Faculty Senate, Tuesday, October 6, 2020, 5:00 PM
Via Zoom

Voting results are in red.

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM.

2. The September 1, 2020, minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

3. Announcements and Information

   Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis reminded senators that Faculty Research and Development Grant proposals (for Round One, Jan. 1, 2021-May 15, 2021) are due Friday Oct. 16 at 5pm. Applications should be sent to committee chair Professor Michael Larsen.

   Mid-term grades are due Oct. 20.

4. Reports

   a. Speaker Lewis thanked everyone for working to make students’ experiences as normal as possible, especially employees with school-age and pre-school children to care for during the pandemic. He also noted that we have a long haul ahead of us this semester and will likely be working under similar conditions in the spring. He believes that underlying conditions at C of C are good and that enrollments will increase once the COVID crisis passes.

   Speaker Lewis highlighted two agenda items, which he sees as very much in line with the strategic plan: the Environmental Geosciences major proposal and the Race, Equity, and Inclusion (REI) proposal. He reminded senators that the latter proposal is to endorse the report in principle; the specific curricular changes will be scrutinized by multiple faculty committees before returning to the senate.

   b. Provost Suzanne Austin echoed Simon’s thanks and acknowledged the challenges everyone on in the college community has faced this semester. She believes that things have gone as well as we could have expected so far and that the three-week period of remote learning in August and September was helpful in that regard.

   Regarding budget reductions, she said that the 1.5% cut was spread equally to all units on campus. Both she and Chief Financial Officer John Loonan come from institutions where there was a commitment to transparency, and they want to share information and educate the community about the financial situation we find ourselves in. If we change the budget model, she said, we will all be in it together and there will be opportunity for everyone to weigh in.
She and others in senior leadership are increasingly concerned about spring enrollment. If there is a significant decline in enrollments, we may need further budget reductions. The Board of Trustees for the past several months has required a balanced budget, but it won’t be balanced if enrollment declines sharply in the spring.

She pointed out that faculty can apply for two one-year modifications to the tenure clock, and Academic Affairs has added pandemic-related issues to the justifications for such modifications. This policy also covers senior instructors.

Looking ahead to the REI proposal, Provost Austin encouraged those working on the curricular changes to allow faculty colleagues with discipline-specific expertise to deliver REI courses in the way they see fit, so as not to make it more complicated than it needs to be.

Prof. Henry Xie (Guest, Management and Marketing) asked for clarification about the distribution of the budget cuts. Provost Austin reiterated that the 1.5% reduction was applied to all units: the dollar amounts varied, but the percentage was consistent.

Senator Jonathan Neufe (Philosophy) asked if the current budget assumes that the current enrollment will remain stable in the spring, or does it assume a decrease in enrollment? Provost Austin replied that while she would defer to CFO John Loonan for a definitive answer, her understanding is that the budget anticipates a small decline for the spring, which is normal. Her concern is the possibility of a larger-than-usual decline in the spring.

Prof. Lisa Covert (Guest, History) asked if the College is negotiating with the state legislature for increased funding due to the pandemic, and if the board might reconsider requiring a balanced budget. Provost Austin replied that the College did receive federal COVID relief through the state, but that the state is probably going to be facing losses in tax revenue and is unlikely to allocate increased funding to higher education. The Board of Trustees is quite concerned about the College’s finances, which is why they have been requiring a balanced budget.

Senator Bob Podolsky (SSM) asked what proportion of the budget deficit is COVID-related, and if that is a large proportion, why are these cuts said to be permanent? Provost Austin said her understanding is that there was already an eight-million-dollar deficit before COVID hit, and the lower enrollments due to COVID created another three-million-dollar deficit. She does think that once we get out of this difficult situation and enrollments stabilize, some cuts may be restored, but there were structural issues and budget practices that led to the eight-million-dollar shortfall. The institution was spending money on recurring costs using one-time money. We are now trying to create real budgets with recurring funds.
Senator Ashley Pagnotta (Physics and Astronomy) asked, in regard to promotion and tenure, if making the choice to teach online during the pandemic will be held against faculty? Provost Austin replied, absolutely not.

c. Godfrey Gibbison, Interim Dean of the Graduate School

1) Temporary waiver/option on standardized test scores for graduate admissions: Dean Gibbison described the policy as a one-time change with the goal of staying competitive. He said the Graduate School will revisit the issue next year.

2) Proposal for common practices/requirements for bachelor’s-to-master’s combined programs: Dean Gibbison pointed out the need for consistency in rules for accelerated bachelor-to-master’s admissions requirements. He described the research that led to the new policy and outlined the policy itself:

- Once admitted to the ABM (Accelerated Bachelor’s to Master’s) program, students may take graduate courses while still undergraduates.

- Some courses may count toward both the undergraduate and graduate degree, but the number is capped.

- To be eligible for this plan, a student must have earned 90 credit hours and have a minimum GPA of 3.2.

- A maximum of 12 hours of graduate-level coursework may be applied to the bachelor’s degree.

- The total credit hours earned toward the bachelor’s and master’s must be at least 150 credit hours; that is, the credit hours counted toward the bachelor’s degree plus the credit hours taken after the bachelor’s is awarded must total at least 150. 30 hours must be at the graduate level, defined as 500-level or higher.

- This total may also contain a maximum of six credit hours of graduate-level research enrollment.
• The total enrollment for an undergraduate student in any semester that includes a graduate-level course must not exceed 18 hours.

