

Faculty Senate, Tuesday, October 5, 2021 5:00 PM
Meeting via Zoom

Minutes

1. Speaker Simon Lewis called the meeting to order at 5:01 pm
2. **Approved August 31, 2021 minutes by unanimous consent**
3. Minute of silence in memory of Jeff Triplehorn, Biology faculty who passed away in September 2021
4. Announcements and Information
 - a. Speaker Simon Lewis announced:

Jeff's memorial slide and others will now be available on Faculty Senate web page along with recognitions of notable achievements.

- Covid dashboard says down to 15 cases.
- Midterm grades due when Fall Break ends.
- Explained how votes during Senate meetings will be handled via Zoom and that votes are legitimate immediately due to recent by-laws change. Remember that you can speak only twice on any topic and announce yourself before you speak.

5. Reports
 - a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis – Surveys of faculty have been informative. Committees doing great work. All committees are very active doing much work that we will hear about throughout the semester. Encourages all to inform themselves about the RCM model and to be prepared to submit their thoughts when asked.
 - b. Provost Suzanne Austin –
 - Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning – up and running with Margaret Hagood as Inaugural Director – Visit CETL.cofc.edu to find information about programs – Center intended to be mechanism for faculty community building; resource for all levels of faculty for professional development; look for a survey about what faculty want CETL to provide; Wellness and Wellbeing Workshop to happen soon.
 - 36 new and visiting faculty members admitted this fall. Provost Austin believes this to be the most diverse cohort in a long time, if not ever: 59% from underrepresented groups, 11% LatinX and 11% black – Overall at CofC: 49% female, 16% underrepresented
 - T&P beginning and going well
 - Surveys of Deans' performance will be distributed before end of October – please let us know how your Dean is doing
 - REI proposal – President Hsu and Provost Austin are supportive of this. Assuming passed during tonight's vote, they will work to find funding for a director for REI.
 - Questions:
 - Q: Beth Goodier – When will results of Deans' surveys be released?
 - A: Usually 60-90 days. Deans will host meeting to address the results and try to gain input on how to move forward.
 - Q: Bob Mignone (Math, At Large SSM) – Time when mask mandate will be reevaluated?
 - A: As far as Provost knows, there are no plans to lift it yet. Will make sure that all are notified of next plans.
 - c. Strategic Enrollment (Sarah Neher for Kennedy & Co.)

Sarah Neher presented a slide presentation indicating 1) what Kennedy & Co has learned through their interviews/meetings with College of Charleston stakeholders and 2) the 5-year goals that are suggested based on what was learned.

- Learned:
 1. Need to diversify enrollment streams that come into College. Shouldn't come just from freshmen. Need growth in transfers and more graduate admissions. Expansions into Engineering will help. Retention is important to revenue
 2. Recruiting – European recruiting, improved external communication and website, centralize the student scholarship process
 3. Culture & Identity – need vision for CofC identity; historic past of Charleston and College creates diversity challenge; heard over-and-over how wonderful relationships between faculty and students are
- 5-year Enrollment Goals – from what was learned
 1. President wants more competitive freshman acceptance rate
 2. Freshman class size of 2350
 3. More incoming transfers
 4. More incoming graduate students
 5. Weighted freshman discount rate
 6. Increase in incoming freshman scholarships
 7. Improving retention (because retention translates to \$)

Questions:

Q: Jonathan Neufeld (Philosophy, Senator) – What's a good retention rate?

A: Clemson and USC is around 90%. We are at 82%. Hoping to get into upper 80s.

Q: Irina Gigova (History, Senator) – Revenue is set to increase but freshman staying the same; how?

A: Primary increase in revenue from increase in transfers and increase in graduate students and improved retention. Modest tuition increases.

Q: Nathaniel Walker (Art & Architectural History, Senator) – Under the Culture & Identity lessons learned, whose minds gave you the perception that the history of the College causes challenges?

