves. Policies should require conflicted IRB members to recuse themselves from deliberations related to studies with which they have a potential conflict. Second, the policies should require the institution’s standing COI committee to prepare summary information about all institutional and individual FCOI related to the research protocol under review. The summary should accompany the protocol when it is presented to the IRB. The IRB should take the COI information into account when determining whether and under what circumstances to approve a protocol. Neither the IRB nor the standing COI committee should be able to reduce the stringency of the other’s management requirements. The double-protection system is consistent with the two sets of federal regulations governing clinical research and provides appropriate additional safeguards for patient volunteers. Finally, if a research protocol is allowed to proceed, university policies should require disclosure of any institutional and investigator FCOI as well as the university’s management plan for addressing them to all patient volunteers (in informed consent documents) and all investigators and units involved with the research protocol.

PRINCIPLE 34—COI, Medical Purchasing, and Clinical Care: Academic medical centers should establish and implement COI policies that require all personnel to disclose financial interests in any manufacturer of pharmaceuticals, devices, equipment, or any provider of services and to
recuse themselves from involvement in related purchasing decisions. If an individual’s expertise is essential in evaluating a product or service, that person’s financial ties must be disclosed to those responsible for purchasing decisions.

**PRINCIPLE 35—COI Transparency in Medical Care:** University policies should require all physicians, dentists, nurses, and other health professionals as well as investigators, to disclose their FCOI to patients, human subject volunteers, and the broader public, unless those COI have been eliminated.

**PART VI—TARGETED PRINCIPLES: STRATEGIC CORPORATE ALLIANCES (SCAs)**

_A Strategic Corporate Alliance (SCA) is a formal, comprehensive, university-managed research collaboration with one or more outside company sponsors, centered around a major, multi-year financial commitment involving research, programmatic interactions, “first rights to license” intellectual property, and other services. An SCA is frequently negotiated through a central university development office in tandem with a group of faculty, an entire academic department, or many different departments in unison. In broad SCA agreements, it is customary for universities, in each new grant cycle, to issue a formal request for faculty research proposals (RFP) on behalf of the outside corporate sponsor(s). In narrow SCA agreements, by contrast, all faculty members eligible for SCA funding and their projects are named and identified in advance, so a university-led RFP and research-selection process is not required._

**PRINCIPLE 36—Shared Governance and Strategic Corporate Alliances (SCAs):** Faculty senates should be fully involved in the planning, negotiation, approval, execution, and ongoing oversight of SCAs formed on campus. The senate should appoint a confidential committee to review a first draft of a memorandum of understanding (MOU) pertaining to newly proposed SCAs. All parties’ direct and indirect financial obligations should be made clear from the outset. Before an agreement is finalized on a broad SCA, the full faculty senate should review it. Formal approval of broad SCAs should await both stages in this process. All approved SCA agreements should be made available to faculty, academic professionals, and the public. If the SCA designates funding for new faculty appointments (FTEs), all normal university and departmental procedures for academic searches, hiring, and promotion decisions must be followed to honor and protect academic self-governance and academic freedom. Temporary employees should not exclusively staff,
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administer, or supervise SCAs. Normal grievance procedures, under collective bargaining agreements where they exist, should govern complaints about interference with academic freedom or other academic rights that may arise under SCAs. In the absence of such procedures, grievances and complaints should be reported to the SCA faculty oversight committee (see Principle 47 for details) or to relevant college or university grievance committees for independent investigation. Standard safeguards regarding procedural fairness and due process must be respected and followed.

PRINCIPLE 37—SCA Governance and Majority Academic Control:
The best practice in any academy-industry alliance agreement—consistent with the principles of academic freedom, university autonomy, and faculty self-governance—is to build clear boundaries separating corporate funders from the university’s academic work. Yet the current conditions of increasingly close university-industry relations make erecting strict walls unrealistic on some campuses. Instead, at a minimum, universities should retain majority academic control and voting power over internal governing bodies charged with directing or administering SCAs in collaboration with corporate sponsors. The SCA’s main governing body should also include members who are neither direct stakeholders of the SCA nor based in academic disciplines or units likely to benefit from the SCA. A joint university-industry SCA governing body may have a role in awarding funding, but it should have no role in such exclusively academic functions as faculty hiring, curriculum design, course content, and academic personnel evaluation.

PRINCIPLE 38—Academic Control over SCA Research Selection (for Broad SCAs): In the case of broad SCAs, university representatives should retain majority representation and voting power on SCA committees charged with evaluating and selecting research proposals and making final research awards. These committees should also employ an independent peer review process.

PRINCIPLE 39—Peer Review (for Broad SCAs): Using a standard peer-review process, independent academic experts should evaluate and award funding whenever SCAs issue a request for proposals (RFPs) in a new grant cycle. Any expert involved in the peer-review and grant-award process should be free of personal FCOI related to the area of research being reviewed to insure that research selection is scientifically driven, impartial, and fair. Appointees to committees charged with research selection for a given SCA should be prohibited from awarding that funding to themselves,
their departments, or their labs, and should not be past recipients of funding from that SCA.

PRINCIPLE 40—**Transparency Regarding the SCA Research Application Process:** SCA agreements must clearly and transparently detail the methods and criteria for research selection and must explain how academic researchers may apply for SCA grants.

PRINCIPLE 41—**Protection of Publication Rights and Knowledge Sharing in SCA Agreements:** All the provisions of Principle 3 should apply to SCAs as well.

PRINCIPLE 42—**SCA Confidentiality Restrictions:** To protect the university’s distinctively open academic research environment, restrictions on sharing corporate confidential information and other confidentiality restrictions should be minimized to the maximum extent possible in SCA agreements. To achieve this objective, sponsors should be discouraged from sharing confidential corporate trade secrets with their academic partners except when absolutely necessary. Such confidential information should ordinarily be disclosed to the smallest number of academic investigators possible, with strict supervision from the university’s legal office to prevent corruption of the academic research environment.

PRINCIPLE 43—**SCA Anti-Competitor Agreements:** Anti-competitor or noncompete agreements compromise the university’s academic autonomy, its ability to collaborate with other outside firms, and its commitment to knowledge sharing and broad public service. Restrictions in SCA agreements on faculty, academic professionals, postdoctoral fellows, and students interacting with or sharing information and research with private-sector competitors of SCA sponsors, or receiving separate research support from outside firms, should be avoided or minimized to the greatest extent possible.

PRINCIPLE 44—**Exclusive Licensing and SCA Agreements:** All the provisions of Principles 17 and 18 should apply to SCAs as well.

PRINCIPLE 45—**Limits on Broader Academic Disruption by SCAs:** Given the size and scope of many SCAs, a vigorous effort must be made to ensure that diverse areas of research—that pursue avenues of inquiry outside the purview of, not in conformity with, or even in opposition to the SCA’s research agenda—are not crowded out and continue to enjoy institutional
support, resources, and sufficient financing. SCAs should be approved only if faculty and students within all academic units will, as a practical as well as a theoretical matter, retain the freedom to pursue their chosen research topics. SCA agreements should not disrupt the financial, intellectual, or professional arrangements of other academic units, colleges, and the university as a whole, and should avoid impact on faculty, academic professionals, postdoctoral fellows, and students engaged in research and activities outside the purview of the SCA. University policies should clearly affirm that no faculty member, postdoctoral fellow, academic professional, or student will be coerced into participating in a sponsored project; all participation must be entirely voluntary.

**PRINCIPLE 46—Early Termination of SCA Sponsor Funding:** With any large-scale SCA, sponsors may threaten reduction or termination of funding or limits on funding in order to shape the research agenda or to express displeasure with its direction or findings. To reduce this risk, SCA contracts should include legally binding provisions to prohibit sudden, early termination of the agreement. If the negotiating process leads to inclusion of an early-termination option, it must prohibit the sponsor from arbitrarily or suddenly terminating the agreement or lowering pledged funding without at least three months advance notification. Salaries and research costs associated with the project must be continued for that period.

**PRINCIPLE 47—Independent, Majority Faculty Oversight of the SCA, and Post-Agreement Evaluation:** An independent, majority faculty oversight committee consisting of faculty with no direct involvement in the SCA should be established at the start of a new SCA agreement to monitor and at least annually review the SCA and its compliance with university policies and guidelines. A post-agreement evaluation plan should also be included in the SCA contract so the campus can reflect and draw on the experience in organizing future campus-based academy-industry alliances. External evaluation may be appropriate for broad SCAs. Evaluation reports should be public documents.

**PRINCIPLE 48—Public Disclosure of Research Contracts and Funding Transparency:** No SCA or other industry-, government-, or nonprofit-sponsored contract should restrict faculty, students, postdoctoral fellows, or academic professionals from freely disclosing their funding source. A signed copy of all final legal research contracts and MOUs formalizing the SCA and any other types of sponsored agreements formed on campus
should be made freely available to the public—with discrete redactions only to protect valid commercial trade secrets, but not for other reasons.

PART VII—TARGETED PRINCIPLES: CLINICAL MEDICINE, CLINICAL RESEARCH, AND INDUSTRY SPONSORSHIP

PRINCIPLE 49—Access to Complete Clinical Trial Data and the Performance of Independent Academic Analysis: All the provisions of Principle 5 should apply to clinical trial data as well.

PRINCIPLE 50—Registry of Academic-Based Clinical Trials in a National Registry: Universities and affiliated academic medical centers should adopt clear, uniform, written policies to require all clinical trials conducted by their academic investigators to be entered into ClinicalTrials.gov (http://www.clinicaltrials.gov)—the national clinical trial registry maintained by the US National Library of Medicine (NLM) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The entry should be made at or before the onset of patient enrollment. Entry in the register will help ward against manipulation of study results, suppression of negative findings, and improper altering of clinical trial protocols after the research has begun.

PRINCIPLE 51—Safeguarding the Integrity and Appropriate Conduct of Clinical Trials: All clinical trials affiliated with academic institutions should be required to use independent data safety monitoring boards (DSMBs) and/or publication and analysis committees to protect the integrity and appropriate conduct of academic-based clinical trial research.

PRINCIPLE 52—Patient Notification: No industry-, government-, or nonprofit-sponsored research agreement should restrict faculty or academic professionals from notifying patients about health risks or lack of treatment efficacy when such information emerges and patients’ health may be adversely affected.

PRINCIPLE 53—Undue Commercial Marketing Influence and Control at Academic Medical Centers: Educational programs, academic events, and presentations by faculty, students, postdoctoral fellows, and academic professionals must be free of industry marketing influence and control. Both academics and administrators should be prohibited from participating in industry-led “speakers bureaus” financed by pharmaceutical or other industry groups. Institutions should also establish funding mechanisms for
clinical practice guidelines and high-quality accredited continuing medical education (CME) programs free of industry influence.

PRINCIPLE 54—Appropriate Use of Facilities and Classrooms at Universities and Academic Medical Centers: Universities, academic medical schools, and affiliated teaching hospitals should have clear and consistent policies and practices barring pharmaceutical, medical device, and biotechnology companies from distributing free meals, gifts, or drug samples on campus and at affiliated academic medical centers, except under the control of central administration offices for use by patients who lack access to medications. As a general principle, academic facilities and classrooms should not be used for commercial marketing and promotion purposes unless advance written permission from academic institutional authorities is explicitly granted and academic supervision ensured. (Commercial marketing of services would, for example, be appropriate at a job fair.) Campus policies should also require all marketing representatives to obtain authorization before site visits. Finally, faculty, physicians, trainees, and students should be prohibited from directly accepting travel funds from industry, other than for legitimate reimbursement of contractual academic services. Direct or indirect industry travel funding for commercial marketing junkets, which may include trips to luxury resorts and expensive dinners, should be prohibited.

PRINCIPLE 55—Marketing Projects Masquerading as “Clinical Research”: Faculty, students, postdoctoral fellows, and academic professionals based at academic-affiliated institutions must not participate in marketing studies that masquerade as scientifically-driven clinical trial research. Such thinly disguised marketing studies are frequently referred to as “seeding trials” because they are intended primarily to expose doctors and patients to newer, brand name drugs, not to uncover medically valuable or scientifically important insights.

PRINCIPLE 56—Predetermined Research Results: Faculty and other academic investigators should be prohibited from soliciting research funding from outside sponsors with the implied suggestion or promise of predetermined research results.

SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL INTEREST: Throughout this report we make use of the current Department of Health and Human Services definition. The DHHS rule defines a “significant” financial conflict of interest as
follows: “Financial conflict of interest (FCOI) means a significant financial interest that could directly and significantly affect the design, conduct, or reporting of PHS-funded research. . . . Significant financial interest means:

(1) A financial interest consisting of one or more of the following interests of the Investigator (and those of the Investigator’s spouse and dependent children) that reasonably appears to be related to the Investigator’s institutional responsibilities:

(i) With regard to any publicly traded entity, a significant financial interest exists if the value of any remuneration received from the entity in the twelve months preceding the disclosure and the value of any equity interest in the entity as of the date of disclosure, when aggregated, exceeds $5,000. For purposes of this definition, remuneration includes salary and any payment for services not otherwise identified as salary (e.g., consulting fees, honoraria, paid authorship); equity interest includes any stock, stock option, or other ownership interest, as determined through reference to public prices or other reasonable measures of fair market value;

(ii) With regard to any non-publicly traded entity, a significant financial interest exists if the value of any remuneration received from the entity in the twelve months preceding the disclosure, when aggregated, exceeds $5,000, or when the Investigator (or the Investigator’s spouse or dependent children) holds any equity interest (e.g., stock, stock option, or other ownership interest); or

(iii) Intellectual property rights and interests (e.g., patents, copyrights), upon receipt of income related to such rights and interests.

(2) Investigators also must disclose the occurrence of any reimbursed or sponsored travel (i.e., that which is paid on behalf of the Investigator and not reimbursed to the Investigator so that the exact monetary value may not be readily available), related to their institutional responsibilities; provided, however, that this disclosure requirement does not apply to travel that is reimbursed or sponsored by a Federal, state, or local government agency, an Institution of higher education as defined at 20 U.S.C. 1001(a), an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute that is affiliated with an Institution of higher education. The Institution’s FCOI policy will specify the
details of this disclosure, which will include, at a minimum, the purpose of the trip, the identity of the sponsor/organizer, the destination, and the duration. In accordance with the Institution’s FCOI policy, the institutional official(s) will determine if further information is needed, including a determination or disclosure of monetary value, in order to determine whether the travel constitutes an FCOI with the PHS-funded research.

(3) The term significant financial interest does not include the following types of financial interests: salary, royalties, or other remuneration paid by the Institution to the Investigator if the Investigator is currently employed or otherwise appointed by the Institution, including intellectual property rights assigned to the Institution and agreements to share in royalties related to such rights; any ownership interest in the Institution held by the Investigator, if the Institution is a commercial or for-profit organization; income from investment vehicles, such as mutual funds and retirement accounts, as long as the Investigator does not directly control the investment decisions made in these vehicles; income from seminars, lectures, or teaching engagements sponsored by a Federal, state, or local government agency, an Institution of higher education as defined at 20 U.S.C. 1001(a), an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute that is affiliated with an Institution of higher education; or income from service on advisory committees or review panels for a Federal, state, or local government agency, an Institution of higher education as defined at 20 U.S.C. 1001(a), an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute that is affiliated with an Institution of higher education.” [Emphasis added] (Source: Department of Health and Human Services, 42 CFR Part 50, 45 CFR Part 94, “Responsibility of Applicants for Promoting Objectivity in Research for which Public Health Service Funding is Sought and Responsible Prospective Contractors,” Federal Register, Vol. 76, No. 165, August 25, 2011, quotes on pp. 53283–84, available at: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2011-08-25/pdf/2011-21633.pdf )
Committee Background

• February 2021
  • Faculty Senate approved a motion on Senate’s commitment to curbing gun violence and created ad hoc committee to study the issue.