• As determined by the participating bachelor’s program, only 500- and 600-level courses may be substituted for undergraduate program or degree requirements.

• In the case of undergraduate/graduate cross-listed courses, students pursuing a Combined Bachelor’s-to-Master’s Plan must complete the graduate-level course.

Senator Anthony Leclerc (SSM) asked if there were requirements as to the number of hours in a major, to which Dean Gibbison replied that those sorts of specific requirements are left up to the program. The Graduate School is establishing minimum requirements; individual programs can create additional requirements.

Senator Irina Gigova (HSS) asked whether these changes applied only to existing 4+1 programs or to all graduate programs. Dean Gibbison responded that they apply to all graduate programs going forward.

5. New Business

a. Election of Speaker Pro Tempore: Sen. Irina Gigova (HSS) was elected by unanimous consent.

b. Committee on By-Laws and the Faculty-Administration Manual (Merissa Ferrara, Chair): By-Laws revision regarding electronic meetings PDF

Speaker Lewis explained the need for by-laws language to legitimize and guide online meetings. He reported that Parliamentarian George Pothering consulted the latest version of Robert’s Rules of Order and adapted its language for our purposes, with the help of the Committee on the By-Laws and FAM. Speaker Lewis further explained that the Senate will need to convene physically at an outdoor space to approve this change, which will then need to be ratified (electronically) by the full faculty. Assuming it passes, the Senate will be able to legally ratify (at a future online meeting) all votes taken via Zoom during the COVID pandemic. The purpose of this vote is to clear the way for an in-person vote that can be taken without further discussion.
The motion to amend the by-laws was approved unanimously by online vote, with the understanding that there will be an in-person vote on the same motion as soon as possible.

c. Curriculum Committee (Nenad Radakovic, Chair):

1) SOST: Program change

https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2645/form

The proposal was approved unanimously by online vote.

2) GEOL: new major in Environmental Geosciences and two new courses:

https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:163/form

Senator Annette Watson (Political Science) asked what effect the new major will have on the minor, and possible future major, in Environmental Studies, specifically whether it would become a BA as opposed to a BS major.

Professor Tim Callahan (Guest, Geology) responded that the two programs should be complementary and not in competition; he foresees potential engagement between the two programs.

Senator Chris Starr (School of Business) asked how the proposed major connects to the strategic plan, and he asked about justifying a new program during a budget crisis. He made clear that he was not speaking in opposition to the program but rather asking questions that should be asked of all new programs.

Prof. Callahan responded that the program aligns closely with the strategic plan’s emphasis on developing “citizens who create innovative solutions to social, economic and environmental challenges.” He said that by the sixth year of the program they expect to have at least 60 students, and that the program should attract students to the College who would not otherwise enroll here. The department has the faculty to teach the courses, so the costs are modest enough that they would be offset by the tuition of just one new student.

The proposal was approved unanimously by online vote.

d. Senator Jonathan Neufeld (Philosophy), on behalf of the ad hoc Committee on the Creation of a Race, Equity, and Inclusion Requirement:

Resolved: The Senate supports pursuing the proposal for the addition of a two-course Race, Equity, and Inclusion requirement to the undergraduate graduation
requirements at the College of Charleston, and charges the Speaker to move the proposal to an appropriate standing committee for further consideration and implementation.

REI Report

Note: The senate discussion of the committee’s report at the April 2020 meeting can be found in the April minutes.

Professors Anthony Greene (African American Studies) and Morgan Koerner (German and Russian Studies), co-chairs of the ad hoc committee, provided background on the proposal. They pointed out that the committee completed its work in the spring when it brought the proposal to the Senate, but that they are still informally discussing and promoting the initiative. They stressed that most of the courses that would satisfy the REI requirement (as currently described) would double-count with some general education requirement. They do not foresee students being required to take additional credit hours. Prof. Koerner estimated that there are currently 179 course sections that would count for the REI.

Senator Pagnotta (Physics and Astronomy) reported that her department strongly supports the proposal but has some concerns and questions. She conveyed their concern as to whether the number and range of courses would provide students with adequate choices for general education/REI. She asked if training would be provided for instructors who wanted to incorporate REI content into their classes. She asked for clarification as to whether the one-third race-related content meant that (a) courses would be devoted entirely to REI, out of which one third must be about race, or (b) in order to count for the REI requirement, one-third of the course must be about race (while the other two-thirds might not be directly REI-related). And she shared that a member of her department, who is Black, said that any time he has participated in diversity-related training at the college he feels singled out and patronized.

Prof. Koerner responded that there would be a training component. Provost Austin added that she understands that for some professors the REI content is already deeply woven into their courses, while others will be expanding the scope of their course content. She hopes that we can partner with Vice President of Access and Inclusion Renard Harris and the Office of Institutional Diversity to help provide training. She would also like the REI to be a focus for the center for faculty development that she has been promoting.

Responding to Sen. Pagnotta, Prof. Greene, and later Prof. Larry Krasnoff (Guest, Philosophy), clarified that one-third of the overall content of a course would have to be “REI,” and that for the purpose of meeting the requirement, the REI component must, by definition, concern race. Prof. Greene said that the committee expects that many of the qualifying courses will deal with other diversity issues and address
intersectionality, but they were deliberate in making race the defining feature of the REI requirement because of its significance to Charleston and the region, and because diversity requirements often sidestep race.