A: Some folks outside of the College, but students, deans and faculty/staff shared that idea – the diversity events/activities at the College are hard to find. While College has lots of diversity programs, going to try to create a centralized location for showcasing these.

d. Board of Trustees Naming Policy and Guiding Principles (Renée Romberger)

- Secretary of the Board of Trustees (BoT) , Renee Romberger, presented information about the drafts of the Naming Policy and Guiding Principles. They want to create a clear policy. Board of Trustees has responsibility for naming buildings and monuments. Have SC Heritage Act which prevents changing of current names and that has been upheld by the SC Supreme Court. Want to tie naming with gifts acceptance policy. Guiding Principles – try to help BOT and future BOT to be consistent in naming process. Studied many policies from other institutions over the past months. – Tried to capture the philosophy around naming. Brown University has a naming policy that is most like the BoT's views. Brown granted permission for our BoT to use their policy as a starting point. Presently, on draft 16 of the Guiding Principles. The process is timely because Racial Inclusion Equity is important, and this is larger than just naming. More about addition than subtraction – how can we add recognition to some who should be recognized (not remove recognition from those already noticed), encouraging recruiting and retaining

minority students. Changed much of the script for campus tour to highlight the work done on our campus by former slaves. Trying to talk with all stake holders: have had 11 meetings with numerous groups and individuals, including Speaker Lewis, SGA, Black Student Union, Foundation Board, Alumni Board, and the Black Alumni group, and is scheduled to meet with Athletic Club.

Questions

Q: Julia Eichelberger (HSS, AtLarge): Thanks for your work. Reminder that faculty has created an ad hoc committee - Committee on Commemoration and Landscapes - Wants to be sure that BoT is aware much of the wording came from that group

A: Definitely impressed with work of that group and finds that committee really important

Q: Julia follow-up: Encourage BoT to remember that you have content experts, researchers, and scholars who would like to help do some of the work related to the policies

Q: Bob Podolsky (SSM, AtLarge) – Where is board in its understanding of Heritage Act and the terms “historic figure”

A: Her understanding is that they have no authority to rename buildings

Ms. Romberger ended with compliment to faculty for having heard during her interviews with students how much faculty know and connect with their students.

6. New Business

a. Curriculum Committee (Xi Cui, Chair)

1. Voted in bundle on i, ii, and iii: **Passed unanimously**

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. HTMT

A. Remove ACCT203 from HTMT minor requirement. [Proposal | Curriculog](#)

iii. CSCI 250

A. Add CSCI 218, in addition to CSCI220 to CSCI 250's pre-req. [Proposal | Curriculog](#)

2. vi. Gen-ed natural science – **Motion passed with 45/48 in favor**

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](#)

Comments from Xi Cui: This change will make it more friendly for transfer students.

Questions:

Q: Ashley Pignota (Physics, Senator) – If there is not a lab's check box, concerned that labs will be accepted that don't meet the learning objects of CofC lab.

A: Chris Korey (Biology) – Doesn't remove lab requirement and there will still be separate approvals. Students may need to make up missed lab hour(s).

3. v. REI requirement - **Approved with 47/50 voting in favor.**

1. A two-course REI requirement will be added to the college curriculum. [Proposal | Curriculog](#)

Discussion:

Anthony Greene (Chair of REI) – Thanks to Provost Austin for promising funding support.

Explained the need to infuse diversity into the curriculum. An earlier proposal had been made in 2012, but the current proposal stemmed from a recommendation from the Gen Ed Committee in November 2019. Morgan Koerner (Co-chair of REI) – challenge from sciences, this will add credit hours to overall major. 74 US sections and 70 global sections are already in place. Honors College, History and Poli-Sci have already created new classes. Provision if transfer student with 45+ hours, will only have to take 1 course. Assessment will be as pragmatic as possible. Not voting tonight on funding but on the proposal. Chance for faculty to say who we are in response to CofC history

Marissa Haynes (Senior at CofC): Learned much related to Critical Race Theory during time at CofC and wants to encourage that this is an important skillset regardless of major. This proposal is an obvious next step.

Zora Brewster (Junior at CofC, President of Black Student Union): This plan is good for sustainable change at the College.

Ryan Thompson (Senior at CofC, President of SGA): Issue in SGA every year brought forward by students, encourages faculty to vote in favor as this will improve critical thinking skills and understanding of our peers.

Chels Hagan (Senior at CofC, Member of iCan and on behalf of PRISM): Will help make other students of color feel safe and accepted by the College and that the College understands the history of black students.

Jerome Stewart (Guest, Asst Prof Management): He mentioned that he accepted the position at CofC because we were doing more than just talking about race, equity and inclusion, we were actually taking action and trying to encourage change. Agree with Zora, we are behind in our requirements, let's make a change that shows the College is taking a strong step to understand diversity.