• Justification for Committee:
  • Gun violence touches our community
  • Obligation to serve public interest by working on local issues
  • Growing commitment public health
    • New School of Health Sciences
    • Alignment with MUSC firearm injury and violence prevention initiative
Mission Statement

• Conduct research and connect with local community partners (academic and nonprofit) to understand, spread information, and implement change to reduce gun violence in the Charleston area
2021-2022 Members

Chair: Sarah Maness  
Secretary: Jordan Ragusa

Members: Jennifer Baker, Kathleen Béres Rogers, Richard Bodek, Paige Bressler, Angela Crespo Cozart, Marcello Forconi, Jonathan Neufeld, and Katie Trejo Tello.
Committee Actions

• Adoption of Mission Statement

• Needs Assessment
  • State and local gun violence data
  • Local researchers and gun violence initiatives
  • Full text available online

• Community Events
  • Spring 2021 Zoom and Facebook Live events
    • “Listen to Our Stories” and “Listen To Our Ideas for Change”.
  • Members participated in book club “Under the Gun” by Stu Durando
    • hosted by the Medical Humanities Program and Department of Health and Human Performance.
Committee Actions

Collaborations:

• Tri-County Gun Violence Coordinating Council
• MUSC Gun Violence Researcher and Trauma Surgeon Dr. Ashley Hink

• $10,000 funding, MUSC Community Engaged Scholars Program
  • 15 week training on Community Based Participatory Research
  • Funding pilot study on gun violence in Charleston
    • Qualitative interviews with community leaders to assess feasibility and support for local gun violence initiatives
Request to extend committee

• The committee would like to request the extension of the ad hoc Committee to Curb Gun Violence for an additional academic year (2022-2023).

• This request will fulfill the committee’s desire to:
  • Invite Dr. Ashley Hink’s Gun Violence Intervention team to campus to speak
  • Strengthen partnerships with gun violence researchers at MUSC and in community
  • Complete training and research funded by the MUSC Community Engaged Scholars Grant.

• We also request to elect additional members to the committee to maintain a core committee of 10 members. At least 5 current members will not be returning to the committee if renewed.
Thank you
[1] Background
At its February 2021 meeting, the Faculty Senate approved a motion by Todd Grantham (HSS, At-Large) expressing the Senate’s commitment to curbing gun violence. Further, the motion charged the Speaker of the Faculty with constituting an ad hoc committee to study the issue. Grantham’s resolution cited three reasons for creating the ad hoc committee. First, although gun violence is a national problem, it touches our local community and our even our campus. For example, in 2015 Cynthia Hurd, a college librarian, was among the nine victims of the Mother Emanuel AME church shooting, and in 2020 Tom DiLorenzo, husband of Provost Susan Austin, was shot and killed blocks from campus. Second, as a state institution, the College has an obligation to serve the public interest by working to solve state and local issues. Indeed, the recently adopted mission statement charges the campus community with creating “innovative solutions to social, economic, and environmental challenges.” And third, the College’s growing commitment to the field of public health—including the creation of a new school of health sciences—brings our campus into greater alignment with the Medical University of South Carolina. Among MUSC’s initiatives is a firearm injury and violence prevention program.

At the subsequent meeting, the Senate approved the ad hoc committee. Ten members were elected: Jennifer Baker, Kathleen Béres Rogers, Richard Bodek, Paige Bressler, Angela Crespo Cozart, Marcello Forconi, Sarah Maness, Jonathan Neufeld, Jordan Ragusa, and Katie Trejo Tello. At the first meeting on March 30th, Sarah Maness was elected chair and Jordan Ragusa was elected secretary. Additionally, the committee adopted the following mission statement: “Conduct research and connect with local community partners (academic and non-profit) to understand, spread information, and implement change to reduce gun violence in the Charleston Area.”

Since then, the committee met 5 times on March 17, 2021, March 30, 2021, September 28, 2021, November 10, 2021, and February 18, 2022. The committee formed two subcommittees, one focusing on research and the other on events and community outreach. These subcommittees met individually during Fall 2021.

[2] Committee Actions
The first goal of the committee after adopting a mission statement was to conduct an informal needs assessment of local gun violence. The results of the needs assessment helped focus the committee’s commitment to working on reducing community gun violence among populations most affected in the Charleston area. The full results of this needs assessment are included in section three of this report.

In Spring of 2021 committee members hosted two community Zoom and Facebook Live events, titled “Listen to Our Stories” and “Listen To Our Ideas for Change”. These events included speakers from the Tri County Gun Violence Coordinating Council, We are Their Voices, My Community’s Keeper Mentor Group, Dee Norton Center, “I Got You Friend” Podcast and Advocacy, North Charleston SC Youth Resistance, Arm in Arm, Charleston County Coroner, and the Charleston Police Department. The committee also participated in a book club and virtual author discussion on the book “Under the Gun” by Stu Durando hosted by the Medical Humanities Program and Department of Health and Human Performance.

In Fall 2021, the committee was asked to review a document created by the Tri-County Gun Violence Coordinating Council with requests for the City of Charleston to reduce gun violence. As a
result of this collaboration, committee members began attending monthly meetings of the coalition as a way to strengthen ties with grassroots organizations working on gun violence. To expand involvement between the College of Charleston and other academic institutions, the committee also had multiple members join the planning committee for the MUSC Pitts Lecture, which has a 2022 focus on Gun Violence. In an additional tie with MUSC, we invited Dr. Ashley Hink, trauma surgeon and gun violence public health researcher, to attend our February 2022 meeting. We are in discussions with Dr. Hink to bring in her team members from the MUSC Turning the Tide Violence Intervention Program to give a presentation on CofC campus. Dr. Hink has also expressed interest in collaborating on future gun violence research with members of the gun violence council.

In October 2021, committee chair Dr. Sarah Maness (Public Health) and Tri-County Gun Violence Coordinating Council leader Mr. Butch Kennedy applied for the MUSC Community Engaged Research Scholars Program as Academic and Community Principal Investigators for a study to qualitatively interview Charleston elected officials and law enforcement to explore feasibility of implementing the Gun Violence Coordinating Council’s plans to reduce gun violence.

In January 2022, we received award notification and we were granted $10,000 in pilot funding to complete a research project regarding gun violence in Charleston as well as 14 weeks of Community Based Participatory Research training to learn how to build research partnerships between academics and community groups. This training began at the end of February 2022 and will run until May 2022. Upon completion of the training, $10,000 will be released for the project to be completed by May 2023. The data resulting from the pilot project will then be used to apply for funding from the National Institutes of Health for a larger study on community gun violence reduction in Charleston.

As such, the committee would like to request the extension of the ad hoc Committee to Curb Gun Violence for an additional academic year (2022-2023). This request will fulfill the committee’s desire to invite a fall speaker to campus to speak on gun violence, strengthen partnerships with gun violence researchers including Dr. Ashley Hink at MUSC, and to complete training and research funded by the one-year MUSC Community Engaged Scholars Grant. We also request to elect additional members to the committee to maintain a core committee of 10 members. At least 5 current members will not be returning to the committee if renewed.


Gun violence is a national problem. With a crude firearm death rate of 12.1 per 1000 residents, the firearm homicide rate is 24.9 times greater in the United States than in other high-income nations. Suicide accounts for the highest percentage of firearm deaths nationally, with access to firearms more than tripling one’s odds of committing suicide, according to a recent meta-analysis. Likewise, one study estimates that homicide is 40% more likely in homes with guns. Gun deaths have increased over the prior two decades in the United States despite declines in both gun ownership and violent crime rate. In 1973, 49% of households claimed to have a gun, compared to 35% in 2019, and from 1993 to 2019 the violent crime rate fell by 49%.

National Gun Violence Data

- Deaths: 39,707
- Death Rate: 12.1 (per 1,000)
  - Suicide: 60%
As far as homicide by gun, the national data reveal that certain demographic groups are disproportionately affected. First, gun homicide victims are more likely to be young, male, and Black. Per 100,000 persons, those aged 20-24 have a crude firearm death rate of 21.1 (compared to 12.1 for those aged 50-54), men have a crude firearm death rate of 21.1 (compared to 3.4 for women) and Blacks have a crude firearm death rate of 22.0 (compared to 10.4 for Whites). Second, women experiencing domestic violence are disproportionately affected. For example, one study showed that that women in abusive relationships are roughly 7.5 times more likely to be a homicide victim if their abuser has access to a firearm.

South Carolina is not immune to gun violence: quite the contrary. In fact, South Carolina ranks 8th in the nation with a crude firearm death rate of 19.7 per 1000 residents. Only Alaska, Mississippi, Wyoming, New Mexico, Alabama, Louisiana, and Missouri have a higher rate. Consistent with the national data, suicide accounts for the highest percentage of firearms deaths in the state. Further, like the national data gun deaths have increased over the past two decades in the state. Unlike the national data, however, the gun homicide rate is nearly 10% higher in South Carolina when compared to the national statistics.

South Carolina Gun Violence Data
- Deaths: 1,012
- Death Rate: 19.7 (per 1,000)
  - Suicide: 53%
  - Homicide: 45%
  - Unintentional Shootings: 2%
- Years of Potential Life Lost (YPLL): 25,415

In Charleston County the firearm death rate is 21.2 per 1000 residents, which translates to 87 firearms deaths per year and 2,528 years of potential life lost. Charleston County ranks 19th overall among South Carolina counties (out of forty-six) for total suicide rates. In Berkeley and Dorchester counties, the firearm death rate is 21.9 and 9.2, respectively. In total, the number of firearm deaths in the Tri-County area in 2019 was 152.

Sex
Males 855 total deaths
Females 157 total deaths

Age
Top 3 age groups with highest total number of deaths 20-24 (143 total deaths), 25-29 (128 total deaths), 30-34 (94 total deaths)

Race
Crude Rate
Black, Non-Hispanic 28.63
White, Non-Hispanic 17.16
White, Hispanic 10.38

Race and Age
Crude Rate
Black Non-Hispanic Male 54.74
Black Non-Hispanic Female 5.77
White Hispanic Male 18.16
White Non-Hispanic Male 28.51
White Non-Hispanic Female 6.35

Local Gun Violence Researchers

At the College of Charleston, there is a dearth of researchers who study gun violence. In fact, we identified just two faculty who have whose research touches on the topic. Dr. Anthony Greene published a paper in 2018 (with former CofC professor Kevin Keenan) on terrorism, race and the Mother Emanuel AME shooting and Dr. Jordan Ragusa has a working paper (with a CofC undergraduate) on the challenges of passing gun control in the U.S. Congress.

In contrast, there are several MUSC faculty with specific expertise on gun violence. Dr. Ashley Hank is a trauma and critical care surgeon who studies community violence intervention programs. She has written opinion pieces of gun violence, and in 2019 she co-authored a review article on firearm injury research. Dr. Hank’s work has received significant local attention, most recently her $1M grant to study community violence prevention programs. Dr. Annie Andrews is a pediatrician who studies gun violence prevention, safe firearm storage, and counseling services for survivors. She has written opinion pieces as well as refereed articles on gun violence prevention. Further, Dr. Andrews is currently running for the U.S. Congress on a platform that includes gun violence prevention.

Gun Violence Centers

Despite its prevalence, including its prevalence on college campuses, there are few gun violence research centers at colleges and universities in the United States. Although Congress approved $25 million in gun violence research in fiscal year 2022, the lack of centers dedicated to curbing gun violence in due, in large part, to a twenty-year-old federal statute that limited the CDC’s ability to fund gun violence research. Indeed, many of the gun violence research centers in the United States are privately funded. In a recent Chronicle of Higher Education article, Rafael Walker put it bluntly: Colleges to “get serious about gun violence.” In particular, Dr. Walker advocates a “all hands-on deck” approach including:

…psychologists and humanists to tell us why guns maintain such a grip on the American imagination; legal and policy experts to generate strategies for disarming objections to gun control; artists to create works that invite viewers to glimpse the beauty of a world free of the mass, random carnage that firearms permit.

In our research, we identified just four research centers on college campuses: the Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Violence Prevention and Policy; the UC Davis Firearm Violence Research Center; the New Jersey Gun Violence Research Center at Rutgers University; and Columbia University’s Scientific Union for the Reduction of Gun Violence. Notably, there are no research centers that we identified in the state of South Carolina.
We also identified notable examples of existing gun violence committees and efforts at Loyola University Chicago, The University of Maryland, and The University of Michigan. These are outlined below:

**Loyola University Chicago**
The Loyola Stands Against Gun Violence committee is a multi-departmental, multi-disciplinary committee which holds representation from Loyola Medicine and Loyola University Chicago. This is an example of a University committee that has hosted a “prevention summit” and teams up with a Medical University and is beginning to team up with community partners. It began due to a need to support those affected by gun violence. It meets monthly to discuss plans and issues. They have begun a long list of initiatives: Stop the Bleed trainings, AmeriCorps partnership for Certified Nurse's Assistant program, Community Paramedicine program in collaboration with Hillside Fire Department, Mother's Dawn gatherings for mothers and family members who have lost loved ones to violence, ongoing data analysis and academic presentations on the scope of gun violence in the Loyola catchment area, Community Grand Rounds on community-identified topics, and a regional network collaboration to explore the feasibility of a community-based Trauma Recovery Center model. [https://hsd.luc.edu/loyolastands/](https://hsd.luc.edu/loyolastands/)

**University of Maryland**
“Public Health Action through Civic Engagement” is the proposed name of a new effort at the University of Maryland to focus on gun policy “not politics,” and they are going to host events for the sake of awareness of the issue. [https://dbknews.com/0999/12/31/arc-zp3csa32w5aevonn7oymgtsqau/](https://dbknews.com/0999/12/31/arc-zp3csa32w5aevonn7oymgtsqau/)

**University of Michigan**
A new gun-violence focused research program at the University of Michigan intends to complete the following: scope of the initiative and research questions, create governance, create a mission, make external and internal advisory panels, develop metrics to track success (producing data among them), identify faculty with relevant research, create mechanisms to grow the pipeline and talent for expertise on this issue, and create a plan for institutional funding. [https://president.umich.edu/initiatives-and-focus-areas/firearm-injury-prevention-research/](https://president.umich.edu/initiatives-and-focus-areas/firearm-injury-prevention-research/) [https://president.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2020/01/Firearm-Injury-Prevention-Charge-FINAL-.pdf](https://president.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2020/01/Firearm-Injury-Prevention-Charge-FINAL-.pdf)

**Conclusions**
In conclusion, this needs assessment identified a high prevalence of gun violence and deaths in South Carolina, including both suicide and homicide deaths. We identified local gun violence researchers with whom the ad hoc committee has the potential to collaborate with. We also noted a paucity of gun violence research centers in the region. Ideas from other universities’ ongoing gun violence committees inform the plans of the present committee. This needs assessment identifies the potential for meaningful and long-lasting investment in gun violence prevention and intervention at the College of Charleston. There is a documented need to focus on community gun violence in Charleston. To work towards our goal of gun violence reduction, we must harness the existing resources of local researchers and community partners, with an ultimate goal of securing long-term funding for collaborative efforts on gun violence reduction at the College of Charleston.

**References**
1 Unless otherwise noted, the data reported here come from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Web-Based Injury Statistics Query System (WISQARS), “Fatal Injury Reports.” Data for 2019.


12 Unless otherwise noted, the data reported here come from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Web-Based Injury Statistics Query System (WISQARS), “Fatal Injury Reports.” Data for 2019.