Senator Tom Carroll (EHHP) asked who would certify the courses, and whether they would go through the Curriculum Committee for approval. He also expressed concern about defining outcomes so that we can know whether or not the program is successful.

Sen. Koerner said that he expects the General Education Committee will certify the courses for REI.

Sen. Irina Gigova (HSS) said that she wants to be sure that the effect of this requirement is not to reify constructs of race. Prof. Greene replied that in fact the whole idea behind the proposal is to question rather than reify constructs of race.

Sen. Anthony Leclerc said that the meaning of the requirement ought to be better defined, and that the choice of two courses to meet the requirement seems arbitrary. He added that in terms of the distribution of courses, some departments will be much more affected than others. Senator Bob Mignone (Mathematics) suggested making the requirement a single course, at least initially, in order to see what the impact is. Prof. Koerner responded that when the committee considered a one-course requirement, the REI component was the entire course. They favor a more integrated approach in which race and inclusion issues presented in one course can be revisited in a later course.

Prof. Chris Korey (Guest, Biology) suggested that the proposal will have a positive impact on teaching simply by encouraging us to think more about how we teach and the kinds of scholars we include in our classes.

The resolution was approved by an online vote of 39-6, with two abstentions.

6. Constituents’ General Concerns

Senator Thomas Ivey (Mathematics) voiced his concern that random COVID testing on campus is not actually happening. Voluntary random testing is not random, he said, and people are not responding in sufficient numbers to provide a meaningful sample. As a result, the numbers the College is reporting may lead to a false sense of security. He called upon the College to make its testing truly random and mandatory, so that we can get a sufficient sample size.

7. The meeting adjourned at 6:48.
The Graduate School of the University of Charleston, S.C. at the College of Charleston remains sensitive to the ongoing challenges people from across the globe face due to the coronavirus pandemic.

In response to these challenges, The Graduate School is temporarily waiving requirements for standardized test scores from the GRE, GMAT, MAT, PRAXIS, and any other accepted test. This waiver applies to applicants seeking admission to a graduate program for the Spring 2021, Summer 2021, and Fall 2021 terms. This waiver does not apply to international applicants whose primary language is not English; those applicants must still provide official scores from an accepted English proficiency exam (TOEFL, IELTS).

In order to holistically evaluate applicants, program’s admissions’ committee may request that applicants submit writing samples, resumes, participate in interviews, or other materials in order to reach an admission decision. Applicants may submit a standardized test score if they choose.

At this time, applicants to the Child Life program are not eligible for this waiver.
FACULTY ORGANIZATION AND BY-LAWS
Proposed changes to allow for electronic meetings. All sections not relevant have been removed for brevity.

Preamble

These by-laws and all amendments shall constitute the rules and regulations governing the conduct and procedures of the faculty of the College of Charleston in the performance of its duties. They establish the Faculty Senate as the primary legislative body of the faculty.

Article II. College Faculty Meetings

Section 1. Ordinary Faculty Meetings

H. Whenever the Speaker of the Faculty determines that exceptional circumstances exist that would prevent the full faculty from meeting in-person, the Speaker may designate that an extraordinary meeting of the faculty will be an electronic (virtual) meeting in which participation will be carried out remotely and in which the verification of a quorum will occur electronically. (Rev. May 2009, Sept. 2020)

Article IV. Faculty Senate

Section 4. Meetings of the Faculty Senate

N. Whenever the Speaker of the Faculty determines that exceptional circumstances exist that would prevent the Faculty Senate from meeting in-person, the Speaker may designate that a regular or special meeting of the Senate will be an electronic (virtual) meeting in which participation will be carried out remotely and in which the verification of a quorum will occur electronically. (Rev. Sept. 2020)

Article V. Committees [Section 1]

H. Meetings of committees shall be called by the Chairs of the committees or by 50% of the members of the committees. Whenever the committee chair determines that exceptional circumstances exist that would prevent the committee from meeting in-person, the chair, or a simple majority of the committee membership, may designate that a meeting of the committee will be an electronic (virtual) meeting in which participation will be carried out remotely and in which the verification of a quorum will occur electronically. (Rev. Sept., 2020)
ARTICLE VI. Meetings Held Electronically.

Except as otherwise provided in these bylaws, meetings of the Faculty, the Faculty Senate, or a committee that are to be conducted electronically through the use of an Internet meeting service will support anonymous voting and will support visible displays identifying those participating, identifying those seeking recognition to speak, showing (or permitting the retrieval of) the text of pending motions, and showing the results of votes. These electronic meetings shall be subject to all rules adopted by these bylaws or standing rules to govern them, which may include any reasonable limitations on, and requirements for the members’ participation. Any such rules incorporated into these bylaws or standing rules shall supersede any conflicting rules in the parliamentary authority, but may not otherwise conflict with or alter any rule or decision of the Faculty, Faculty Senate, or their committees. An anonymous vote conducted through the designated Internet meeting service shall be deemed a ballot vote, fulfilling any requirement in the bylaws or rules that a vote be conducted by ballot.