Andrew Clark (Biology Department, At Large): Agrees that this needs to pass, but this needs to be long term to work. Is there a way that we can have a diverse group teaching these courses not just the minority faculty?

David Hansen (Guest, Entrepreneurship): Agrees it should pass. There is a course in his school that he can teach as a white male that falls in the REI.

Julia McReynolds-Perez (Sociology, Guest, REI Committee Member): Many of the courses already gathered are not taught by faculty of color.

Jocelyn Evans (Assoc Dean School of Business): Business School had already voted separately on the proposal and overwhelmingly approved it; business students need to be able to work in diverse groups. Believes this could be an authentic area of distinction.

Andrew Clark (Biology, At Large): Thanks to colleagues stepping up and doing this. Need to hire more diverse faculty. Glad that we did that this past hiring term.

Chris Korey (Biology, Assoc Dean): I teach a course for HONS and WGS that covers genetics and society that covers this material. It will be a course that can be made a permanent part of the Biology Curriculum to educate STEM students in their own field.

Anthony Greene (Chair of REI): Diversity sessions, Decolonizing the Curriculum, being offered on how to incorporate topics of race into your discipline.

4. vi. SWEN – Motion passed 44/49

Discussion: Computer science is creating a Software Engineering major (SWEN) with a global/cultural minor requirement [Proposal | Curriculog](#) Xi Cui: New major with global component – the Curriculum Committee expressed concerns that high credit hours in Engineering are taking away from liberal arts. But this proposal only has 50 hours in major and 18 hours in minor – minor is in liberal arts field which “builds on liberal arts skills” with minor in LCWA college

Questions:

Q: Nathaniel Walker (Senator, Art & Architectural History): Consider adding minor in Art & Architectural

A: Renee McCauley (Chair, Computer Science): We only considered minors from LCWA

Q: Hector Qirko (Anthropology, Senator): Consider adding minor in Anthropology

A: Tim Johnson (Dean, LCWA): Minors were chosen to help the majors that combined second language acquisition with courses in 300+ level. Other minors could be considered if this is passed.

A: Sebastian van Delden (Dean, SSM): The proposers hadn't intended to exclude any minors. Initially language acquisition but even proposers have changed. Let's talk about adding other minors

5.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. - **Passed unanimously 48/48**

- 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](#)

Discussion:

Xi Cui: EDFs – students will be certified to work with students with varying learning challenges. Is the goal of 100% certification too ambitious – this is in keeping with their current standards.

6. viii. Statistics B.S. – **Passed unanimously 47/47**

Mathematics department is making the statistics track of math major a standalone major. [Proposal | Curriculog](#)

Comment: Dan Greenburg (Chair, Planning Committee) – His committee voted in favor.

- b. General Education Committee (Suanne Ansari, Chair) – **Passed unanimously 47/47**
 - 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 – **Passed unanimously 47/47** *Note this vote was taken twice. The original course number given for deactivation and presented in the agenda was PUBA 632. This was not the correct course number to be deactivated. Once the problem was discovered, a new vote was immediately taken to actually deactivate PUBA 623.
 - A. PUBA 623: course deactivation [Proposal](#) | [Curriculog](#)
 - ii. Languages, MED Poll 1 (reused) – **Passed unanimously 46/46**
 - 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](#) (Jonathon Neufeld – Senator, Philosophy presenting on behalf of Irina Gigova) - **Vote in favor 45/45**
 Discussion: In our August 31 Senate meeting, Claire Wofford outlined the requirements of the REACH Act. She explained why this was a legislative overreach. – After that a committee was formed to express the CofC unease with legislative interference in academic freedoms, propose creation of new committee to create
 Questions:
 Q: Lisa Covert (Guest, President of AAUP) – Working with State AAUP to work on legislative overreach with the REACH ACT
 Q: Larry Krasnoff (Guest, Philosophy) – While he does not believe the REACH Act violates an instructor’s 1st Amendment rights, he appreciates that the resolution addresses what he sees as a definite violation of Academic Freedom, hopes Senate will support this resolution.
6. Constituents’ General Concerns –
 Frank Duvall (Music Department, Adjunct Senator): Hope that a raise will be considered for adjuncts as they contribute heavily to the College’s teaching load. Would appreciate not just a 3% raise but a significant raise.
 Suzanne Austin (Provost) – Raise for adjuncts is “in the budget plan for next fiscal year.”
7. Meeting adjourned at 7:12 pm

Supporting Documents:

In the pages that follow, find

1. A copy of the presentation by Kennedy & Co.
2. A draft of the Naming Policy for CofC Building, Monuments, Academic Schools, Spaces, Programs or Positions
3. A draft of the CofC Guiding Principles for Naming
4. A resolution from the Faculty Senate Regarding Implementation of the REACH Act



KENNEDY & COMPANY



COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON FACULTY SENATE

October 5, 2021

COMPLICATING FACTORS

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.