13 Note that this estimate is not specific to firearm suicides. Data come from SCDHEC County Health Profiles App.

14 For more information see the Educational Fund to Stop Gun Violence: https://efsgv.org/.
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## Academic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakanic, Von</td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucher, David</td>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeHaan, Kathy</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunkle, Tom</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pothering, George</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sieverdes, John</td>
<td>Health and Human Performance</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spade, Thomas</td>
<td>Accounting and Legal Studies</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayalon, Yaron</td>
<td>Jewish Studies</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayme-Southgate, Agnes</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker, Tim</td>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan, Adam</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neufeld, Jonathan</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacock, Cliffton</td>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitts, Robert</td>
<td>Management and Marketing</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## By-Laws and the Faculty Administration Manual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cory, Wendy</td>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrara, Merissa</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelzer, Josette</td>
<td>Accounting and Legal Studies</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REI requirement

Dear Colleagues,

As we heard during the March 1 meeting of this body, implementation of the REI requirement, approved by Faculty Senate on November 2, 2021, is facing several administrative and logistical challenges. Because all undergraduate students at the College of Charleston would be subject to this new requirement, it will need the approval of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE). Although we had all hoped for its quick implementation, the program may not be fully prepared to run in the 2022 fall semester, for which students are about to start registering. While a considerable number of courses that would fulfill the requirement have been approved, a significant amount of institutional work remains, including:

a. Recruiting a program director, who can oversee a plan for implementation that involves further faculty training and course development in line with national best practices;
b. Incentivizing and training a sufficient number of faculty to offer a variety of REI choices, particularly in disciplines that require more extensive adaptation of existing courses or conception of new courses;
c. Making sure that a sufficient number of courses are scheduled to meet the needs of all students who will be affected by the new requirement;
d. Ensuring that offices outside of academic departments are prepared to discuss and provide advice on the new requirement;
e. Identifying recurrent funds to support the costs of this new program.

The above considerations provide context for the following motion:

In order to allow for successful planning, CHE approval, and implementation of the important new REI two-course requirement in the College of Charleston curriculum, the Faculty Senate supports a decision to delay the CHE review until the 2022-2023 academic year.

This timing would not affect the ability of departments, programs and schools to offer already approved courses in the coming academic year and to use student enrollment data to identify and resolve potential problems with the adequacy of course offerings when the program is fully implemented.
Meeting the REI Requirement
How many seats are needed?

- \( \sim 2500 \text{ students} \times 2 \text{ courses/student} = \sim 5000 \text{ seats} \)
- \( \sim 5000 \text{ seats} \div 8 \text{ semesters} = 625 \text{ seats/semester} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall '22</th>
<th>Spring '23</th>
<th>Fall '23</th>
<th>Spring '24</th>
<th>Fall '24</th>
<th>Spring '25</th>
<th>Fall '25</th>
<th>Spring '26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class of '26</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of '27</td>
<td></td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of '28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of '29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Assumes students distribute requirement evenly across semesters.
- Assumes no transfer credit/AP/IB.
- Assumes “perfect fit” between students and available courses.
- Any “deficit” must be made up later.
How many **seats** available in Fall ‘22? (target = 625)

- ~100 courses approved
  - ~1800 seats originally offered in Fall ’22
  - ~300 guaranteed seats in FYEs and LCs
    - ~880 seats available as of 3 PM on 4/12
    - ~790 seats available in courses without prereqs
      - Registration is ongoing (>1000 students left to register)

- At least 300, fewer than 880.
Registration Counts (as of this morning)

Cumulative Registration Counts

- Registration Days: 15
- Date: 4/12/2022
- Term: Fall 2022
- Daily Registered: 422
- Cumulative Registered: 5,175

Percent Registered

- Registration Days: 15
- Date: 4/12/2022
- Term: Fall 2022
- Percent Registered: 73.5%
- Number Registered: 5,175
- Final/Expected Registered: 7,039
Transfer Credit Policy

Recommendations for Changes

Faculty Committee on Academic Standards
Transfer Credit Policy

• S.C. Proviso 117.152 (Transfer Student Credits) The Commission on Higher Education shall work in consultation with the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education and the public institutions of higher learning to develop policies by March 1, 2022, to guarantee that students who have earned an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree from a public two-year institution of higher learning shall receive a minimum of sixty transfer credit hours at a public four-year college or university and shall be given junior status at the college or university. Course prerequisites and minimum credit requirements for awarding degrees shall still apply. Implementation of the provision shall be effective beginning June 1, 2022.
Transfer Credit Policy

• Recommended Changes:

• The College of Charleston revise current transfer credit policies to award 60 credits and junior status to students who complete an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree at a two-year public South Carolina technical college.
Transfer Credit Policy

• Recommended Changes:

• A new acronym and course number, SCTR 1EE, will be established to award elective transfer credit for coursework that is not applicable to current direct transfer policies, up to 60 hours, earned during the completion of an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree at a two-year public South Carolina technical college.
Transfer Credit Policy

• Recommended Changes:

• The College of Charleston shall revise the current transfer philosophy statement to align with S.C. proviso 117.152.
Transfer Credit Policy

• Recommended Changes:

  • The College of Charleston shall revise current transfer credit policies to allow students who complete an Associate of Arts or an Associate of Science degree at a two-year public South Carolina technical college to waive all pre-requisite requirements for declaration of the Bachelor of Professional Studies (B.P.S.) degree.
Transfer Credit Policy Revisions
Faculty Committee on Academic Standards

In December 2021, the Transfer Policy Revision Task Force was formed to recommend changes to the College of Charleston transfer policy and philosophy to bring the College into compliance with S.C. Proviso 117.152. The Task Force presented the recommended changes to the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards the end of February, and after reviewing their recommendations and getting assurances from the deans of the schools that they do not have any concerns, FCAS presents the following changes to the College’s transfer policy and philosophy for approval by the Faculty Senate.

S.C. Proviso 117.152 (Transfer Student Credits)
The Commission on Higher Education shall work in consultation with the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education and the public institutions of higher learning to develop policies by March 1, 2022, to guarantee that students who have earned an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree from a public two-year institution of higher learning shall receive a minimum of sixty transfer credit hours at a public four-year college or university and shall be given junior status at the college or university. Course prerequisites and minimum credit requirements for awarding degrees shall still apply. Implementation of the provision shall be effective beginning June 1, 2022.

Recommended Changes:

- The College of Charleston revise current transfer credit policies to award 60 credits and junior status to students who complete an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree at a two-year public South Carolina technical college.

- A new acronym and course number, SCTR 1EE, will be established to award elective transfer credit for coursework that is not applicable to current direct transfer policies, up to 60 hours, earned during the completion of an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree at a two-year public South Carolina technical college.

- The College of Charleston shall revise the current transfer philosophy statement to align with S.C. proviso 117.152.

- The College of Charleston shall revise current transfer credit policies to allow students who complete an Associate of Arts or an Associate of Science degree at a two-year public South Carolina technical college to waive all pre-requisite requirements for declaration of the Bachelor of Professional Studies (B.P.S.) degree.
Attachments:

1. Transfer Policy Revision Task Force Members
2. Revised Transfer Philosophy Statement
3. Revised Transfer Policy
4. Table with SC Peer Institution implementation plans
5. Comparison of A.A./A.S. requirements to current General Education and B.P.S. prerequisite requirements
6. Fall 2021 A.A./A.S. Transfer Student data

Transfer Policy Revision Task Force Members:

Chair: Michelle Futrell

Dawn Bare – Transfer Resource Center
Keonya Booker – Associate Professor, Teacher Education
Lisa Chestney – Registrar’s Office
Jim Deavor – Professor, Chemistry & Biochemistry
Carmen Grace – Associate Professor, Hispanic Studies
Khala Granville – Admissions
Jen Kopfman – Associate Professor, Communication
Carrie Messal – Professor, Management
Michael O’Brien – Associate Professor, Music
John Sare – Academic Advising and Planning Center
Michelle Smith – Institutional Research
Scott Woolum – Financial Assistance & Veterans Affairs
Transfer Credit Philosophy

The Task Force recommends that the current Transfer Credit Philosophy be revised as follows:

The College of Charleston welcomes transfer students. The Transfer Resource Center assists students with questions prior to enrolling at the College, and with the official evaluation of transcripts submitted from other universities. Transfer credit equivalency at the College of Charleston is evaluated by the academic departments in consultation with the Transfer Resource Center. Courses eligible for transfer are evaluated based on content, level, comparability of the course completed, and any program accreditation of the institution at which the course was taken. Credit can be evaluated in three ways: equivalent, elective, or not applicable for transfer. As a rule, credit for a specific College of Charleston catalog course will be granted when the academic department has determined that the content, level, and pre-requisites of the course completed elsewhere are equivalent to the College of Charleston course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Transfer Philosophy</th>
<th>Transfer Philosophy Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer Credit Philosophy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transfer Credit Philosophy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College of Charleston welcomes transfer students. The Transfer Resource Center assists students with questions prior to enrolling at the College, and with the official evaluation of transcripts submitted from other universities. Transfer credit equivalency at the College of Charleston is evaluated by the academic departments in consultation with the Transfer Resource Center. Courses eligible for transfer are evaluated based on content, level, comparability of the course completed, and any program accreditation of the institution at which the course was taken. College-level coursework will only transfer if a grade of C or better has been earned at a regionally accredited institution. Courses that are technical or vocational in nature cannot be accepted in transfer unless similar content or courses are offered for credit by the College of Charleston. Credit can be evaluated in three ways: equivalent, elective, or not applicable for transfer. As a rule, credit for a specific College of Charleston catalog course will be granted when the academic department has determined that the content, level, and pre-requisites of the course completed elsewhere are equivalent to the College of Charleston course. Students may be asked to retake outdated coursework and courses completed more than ten years ago may be subject to additional review.</td>
<td>The College of Charleston welcomes transfer students. The Transfer Resource Center assists students with questions prior to enrolling at the College, and with the official evaluation of transcripts submitted from other universities. Transfer credit equivalency at the College of Charleston is evaluated by the academic departments in consultation with the Transfer Resource Center. Courses eligible for transfer are evaluated based on content, level, comparability of the course completed, and any program accreditation of the institution at which the course was taken. Credit can be evaluated in three ways: equivalent, elective, or not applicable for transfer. As a rule, credit for a specific College of Charleston catalog course will be granted when the academic department has determined that the content, level, and pre-requisites of the course completed elsewhere are equivalent to the College of Charleston course. Students may be asked to retake outdated coursework and courses completed more than ten years ago may be subject to additional review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transfer Credit Policy Revisions

The Task Force recommends that the current transfer policies be revised as follows:

Transfer Credit

A final transcript is required from each college or university attended, whether or not credit was earned or courses completed. Failure to provide information regarding each college or university attended or failure to submit transcripts may result in withdrawal of any offer of admission, restrictions on registration and/or dismissal from the College.

The College of Charleston will not release copies of education records/transcripts received from previous institutions and/or copies of test scores submitted from testing agencies.

A course from another institution is eligible to be evaluated for transfer credit when the course is:

- earned at a school accredited by a regional accreditation association
- graded at least a “C” (2.000 on a 4.000 scale)
- not a duplication of credits already earned

The College of Charleston requires the relevant academic program director (or director’s designee), or the relevant dean (or dean’s designee) for a discipline or interdisciplinary program not currently represented at the College, to determine the suitability of course credit earned elsewhere for transfer to the College. Disputes over transfer credit determination may be appealed in writing to the Provost (or the Provost’s designee) no later than 15 days following receipt of the transfer credit evaluation. The decision of the Provost is final.

Coursework completed more than ten (10) years ago may be subject to an additional review to determine if transfer credit will be awarded.

The maximum number of transfer credits acceptable toward a College of Charleston A.B., B.A., B.G.S., or B.S. degree is ninety (90) credit hours, including all credits earned by examination (e.g., Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, etc.). The maximum number of transfer credits that may be applied to the requirements for a College of Charleston B.P.S. degree is eighty-seven (87) credit hours, including all credits earned by examination. 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 is sixty-six (66) credit hours.

Students may decline transfer credit to add another transfer course(s) without going over the maximum hours of transfer credit allowed. Students may also decline transfer credit to take a course at another institution as a transient or cross-registered student.

Coursework completed at other institutions must have a minimum grade of “C” (2.000 on a 4.000 scale) to be awarded transfer credit. Exceptions exist for students participating in the South Carolina Associate Degree Transfer Guarantee program. Courses graded on a pass/fail basis are acceptable only if the institution where the courses were completed indicates in their published grade scale information that a “Pass” grade is the minimum equivalent of “C” (2.000 on a 4.000 scale). Exceptions exist for students participating in the South Carolina Associate Degree Transfer Guarantee program. Credit hours awarded will reflect the hours of credit the other institution would have awarded the course, however credits awarded at another institution as a result of placement testing are not acceptable.
Grades do not transfer, only credits; therefore, students will enter the College of Charleston without a grade point average (GPA).

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, and/or non-credit bearing coursework completed toward a professional certificate. Graduate and doctoral level coursework will not be accepted for undergraduate transfer credit. The College of Charleston does not give academic credit for non-credit coursework and does not accept non-credit coursework, certificates or continuing education units for credit.

The College of Charleston is on a semester system. The following table should be used to determine semester hour equivalent of courses taken from a quarter hour system school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter Hours</th>
<th>Semester Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: College of Charleston rounds half credit hours up to the next whole number. (For example, a half credit from another school would equal one credit hour at College of Charleston.)

Students offered admission to the College of Charleston may use Degree Works to view an updated list of awarded and pending transfer credit. The “Term by Term History” link in Degree Works provides the best view of transfer credit, although the information is also visible in the degree audit area.

**Transfer from South Carolina Colleges/Universities**

The South Carolina Transfer Articulation Agreement identifies 86 courses guaranteed to transfer among and between public colleges and universities within South Carolina. Lists detailing how these 86 courses transfer to the College of Charleston are available on the Transfer from SC Schools page on the Transfer Resource Center website.

Additional information about transfer of courses to the College of Charleston from other South Carolina colleges/universities is available online through the South Carolina Transfer and Articulation Center (SC TRAC) website. Information on SC TRAC may not be current for all institutions. The information on SC TRAC is informational and does not replace an official transfer credit evaluation that is completed after an applicant is accepted to the College of Charleston.