Article VII. Amending Procedures

Section 1. Senate Option for Amendment Introduction

Motions for amendment or repeal of these by-laws may be made in writing at any meeting of the Faculty Senate. Unless made initially by the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, the motion shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the Senate its recommendations on the motion originating elsewhere and any amendments at the next Senate meeting. Motions made by the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual can be considered at the Senate meeting at which they are introduced. Motions to amend or repeal these by-laws require a two-thirds vote in the Senate for approval. Approved motions must then be ratified by a simple majority of regular faculty members voting by electronic ballot on the motion. (Rev. Jan. 2007; April 2013)

Section 2. Extraordinary Meeting Option for Amendment Introduction

Motions for amendment or repeal of these by-laws may be made in writing at any extraordinary meeting of the College faculty. The motion shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the faculty its recommendation on the motion and any amendments at a second extraordinary faculty meeting called by the Speaker of the Faculty to consider the motion. The faculty will then vote on the motion to amend or repeal the by-laws. It shall be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the membership voting, provided a quorum is present. (Rev. May 2009)
STANDING RULES OF THE FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON

6. Meetings of the College faculty and Faculty Senate shall be held in a place conducive to full and free debate.

7. Conduct of Electronic Meetings

If the Speaker has determined that meetings of the Faculty or the Faculty Senate are to be conducted electronically, the faculty Secretary shall distribute at least one week prior to the first such meeting a set of guidelines clarifying how the parliamentary authority will apply to the conduct of electronic meetings. Nothing in those guidelines may conflict with anything else in these by-laws or other standing rules.

8. Media coverage of College faculty and Faculty Senate meetings shall adhere to the following guidelines:

   a. Attendance at College faculty and Faculty Senate meetings will be first cleared through the Office of Marketing and Communications.

   b. The media will set up equipment prior to the faculty or Faculty Senate meeting.

   c. The media will be restricted to a set location determined by the Speaker of the Faculty and the Office of Marketing and Communications.

   d. Camera lights will not be allowed during the proceedings.

9. Smoking cigarettes, cigars and pipes is prohibited at all official working sessions of the faculty to include College faculty, Faculty Senate, department, school and committee meetings.
Executive Summary

Report from Adhoc Committee on the Creation of a Race, Equity, and Inclusion Requirement

The following report presents the rationale for the Adhoc Committee’s recommendation that the College of Charleston begin planning and implementation of a 6 credit hour (two 3-credit hour courses), campus-wide undergraduate Race, Equity, and Inclusion requirement.

The opening introduction segment recounts the genesis of the Committee’s formation and makeup and concludes with the specifics of the recommendation. Namely the Race, Equity, and Inclusion requirement be so articulated that the courses are not part of a GenEd requirement, but rather a requirement analogous to the First Year Experience Program, that 1/3 of each course focus on race/racism in its content and that the courses can be offered in any discipline, and that one of the required courses focuses on Race, Equity and Inclusion in the US and the other explores Race, Equity, and Inclusion in a Global Context.

The second section of the report focuses on the rationale for the recommendation, beginning with a subsection that explains the recommendation for a curricular requirement that focuses explicitly on race, equity, and inclusion. The section first discusses how changing national demographics, workforce needs, and student demands support the need for a requirement, and then explains the reasoning for recommending that 1/3 of each of the two courses focus explicitly on issues of race and racism. In a nutshell, the Committee concludes that for the purposes of a rigorous academic curriculum, diversity is not an explicit enough term to ensure that the requirement addresses the issues of racism that are part of the past and present of Charleston and the College of Charleston. Thus articulated as a requirement that addresses race and its intersections with other issues of equity and inclusion, the requirement will go further towards helping students confront racism effectively and increase their ability and determination to see and intervene in other forms of discrimination.

The next section of the rationale explains the reasoning for a two 3-credit hour course requirement by discussing the Ad Hoc Committee’s research subcommittee’s findings from their analysis of 23 diversity and ethnic studies requirements at universities across the country. Here the Committee discusses different diversity requirement models and their documented shortcomings and finds that a two-course requirement is best suited to promote a rigorous and academic treatment of the topics as well as more likely to reduce implicit bias among students and the frequency of racially charged incidents on campus. This subsection concludes with a discussion of what the courses could look like and a justification for a US and globally focused course.

In the third section, the Committee outlines a recommended timeline for implementation of the REI requirement at the College of Charleston, which is largely based on the First Year Experience’s model. The goal is to run a pilot program in the 2021-22 year and then launch the program as an official requirement for the 2022-23 academic year.
Report and Recommendation from the Ad Hoc Committee on the Creation of a Race, Equity, and Inclusion Requirement

I. Introduction and Recommendation

At the Nov. 5th 2019 senate meeting, the Senate passed a motion proposed by the Committee on General Education that the Faculty Speaker form an *ad hoc* committee to research and plan a diversity requirement as part of the required curriculum at the College of Charleston. The Committee on General Education formulated the rationale for this charge as follows:

Over the last few years, there have been increasing calls for diversity/racial justice initiatives on campus to include curricular elements. Following the Board of Trustees approval of the *College of Charleston Diversity Strategic Plan (DSP)* in April 2012, Provost Hynd charged a 10-person ad hoc committee to review the DSP’s Goal #4: “infuse diversity into the curriculum”; and the corresponding benchmark: “[b]y the fifth year of the current plan, all incoming and degree-seeking undergraduate students will be required to complete diversity-related experiences in one or more of their courses.” On March 20, 2013, the committee submitted a 5-page report that included the recommendation that “the Senate create and the Provost and faculty approve a “Committee for Diversity in the Curriculum” and that “all students entering the College after Spring 2017 complete a credit-bearing, diversity-related experience as a requirement of graduation.” Unfortunately, no formal action was taken on the report.