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

	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025	2025-2026
Net Tuition Revenue	\$ 142.6 M	\$149.4 M	\$156.7 M	\$165.5 M	\$168.2 M
NTR % Change vs Previous Year	12%	5%	4%	5%	1%
Acceptance Rate	76.3%	74.0%	73.0%	71.0%	69.0%
Freshman Class Size	2,440	2,350	2,350	2,350	2,350
Incoming Fall Transfer	620	644	676	710	746
Incoming Graduate	196	216	237	261	287
Weighted Freshman Discount Rate	29%	29%	29%	30%	30%
Incoming Freshman Scholarships	\$10.6 M	\$11.0 M	\$10.7 M	\$11.2 M	\$11.0 M
Additional Growth Potential					
1 Point Retention Growth Each Year	-	\$452K	\$1.2 M	\$1.8 M	\$3.1 M

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	Transfer: 80% In-State
URM 18%	Honors College 275
Spring 2022 300 Transfer 15 Freshman	

**Feb. 9, 2021 (EWK), May 19, 2021 (BC/EWK), June 2, 2021 (BC/EWK),
June 18, 2021 (EWK), July 2, 2021 (EWK), July 19, 2021 (EWK), Aug. 10 (EWK)**

Naming Policy for College of Charleston Buildings, Monuments, Academic Schools, Spaces, Programs or Positions

1.0 Policy Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to define how the College of Charleston manages and approves proposals for the naming of College buildings, monuments, academic schools, spaces, programs or positions in honor of a donor, individual, organization or entity.

2.0 To Whom the Policy Applies

This policy applies to the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston/ University of Charleston, S.C. (the Board), the President, the Executive Vice President of Institutional Advancement, and to any member of the College of Charleston community who engages in management or approval of proposals for the naming of College buildings, monuments, academic schools, spaces, programs or positions.

3.0 Policy Statement

The College may acknowledge gifts and/or honor an individual or organization by naming a building, monument, academic school, space, program or position. Naming is one of the ways in which the College acknowledges the generosity of donors and honors those whose service to or affiliation with the College of Charleston enhances the College. It is the responsibility of the President and the Board to nurture, preserve and protect that legacy.

In considering proposals to name a building, monument, academic school, space, program or position, the President and the Board shall exercise judgment with regard to the individual or entity the proposal is intended to honor and evaluate the proposal based on a set of Guiding Principles developed by the Board.

In accordance with state law, the College reserves the right to rename a building, monument, academic school, space, program or position in the event of unusual or compelling circumstances.

In general, the President and the Board, or those to whom authority to approve naming is delegated, will not approve proposals for naming where, in their judgment, doing so:

(1) Is not aligned with the College's **mission**:

Founded in 1770, the College of Charleston is a public university grounded in the principles of the liberal arts and committed to developing ethically centered, intellectually versatile and globally fluent citizens who create innovative solutions to social, economic and environmental challenges;

(2) Is not aligned with the College's **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.

(3) Compromises the academic freedom of the university community; and/or

(4) Could inflict damage on the College's reputation, standing or integrity through association with the proposed name.

3.1 Naming a College Building or Monument

Proposals for the naming of a College building or monument associated with a gift must be submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President for Institutional Advancement (as noted in the College of Charleston Gift Acceptance Policy, 4.2). The proposal must include a description of the building or monument to be named, its current use and any relevant information regarding the history of the facility, together with a description of the name proposed and its significance to the College, including the amount of the gift and the identity of the donor(s).

If the Executive Vice President in accordance with the process outlined in the Gift Acceptance Policy 4.2 supports the proposal, it shall be forwarded to the Office of the President for review by the President and, if approved by the President, inclusion on the agenda of the next scheduled meeting of the Board of Trustees Development, Alumni, Governmental and External Relations Committee (DAGER Committee) to make a recommendation to the full Board for consideration and final approval. If timing or other special considerations merit urgency, the Board may opt to consider the proposal via a specially called meeting.