**South Carolina Associate Degree Transfer Guarantee**

Beginning June 1, 2022 in compliance with SC Proviso 117.152, students who have earned an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree from a public two-year institution of higher learning in South Carolina shall receive a minimum of sixty transfer credit hours at the College of Charleston and shall be awarded junior status. Courses taken at public two-year institutions of higher learning in South Carolina as part of an earned AA or AS degree will be reviewed for equivalent transfer, and those not eligible for equivalent
transfer based on current transfer policies will be considered for a block of transfer credit as SCTR 1EE if needed to reach sixty credits. Completion of an AA or AS degree at a public two-year institution of higher learning in South Carolina will meet all pre-requisite requirements for admission into the Bachelor of Professional Studies, B.P.S. degree.
Comparison of Peer Institution’s Approach to SC Proviso 117.152

Members of the Task Force reached out to the University Registrars of each of the following institutions to determine their current approach to meeting this new law within the context of the questions posed to our Task Force.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>SC vs. National</th>
<th>Gen Ed Block</th>
<th>Non-equivalent courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Carolina</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Meets all core curriculum requirements (38-40 hrs)</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Marion</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Will not be waived, students will need to complete all Gen Ed requirements</td>
<td>Non-equivalent coursework up to 60 hrs would be transferred in as a block of elective credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthrop</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Waives most Gen Ed credits with the exception of a few Winthrop specific requirements.</td>
<td>Only credits with grade of C- or above meet graduation credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical University of South Carolina</td>
<td>Transfer credits are managed in the Admissions Office. Students must be accepted and then petition for transfer credit to be accepted. Information has been requested from Admissions, but per the Registrar, to their knowledge the approach has not yet been determined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Citadel</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Most courses meet current Gen Ed requirements but block waiver is not awarded</td>
<td>Non-equivalent coursework up to 60 hrs is awarded as a block of elective credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>Policy has not yet been finalized, but per Registrar intends something similar to USC. They already have subject codes and numbers that can be used to award additional credit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>Effective June 1, 2022, students who graduate with an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree from a state of South Carolina public two-year institution of higher education are guaranteed to receive a minimum of 60 transfer credit hours and junior class standing upon enrolling at the University of South Carolina – Columbia. All degree requirements, course prerequisites, minimum grades and credit requirements still apply. (South Carolina proviso 117.152)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lander University</td>
<td>No response to multiple attempts at outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lander University

No response to multiple attempts at outreach
Summary of 21 Entering Transfer Students from Fall 2021 with an AA/AS degree from a SC Two-Year Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen Ed Requirement</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent who Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Founding Documents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Ed First-Year Writing</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Ed Foreign Lang</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Ed History</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Ed Humanities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Ed Math</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Ed Nat Sci</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Ed Soc Soci</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students meeting all of Gen Ed:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percentage of Credits Applied to Gen Ed: | 58.9% |
| Percentage of Credits Applied to Major/Minor: | 12.9% |
| Percentage of Credits Applied to general 122 hours: | 28.2% |

*Data provided by Institutional Research*
### Comparison of General Education and BPS Pre-requisites to A.A./A.S. Requirements

The table below was used by the Task Force when comparing current College of Charleston General Education requirements to the A.A and A.S. requirements outlined by the South Carolina Technical College System (SCTCS):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CofC (AB,BA,BS,BGS)</th>
<th>SCTCS: AA (60 cr)</th>
<th>SCTCS: AS (60 cr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written &amp; Oral Communication</td>
<td>ENGL 110 (4) or 6 credit combination</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 (6 ENGL/3 public speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>Complete 202 level (12)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Pre-Modern (3)/Modern (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>12 (no more than 2 in same discipline)</td>
<td>21 (includes options in comm &amp; social science)</td>
<td>9 (includes options in social science &amp; languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>8 (in sequence) + labs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math or Science</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Yr Experience</td>
<td>Grad req only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Electives</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below was used by the task force when comparing current Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS) Pre-requisites to the A.A. and A.S. requirements outlined by the South Carolina Technical College system (SCTCS):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CofC (BPS) Pre-Requisites</th>
<th>SCTCS: AA (60 cr)</th>
<th>SCTCS: AS (60 cr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written &amp; Oral Communication</td>
<td>6 (3 ENGL/3 Public Speaking)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 (6 ENGL/3 public speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>6 (in 2 different disciplines)</td>
<td>21 (includes options in comm &amp; social science)</td>
<td>9 (includes options in social science &amp; languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6 (MATH 104 + 3 cr)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>3 (no lab req)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>6 (in 2 different disciplines)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math or Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Yr Experience</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Electives</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Senate Resolution

TO: The College of Charleston Faculty Senate

FROM: Christopher Day

RE: Resolution Defending Academic Freedom in Teaching and Research
Date: March 23, 2022

WHEREAS state legislative proposals are being introduced across the United States to restrict academic discussions of racism and related issues in American history in schools, colleges and universities;

WHEREAS the College of Charleston Faculty Senate approved in October 2021 a Resolution from the Faculty Senate Regarding Implementation of the REACH Act, which objects “to legislative overreach that violates the principles of academic freedom and institutional autonomy embedded in the South Carolina Code of Laws, the standards of our accreditor SACSCOC, and the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM) of the College of Charleston”;

WHEREAS the College of Charleston’s Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM), Section IV.C, affirms the importance of academic freedom to the proper functioning of universities, citing the American Association of University Professors’ 1940 statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure;

WHEREAS faculty have responsibility for the curriculum at their universities, as affirmed by the AAUP Statement on the Government of Colleges and Universities (2.b);

WHEREAS educating members of this community about barriers to a broad-based and inclusive democracy is central to the active and engaged pursuit of knowledge in the 21st century and to The College of Charleston’s commitment to producing “ethically centered, intellectually versatile and globally fluent citizens” (Strategic Plan);

WHEREAS over 140 organizations, including the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), issued the Joint Statement on Legislative Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism and American History (June 16, 2021) stating their “firm opposition to a spate of legislative proposals being introduced across the country that target academic lessons, presentations, and discussions of racism and related issues in American history in schools, colleges and universities”;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that The College of Charleston Faculty Senate affirms the American Association of University Professors’ (AAUP) Joint Statement on Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism, authored by the AAUP, PEN America, the American Historical Association, and the Association of American Colleges & Universities, endorsed by over 140 organizations, and issued on June 16, 2021;
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senate calls upon The College of Charleston’s President and Provost to affirm the American Association of University Professors’ (AAUP) Joint Statement on Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism, authored by the AAUP, PEN America, the American Historical Association, and the Association of American Colleges & Universities, endorsed by over 140 organizations, and issued on June 16, 2021;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senate stands with our K-12 colleagues throughout South Carolina and the nation who may be affected by pernicious legislation and other attacks when they seek to teach racial histories and related issues in their courses.
Faculty Senate, Tuesday, March 1, 2022 5:00 PM  
Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the February 1, 2022 minutes

3. Announcements and Information

4. Reports
   a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
   b. President Andrew Hsu

5. New Business
   a. FAM modification regarding the Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness (By-Laws/FAM, Merissa Ferrara, Chair)
   b. Program Proposals and New Schools (Academic Planning, Dan Greenberg, Chair)
   c. Curriculum Committee (Xi Cui, Chair)
      i. Biology
         A. BIOL - 498A and 498B - Bachelor's Essay in Marine Biology New course Curriculog link Courtney Murren
      ii. Middle Grades Education
          A. Middle Grades Education, B.S. - BS-EDMG Allow Gen Ed math alternatives to fulfil major's math requirement Curriculog link Ian O'Byrne
      iii. European Studies
          A. European Studies Minor - EUST course adjustments, SLO revision Curriculog link Irina Gigova
      iv. African American Studies
          A. African American Studies Minor - AAST Add DCSP350 and 395 (DC semester program for Democracy, Culture and the Arts) to AAST minor electives Curriculog link Mari Crabtree
          B. African American Studies, B.A. - BA-AAST Add DCSP350 (DC semester program for Democracy, Culture and the Arts) to AAST BA electives; ADD DCSP 395 to the required course as an alternative to AAST for the internship requirement Curriculog link Mari Crabtree
v. Arts
   A. ARTS - 316 - Digital Photography I Changing the current title of the ARTS 316 Digital Photography I: Portrait and Documentary Photography to ARTS 316 Digital Photography I Curriculog link Sara Frankel
   B. ARTS - 349 - Digital Photography II Changing the title of ARTS 349, Digital Photography II: Landscape Photography to ARTS 349, Digital Photography II. Curriculog link Sara Frankel

vi. First Year
   A. FYSG - 1xx - First Year Seminar on Race, Equity & Inclusion in the Global Context New course: REI course within FYE Curriculog link Sarah Owens
   B. FYSU - 1xx - First Year Seminar on Race, Equity & Inclusion in the US Context New course: REI course within FYE Curriculog link Sarah Owens

vii. Computing in the Arts
   A. Computing in the Arts, Theatre Concentration, B.A. - BA-CITA-CITH Curricular adjustments Curriculog link Renee McCauley; Jenine McCabe

viii. History
   A. HIST - 118 - Modern History/Global Race, Equity, and Inclusion New course: 100-level REI course Curriculog link Jason Coy
   B. HIST - 117 - Pre-Modern History/Global Race, Equity, and Inclusion New course: 100-level REI course Curriculog link Jason Coy
   C. History-Teacher Education Program (Grades 9-12), B.A. - BA-EDHS "POLI 101 OR POLI 111" to replace POLI 101. POLI 111 is the REI version of 101 Curriculog link Jason Coy

ix. Environmental Geosciences
   A. Environmental Geosciences, B.S. - BS-GENV Add GEOL 303, 397, 469 to GEOL electives Curriculog link Timothy Callahan
   B. GEOL - 402 - Geospatial Science Cross-list GEOL 402/402L with EVSS 502/502L Curriculog link Annette Watson

x. Italian Studies
   A. Italian Studies Minor - ITST Add ITST 401 - Internship to the minor's electives Curriculog link Mike Maher
   B. ITST 401 Internship New course Curriculog link Mike Maher

xi. HSS
   A. Sociology-Teacher Education Program (Grades 9-12), B.S. - BS-EDSC Add POLI 111 as an alternative to POLI 101 Curriculog link Jordan Ragusa
   B. POLI - 350 - Global Gender Politics course name change Curriculog link Jordan Ragusa

xii. International studies
   A. International Studies, Africa Concentration, B.A. - BA-INTL-INAF Add AFST 205 to 200-level electives Curriculog link Malte Pehl
B. International Studies, Europe Concentration, B.A. - BA-INTL-INEU Add 4 courses to two categories of electives Curriculog link Malte Pehl
C. International Studies, Latin America and the Caribbean Concentration, B.A. - BA-INTL-INLA Add HISP 251 to Latin America and Caribbean concentration electives Curriculog link Malte Pehl

xiii. Women's and Gender Studies
A. WGST - 250 - Approaches to Research and Practice in WGS New course Curriculog link Kris De Welde
B. Women's and Gender Studies Minor - WGST Add WGST 250, JWST/WGST 340, SOCY 322, PSYC 332 to the minor's electives Curriculog link Kris De Welde
C. Women's and Gender Studies, B.A. - BA-WGST Add new courses and restructuring the categories of courses in the curriculum Curriculog link Kris De Welde

xiv. Physics
A. PHYS - 209 - Seminar in Biomedical Physics new course for the Biomedical physics minor Curriculog link Sorinel Oprisan
B. Computational Neuroscience Concentration (18+ credit hours) - CBIO Add BIOL, PSYC, and MATH courses to the electives of CBIO concentration under both PHYS BA and BS Curriculog link Sorinel Oprisan
C. Biomedical Physics Minor - BMPH add PHYS 270 as an alternative to PHYS 203 in the Required Courses. Curriculog link Sorinel Oprisan
D. Physics, Computational Neuroscience Concentration, B.A. - BA-PHYS-CBIO Remove the courses from the GPA exclusion list. Curriculog link Sorinel Oprisan

xv. Philosophy
A. POLI - 280 - American Political Thought Rename POLI 387 to 280, cross-list with PHIL 220 American Political Thought; REI Curriculog link Larry Krasnoff
B. PHIL 110 Race and Value A new REI course Curriculog link Larry Krasnoff
C. Required Courses - PHIL Add PHIL 110, 220 (POLI 280) to major's electives Curriculog link Larry Krasnoff
D. PHIL - 220 - American Political Thought New course, cross-list with POLI 280 American Political Thought; REI Curriculog link Larry Krasnoff
E. Philosophy, Politics, Philosophy and Law Concentration, B.A. - BA-PHIL-PPLW Except POLI 280 from POLI courses excluded from the PHIL-PPLW major GPA Curriculog link Larry Krasnoff
F. Political Science, Politics, Philosophy and Law Concentration, B.A. - BA-POLI-PPLW Except PHIL 220 from PHIL courses excluded from POLI-PPLW GPA calculation Curriculog link Larry Krasnoff

xvi. Art History
A. ARTH - 254 - African American Art New course Curriculog link Mary Trent
B. Art History, B.A. - BA-ARTH Add ARTH 212 and 213 to Category A options in the curriculum Curriculog link Tara Prakash
C. ARTH - 212 - Ancient Egyptian Art and Architecture New course Curriculog link Tara Prakash
D. ARTH - 213 - Art and Architecture of Ancient Mesopotamia and the Near East New course Curriculog link Tara Prakash
xvii. French and Francophone Studies
   A. French and Francophone Studies-Teacher Education Program (Grades PK-12), B.A. - BA-EDFF Curriculum adjustments Curriculog link Shawn Morrison
   B. FREN - 313 - French Composition in Cultural Contexts Change offering to Fall only; remove 313/314 concurrency in note Curriculog link Shawn Morrison
   C. FREN - 314 - Speaking French in Cultural Contexts Change offering to Spring only; remove 313/314 concurrency in note Curriculog link Shawn Morrison
   D. French and Francophone Studies Minor - FRFS add note: Students may substitute either of the FRCS courses with a 300-level FREN course and/or a 400-level FREN course, with permission of the chair. Curriculog link Shawn Morrison
   E. French and Francophone Studies, B.A. - BA-FRFS Curriculum adjustments Curriculog link

xviii. Honors College
   A. Honors College Requirements - HONS add HONS 264, 265, 388 and 389, REI courses, into electives Curriculog link Bryan Ganaway
   B. HONS - 264 - Honors Colloquium: Global Issues in the Modern World new course, 200-level REI-global Curriculog link Bryan Ganaway
   D. HONS - 388 - Advanced Seminar on Global Issues in the Modern World new course, 300-level REI-global Curriculog link Bryan Ganaway

xix. English
   A. ENGL - 195 - Introduction to Creative Writing New course Curriculog link Gary Jackson
   B. ENGL - 368 - Flash Fiction Name change from "Short-Short Fiction" to "Flash Fiction" Curriculog link Gary Jackson
   C. ENGL - 192 - Appreciation of Literature and Film New course Curriculog link Timothy Carens
   D. ENGL - 450 - Senior Seminar in Major Authors Deactivate Curriculog link Timothy Carens
   E. ENGL - 460 - Senior Seminar in Major Literary Themes Deactivate Curriculog link Timothy Carens
   F. ENGL - 461 - Senior Seminar in Literature in History Pre-1700 Deactivate Curriculog link Timothy Carens
   G. ENGL - 462 - Senior Seminar in Literature in History 1700-2000 Deactivate Curriculog link Timothy Carens
   H. ENGL - 463 - Senior Seminar in Literature in History 2000-Present Deactivate Curriculog link Timothy Carens

d. General Education Committee (Suanne Ansari, Chair)
   i. General Education
B. Humanities ARTH 254 - African American Art
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3785/form
C. Humanities ENGL 192 - Appreciation of Literature and Film
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3823/form
D. Humanities ENGL 195 - Intro to Creative Writing
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3676/form
E. History: Pre-Modern HIST 117 - Pre-Modern History/ Global Race, Equity, and Inclusion
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3774/form
F. History: Modern HIST 118 - Modern History/ Global Race, Equity, and Inclusion
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3777/form
G. Humanities POLI 280 - American Political Thought
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3826/form
H. Humanities ARTH 212 - Ancient Egyptian Art and Architecture
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3738/form
I. Humanities ARTH 213 - Art and Architecture of Ancient Mesopotamia and the Near East
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3739/form
J. History - Modern HIST 213 American Jewish History: Colonial Times to the Present
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3659/form
K. Humanities JWST 260 American Jewish History: Colonial to the Present
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3439/form
L. Humanities PHIL 110 - Race and Value
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3836/form