More recently, in spring 2019, following a series of disturbing racial incidents on campus, the student group I-CAN (Intersectional Cougar Action Network) approached the Committee on General Education with a request and some suggestions for a curricular diversity requirement. The current Strategic Planning process may be an ideal context for such an initiative to take place.

The Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis subsequently reached out to faculty members from across campus to form an Ad Hoc Committee tasked with creating a report and recommendation for the Senate. The initial committee consisted of Anthony Greene (AAST), Morgan Koerner (German), Julia McReynolds-Perez (Sociology). The Ad Hoc Committee first convened on December 6th, 2019, elected Anthony Greene and Morgan Koerner as Co-chairs of the Committee, and split into two subcommittees: a research subcommittee chaired by Julia

---

McReynolds-Perez (together with Judy Milleson, Nenad Radokovic, Kristi Brian, and Anthony Greene) to explore diversity curricular requirements in higher education in North America as well as research on the efficacy of diversity requirements; and, a strategic subcommittee tasked with looking at existing models at the College of Charleston (Morgan Koerner, Charissa Owens, Jason Vance). The Committee then reconvened on January 24th, 2020 and February 21st, 2020, to discuss the subcommittee’s findings; based on those findings and our discussion, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the College of Charleston:

- introduce a 6 credit hour (two 3-credit hour courses), campus-wide undergraduate Race, Equity, and Inclusion (REI) Requirement for all undergraduate students, with one course focusing on Race, Equity, and Inclusion in the United States and one focusing on Race, Equity, and Inclusion in a global context.
- articulate the requirement so that 1/3rd of each course covers race/racism in its content and that the courses can be offered in any discipline.
- implement the REI requirement not as a GenEd requirement, but rather as a requirement as analogous to the First Year Experience: a curricular requirement that might be satisfied by courses inside or outside of the General Education program and tagged for audit by degree works.
- determine and provide the necessary funding to implement the REI requirement.
- take immediate steps to implement an REI requirement, with the goal of piloting REI courses in the 2021/22 academic year and instituting the requirement for incoming freshmen in the 2022/23 academic year.

The following report lays out the rationale for these suggestions and then presents a model timeline for implementation.

II. Rationale

A. The Rationale for a Race, Equity and Inclusion requirement

There has never been a more relevant time for making the case to include a race, equity, and inclusion requirement in the undergraduate curriculum at the College of Charleston. The requirement will play a critical role in the College of Charleston’s implementation of its new strategic plan, which includes diversity, equity, and inclusion as well as sustainability as two of its key components. The following narrative discusses national factors that justify the need for an undergraduate Race, Equity, and Inclusion requirement—changing demographics, workforce demands, and student expectations—and then discusses the rationale for recommending that the curricular requirement explicitly address issues of race in 1/3rd of its content.
Changing Demographics
Findings from a Pew Research Center survey indicate Generation Z (those born after 1996) is “the country's most racially and ethnically diverse generation and is on its way to becoming the best-educated generation yet.” By the year 2025, 75% of the global workforce will be made up of millennials and those from GenZ. This group will occupy the majority of leadership roles over the coming decade and they will be responsible for making important decisions that affect workplace cultures and people's lives. While it is true that this group already has a unique perspective on diversity, viewing “diversity as a melding of varying experiences, different backgrounds, and individual perspectives,” college campuses have an opportunity to cultivate and grow these perspectives in ways that have been unprecedented in the past. This generation of students is more interested, willing, and receptive to conversations about race, equity, and inclusion as well as how to create an ideal workplace with a supportive environment that gives space to varying perspectives on issues that affect people’s lives.

Workplace Demands
We live in a complex, interconnected world where diversity, shaped by changing national demographics, globalization, and technological innovation. Notwithstanding this interconnectedness, there is also growing polarization fueled by identity politics and the resurgence of nationalist ideals. Significant demographic shifts in the U.S. workforce, involving age, race, gender, religion, and other individual identity characteristics are giving public, private, and nonprofit organizations unprecedented opportunities to bring new ideas and perspectives to their staff teams, encourage organizational innovation, and engage community in new ways.

Employers from the public, private, and nonprofit sectors intuitively recognize that diversity is good for the bottom line; whether that bottom line is related to profit, public value, or mission-related goals and objectives. And, there are a number of initiatives across all three sectors that indicate diversity is becoming (if it is not already) a key part of organization culture. Consistent with these ideas, findings from a research study conducted by the National Association of Colleges and Employers identified eight competencies associated with career readiness (which interestingly correspond to the documented benefits of diversity). The report notes that employers are looking for employees who can not only work collaboratively in teams and exhibit critical thinking and problem-solving skills, they also want employees who have the capacity to “value, respect, and learn from diverse cultures, races, ages, genders, sexual orientations, and religions...[and who can] demonstrate, openness, inclusiveness, sensitivity, and the ability to interact respectfully with all people and understand individuals’ differences.”
Given these findings along with increased activity in the workplace focused on how to create more open, diverse, and inclusive work environments, college campuses have a moral imperative to consider how the curricular content offered to students prepares them for professional success.