In the naming of buildings, a distinction should generally be made between the name of the facility and the name of the program housed in the facility. Since programs, centers, institutes, labs and departments may from time-to-time change, grow, move, merge or dissolve, the College will generally distinguish between the name of the facility and the name of the program or programs it houses.

3.2 Naming a College Academic School

Proposals for the naming of a College academic school associated with a gift must be submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President for Institutional Advancement (as noted in the College of Charleston Gift Acceptance Policy, 4.2). The proposal must include a description of the school to be named, together with a description of the name proposed and its significance to the College, including the amount of the gift and the identity of the donor(s).

If the Executive Vice President in accordance with the process outlined in the Gift Acceptance Policy 4.2 supports the proposal, it shall be forwarded to the Office of the President for review by the President and, if approved by the President, inclusion on the agenda of the next scheduled meeting of the Board of Trustees DAGER Committee to make a recommendation to the full Board for consideration and final approval. If timing or other special considerations merit urgency, the Board may opt to consider the proposal via a specially called meeting.

3.3 Naming a College Space, Program or Position

Proposals for the naming of a College space (including, but not limited to, fields, terraces, greens and courtyards), program (including, but not limited to, centers, departments, institutes, labs, scholarships, fellowships, lectures, societies and awards) or position (including, but not limited to, deanships, professorships and coaches) associated with a gift must be submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President for Institutional Advancement (as noted in the College of Charleston Gift Acceptance Policy, 4.2). The proposal must include a description of the space, program or position to be named, its current use and any relevant information regarding its history, together with a description of the name proposed and its significance to the College, including the amount of the gift and the identity of the donor(s).

As outlined in the College of Charleston Gift Acceptance Policy, if the Executive Vice President supports the proposal, it shall be forwarded to the President for review and approval.

3.4 Duration of Naming

Naming for an honoree or a donor is generally granted for the useful life of the entity. The College may deem the naming period concluded in certain circumstances, including, but not limited to:

- If the purpose for which the named entity is or needs to be significantly altered or is no longer needed/ceases to exist.
- If a physical entity is replaced, significantly renovated or no longer habitable/usable.
- The period of time of the naming specified in the gift agreement has expired.

The appropriate College representative will make all reasonable efforts to inform in advance the original donors or honorees when the naming period is deemed concluded. The College may provide alternate recognition as may be appropriate in recognition of the original gift or honor.

3.5 Right to Rename a College Building, Monument, Academic School, Space, Program or Position

In consideration of a renaming proposal, the sole responsibility rests with the Board of Trustees who will use the Guiding Principles in making any such determination.

In the case of the renaming of a building or monument for which the South Carolina Heritage Act (ACT 292 from Year 2000, SC Code Section 2. Section 10-1-165) applies, the Board will make the recommendation to the South Carolina General Assembly in accordance with the Heritage Act.

The appropriate College representative will make all reasonable efforts to inform in advance the original donors or honorees (and/or families or designated estate representative) when the naming period is deemed concluded. The College may provide alternate recognition as appropriate for the original gift or honor.

3.6 Other Considerations

With regard to naming proposals associated with a gift, any special circumstances or request for exceptions to this policy must be referred to the Executive Vice President of Institutional Advancement who will recommend the course of action, which will include consultation with the President and/or the Board.

The College will generally not name a building, academic school, monument, space, program or position in honor of a current faculty, staff member or administrator. Such naming proposals may be approved to take effect upon the retirement of the individual faculty, staff member or administrator.

3.7 Honorific Namings

From time to time the College may consider proposals to name a building, academic school, monument, space, program, or position in honor of an individual not associated with a gift. Such proposals shall be considered and approved under this policy subject to the principles in Section 3.0 and the processes described in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, except that the Office of the President shall be substituted for the Office of the Executive Vice President for Institutional Advancement.

4.0 Definition of Gift

A gift, or contribution, has the same meaning as a gift, or contribution, pursuant to the College's Gift Acceptance Policy.

5.0 Responsibilities

All individuals to whom this policy applies are responsible for becoming familiar with and following this policy. College supervisors are responsible for promoting the understanding of this policy and for taking appropriate steps to help ensure compliance. Senior officers are responsible for the development of appropriate practices and protocols to ensure compliance.