ii. REI
   A. US Context PHIL 110 - Race and Value
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3837/form
   B. Global Context HONS 264 - Honors Colloquium, Global Issues in the Modern World
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3654/form
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3656/form
   D. Global Context HONS 388 - Advanced Seminar on Global Issues in the Modern World
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3657/form
   E. Global Context HONS 389 - Advanced Seminar on US Issues in the Modern World
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3658/form
   F. Global Context DANC 330 - History of Non-Western Dance
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3883/form
   G. US Context DANC 331 - History of Western Dance
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3885/form
   H. Global Context ENGL 326 - Irish Literature
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3881/form
   I. US Context ENGL 341 - Literature of the American South, 1900-present
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3874/form
   J. US Context ENVT 363 - Race, Gender, and Environment
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3877/form
K. US Context SOST 200 - Introduction to Southern Studies  
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3872/form
L. US Context SOST 241 - Studying Southern Cultures and Literature  
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3873/form
M. Global Context HIST 117 Pre-Modern History/Global Race, Equity, and Inclusion  
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3775/form
N. Global Context HIST 118 Modern History/Global Race, Equity, and Inclusion  
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3778/form
O. Global Context POLI 350 Global Gender Politics  
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3768/form
P. US Context POLI 387 American Political Thought;  
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3827/form

iii. Founding Documents Requirement (FDR) THTR 212 History of American Theatre  
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3800/form

e. Committee on Graduate Education (Shawn Morrison)

i. Biology
   A. BIOL 527 – Marine Tetrapod Biology: course renumber, course title change,  
      course description change, credit hour change, pre-req change, remove lab, add  
      cross-listing (BIOL 427) BIOL - 527 - Marine Tetrapod Biology | Curriculog
   B. BIOL 532 – Biology of Fishes: course renumber, course title change, add cross-listing  
      (BIOL 432) BIOL - 532 - Biology of Fishes | Curriculog
   C. BIOL 535 – Marine Botany: course renumber, course description change, add cross- 
      listing (BIOL 435) BIOL - 535 - Marine Botany | Curriculog
   D. BIOL 537 – Biology of Invertebrates: course renumber, course title change, add  
      cross-listing (BIOL 437) BIOL - 537 - Biology of Invertebrates | Curriculog

ii. Business Administration, MBA
   A. MBAD 500 – Law of Corporate Governance: credit hour change MBAD - 500 -  
      Law of Corporate Governance | Curriculog
   B. MBAD 505 – Creativity and Innovation: credit hour change MBAD - 505 - Creativity  
      and Innovation | Curriculog
   C. MBAD 520 – Global Enterprise: course description change MBAD - 520 - Global  
      Enterprise | Curriculog
   D. MBAD 526 – Info. Mgmt for Competitive Advantage: new course MBAD - 526 -  
      Information Management for Competitive Advantage | Curriculog
   E. Program Change: add new course to requirements, increase degree hours from  
      36 to 39, add clarifying language to non-credit program requirements Business  
      Administration, M.B.A. - MBA-MBAD | Curriculog

iii. Community Planning, Policy, and Design, MA
   A. Program Change: decrease degree hours from 54 to 51 (credit hour change  
      CPAD 790) Community Planning, Policy, and Design, M.A. - MA-CPAD | Curriculog

iv. Creative Writing, MFA
A. Program Change: add new course (ENGL 561) to requirements for new emphasis area in creative nonfiction; add new course to electives for studio and ARCM emphasis; add new courses (ENGL 577 and ENGL 578) to electives

Creative Writing, M.F.A. - MFA-CREW | Curriculog

v. English, MA
A. ENGL 709 – ePortfolio Tutorial: new course ENGL - 709 - ePortfolio Tutorial | Curriculog
B. ENGL 710 – Revising for Academic Publication: new course ENGL - 710 - Revising for Academic Publication | Curriculog
C. Program Change: add new courses to program capstone options English, M.A. - MA-ENGL | Curriculog

vi. Environmental and Sustainability Studies, MS
B. EVSS 671 – Biodiversity Management: new course EVSS - 671 - Biodiversity Management | Curriculog

vii. Teacher Education
A. EDEE 507 – Creating Effective Learning Communities: pre-req change (remove EDEE 590) EDEE - 507 - Creating Effective Learning Communities | Curriculog
B. EDEE 595 – Field Experience: Advanced Curriculum, Instruction, and Literacies Assessment (2-6): pre-req change (remove EDEE 590) EDEE - 595 - Field Experience: Advanced Curriculum, Instruction and Literacies Assessment (2-6) | Curriculog

viii. Teaching, Learning, and Advocacy, MED
A. New Literacies Concentration: terminate concentration Teaching, Learning and Advocacy, New Literacies Concentration, M.Ed. - MED-MTLA-NLIT | Curriculog

5. Constituents’ General Concerns

6. Adjournment
Motion to amend language to the FAM regarding the Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness

Specifically on p. 25 of the FAM under V.3.15.a. it states:

“15. Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness a. Composition: Nine faculty members. In addition, the following are exofficio non-voting members: the Provost or their designee and the Senior Vice President for Institutional Research. (Rev. Aug. 2018)”

Motion

The faculty senate recommends that the Faculty/Administration Manual’s procedures for the Faculty Hearing Committee be amended as follows:

“15. Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness a. Composition: Seven faculty members. In addition, the following are exofficio non-voting members: the Provost or their designee and the Senior Vice President for Institutional Research. (Rev. Aug. 2018)”

Rationale

A committee size of 9 faculty is difficult to convene as one group and is larger than the workload expectations. A committee size of 7 is more manageable for efficiency and effectiveness.
Faculty Senate, Tuesday, February 1, 2022 5:00 PM  
Meeting via Zoom

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the January 11, 2021 minutes

3. Announcements and Information

4. Reports
   a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
   b. Alicia Caudill (Student Affairs)

5. New Business
   a. American Sign Language – Foreign Language Credit (Leah Martin and Meghan Guthrie, Students)
   b. Curriculum Committee (Xi Cui, Chair)
      i. AAST – 335 - Race in American Film & Media (Anthony Greene): A new course is proposed in the African American Studies program. Curriculog link
      ii. ARTS – 334 – Advanced Photography (Sara Frankel): Add ARTS 316 as a pre-requisite, in addition to the existing ARTS 215 and ARTS 315, to ARTS 334. Curriculog link
      iii. FREN 383 – Summer Internship in a French Workplace (Shawn Morrison): remove FREN 381 as the pre-requisite of FREN 383. Curriculog link
      v. BMPH – Biomedical Physics Minor: add new courses as electives, interdisciplinary designation. Curriculog link
      vi. PHYS - 181L - Physics and Astronomy Research Rotation: add new course to expose students to research early on. Curriculog link
      vii. BIST B.I.S. name change: Change General Studies B.G.S to Integrated Studies, B. I. S. Curriculog link
      viii. BIST – 101 Intro to Bachelor of Integrated Studies (Alice Hamilton): change BGST (General Studies) to BIST with corresponding changes in pre-requisite and description. Curriculog link
      ix. BIST – 400 – Senior Synthesis Seminar (Alice Hamilton): change BGST to BIST with corresponding changes in pre-requisite and description. Curriculog link [Updated link]
x. ENGL - 477 – Proseminar in Major Literary Themes (Anton Vander Zee): new course, cross-listed with ENGL 577
  Curriculog link

xi. ENGL - 478 – Proseminar in Major Literary Genres (Anton Vander Zee): new course, cross-listed with ENGL 578.
  Curriculog link

xii. ENGL core shared by concentrations (Anton Vander Zee): add ENGL 477 and 478 to open electives.
  Curriculog link

xiii. ENGL – ELFC – BA (English major, Literature, Film, and Cultural Studies Concentration) (Anton Vander Zee):
    add ENGL 477 and 478 as focus electives. Curriculog link

xiv. EDEN BS (English – Teacher Education Program G 9-12) (Anton Vander Zee): Add ENGL 475, 477, and 478 to EDEN’s open electives.
    Curriculog link

xv. ENLF minor (Tim Carens): new minor in Literature and Film. Curriculog link

xvi. BADM- GLAT BS (Business Administration, Global Logistics and Transportation Concentration) (Kent Gourdin):
    ECON310, FINC 382, MGMT325, MKTG326, REAL 310 are added to the 6-hour elective list.
    Curriculog link

xvii. BADM – GLAT Minor (Kent Gourdin): ECON310, FINC 382, MGMT325, MKTG326, REAL 310 are added to the 6-hour elective list.
    Curriculog link

xviii. MKTG - Marketing Minor: remove ECON 201 from core requirement, add MKTG 315 to core optional courses, require core optional course from 3 to 6 hours, increase electives from 6 to 9 hours.
    Curriculog link

xix. MKTG – 315 – Marketing Management: title change, remove ECON201 as a pre-requisite, require junior standing.
    Curriculog link

xx. MKTG – 320 – Marketing Research and Consumer Insights (Julia Blose): title change, remove ECON201 as a pre-requisite.
    Curriculog link

xxi. MKTG – 329 – Consumer Behavior (Julia Blose): remove ECON201 and junior standing as pre-requisites.
    Curriculog link

xxii. MKTG – 330 – Advertising (Henry Xie): Remove ECON201 and junior standing as pre-requisites.
    Curriculog link

    Curriculog link [Updated course number]

xxiv. BIOL – 413 – Marine Conservation Genetics (Eric McElroy): Convert a special-topic course into a regular offering.
    Curriculog link

xxv. BIOL – 413L – Marine Conservation Genetics Lab (Eric McElroy): The lab component of BIOL 413.
    Curriculog link

    Curriculog link

xxvii. BIOL – 432 – Biology of Fishes (Eric McElroy): Change course number from 335 to 432 in order to cross-list with BIOL – 532. Revise course description.
    Curriculog link
xxviii. BIOL – 435 – Marine Botany (Eric McElroy): Change course number from 303 to 435 in order to cross-list with BIOL – 535. Revise course description. Curriculog link

xxix. BIOL – 437 – Biology of Invertebrates (Eric McElroy): change BIOL 337 to 437 in order to cross-list with 537. Curriculog link

xxx. EDBL BS (Biology – Teacher Education Grade 9-12) (Eric McElroy): Add BIOL 413, 413L and 427 to electives. Curriculog link

xxi. MBIO BS (Marine Biology) (Eric McElroy): Add BIOL 398, 413/413L, 427, 498A and 498B to marine electives. Curriculog link

xxxii. EDEE – 365 Teaching Mathematics (PreK-Grade3) (Nenad Radakovic): Add EDEE 323 Development of Mathematical Thinking as a prerequisite. Curriculog link

xxxiii. EDEE - 366 Teaching Mathematics (Grades 2-8) (Nenad Radakovic): Add EDEE 323 Development of Mathematical Thinking as a prerequisite. Curriculog link

xxxiv. EDEE – 429 Instructional Strategies for Emergent Literacies (PreK-3) (William Veal): Add EDEE 425 Foundations of Language and Literacies Development (Birth-G6) as a pre-requisite. Curriculog link

xxxv. EDEE – 438 – Teaching Writing/Design with Children’s Literature and Multimodal Texts (PreK-3) (William Veal): Add EDEE 425 Foundations of Language and Literacies Development (Birth-G6) as a pre-requisite. Curriculog link

xxxvi. EDEE – 445 – Teaching Writing/Design with Children’s Literature and Multimodal Texts (G2-6) (William Veal): Add EDEE 425 Foundations of Language and Literacies Development (Birth-G6) as a pre-requisite. Curriculog link

xxxvii. EDMG – 335 - Teaching Writing/Design with Adolescent Literature and Multimodal Texts (G5-8) (William Veal): Add TEDU 325 Foundations of Languages and Literacies Development (G5-12) as a pre-requisite. Curriculog link

xxxviii. EDMG – 401 – Adolescent/Disciplinary Literacies (William Veal): Add TEDU 325 Foundations of Languages and Literacies Development (G5-12) as a pre-requisite. Curriculog link

xxxix. EDEL BS – Elementary Education (Brian Lanahan): allow math alternatives to be used for major’s math requirement for approved students. Curriculog link

xl. POLI - 111 - Race, Equity and American Politics: create a spin-off of POLI 101 which focuses on race and equity. Curriculog link

xli. POLI – BA change to major: add POLI 111 as an alternative to POLI 101 in the major requirement. Curriculog link

xlii. PoliSci-Teacher Ed – EDPS BA change to major: add POLI 111 as an alternative to POLI 101 in the major requirement. Curriculog link
b. General Education Committee (Suanne Ansari, Chair)

i. REI
   A. MGMT 308 - Managing Diversity (REI): US Context
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:255/form
   B. RELS - 348 - Asian Religions in America (REI): US Context
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3393/form

ii. GENERAL EDUCATION
   A. POLI 111 - Race, Equity and American Politics
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:255/form

c. Committee on Graduate Education (Shawn Morrison)

i. Accountancy, MS
   A. ACCT 500 Accounting Theory: course description change
   B. ACCY 599 Contemporary Accountancy Issues: course description change; pre-req change (remove ACCT 500)

ii. Marine Biology, MS
   A. BIOL 513 Marine Conservation Genetics: course renumber, course title change, course description change, credit hour change, add cross-listing (BIOL 413)
   B. BIOL 513L Marine Conservation Genetics Lab: new course, add cross-listing (BIOL 413L)

iii. Community Planning, Policy, and Design, MA
    A. CPAD 790 Independent Design Field Study: credit hour change, pre-req change (change to CPAD 525 and CPAD 526)

iv. Creative Writing, MFA
    A. ENGL 561 MFA Workshop in Creative Nonfiction: new course
    B. Admissions change: add requirements for new emphasis in creative nonfiction

v. Data Science and Analytics, MS
    A. DATA 507 Scientific Computer in Data Science: pre-req change (remove DATA 505 and DATA 506)
    B. DATA 590 Special Topics in Data Science and Analytics: pre-req change (remove DATA 505 and DATA 506)
    C. DATA 591 Independent Study: pre-req change (remove DATA 505 and DATA 506)
    D. Program change: add courses to elective options (INFM 530 and INFM 532)
    E. Admissions change: remove summer as admission term, add fall as only admission term, remove entrance exam, add pre-req requirements, add description to statement of purpose, add resume
vi. English, MA
   A. ENGL 577 Proseminar in Major Literary Themes: new course, add cross-listing (ENGL 477) Proposal | Curriculog
   B. ENGL 578 Proseminar in Major Literary Genres: new course, add cross-listing (ENGL 478) Proposal | Curriculog
   C. Program change: add new courses to electives Proposal | Curriculog

vii. Historic Preservation, MS
   A. Program termination: effective Fall 2022 Proposal | Curriculog
   B. Course deactivations: effective Fall 2023
      1. HSPV 620 Preservation Law and Economics Proposal | Curriculog
      2. HSPV 802 Historic Preservation Research Seminar Proposal | Curriculog
      3. HSPV 803 Building Technology and Pathology Proposal | Curriculog
      4. HSPV 804 Management and Administration of Historic Preservation Proposal | Curriculog
      5. HSPV 805 Preservation Studio Proposal | Curriculog
      6. HSPV 807 American Architecture Proposal | Curriculog
      7. HSPV 808 History and Theory of Historic Preservation Proposal | Curriculog
      8. HSPV 809 Historical Research Methods Proposal | Curriculog
      9. HSPV 810 Conservation Science Laboratory Proposal | Curriculog
     10. HSPV 811 Advanced Conservation Laboratory Science Proposal | Curriculog
     11. HSPV 819 Investigation, Documentation, Conservation Proposal | Curriculog
     12. HSPV 821 Historic Preservation and Public Memory Proposal | Curriculog
     13. HSPV 822 Vernacular Places and Spaces Proposal | Curriculog
     14. HSPV 823 Historic American Interiors Proposal | Curriculog
     15. HSPV 825 Sustainability and Historic Preservation Proposal | Curriculog
     16. HSPV 826 Historic Structures Report Proposal | Curriculog
     17. HSPV 827 Adaptive Use Proposal | Curriculog
     18. HSPV 828 Case Studies in Preservation Engineering Proposal | Curriculog
     19. HSPV 833 Cultural and Historical Landscape Preservation Proposal | Curriculog
     20. HSPV 840 Digital Tools for Historic Preservation Proposal | Curriculog
     21. HSPV 845 Internship in Historic Preservation Proposal | Curriculog
     22. HSPV 891 Thesis in Historic Preservation Proposal | Curriculog
     23. HSPV 892 Special Topics in Historic Preservation Proposal | Curriculog
     24. HSPV 893 Independent Study in Historic Preservation Proposal | Curriculog

viii. Public Administration MPA
   A. PUBA 512 Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in the Public Sector: course title change, course description change Proposal | Curriculog
   B. PUBA 522 Intergovernmental Relations: course deactivation Proposal | Curriculog
C. PUBA 536 Economic Theory for Policy Analysis: course renumber Proposal Curriculog

6. Constituents’ General Concerns

7. Adjournment
Faculty Senate, Tuesday, January 11, 2022 5:00 PM  
Meeting via Zoom

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the December 7, 2021 minutes

3. Announcements and Information

4. Reports
   a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
   b. Paul Patrick (Office of the President)
   c. Margaret Hagood (CETL)
   d. Reapportionment (N&E, Laura Penny)

5. New Business
   a. Curriculum Committee (Xi Cui, Chair)
      i. Linguistics Minor change: Reduce “Language and Society” component in the minor’s core from 6 to 3 hours and increase electives from 6 to 9 hours. Curriculog link
      ii. CITA-395: Proposal to add CSCI 380 as a pre/co-requisite to CSCI 395, in addition to "Declared CITA major, CITA 280/CSCI 280, CSCI 230(or CSCI 315 or CSCI 370) with a grade of C- or better, 9 credit hours in concentration." Curriculog link
      iii. DATA B.S.: Proposal to add a 9 credit-hour "Language Process and World Outlooks Emphasis" to DATA BS major. Curriculog link
      iv. CITA-Art Concentration change: Add ARTS 316 to this concentration's electives because 1) it is inherently relevant and 2) Dept. of Studio Art will add ARTS 316 as a pre-requisite of ARTS 334 which is currently in this concentration's elective. Curriculog link
      v. CSCI 315: Proposal to explicitly list MATH207 as a pre-requisite. Curriculog link
      vi. CSCI 370: Proposal to explicitly list MATH207 as a pre-requisite. Curriculog link
      vii. CSCI 390: Proposal to explicitly list MATH207 as a pre-requisite. Curriculog link
      viii. CSCI 392: Proposal to explicitly list MATH207 as a pre-requisite. Curriculog link
      ix. EDEC BS Early Childhood Edu: Proposal to add TEDU 462 (Study Abroad Visual and Performing Arts Education) as an alternative option for EDEE 403 (Visual and Performing Arts). Curriculog link
x. EDEC BS Early Childhood Edu: proposal to allow alternative math courses in lieu of the current required math courses for those approved for alternative math. [Curriculog link](#)

xi. EDEL BS Elementary Education: Proposal to add TEDU 462 (Study Abroad Visual and Performing Arts Education) as an alternative option for EDEE 403 (Visual and Performing Arts). [Curriculog link](#)

xii. TEDU Education Minor: Proposal for new TEDU minor [Curriculog link](#)

xiii. New course proposal TEDU 462: Study Abroad Visual and Performing Arts Education [Curriculog link](#)

b. General Education Committee (Suanne Ansari, Chair)

   i. REI

   ii. General Education

c. Committee on Graduate Education (Shawn Morrison)
i. Computer and Information Sciences, MS - CSIS 638 – Implementation of Database Management Systems: pre-req change (remove DATA 505 and DATA 506) Proposal | Curriculog

ii. Public Administration, MPA - Program change: increase degree hours from 33 to 36 as required by external accreditation agency, add one elective to degree requirements Proposal | Curriculog

6. Constituents’ General Concerns

7. Adjournment
Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL)
Fall 2021 Faculty Survey Highlights

Margaret Hagood, Director
Survey Construction

- CETL Advisory Committee, made up of representatives from all schools, a member of Faculty Senate, and a representative from TLT, worked with divisions across campus.
- 74 statements with Likert scale response and open-ended comments at end of each section.
- Survey ran from October 20, 2021 to November 1, 2021.
- Distributed via email to all faculty (877 emails).
- Six sections:
  - Teaching pedagogy
  - Supporting Students
  - Support of Teaching
  - Learning Support Materials
  - Advising and Student Mentoring
  - Culture of Wellness & Well-Being
Responses: 25.9 % response rate

HSS: 26.8%

SSM: 19.7 %

SOB: 15.4%

LCWA: 13.2%

EHHP: 11 %

SOTA: 7%

Associate Professor: 29.8 %

Full Professor: 28.5%

Assistant Professor: 19.3%

Adjunct Professor: 8%

Senior Instructor: 5.7%

Instructor: 4.8%

Visiting Faculty: 3.8%
Survey Highlights

- Faculty value professional development and include it in their annual goal setting, but they have a difficult time finding time to fit it in.
  - Most faculty want professional development opportunities offered during 10-month contract
  - Faculty prefer small group professional development, followed by workshops, conferences, one-on-one consultations, on-demand, online groups
  - Most faculty prefer communication from CETL via email and on the website

- Pandemic conditions since March 2020 have made thoughtful professional development difficult as face-to-face instruction moved online and faculty needed to focus on new forms of instruction.

- More than 80% of the responding faculty are interested in learning about new pedagogies and strategies to enhance teaching.

- 78% of the responding faculty want to learn more about strategies for student engagement

- Faculty would like to have more incentives/recognition for excellent/innovative teaching.
Survey Highlights continued

- 84% of respondents would like additional tools beyond student evaluations to inform their instruction.

- Peer evaluation varies widely across schools/departments.

- Over half of the responding faculty would like support in connecting advising and mentoring into their annual reviews and major evaluations.

- Resources to support instruction are often unknown to and underutilized by faculty.

- 70% of respondents believe wellness and well-being are important components of teaching and learning; 48% feel confident in their abilities to infuse a culture of wellness and well-being into their courses.
CETL Next Steps

- Monthly email communication
- Collaborate with units across campus
  - To curate and share resources for teaching and learning
  - For creation of pedagogies to support faculty development
- Provide one-on-one consultations for instructor goal setting and feedback
- Spring Offerings
  - First few weeks of classes online check-in
  - QEP/OID/CETL REI Spring Book Club Discussion
  - February-March-April Lunch and Learn topics TBD
  - ORGA workshop for NSF Early Career Development Program Award
  - Writer’s Retreat (March and May)
  - Course Re/design Retreat (May)
CETL Advisory Committee Members

Tamara Butler, Libraries
Janine McCabe, SOTA
Yu Gong, SSM
Zach Hartje, TLT
Lei Jin, LCWA

Steve Litvin, SOB
Brooke Permenter, Honors College/Senate
John Peters, Graduate School
Nenad Radakovic, EHHP
Chris Warnick, HSS
Allocation of Faculty Senators for 2022 - 2025

Emily Beck, Irina Gigova, Thomas Ivey, Phyllis Jestice, Natalia Khoma, Namjin Lee, and Laura Penny (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>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCWA</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBR</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTA</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>131.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>504</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Huntington-Hill Method

1. Find the divisor \( D = \frac{\text{Total number of faculty}}{\text{number of Senate seats}} \)

2. Find the school quota \( (\text{quota} = \frac{\text{number of school faculty}}{D}) \)

3. Compare the school quota to the geometric mean (i.e. quota is 4.125, geom. mean = \( \sqrt{4 \times 5} \approx 4.472 \))

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, total number of senate seats is 50.

https://sites.google.com/site/huntingtonhillmethod/the-huntington-hill-method
## Allocated Senators for Fall 2022 – Spring 2025

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>2022-25 Number of Senators</th>
<th>Departmental Senators</th>
<th>At-large Senators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHHP</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCWA</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBR</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>131.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Resulting Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2022-25 Number of Senators</th>
<th>2019-22 Number of Senators</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHHP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></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>6</td>
<td>7</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>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
Faculty Senate, Tuesday, December 7, 2021 5:00 PM  
Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)

Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the November 2, 2021 minutes
3. Announcements and Information
4. Reports
   a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
   b. President Andrew Hsu
   c. Dan Greenberg (Academic Planning)
5. New Business
   a. Approval of December Graduates (Provost)
   b. Approval of the ad-hoc REACH Act Committee slate (Nominations & Elections)
      Proposed Slate:
      Jennifer Baker, Philosophy, Professor;  
      Jason Coy, History, Professor;  
      Jared Seay, Library, Librarian II;  
      Barry Stiefel, Art & Architectural History, Associate Professor;  
      Claire Wofford, Political Science, Associate Professor;  
      Ex-officio: Mark Del Mastro, Academic Affairs; Lisa Chestney Leeke, Registrar’s Office
   c. Curriculum Committee (Xi Cui, Chair)
      i. Chemistry course description change: revise the course description of CHEM 101 to clarify the interdisciplinary connections of this course with the environment, climate, and energy, etc. Curriculog Link
      ii. PSYC 344 (Psychology of Substance Abuse), Course Change: Remove PSYC 221 as a pre-requisite course. Curriculog link
      iii. Course change: simplifying ENGL 190 description and removing ENGL110 as the pre-requisite. Curriculog link.
      iv. Course change: simplifying ENGL 290 description and removing ENGL110 as the pre-requisite. Curriculog link.
      v. Environmental Geosciences BS (GENV) major change: Add BIOL213 as an elective. Curriculog link.
vi. GEOL 200 new course: Geology and Environmental Geosciences Department proposes a new course called "The Age of Dinosaurs." Curriculog link

vii. GEOL 266 new course: Geology and Environmental Geosciences Department proposes a new course called "Virtual Expedition in Paleontology." Curriculog link

viii. BA-GEOL-GEOP change to major: add Paleontology concentration to GEOL BA major. Curriculog link

ix. BS-GEOL-GEOP change to major: add Paleontology concentration to GEOL BS major. Curriculog link

x. CITA 395 course change: change the description and title to better reflect what is being taught, remove redundancy in pre-requisite requirements. Curriculog link (The current CITA395 catalog info is here)

xi. CITA 495 course change: change the description and title to better reflect what is being taught, remove redundancy in pre-requisite requirements. Curriculog link (The current CITA495 catalog info is here)

xii. CSCI 462 course change: change the description and title to better reflect what is being taught, remove redundancy in pre-requisite requirements. Curriculog link (The current CSCI 462 catalog info is here)

xiii. DATA 495 course change: change the description to better reflect what is being taught. Curriculog link (The current CSCI 462 catalog info is here)

xiv. Change to ARTM minor: Adjustment to the structure of the minor by adding and removing required and elective courses. Curriculog link

xv. Change to ARTM major: Additions and deletions are made to the "foundational arts electives" category in the curriculum. Curriculog link

xvi. Change to ARTM 240: Change prerequisites from specific Art History courses to all Art History courses (ARTH 100:499). Curriculog link

xvii. Change to ARTM 255: Remove prerequisites. Curriculog link

xviii. Change to ARTM 400: Add ARTM 270 as a prerequisite. Curriculog link

xix. Change to ARTM 401: Add ARTM 270 as a prerequisite. Curriculog link

xx. PBHL BA major change: PBHL proposes to overhaul the BA major structure. Curriculog link

xxi. New course HEAL 321 (Special Topics in Global Health). Curriculog link

xxii. New course HEAL 322 (Special Topics in Maternal and Child Health). Curriculog link

xxiii. New course HEAL 329 (Applied Women's Health Research and Advocacy). Curriculog link

xxiv. Business Language Minor in Spanish (BLSP-Minor) program change: To count all SPAN333 sections toward the minor's requirements, not only those with a contemporary focus. Curriculog link

xxv. HISP 401- Internship, new course: An independent study for internship experience is proposed. It complements SPAN401 in that HISP401 doesn't require an exclusively Spanish language environment. Curriculog link
xxvi. HISP-BA change to major: Add HISP401 to HISP-BA curriculum (level 3, option 2) Curriculog link

xxvii. Spanish-Teacher Education, EDSH-BA, change to major: same as the HISP-BA change, add HISP401 to EDSH-BA curriculum (level 3, option 2). Curriculog link

xxviii. PORT - 150 Intensive Elementary Portuguese through Culture, new course: Following the SPAN model of language course through culture, a 6-credit course is proposed as an equivalent to the two-semester PORT 101 and 102 combination. Curriculog link

xxix. PORT - 250 Intensive Elementary Portuguese through Culture, course change: Change from "Intensive Intermediate Portuguese" to "Intensive Intermediate Portuguese through Culture". Curriculog link

xxx. SPAN-383 Topics in Spanish Language Studies, new course: a literary and culturally oriented language course option, in addition to the current SPAN 381, for SPAN minor students. Curriculog link

xxxi. SPAN minor change: add SPAN 383 as an alternative to SPAN 381 for minors. Curriculog link

xxxii. JWST 340 and WGST 340 (Jews, Gender, and Sex), new cross-listed courses: Jewish Studies and Women’s and Gender Studies respectively propose new courses which are cross-listed. JWST 340 Curriculog link,

xxxiii. WGST 340 Curriculog link

xxxiv. JWST 260 (American Jewish History: Colonial Times to the Present), new course: Curriculog link

xxxv. HIST 213 course change: Cross-list HIST 213 with JWST 260. Curriculog link;

xxxvi. Change to JWST minor: add JWST 260 and JWST 340 to minor electives. Curriculog link

xxxvii. Change to JWST-BA major: Curriculog link

c. General Education Committee (Suanne Ansari, Chair)

i. REI Courses
   A. ENGL - 207 - American Literature to the Present; (REI): US Context
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3341/form
   B. ENGL - 233 - Survey of Non-Western Twentieth Century Literature; (REI): Global Context
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3342/form
   C. ENGL - 234 - Survey of Third-World Masterpieces; (REI): Global Context
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3343/form
   D. ENGL - 328 - British Novel II; (REI): Global Context
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3344/form
   E. ENGL - 352 - Major African Writers; (REI): Global Context
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3345/form
   F. ENGL - 353 - African Women Writers’ (REI): Global Context
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3346/form
   G. ENGL - 358 - Colonial and Postcolonial British Literature; (REI) Global Context
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3347/form
H. ENGL - 371 - Multi-ethnic Literature of the U.S.; (REI) US Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3348/form

I. HIST - 255 - A History of Reproduction in the Atlantic World; (REI) Global Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3338/form

J. HIST - 263 - Latin America since Independence; (REI) Global Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3336/form

https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3335/form

L. HIST - 252 - Women in Europe; (REI) Global Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3337/form

M. SOST - 175 - Religions in the U.S. South; (REI) US Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3394/form

N. LACS - 101 - Introduction to Latin American and Caribbean Studies; (REI) Global Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3334/form

O. ANTH - 115 - Introduction to Cultural Sustainability; (REI) Global Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3356/form

P. ANTH - 201 - Cultural Anthropology; (REI) Global Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3357/form

Q. ANTH - 205 - Language and Culture; (REI) Global Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3358/form

R. JWST - 230 - The Holocaust; (REI) Global Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3383/form

S. JWST - 315 - Southern Jewish History; (REI) US Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3385/form

T. JWST - 350 - Jews and Muslims: Coexistence and Conflict; (REI) Global Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3386/form

U. JWST - 220 - History of Israel; (REI) Global Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3382/form

V. JWST - 250 - The Arab-Israeli Conflict; (REI) Global Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3384/form

W. THTR - 310 - Theatre History and Literature to 1750; (REI) Global Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3305/form

X. THTR - 311 - Theatre History and Literature after 1750; (REI) Global Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3306/form

Y. THTR - 315 - Feminist Theatre; (REI) US Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3328/form

Z. THTR - 316 - African American Theatre; (REI) US Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3307/form

AA. WGST - 200 - Introduction to Women's and Gender Studies; (REI) US Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3304/form

BB. HPCP - 325 - Community Planning for Preservationists (REI) Global Context
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3353/form

CC. MEDH - 200 - Introduction to Medical Humanities (REI) US Context
DD. PSYC - 330 - Psychology of Prejudice and Discrimination (REI) Global Context  
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3317/form

EE. PSYC - 332 - Psychology of Social Change (REI) Global Context  
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3318/form

FF. RELS - 118 - Modern History of Religions (REI) US Context  
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3387/form

GG. RELS - 215 - Religion and Globalization (REI) Global Context  
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3388/form

HH. RELS - 250 - Religion in America (REI) US Context  
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3389/form

II. RELS - 260 - Native American Religions (REI) US Context  
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3390/form

JJ. RELS - 270 - African-American Religions (REO) US Context  
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3391/form

KK. RELS - 305 - Topics in Indigenous Religions (REI) US Context  
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3392/form

LL. SOCY - 102 - Contemporary Social Issues (REI) US Context  
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3309/form

MM. SOCY - 107 - Issues of Race and Ethnicity (REI) US Context  
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3310/form

NN. SOCY - 326 - African American Culture and Society (REI) US Context  
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3372/form

OO. SOCY - 337 – Prejudice (REI) US Context  
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3311/form

PP. SOCY - 366 - Race and Ethnic Relations (REI) US Context  
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3312/form

ii. FDR Proposals
   A. JWST - 260 - American Jewish History: Colonial to the Present; 2021-2022 Founding Documents Requirement (FDR)  
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3413/form

iii. Math/Logic Alternative
   A. CSCI - 115 - Website Design; Math Logic Alternative  
      https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3459/form  
      This proposal was retracted.

6. Constituents’ General Concerns

7. Adjournment
The Charge in the FAM

• To consider and recommend long-range academic programs and goals for the College....

• [T]he committee shall gather information from such...individuals as are advocating new programs and goals....

• The committee shall also review and respond to plans brought to the committee by the Provost concerning the termination of programs, and shall gather such information as would be necessary to evaluate the impact of program termination upon the College’s academic mission.

• The Chair of the Academic Planning Committee or their representative shall attend meetings of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.
The Recent Reality

• Additional step at the *end* of review process
• Somewhat duplicates Faculty Curriculum Committee
• Senators feel surprised by proposals (and pressured to approve them)
• Shared governance should probably not be high-stakes
The Plan for Planning

- Review new or deactivated majors, programs, minors, certificates
- Move Planning to *start* of process to conduct initial conceptual review
Nature of Review

• Submit summary/overview before entering everything in Curriculog

• Key questions
  • To what extent does this proposal align with our strategic plan? With the academic unit’s strategic plan?
  • How does this proposal fit with or overlap with other programs?
  • What is the anticipated demand for the program in the short and long terms? Are there employment opportunities, research opportunities, opportunities for civic engagement, etc.?
  • How resilient will the program be to changes in faculty lines? To changes in student enrollment?

• Report to Senate

• Final vote at end of process (ideally pro forma)
Transition Year

• Previously-submitted proposals follow old process
  • STAT major
  • SWEN major
  • ...

• New proposals
  • TEDU Minor
Questions?
Faculty Senate, Tuesday, November 2, 2021 5:00 PM
Meeting via Zoom

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the October 5, 2021 minutes

3. Announcements and Information

4. Reports
   a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
   b. Provost Suzanne Austin
   c. Budget Committee (Robert Pitts, Chair)

5. New Business
   a. Curriculum Committee (Xi Cui, Chair)
      i. MATH change to major: Remove the remaining tracks under MATH major and add a capstone requirement to the MATH major. Curriculog link
      ii. Minor termination BLFR: terminate Business Language Minor in French - BLFR Curriculog link
      iii. Course deactivation FREN 330: deactivate FREN 330 Collateral Study Curriculog link
      iv. New course PHYS 430: Department of Physics and Astronomy is turning a successful special topic course into a regular offering PHYS 430 - General Relativity Curriculog link
      v. Change to major Astronomy BA (ASTR-BA): add PHYS 430 General Relativity to ASTR major electives Curriculog link
      vi. Change to major Astrophysics BS (ASTP-BS): add PHYS 430 General Relativity to ASTP major electives: Curriculog link
      vii. Change to major Physics BA (PHYS-BA): Add PHYS 430 - General Relativity to PHYS BA electives: Curriculog link
      viii. Change to major Physics BS (PHYS-BS): Add PHYS 430 - General Relativity to PHYS BS electives: Curriculog link
      ix. New minor in Business Applications of Weather and Climate (BAWC): Curriculog link
      x. New course PHYS 305: a new course PHYS 305 The Nexus of Management and Weather is proposed for the BAWS minor. It is cross-listed with MGMT 305. Curriculog link
      xi. New course MGMT 305: the cross-listed counterpart of PHYS 305 Curriculog link
      xii. Change to major Physics BA (PHYS-BA): Add PHYS305/MGMT305 to general electives of PHYS B.A. Curriculog link
      xiii. Change to major Physics BS (PHYS-BS): Request to NOT list PHYS305 in PHYS BS electives. Curriculog link
xiv. Change to major Meteorology BA (METR-BA): add GEOG101 (World Regional Geography), GEOG219 (Reading the Lowcountry Landscape), and PHYS305/MGMT305 (The Nexus of Management and Weather) as general electives for majors. Curriculog link

xv. Change to minor Meteorology (METR minor): add GEOG101 (World Regional Geography), GEOG219 (Reading the Lowcountry Landscape), and PHYS305/MGMT305 to the general electives of the minor. Curriculog link

b. General Education Committee (Suanne M. Ansari, Chair)

i. REI Courses:
R. GRST - 221 - The African Diaspora in German-speaking Cultures 2021-2022 Race, Equity, and Inclusion (REI): **Global Context**  
U. INTL - 100 - Introduction to International Studies 2021-2022 Race, Equity, and Inclusion (REI): **Global Context**  

c. Committee on Graduate Education (Shawn Morrison, Chair)  
   
i. Languages, MED  
   A. LALE 695: pre-req change Proposal | Curriculog  
   ii. Urban & Regional Planning Graduate Certificate  
   A. Program change: add PUBA 519 to Policy & Management course options Proposal | Curriculog  

6. Constituents’ General Concerns  

7. Adjournment
Budget Committee Report to the Faculty Senate November 2021

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

I remind the committee and the Senate that Strategy directs the allocation of resources thus budgets are the financial tools of strategy.

Working with CFO John Loonan and Provost Suzanne Austin the Budget Committee is experiencing a new environment of transparency and commitment to faculty inclusion in budgetary decisions. Further the College has adopted sounder budgetary process and made significant progress in the development of the monetary reserves (and admissions and scholarship administration) necessary for financial stability.

So far this year we reviewed the 2021 College budget after approval by the trustees with a new level of detail and reviewed the budgets of the three new major approved by the Senate last month. Most importantly the Committee is now working with the CFO and Provost to address major issues concerning (1) The Role of Budget Committee in Academic Affairs Program Approval and (2) RCM Development & the Role of Budget Committee under RCM.

RCM Development & the Role of Budget Committee under RCM.

A major part of this discussion is a shift in the committee’s orientation to a role in the long range (3-5 year) budget planning anticipated under RCM. It is anticipated that The Senate Budget Committee will operate at the College level assisting in review of allocations to strategic programs (Strategic Initiative Funds), review new program proposals and RCM policies and procedures. The process through which the Budget Committee will make recommendations on allocations and policies is being developed with CFO John Loonan. In addition to its role at the College level the Committee unanimously recommends that each School have a Budget Committee to make school level recommendations to their school’s dean. This application of transparency under RCM would be accompanied by a yearly budget report of sources and uses of funds by the dean.

Scott Harris (former chair of the Budget Committee and I are members of the RCM Steering Committee. The Committee has received an update from the Kennedy & Co. on RCM development. The consultants Kennedy & Co. are working toward a first look at school level
numbers comparing school expenses (cost accounting) against revenue allocations over the next number of weeks.

Let me remind the Senate that RCM numbers are managerial tools. The real issues are how the numbers are used in decision making.

The Role of Budget Committee in Academic Affairs Program Approvals

The role of the Budget Committee in the program approval process in Academic Affairs has been an ongoing issue. For the faculty committee to have real input into program budget decisions we must be part of early program discussions in Academic Affairs rather than informed of a major or other decision for approval in Curriculog. Committee questions about the Software Engineering budget provided a response from Academic Affairs that AA approval in Curriculog meant that the program and its budget had been approved by the President, Provost and CFO and that any resources needed would be provided. (Academic Affairs approval in the Curriculog approval process proceeds that of the Academic Planning, Budget and Curriculum approvals prior to Senate vote.)

The Budget Committee is now working with Provost Austin to develop a procedure in which the committee will be engaged prior to approval by Academic Affairs.

The effect of this will be to have Committee input into the development and consideration of proposal’s budget prior to Academic Affairs Curriculog approval. The provost submits budget items in mid-February thus on a yearly basis with the College’s yearly budget development timetable operationalization will require that the Committee and Provost work on a yearly input process prior to that time. The committee must also take a longer-term approach to Academic program budget consideration. Given the multiple processes necessary for approval of significant program and major additions (or deletions) (Trustees, CHE & SACS?) budget implications of such are generally not experienced until a year or more after Senate approval.

Committee Review of 2021/22 College Budget

The College Budget the Committee requested and received copies of the budget briefing detail presented to the Trustees for approval of the 2021/22 budget. We were able to review new budget items in much more detail than available in the annually published Budget Summary. [https://budgetingandpayroll.cofc.edu/documents/2021.2022-college-of-charleston-budget.pdf](https://budgetingandpayroll.cofc.edu/documents/2021.2022-college-of-charleston-budget.pdf)

We asked for and received explanations of budget items from this detail. Note that the current budgetary process focus is on yearly changes from the previous year and that existing expenditures are not generally detailed nor reviewed at this level. We reviewed new funding not existing funding.
The 21/22 budgeted Education and General (E&G) Revenue of $187,039,507

2021/22 Education and General Expense Allocations

President ..................................... $5,157,591 In earlier CofC budgets this line included Scholarships
Marketing and Enrollment........ 6,365,197
Provost ........................................ 15,455,237
Schools........................................... 63,552,467
Business Affairs ....................... 16,325,119
Facilities Mgt...............................13,811,673
Intuitional Advancement ...... 2,503,443
Student Affairs ......................... 4,122,923
Information Technology .......... 17,796,659
General Institution................. 38,025,744

The Trustees approved a total of $8,950,075 in new expenditures for 21/22. Required new expenses for ongoing operations totaled $1,922,731. Voluntary Retirement from 20/21 produced a net salary and benefit saving for 21/22 of $878,221.

New Spending was enumerated under the College’s Strategic Plan’s Pillars were presented to the Trustees as follows:

“Strategic Action Items” $5,113,709

Pillar I – Student Experience and Success .......... $706, 323

Notable additions include:
  MUSC Psychiatry contract .....$ 78,542

  iCharleston Program .......... $237,500
  (First year “bridge” program –“ iCharleston participants live and study in Dublin, Rome or London where the College has set up academic programs with partner institutions.” Started in 2014 – 300 students have participated.)
  Academic Strategic Plan Adjustment ....... $150,000
  (Will support program realignments on an as needed basis.)

Pillar II Academic Distinction .................$1,773,770

Notable additions include:
  Engineering program start up .....$262,000
  (This funding was guaranteed by previous administrations when the Engineering Programs were approved)

  Establish Adjunct Faculty Recurring Budget .... $500,000
  (The Committee was made aware of this need last year – in previous budgets adjunct salaries were funded from unspent faculty salaries)

Admissions/University Marketing ........
New position FTE .................. $ 82,600
Student Labor........................$ 78,488
Advertising and Promotion...$630,330

Pillar III Employee Experience and Success ........ $4,509,79

   Notable additions include:
   1% Merit .......................................................... $1,191,647 (performance, promotions etc.)
   3% Base (net of state funding) .......... $2,689,882 (SC Legislature mandate 2.5%)
   Health Insurance .......................... $  101,974
   Promotion etc........................................... $ 374,108

   “Cross Pillar Initiatives” ............$2,838,404

   Notable additions include:
   IT Contract Escalations .................. $ 857,925
   IT Strategic Initiatives ................. $1,358,963
   Travel Expense System ................. $ 63,858
   Facilities Management Benchmarking .. $ 53,000

Looking ahead the net revenue goals /forecast from the Kennedy & Company at the October Senate meeting of 5.4, 5.1% assuming no tuition increases indicate limited discretionary funds in future years. This assumes no tuition increases and expected required new expenditures related to inflation and the desire for faculty and staff raises. The forecast increases are approximately $6,000,000 for the next 3 years and only $3,000,000 in 2025/26. This is a key topic for discussion for the Budget Committee as we shift our focus to longer term budget planning.

Submitted for the Committee by Robert Pitts (Chair)
Yaron Ayalon - Jewish Studies
Julie Davis - Communication
Adam Jordan - Teacher Education (Secretary)
Todd McNerney - Theatre and Dance
Johnathan Neufeld - Philosophy
Robert Pitts - Management and Marketing (Chair)
Agnes Southgate - Biology
Course Criteria for REI Requirement

To count for the race, equity, and inclusion graduation requirement, the course must satisfy the following criteria:

1) It should be at least a three credit hour course.
   a) Special topics courses will NOT count unless it is clear that the course will always have an REI focus, regardless of topic.

2) It should have as its historical, narrative, applied, analytical, and/or geographic focus either the US or global context. This means two possible tracks for REI courses: US-based REI courses, or Global REI courses.
   a) For feedback on how your course would meet one of these tracks, regardless of discipline, please email Morgan Koerner (koernerm@cofc.edu) and Anthony Greene (greenead@cofc.edu)

3) It should include two of the following three SLOs as reflected in the course syllabus:

   SLO 1: Students will describe how race is socially constructed and intersects with multiple forms of oppression in US and/or global contexts.

   SLO 2: Students will identify and analyze how social hierarchies manifest in relation to legacies of colonialism, white supremacy or structural oppression in historical and/or current US and/or global contexts.

   SLO 3: Students will identify and evaluate legal, political, economic, institutional, and/or personal solutions or forms of resistance to racial inequities and discrimination.

4) In addition to including the SLOs, the syllabus should also make clear that 1/3rd of the course content, or roughly 14 contact hours or 4 ½ weeks of class time in a 14 week semester, is focused on the SLOs in the content. This should be made clear both in the course description and in the breakdown of readings/units in the semester and/or the required readings/viewings for the class and it can be done in a variety of ways:
   a) Some courses, such as those in AAST, will consist entirely of REI content throughout;
   b) A concentrated module (minimum of 4 ½ weeks) addressing the 2 out of 3 SLOs;
   c) 1/3 of the assignments throughout a semester address the 2 out of 3 SLOs;
   d) A recurring REI focus throughout the syllabus that adds up to 1/3rd or more content (like INTL 100).
These are just some for the ways that the ⅓ REI content could be met. For consultation on the ⅓ requirement, please email Morgan Koerner (koernerm@cofc.edu) and Anthony Greene (greenead@cofc.edu).
Faculty Senate, Tuesday, October 5, 2021 5:00 PM  
Meeting via Zoom

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the August 31, 2021 minutes

3. Announcements and Information

4. Reports
   a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
   b. Provost Suzanne Austin
   c. Strategic Enrollment (Kennedy & Co.)
   d. Board of Trustees Naming Policy and Guiding Principles (Renée Romberger)

5. New Business
   a. Curriculum Committee (Xi Cui, Chair)
      i. LACS Latin American and Caribbean Studies (LACS)
         A. Remove LTSP 250 from major electives; add HISP 251* and 252 to major electives. [Proposal | Curriculog]
         B. Add HISP 251* and 252 to minor electives [Proposal | Curriculog]
         C. *HISP252 sections must have more than 1/3 content relevant to LACS
      ii. Gen-ed natural science
         A. Remove the mention of credit hours for the two-course Gen-ed natural science requirements because some transfer students’ previous institutions do not use a “3-hr lecture + 1-hr” lab system. [Proposal | Curriculog]
      iii. HTMT
         A. Remove ACCT203 from HTMT minor requirement. [Proposal | Curriculog]
      iv. CSCI 250
         A. Add CSCI 218, in addition to CSCI220 to CSCI 250’s pre-req. [Proposal | Curriculog]
      v. REI requirement
         A. A two-course REI requirement will be added to the college curriculum. [Proposal | Curriculog]
      vi. SWEN
         A. Computer science is creating a Software Engineering major (SWEN) with a global/cultural minor requirement [Proposal | Curriculog]
      vii. EDFS: A multicategorical Special Ed B.S is proposed to replace the categorical special ed program. Related proposals for course change or new courses are also submitted.
A. EDFS 401: change course title and description to incorporate language of neurodiversity. Proposal | Curriculog
B. EDFS 403: A new course proposed to in accordance with the multicategorical certification Special Ed program Proposal | Curriculog
C. EDFS 404: A new course proposed to in accordance with the multicategorical certification Special Ed program Proposal | Curriculog
D. EDFS 405: A new course proposed to in accordance with the multicategorical certification Special Ed program Proposal | Curriculog
E. EDFS 406: A new course offering training on working with families of students with disabilities and social workers Proposal | Curriculog
F. EDFS 408: A new course training students to work with school mental health providers Proposal | Curriculog
G. EDFS 437: change course title and description to be more self-explanatory. Remove pre-reqs Proposal | Curriculog
H. Special Ed, Multicategorical B.S. Proposal | Curriculog

viii. Statistics B.S.
A. Mathematics department is making the statistics track of math major a standalone major. Proposal | Curriculog

b. General Education Committee (Suanne Ansari, Chair)
   i. General Education
      A. ANTH-115 Introduction to Cultural Sustainability for Social Science credit in General Education Proposal | Curriculog

c. Committee on Graduate Education (Shawn Morrison)
   i. Public Administration, MPA
      A. PUBA 623: course deactivation Proposal | Curriculog
   ii. Languages, MED
      A. SPAN 614: course description change, make repeatable Proposal | Curriculog
      B. SPAN 615: course description change, make repeatable Proposal | Curriculog
      C. SPAN 655: course deactivation Proposal | Curriculog
      D. SPAN 671: course deactivation Proposal | Curriculog

d. REACH Act Resolution (Irina Gigova)

e. Constituents’ General Concerns

f. Adjournment
A number of factors impact the potential for College of Charleston to grow its enrollments, from limited entry points to disjointed recruiting and a history that creates current challenges.

**Complicating Factors**

**Diversify Enrollment Streams**
- The current model relies almost entirely on freshman entry growth.
- Transfer application strategy has focused on transfers from 4-year institutions rather than technical/community college partnerships with guaranteed entry.
- Graduate programs offered in limited areas and with significant abatements.
- Current expansion into engineering underway will help.
- Retention challenges limit long-term revenue.

**Recruiting Focus & Processes & Policies**
- For Admissions to grow enrollment, the entire institution must be focused on external communication and the website.
- Focus on European recruiting, both through partnerships and Athletics has come at the expense of other opportunities.
- Changes to policies that will encourage applications are already underway, but the general education core and major requirements are still opportunities.
- Incoming student scholarship process is not strategic or centralized.

**Culture & Identity**
- The Community has a lack of future vision for the College of Charleston identity – as a liberal arts college or professional school-focused institution.
- The historic past of Charleston and the College create diversity challenges that other schools do not have.
- Students, Staff, and Faculty all highlighted the incredible access and quality of the faculty that led to strong, unique relationships.
## College of Charleston 5 Year Enrollment Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Tuition Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$142.6 M</td>
<td>$149.4 M</td>
<td>$156.7 M</td>
<td>$165.5 M</td>
<td>$168.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NTR % Change vs Previous Year</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptance Rate</strong></td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freshman Class Size</strong></td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incoming Fall Transfer</strong></td>
<td>620</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incoming Graduate</strong></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Freshman Discount Rate</strong></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incoming Freshman Scholarships</strong></td>
<td>$10.6 M</td>
<td>$11.0 M</td>
<td>$10.7 M</td>
<td>$11.2 M</td>
<td>$11.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Growth Potential</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 Point Retention Growth Each Year</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$452K</td>
<td>$1.2 M</td>
<td>$1.8 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assumptions

**Yield**
- 21% In-state (FTF)
- 14% Out-of-state (FTF)
- 45% Transfer

**Application #s**
- Assumed to stay level; If app #s decrease, more scholarship money will be required to achieve targets

**Incoming Class Growth**
- Transfer: 5%
- Graduate: 0% in 2021-22, 10% onward

**Tuition**
- 3.4% Tuition Increase in 2021-2022, but no increase in next years

### Additional 2022 Targets

- **Freshman:**
  - 46% In-State
  - 18% URM
  - Honors College: 275
- **Transfer:**
  - 80% In-State
  - Spring 2022:
    - 300 Transfer
    - 15 Freshman
Faculty Senate, Tuesday, August 31, 2021 5:00 PM
Hybrid: Wells Fargo Ballroom (Beatty Center 115) and via Zoom

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the April 6, 2021 minutes

3. Announcements and Information

4. Reports
   a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
   b. President Andrew Hsu

5. New Business
   a. Vote to approve all motions passed during virtual 2020-21 Senate meetings
   b. Election of Speaker Pro Tempore
   c. REACH Act – Claire Wofford PDF
   d. Sustainable Literacy Institute – Laura Turner PDF

6. Constituents’ General Concerns

7. Adjournment
The R.E.A.C.H. Act

CLAIRE B. WOFFORD, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
FACULTY SENATE MEETING – AUGUST 31, 2021
The Reinforcing College Education on America’s Constitutional Heritage Act (R.E.A.C.H Act)

- College students must complete a “three credit class in American history, American government or another equivalent course of instruction that provides a comprehensive overview of the major events and turning points of American history and government which includes, at a minimum, reading”:
  - The United States Constitution in its entirety;
  - The Declaration of Independence in its entirety;
  - The Emancipation Proclamation in its entirety;
  - A minimum of five essays in their entirety from the Federalist Papers as selected by an instructor; and
  - One or more documents that are foundational to the African American Freedom struggle.
Compliance By College of Charleston: The Courses

**Political Science**
- POLI 101 American Government
- HONS 165 Honors American Government
- POLI 320 Constitutional Law
- POLI 321 Civil Liberties
- POLI 387 American Political Thought

**Philosophy**
- PHIL 209 Political Philosophy
- PHIL 310 American Philosophy

**History**
- History 201 United States to 1865
- History 202 United States since 1865
- HIST 216 African American History to 1865
- HIST 217 African American History since 1865
- HIST 304 History of the United States: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1845-1877
What’s Wrong with REACH

- Universities vs. Secondary/Elementary Schools
- Academic Freedom
- The 1st Amendment
  - Content Based Restriction
  - Compelled Speech
- The Slippery Slope
“Critical race theory instruction prohibition. A bill to amend the code of laws of South Carolina, 1976, by adding section 59-29-12 so as to provide public school districts, public schools, and public institutions of higher learning may not direct or otherwise compel students to personally affirm, adopt, or adhere to the tenets of "critical race theory" or provide related instruction…”
Sustainability Program
Future
What is the future of our Sustainability Program from an academic standpoint?

What are the plans for our Current SLI director position?
Our Core Commitments in our Strategic Plan are:

Foster a culture of **innovation** to create **sustainable solutions**: Assess, adjust and establish policies, programs and incentives to encourage and enable innovation and continuous improvement in how faculty, staff and students teach, learn and lead.

Advance our commitment to diversity, **equity & inclusion**: Refresh and implement the University’s Diversity & Inclusion Plan (e.g., education, programs, accountabilities, and metrics) in order to drive noticeable improvement in creating a campus culture where everyone feels they belong.

Cultivate impactful strategic **partnerships**: Establish a central office to help forge, facilitate and foster high-impact strategic partnerships across campus with industry, educational institutions, local and state government, and community organizations in order to advance our mission, vision and strategic priorities.
OUR VISION:
The College of Charleston will be a transformative national university redefining liberal arts education through innovation.

The ideas that will help us not only survive, but thrive are not going to come from just scientists, they’re going to come from global thinkers across the curriculum - the kind that we produce at the College of Charleston and the kind that sustainability education creates.
CORE VALUES

**Integrity:** We take accountability for our actions and adhere to the highest ethical standards in all our professional obligations and personal responsibilities. We demonstrate respect for self, others and place.

**Academic Excellence:** We are committed to a dynamic intellectual community, high academic standards, strong academic programs, exceptional teacher-scholars, engaged students and lifelong learners.

**Liberal Arts Education:** We encourage intellectual curiosity and foster each student’s ability to think creatively and analyze, synthesize, apply and communicate knowledge from many sources.

**Diversity, Equity & Inclusion:** We create and nurture a diverse and inclusive community demonstrated through our thoughts, words and actions. We value and respect the unique perspectives, backgrounds and experiences every individual has to offer.

**Student Centeredness:** We are devoted to nurturing thriving scholar-citizens through the intellectual, ethical and social development of each individual student.

**Innovation:** We act with an entrepreneurial spirit to imagine and implement creative, bold and sustainable solutions in our pursuit of excellence and continuous improvement.

**Public Mission:** We demonstrate social responsibility in meeting the educational and professional needs of our community, our state, our nation and the world.
## 2019 NSSE Survey Results: CofC Seniors vs. Other University Seniors

**Questions and Results**

Listed below are the results of the 2019 NSSE survey comparing CofC Seniors to other university seniors. The results are summarized in a table format, with the mean values and 95% confidence intervals provided for each question. The results are also categorized as either a 'No Difference' or a statistically significant difference.

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>CofC Mean (95% CI)</th>
<th>SG Mean (95% CI)</th>
<th>Results¹</th>
<th>NSSE Results²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>2.38 (2.30-2.46)</td>
<td>2.45 (2.41-2.49)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>3.38 (3.32-3.44)</td>
<td>3.21 (3.17-3.25)</td>
<td>CofC Higher</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>3.12 (3.06-3.18)</td>
<td>3.04 (3.01-3.07)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>2.52 (2.44-2.60)</td>
<td>2.48 (2.44-2.52)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>2.68 (2.60-2.76)</td>
<td>2.60 (2.56-2.64)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2.67 (2.60-2.74)</td>
<td>2.64 (2.60-2.68)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>2.54 (2.46-2.62)</td>
<td>2.43 (2.39-2.47)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>1.95 (1.87-2.03)</td>
<td>1.87 (1.78-1.86)</td>
<td>CofC Higher</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>2.63 (2.56-2.70)</td>
<td>2.40 (2.36-2.44)</td>
<td>CofC Higher</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>1.70 (1.63-1.77)</td>
<td>1.54 (1.50-1.58)</td>
<td>CofC Higher</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>2.43 (2.36-2.50)</td>
<td>2.37 (2.33-2.41)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>2.78 (2.71-2.85)</td>
<td>2.43 (2.39-2.47)</td>
<td>CofC Higher</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>2.51 (2.44-2.58)</td>
<td>2.32 (2.28-2.36)</td>
<td>CofC Higher</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>2.52 (2.45-2.59)</td>
<td>2.36 (2.32-2.40)</td>
<td>CofC Higher</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>2.83 (2.76-2.90)</td>
<td>2.79 (2.75-2.83)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>2.88 (2.81-2.95)</td>
<td>2.85 (2.81-2.89)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>2.52 (2.45-2.59)</td>
<td>2.40 (2.36-2.44)</td>
<td>CofC Higher</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>2.44 (2.36-2.52)</td>
<td>2.40 (2.36-2.44)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5F</td>
<td>2.76 (2.69-2.83)</td>
<td>2.62 (2.58-2.66)</td>
<td>CofC Higher</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5G</td>
<td>2.80 (2.73-2.87)</td>
<td>2.80 (2.76-2.84)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Comparison of COFC mean (95% CI) to mean (95% CI) of comparable sustainability group (SG); ²Results from t-tests, note that non-overlapping 95% CIs correspond to p<0.01.
# NSSE Survey Results: CofC Senior Comparison, 2016 vs. 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>2016 SENIORS MEAN (95% CI)</th>
<th>2019 SENIORS MEAN (95% CI)</th>
<th>RESULTS¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>2.18 (2.09-2.27)</td>
<td>2.38 (2.30-2.46)</td>
<td>2019 Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>3.27 (3.19-3.35)</td>
<td>3.38 (3.32-3.44)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>3.09 (3.01-3.17)</td>
<td>3.12 (3.06-3.18)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>2.25 (2.15-2.35)</td>
<td>2.52 (2.44-2.60)</td>
<td>2019 Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>2.53 (2.43-2.63)</td>
<td>2.68 (2.60-2.76)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2.55 (2.45-2.65)</td>
<td>2.67 (2.60-2.74)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>2.35 (2.25-2.45)</td>
<td>2.54 (2.46-2.62)</td>
<td>2019 Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>1.72 (1.63-1.81)</td>
<td>1.95 (1.87-2.03)</td>
<td>2019 Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>2.42 (2.33-2.51)</td>
<td>2.63 (2.56-2.70)</td>
<td>2019 Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>1.60 (1.51-1.69)</td>
<td>1.70 (1.63-1.77)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>2.27 (2.18-2.36)</td>
<td>2.43 (2.36-2.50)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>2.31 (2.22-2.40)</td>
<td>2.78 (2.71-2.85)</td>
<td>2019 Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>2.20 (2.11-2.29)</td>
<td>2.51 (2.44-2.58)</td>
<td>2019 Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>2.29 (2.20-2.38)</td>
<td>2.52 (2.45-2.59)</td>
<td>2019 Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>2.82 (2.73-2.91)</td>
<td>2.83 (2.76-2.90)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>2.78 (2.69-2.87)</td>
<td>2.88 (2.81-2.95)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>2.22 (2.13-2.31)</td>
<td>2.52 (2.45-2.59)</td>
<td>2019 Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>2.24 (2.15-2.33)</td>
<td>2.44 (2.36-2.52)</td>
<td>2019 Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5F</td>
<td>2.55 (2.46-2.64)</td>
<td>2.76 (2.69-2.83)</td>
<td>2019 Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5G</td>
<td>2.69 (2.59-2.79)</td>
<td>2.80 (2.73-2.87)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Comparison of 2019 mean (95% CI) to 2016 mean (95% CI) among COFC seniors
Dissolving this centralized academic leadership in this area does not seem to be congruent with our new strategic plan.