**Student Expectations**

On January 16, 2016, *Higher Education Today*, a blog published by the American Council on Education, categorized and summarized a list of demands from students across the continent expressing a desire to “end systemic and structural racism on campus(es).” The report clearly indicated that over two-thirds of the demands call for curricular revisions or additions. “These demands range from charging the university to revise the entire campus curriculum to include diverse perspectives and inclusive pedagogies, to curriculum development in specific areas of study. Student groups that presented the demands also want to incorporate diversity or cultural competency courses into the required curriculum.” At a time when the nation’s young people are more aware of and sensitive to the systemic issues that have privileged some groups over others, it seems not only prudent, but responsible to provide students with the tools they need to engage in difficult conversations, value alternative perspectives, and cultivate a trusting environment where all ideas are welcomed and employees feel comfortable and empowered to be their authentic selves.

**The Case for the 1/3 Race Emphasis in the Curriculum Requirement**

The Committee recommends that the REI course requirement be articulated so that at least 1/3 of each course focus on issues of race. This recommendation follows trends in higher education pedagogy and scholarship that stress the need for increased racial literacy among college students (DiAngelo 2018, Sept 18; Verduzco 2019, March 18). While most colleges and universities nation-wide have used the language of *diversity and inclusion* for recruiting and retention purposes, educators have a responsibility to offer a specifically *anti-racist* curriculum to inform students on how racism produces systemic inequities (Lynch et al, 2017). The Committee recommends the *Race, Equity and Inclusion* requirement as a means of deepening our students’ understanding of processes of racialization; providing a rigorous examination of racism at the intersections of other forms of inequity (such as gender, economic class, ability, sexuality, citizenship status, etc.); and, supporting students in developing practices of inclusion in their academic analysis and interpersonal actions. In short, the requirement will equip students to develop a racial equity lens which will empower them to assess the impact of other forms of injustice as well.

---

3 Respondents represented 73 U.S. colleges and universities, three Canadian universities, one coalition of universities, and one consortium of Atlanta HBCUs.
As a Committee we are morally and professionally compelled to lead the charge for a curricular enhancement to advance the racial literacy of our graduates and our institution. This renewed initiative comes as a response to several local, racially-charged incidents. The Halloween incident of 2017 involved CofC students making light of the death of Freddy Gray, an African American man who died in police custody. The following year, members of our softball team mocked Latin American immigrants in their Halloween costumes. The spring of 2019 saw another campus protest as students became aware of their white peers depicting themselves as slave masters while on a College of Charleston field trip. Photographs and videos from all three bias-incidents made headlines.

As a historically white institution, the College of Charleston has a troubled past involving college presidents who were slave owners, endowments involving profits from slave auctions, a campus built using enslaved labor, and a deliberate strategy of privatization to avoid racial integration until 1967. The violence and tensions of our recent past make examining this institutional history unavoidable. The Mother Emanuel massacre of 2015 was carried out by a self-avowed white supremacist just blocks away from campus. The year before, the College made national headlines for the controversial appointment of Glen McConnell as president, which highlighted McConnell’s outspoken support and enthusiasm for South Carolina’s Confederate history.

The College of Charleston is embedded in a city that has never sufficiently addressed its need for racial healing and racial justice. The State of Racial Disparities in Charleston County, South Carolina 2000–2015 report “specifically identifies policies, practices, and structural arrangements of power that maintain a social environment where black residents are overwhelmingly impacted by pervasive inequities in education, employment, housing and gentrification, public health, policing, and racialized violence” (2017, 1). This report commissioned by the Race and Social Justice Initiative, a College of Charleston collaborative effort led by the Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture, should serve as a directive for us as an institution to develop concrete actions to address these local racial disparities. The REI requirement is one such action, and the report itself could be incorporated as part of the curriculum in some of the REI courses.

In recognition of the historical reality that 40% of all enslaved people in the U.S. passed through Charleston ports, we have an obligation to educate our students through a racial equity lens that helps them understand how slavery, white supremacy, and well documented racial

---

4 Barry Stiefel (CofC Associate Professor in the Department of Art and Architectural History, Historic Preservation & Community Planning Program) has a working paper that identifies former presidents Jasper Adams (served 1824-1826, 1828-1838) and William Peronneau Finley (served 1845-1857) as owning enslaved people as documented through archival documents, Bill of Sale, and the Slave Schedule of the 1850 U.S. Federal Census. Documentation of the auctioning of enslaved people for the financial bond endowment for the College of Charleston is available through the College of Charleston Trustees’ Minutes, Special Collections Department, Addlestone Library, Vol 1.
disparities shape our experiences in the Low Country and beyond. This recommended REI requirement aligns with the College’s recent association with the Universities Studying Slavery (USS) consortium and the efforts of our own Center for the Study of Slavery in Charleston. These initiatives put the College of Charleston in good company with other universities including Brown, Harvard, Georgetown, the University of Virginia, the College of William and Mary, and the Citadel who understand that institutional histories ought to serve as learning opportunities not hidden secrets. Fortunately, we will also soon have the International African American Museum to assist us in educating our students and the public on Charleston’s history that must become a future of racial reconciliation. The *Race, Equity and Inclusion* requirement will prepare students and faculty to make a meaningful contribution toward that future.

Extensive research indicates that students of color and white students all benefit from courses that incorporate historical analysis and intentional dialogue aimed at reducing bias and increasing empathy for multiple forms of oppression (Parker, et al 2016). When students are able to confront racism effectively, they increase their ability and determination to see and intervene in other forms of discrimination. The overall objective of the *Race, Equity and Inclusion* requirement is to create communities of practice where students become confident and fluent in recognizing and disrupting the status quo of inequity in the U.S. and globally.

**B. Rationale for requiring two 3-credit courses**

The research subcommittee compiled a list of 23 institutions of higher learning that have some form of Diversity or Ethnic Studies requirement in their undergraduate curriculum. This list is by no means exhaustive. Two dominant models emerge as we reviewed the evidence on different ways in which this requirement has been implemented at other campuses. (For additional details, see the links to our complete spreadsheet of programs reviewed, and our working document at the end of this document.)

Five of these institutions have two-course (or, in one case, three-course) diversity requirements. These are West Virginia University, Florida State University, Georgetown, University of Vermont, and the University of Colorado at Boulder. The most common model among these five institutions is one course with a US-focus and a second course with an international focus. Georgetown has a particularly interesting model in that their two-course diversity requirement is part of a broader campus reckoning with a past history of institutional support of slavery and other campus initiatives to support racial justice. Beloit College, although it does not have a diversity requirement per se, also came to our attention as having an Andrew Mellon-funded project on Decolonizing Pedagogies that may be relevant to efforts to better train and support faculty who teach and engage with issues of race and justice.
The more common model we found was the one-course diversity/ethnic studies requirement. Some version of this model was in place at the other 18 institutions that we documented. The description and implementation of this model varied quite a bit, and in ways that raised concerns that we would do well to be aware of. On some campuses, the concept of diversity was so broadly defined that it resulted in problems for course assessment and implementation. This created problems for defining good course inclusion criteria. There were also issues when the course inclusion criteria were unclear as to the amount of class time that must be dedicated to issues of diversity or race in order for course inclusion. The University of Wisconsin at Madison was illustrative. Their Ethnic Studies requirement is intended to focus on issues of marginalized racial and ethnic minorities and/or indigenous peoples in the United States. Yet more than 20 years after its implementation, an assessment effort discovered that Anthropology 101, the course that a plurality of students took to fulfill the requirement, often included no more than 1-2 weeks of course content specifically related to race or ethnicity.

The one-course diversity/ethnic studies requirement is the more common model. But as we detail below, evidence on the success of this model is mixed, and several of the institutions where this requirement has been in place for some time are now debating the merits of this system with student and/or faculty pressure to expand to a two-course model or add other components in order to strengthen the effectiveness of the diversity/ethnic studies requirement.

**Evidence of Success of Programs**

For the last couple of decades, many universities in the US have implemented the diversity requirement. Consequently, there have been studies and reports on the effectiveness and impact of these programs. Many studies support the claim that diversity requirements have a positive impact on student learning. For example, Chang (2002) found that a diversity requirement at a public school in the Northeast had significantly diminished racial prejudice towards African Americans even when students were not taking classes related to Black history and culture. Case (2007) showed that enrolling in a single course in psychology about racial bias can increase student awareness of White privilege and racism as well as increase their support for diversity and inclusion. Some research goes beyond racial biases to document other positive effects on students who have completed the diversity requirement. For example, Parker et al. (2016) showed that diversity and social justice courses contribute positively to college students’ moral development.

The limitations of one-course diversity requirements are well documented. For example, students at Boston College expressed that a one-course diversity requirement is not enough to improve racial justice and the climate at the school, and suggested increasing the diversity
requirement to two courses (Bockus, 2017, October 31). Similarly, following the assessment and evaluation of the effectiveness of a 20-year-old diversity requirement at University of Wisconsin at Madison, it has been suggested that the requirements should be expanded to two 3-credit courses in order to address the pitfalls of the program. The purpose of the expansion is to make the requirement more rigorous and also to serve as a vehicle for recruiting more diverse faculty who can teach these courses (Editorial, 2019, March 7). The assessment of the diversity requirement for some students at University of Michigan suggests that the 3-credit requirement is not enough to improve racial justice on campus and reduce the frequency of racist incidents. It has been suggested that the university should introduce courses for all undergraduates that have clear student learning outcomes connected to an understanding of race and ethnicity (Editorial, 2018, April 10).

Based on the above findings, the recommendation of the Committee is that the College of Charleston introduces a two 3-credit course diversity requirement for all undergraduates. The courses should have a clear set of student learning outcomes connected to race and justice. The Committee recommends that one of the courses focus on Race, Equity, and Inclusion in the United States and the other focus on Race, Equity, and Inclusion in a global context. The courses could appear as follows:

- **Race, Equity, and Inclusion 1: Race, Equity, and Inclusion in the US**
  One 3-credit course whose focus is on Race, Equity, and Inclusion in the US. It is recommended that students take this course as early as possible after matriculation at CofC. Courses must spend at least 1/3 of course time on issues of race and racism as they relate to Equity and Inclusion. In other words, courses that treat issues related to equity and inclusion in the US, including but not limited to courses on gender, sexuality, religion, ability, and marginalized populations, would count towards the requirement provided that 1/3 of the course content focuses on race in the US. This course may include a graded assignment related to an experiential component outside the classroom over the course of the semester. This experiential requirement would present an opportunity for campus and community engagement, such as student group visits to the International African American Museum, small projects using resources at the Avery Research Center, and others.

- **Race, Equity, and Inclusion 2: Race, Equity and Inclusion in a Global Perspective**
  A second 3-credit course whose focus is on Race, Equity and Inclusion in a global perspective. Courses must spend at least 1/3 of course time on issues of race and racism. In other words, courses that cover issues related to equity and inclusion in a global context, including but not limited to courses on gender, sexuality, religion, ability, and marginalized populations, would count towards the requirement provided that 1/3rd of the course content focuses on race and racism in a global context.
The Committee recommends this two-part sequence with the goal of providing students with a holistic understanding of the impact of European colonialism and its intersections with other issues involving equity and inclusion. Racism, and its effects, are not exclusively situated in the United States. Yet, the fundamental role and consequences of racism in the U.S. are particularly unique. However, there are significant intersecting experiences with the U.S. and the rest of the world who are by-products of colonialism and imperialism. Charleston is situated as a great example of both unique racial histories, but remains distinctively connected abroad, specifically to the Caribbean (Barbados) and Africa (Liberia). These overlaps can be seen in Charleston's food culture, architecture, and language.

III. Recommendations for Implementation

To optimize the amount of work and planning required to initiate the REI Curriculum, the implementation process consists of multiple phases. The phases are manageable steps where the expertise and workload of faculty and staff stakeholders are taken into careful consideration in order to initiate a high-quality REI Curriculum for the College. These phases include the development of the pilot REI Curriculum Program for the two next academic years (2020/21 and 2021/22) with the goal of implementing the full REI Curriculum requirement for all students for the 2022/23 academic year. A proposed initiation budget and annual budget is included at the end of this section.

Planning & Development

Phase 1: Planning & Development (Tentative Time Frame: August 2020 - December 2020)

Designated as the planning and development phase, the REI Implementation Committee will be defined and established. The REI Implementation Committee will fulfill the following responsibilities during the Summer 2020 and Fall 2020 semesters.

1. Oversee an internal CofC search for an REI Director
2. Oversee an internal CofC search for an REI Assistant
3. The transition from an REI Implementation Committee to the REI Oversight Committee, which will be composed of the following:
   a. Nine faculty members from each academic school (9 schools)
   b. Two staff members (Registrar's Office and Office of Diversity)
   c. Two student members (one selected by the Student Government Association and one selected by Multicultural Student Programs and Services)

The REI Oversight Committee will be chaired by the REI Director and will report to the Faculty Senate.
Once the REI Oversight Committee is established, the committee is charged with the following responsibilities:

1. Set goals that are Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Time-phased (SMART) or Collaborative, Limited, Emotional, Appreciable and Refinable (CLEAR) for the REI Curriculum Requirement.
2. Define student learning outcomes required of REI courses.
3. Define approval criteria for REI Curriculum coursework that take into consideration The First-Year Experience of Diversity EDU’s SLO’s, transfer credits, and other degree requirements.
4. Conduct a curriculum audit to identify existing courses that meet the REI Curriculum criteria.
5. Conduct an audit to identify existing courses that need minor revision to meet the REI Curriculum Criteria.

**Phase 2: Forecasting** (Tentative Time Frame: January 2021 - June 2021)

The next phase is designated as the forecasting phase portion of the pilot years where the REI Oversight Committee will work closely with respective divisions and offices to complete the following responsibilities.

1. Identify the number of courses needed to meet the demand of freshmen student enrollment during the REI Curriculum initiation year.
2. Collaborate with the Office of the Registrar to develop an application process that designates eligible courses (existing or new) as REI Curriculum courses.
3. Develop a repository of eligible REI Curriculum coursework and schedule for updates (the additions, revisions, deletions of courses).
4. Prepare and promote an introductory roll out of eligible REI courses for registration during the pilot 2021/22 academic year.
5. Collaborate with the Office of Institutional Diversity to create a scope and sequence for a multiday faculty training on creating inclusive classroom environments and using culturally responsive pedagogy, to be offered annually in May along with the model of the FYE training.

**Pilot Year (AY 2021/2022)**

**Phase 3: Performance and Execution** (Tentative Time Frame: June 2021 - June 2022)

The final phase will be the Performance and Execution phase. Incoming freshmen will be expected to fulfill the REI Curriculum as a degree requirement starting this academic year. The REI Oversight Committee is charged with collaborating with key divisions and offices to roll out the new degree requirement.
During this phase, the REI Oversight Committee will also oversee and monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the REI Curriculum Program. The regular collection and review of data will ensure the quality of the REI Curriculum. The committee will use data collected from the performance indicators and REI Curriculum SLO’s to:

1. Determine the program’s progress towards the SMART or CLEAR goals.
2. Determine whether courses are meeting the learning objectives of the REI Curriculum. Based on the progress towards the program goals, the Committee can target their efforts to improve the program each year. Data from the performance indicators will inform the committee whether courses may continue as designated REI Curriculum coursework or be removed as a designated REI Curriculum course. The evaluation of the REI Curriculum Program and REI Curriculum courses should be done on a rotating schedule with reports prepared on a regular basis for reporting to appropriate campus leaders.

**Continuation Years (AY 2022/2023 and onward)**

**Phase 4: Continuation** (Tentative Time Frame: June 2022 and onward)
Evidence-based improvements during the performance and execution phase will produce the formal REI Curriculum Program and REI Curriculum coursework as a standing requirement for all students. Regular program assessment and course evaluation based on REI Curriculum data will support the program’s effectiveness and sustain high quality.
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