6.0 Related Policies and Statutes:

- Gift Acceptance Policy <https://policy.cofc.edu/documents/4.2.pdf>

- South Carolina Heritage Act <https://www.scstatehouse.gov/code/t10c001.php>
According to SC Code **SECTION 10-1-165**. Protection of certain monuments and memorials. “No street, bridge, structure, park, preserve, reserve, or other public area of the State or any of its political subdivisions dedicated in memory of or named for any historic figure or historic event may be renamed or rededicated.”
- The Board of Trustees reviewed the naming policies from numerous institutions of higher learning. The rationale and philosophies behind Brown University’s naming policy, in particular, provided an appropriate and thoughtful framework, upon which the College of Charleston’s naming policy was developed.



Oct. 21/22, 2021 BOT Agendas review with President and Board Liaisons

COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR NAMING

(DEVELOPED AND ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES ON XXXX XX, 2021)

In developing these guiding principles for naming, the Board of Trustees reviewed and considered similar work conducted by numerous colleges and universities (listed in the “resources” section), specifically their research and writings around the proper acknowledgment of an institution’s full history and their general philosophies of naming and commemoration.

PRINCIPLE OF HISTORICAL CONTEXT

We maintain our campus as a historical record and as a transformational site of learning and knowledge.

The College believes our campus is an extension of our classrooms and that lessons of the past can be studied in our landscape and better understood in the present. That understanding is the heart of the College’s core mission of preserving and increasing human knowledge, articulated so succinctly in our motto: “Wisdom Itself Is Liberty.”

The College of Charleston recognizes that some aspects of its past do not necessarily align with the institution’s current values, mission and vision. As one of the oldest institutions of higher learning in the country and the oldest in South Carolina, the College of Charleston engages with history – for the past has a very real impact on the present and the future. The study of history, understanding its effects on different populations – especially those previously excluded – and acknowledging the contributions and histories of all people are vital to the College of Charleston’s mission of educating the whole person in an effort to improve society.

Ongoing scholarship provides an opportunity for the College of Charleston to act in a thoughtful, constructive and restorative way. Scholarly consensus about principal legacies is a powerful measure in naming decisions. Principal legacies are typically the lasting effects that cause a person’s name to be remembered. In considering principal legacies, the Board of Trustees should consider how an individual’s viewpoints and actions align, or misalign, with the values of the College of Charleston and should, therefore, determine that principal legacy’s overall impact on campus.

Decisions about naming made today may be at issue in the future. Therefore, out of humility and appreciation for the past and present, the Board of Trustees and the campus

community should give the same respect to previous decision makers that they would like their decisions to be accorded in the future.

PRINCIPLE OF MISSION

We affirm, embrace and hold ourselves accountable to the College of Charleston core values.

The College of Charleston embraces its role as a training ground for citizens and future leaders.

As a public university on public land, we, the College of Charleston, believe in approaching our campus as a public space. Campus names and historical interpretative signage should reflect the institution's desire that all students, faculty and staff feel welcomed, valued and represented.

When the College of Charleston reviews its history, as it relates to naming and individuals who served or were connected to the institution, the Board of Trustees, through careful scholarship and research, will determine the principal legacy of a namesake and that principal legacy's overall impact on campus.

The College of Charleston encourages a culture of listening and empathy, which we believe is essential to a vibrant campus community and healthy democratic society.

PRINCIPLE OF VISION

We affirm our values through our actions.

Grounded in history and a liberal arts tradition, the College of Charleston must view history in context and with a longitudinal, future-oriented perspective that will serve the community beyond the particular moment. The College recognizes its moral responsibility to understand its past in order to live in the present and shape the future as a continually welcoming and inclusive institution.

The College of Charleston cannot undo the past or ignore it. Rather, the College should use it wisely in the landscape by looking for the best in people, respecting differences of opinion and learning important lessons, especially tolerance, to help move forward as one people.

PRINCIPLE FOR THE DUTY OF CARE

We strive to maintain a complete public historical record.

Under the duty of care, the Board of Trustees is responsible for preserving our institution's resources for future generations.

The process around naming a university building or place must be thoughtful and deliberate, as is fitting with the College of Charleston's longstanding liberal arts tradition. The Board of Trustees will use academic research to inform its decisions and actions.

The Board of Trustees supports the institution's efforts to tell a more complete story of the College's history, especially with the addition of historical interpretative signage, new naming opportunities and the publishing of more information (both physical and virtual) in order to better recognize the College's underrepresented populations.

RESOURCES

- Brown University (Naming or Renaming University Buildings, Spaces, Programs and Positions)
- College of Charleston Historical Review Taskforce
- Duke University (2017 Commission on Memory and History Report: Guiding Principles)
- George Washington University (Naming Task Force)
- Oklahoma State University (Consideration of Removing Names of Facilities)
- Rhodes College (Principles for the Process of Discernment Related to Contested Names)
- Stanford University (Principles and Procedures for Renaming Buildings and Other Features)
- University of Cincinnati (McMicken Working Group to the President)
- University of Michigan (President's Advisory Committee on University History)
- University of Minnesota (Task Force on Building Names and Institutional History)
- University of Virginia (President's Commission on the University in the Age of Segregation)
- William and Mary (Working Group on Principles for Naming and Renaming)
- Yale University (Committee to Establish Principles on Renaming)

A Resolution from the Faculty Senate Regarding Implementation of the REACH Act

The Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston wishes to express its grave concern with the South Carolina state legislature's efforts to regulate and direct college curricula. Most recently, the legislature has dictated the content of certain courses via the [REACH Act](#), approved on April 28, 2021. We fully support the goal of teaching students about the fundamental documents and principles of American history and government, and many classes of the existing curriculum already do so. However, we object 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.

The faculty takes issue with this legislation for the following reasons:

First, The REACH Act represents a slippery slope in terms of legislative and political interference with the college curriculum and academic freedom. Its intent to regulate the specific subject-matter and content of courses usurps the role of faculty in determining what material best serves our students. As such, it goes against the spirit of SECTION 59-104-660 of the [SC code of laws](#), which states that *“all state-supported institutions of higher learning shall establish their own procedures and programs to measure student achievement,”* that must *“(1) derive from institutional initiatives, recognizing the diversity of South Carolina public colleges and universities, the tradition of institutional autonomy, and the capacity of faculty and administrators to identify their own problems and solve them creatively; 2) be consistent with each institution's mission and educational objectives; (3) involve faculty in setting the standards of achievement, selecting the measurement instruments, and analyzing the results.”*

Second, by demanding in late April the immediate implementation of the act in the 2021/22 academic year, the Legislature prevented the College of Charleston from following its established policies and procedures for handling curricular change. This jeopardizes our compliance with the SACSCOC accreditation standards. By seeking to manage on a granular level the content of courses, the REACH Act goes against the curricular autonomy of faculty embedded in Section 6 (Faculty) of our accreditor's [Principles of Accreditation](#), which states that *“The tradition of shared governance within American higher education recognizes the importance of both faculty and administrative involvement in the approval of educational programs. Because student learning is central to the institution's mission and educational degrees, the faculty is responsible for directing the learning enterprise, including overseeing and coordinating educational programs to ensure that each contains essential curricular components, has appropriate content and pedagogy, and maintains discipline currency.”* In the process, the hurried implementation violated the practice of academic governance, articulated in Section 10.4(c), which stipulates that the institution *“places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty.”*

Third, the College of Charleston [FAM](#)'s Statement of Academic Freedom (Art. IV, Sect. C.1) affirms that *“Academic freedom in its teaching aspects is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the faculty member in teaching and of the student in learning.”*

Both the College's [BOT ByLaws](#) (Art. X, Sect. 6) and the FAM acknowledge that the College of Charleston's faculty has a collective responsibility for the curriculum. In particular, the FAM states: "*The Faculty Senate shall be concerned with all matters relating to academic programs, the curriculum, admissions and continuation standards, the grading system, degree and certificate requirements, and the utilization of the intellectual resources of the College. The Faculty Senate shall have the right and obligation to initiate needed institutional and academic studies, either directly or through appropriate committees*" (Faculty ByLaws, Art. IV, Sect. 1.B).

Be it resolved then that the Faculty Senate shall take charge of the review and implementation of the REACH Act requirement through the creation of an *ad hoc* committee that will work with relevant departments and standing faculty committees to design course work and evaluation measures as consistent with our institutional mission, educational objectives and curricular policies as possible.

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate shall charge the Speaker of the Faculty to convey the faculty's serious concern with the current legislative overreach and other pending or future bills usurping the faculty's authority over curriculum to the President and Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston.