

COLLEGE of CHARLESTON

Summary of Changes to the By-laws and *Faculty/Administration Manual* for 2021-2022 edition

Last Revised: October 5, 2021

Changes to Faculty By-Laws

- **Changes to Faculty By-Laws to allow Faculty meetings, Faculty Senate meetings, and voting at both to be conducted electronically (Articles II, IV, V, VI and VII):**
 - Various changes to the by-laws to allow for these meetings and votes to be conducted electronically.
 - Proposed changes developed by George Pothering, Parliamentarian, with review and input from the Committee on the By-laws and *Faculty/Administration Manual*.
 - Brought to the October 6, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting as new business by the Committee on the By-Laws and *Faculty/Administration Manual*, where it was unanimously endorsed via an online vote.
 - That vote was affirmed in-person at the August 31, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting.
 - These by-laws changes were then ratified by the full faculty on September 27, 2021.
- **Change to the Standing Rules of the Faculty to allow for electronic meetings of the Faculty or the Faculty Senate:**
 - Same process of review and action as outlined above for the corresponding changes to the faculty by-laws.
 - Ratified by the full faculty on September 27, 2021.
- **Change to Article V, Section 3.B.20, Advisory Committee on the First-Year Experience:**
 - Deletion of item (c) addressing a contingency on the initial constitution of the Advisory Committee on the First-Year Experience.
 - Introduced as new business by Committee on the By-Laws and *Faculty/Administration Manual* at the December 8, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting, where it was approved in an online vote.
 - That vote was affirmed in-person at August 31, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting.
 - This by-laws change was then ratified by the full faculty on September 27, 2021.

Changes to Administrative Sections

- **Sections VI.A through VI.D on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review:** As outlined in a memo issued June 2, 2021, the following changes have been made:

External reviews of research (Section VI.A.2.b.(2).ii.(b)): The new language provides more explicit guidance to Departmental Evaluation Panel chairs for soliciting external reviews of research, in cases where such reviews are used. The focus is on soliciting a review of the quality of a candidate's

research and professional development, rather than an overall assessment of whether the candidate would meet research expectations at the reviewer's own institution. Additionally, the solicitation letter may reflect any quantitative or qualitative research expectations set by college-wide or approved school or departmental guidelines.

Presentation of certain professional activities (Section VI.A.2.b.(5) and Section VI.A.3.a): The new language clarifies an ambiguity in past editions of the *Faculty/Administration Manual* and clearly communicates that certain professional activities can be presented by the candidate as either professional development or service.

These two major changes arose as follows:

- The first change was introduced conceptually via conversations, facilitated by Provost Austin, with Simon Lewis, Speaker of the Faculty; Lisa Covert, president of College of Charleston chapter of the AAUP; and Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.
 - The second change was initially proposed by Anton Vander Zee, chair of the 2021-2022 Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review.
 - Draft language for both changes was reviewed by Simon Lewis, Lisa Covert, Anton Vander Zee, and the College of Charleston deans. Draft language was also shared with the Committee on the By-laws and *Faculty/Administration Manual* in late April 2021.
 - Final changes were announced to all faculty in writing on June 2, 2021 and posted on the academic affairs website, alongside the 2021-2022 Joint Memo on tenure, promotion, and third-year review, and on the *Faculty/Administration Manual* web page.
- **Section VIII.A.9, Class Attendance:** Changes were made to the last paragraph of this section in late Fall 2020 to reflect that the WA, withdrawal for absences, has been eliminated as a grade option. Instead, faculty members must assign an actual grade. The new *Faculty/Administration Manual* language in this section reflects that attendance may still be a part of the course grading, while also outlining the instructor's responsibilities in that case.
 - **Section IX, Faculty Awards:** There are two sets of changes here.

Introduction of a new faculty award for undergraduate mentoring. This award was proposed and conceptualized by Beth Meyer-Bernstein while serving as Associate Dean of the Honors College and director of our Undergraduate Research and Creative Activities program. It has been approved by the College's Board of Trustees, as required by state statute for monetary awards for employees.

Modification of the eligibility requirements for our distinguished faculty awards in order to spread the recognition. These changes were originally developed by an *ad hoc* committee of past award selection committee chairs, convened by Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. They were subsequently considered by the 2020 award selection committees and the 2020-2021 Committee on the Bylaws and the *Faculty/Administration Manual* (in April 2021). These changes have also been approved by the College's Board of Trustees. These changes are as follows:

- To all six existing awards, added the stipulation that no faculty member may receive the award more than once.

- Stipulate that recipients of the Distinguished Teaching Award and the Distinguished Research Award are not eligible for consideration for the William V. Moore Distinguished Teacher-Scholar Award for the first three academic years after receipt of either of these other two awards.
 - Stipulate that recipients of the William V. Moore Distinguished Teacher-Scholar Award are not eligible for consideration for the Distinguished Teaching Award or the Distinguished Research Award for the first five academic years after receipt of the teacher-scholar award.
- **Section X.I.3, Grievances Before the Faculty Hearing Committee:** Changes proposed by the Committee on the By-Laws and *Faculty/Administration Manual* and endorsed by the Faculty Senate at April 2021 meeting. Endorsed by the full faculty on September 27, 2021.
- Minor formatting changes

On electronically held Faculty meetings, Faculty Senate meetings, and associated votes

- Agenda – October 6, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting
- By-laws proposal
- Highlights – October 6, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting
- Minutes – October 6, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting
- Agenda – August 31, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting
- Minutes – August 31, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting

On Standing Rules of the Faculty, regarding the conduct of electronic meetings

- Same documentation as above

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

Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the [September 1, 2020](#), minutes.
3. Announcements and Information
4. Reports
 - a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
 - b. Provost Suzanne Austin
 - c. Godfrey Gibbison, Interim Dean of the Graduate School
 - 1) Temporary waiver/option on standardized test scores for graduate admissions
 - 2) Proposal for common practices/requirements for bachelor-to-master's combined programs
5. New Business
 - a. Election of Speaker Pro Tempore
 - b. Committee on By-Laws and the Faculty-Administration Manual (Merissa Ferrara, Chair):
By-Laws revision regarding electronic meetings [PDF](#)
 - c. Curriculum Committee (Nenad Radakovic, Chair)
 - 1) SOST: Program change

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2645/form>
 - 2) GEOL: new major in Environmental Geosciences and two new courses:

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:163/form>
 - 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](#).

6. Constituents' General Concerns

7. Adjournment

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.

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

Highlights --- Voting results in red.

1. Call to Order
2. **The September 1, 2020, minutes were approved.**
3. Announcements and Information
4. Reports
 - a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
 - b. Provost Suzanne Austin
 - c. Godfrey Gibbison, Interim Dean of the Graduate School
 - 1) Temporary waiver/option on standardized test scores for graduate admissions
 - 2) Proposal for common practices/requirements for bachelor-to-master's combined programs
5. New Business
 - a. Election of Speaker Pro Tempore: **Sen. Irina Gigova (HSS) was elected.**
 - b. Committee on By-Laws and the Faculty-Administration Manual (Merissa Ferrara, Chair):
By-Laws revision regarding electronic meetings [PDF](#)

The motion to amend the by-laws was approved.
 - c. Curriculum Committee (Nenad Radakovic, Chair): **Both proposals and related courses were approved.**
 - 1) SOST: Program change

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2645/form>
 - 2) GEOL: new major in Environmental Geosciences and two new courses:

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

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](#).

The resolution was approved.

6. Constituents' General Concerns

7. Adjournment

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 Neufeld (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 Senate, Tuesday, August 31, 2021 5:00 PM
Hybrid: Wells Fargo Ballroom (Beatty Center 115) and via Zoom

Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the [April 6, 2021](#) minutes
3. Announcements and Information
4. Reports
 - a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
 - b. President Andrew Hsu
5. New Business
 - a. Vote to approve all motions passed during virtual 2020-21 Senate meetings
 - b. Election of Speaker Pro Tempore
 - c. REACH Act – Claire Wofford [PDF](#)
 - d. Sustainable Literacy Institute – Laura Turner [PDF](#)
6. Constituents' General Concerns
7. Adjournment

Faculty Senate, Tuesday, August 31, 2021 5:00 PM
Hybrid: Wells Fargo Ballroom (Beatty Center 115) and via Zoom

Voting/unanimous consent results appear in red.

1. Speaker Simon Lewis called the meeting to order at 5:01pm
2. Speaker Lewis asked for a moment of silence in honor of Lucille Whipper and Richard Nunan.
 - Lucille, an alumna of the College of Charleston, was active in the civil rights movement as well as working with the College where, among many contributions, she was instrumental in establishing the Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture.
 - Richard, a recently retired faculty member from Philosophy, and an active presence in Faculty Senate, died soon after retirement from a brain tumor.
 - Simon Lewis gave an opportunity for attendees to speak names of those they know who have died from Covid.
3. An in-person count was taken, and a quorum was deemed present. **The April 6, 2021 minutes were approved.**
4. Speaker Lewis asked if there was any objection to his modifying the meeting order in the agenda by moving the two voting matters from New Business forward to ensure a quorum was present. Hearing no objections, **the agenda order was changed by unanimous consent.**
 - **The Senate voted to approve all motions passed during the virtual 2020-21 Senate meetings.**
 - **Irina Gigova was elected as Speaker Pro Tempore**
5. Announcements and Information
 - Speaker Lewis welcomed senators new and old and Raquel Gleicher as the new Faculty Secretariat and RoxAnn Stalvey as the new Faculty Secretary. Meetings are being recorded for Secretary's use only. Change of meeting date from first Monday in September was due to Rosh Hashanah. Reminder that the by-laws limit a speaker to speaking no more than twice on a given issue and for two or fewer minutes per time. Reminder (although not normally a need in this environment), please treat each other with civility. Attendance Verification is due September 14. The CofC library is doing great things to keep our students safe, including requiring face coverings at all times when in the building and requiring Cougar Card to gain access. Please look over their new requirements. In order to take advantage of access to student records on the upgraded DegreeWorks, faculty need to remember to take the FERPA test and familiarize themselves with College privacy policies.
6. Reports
 - Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
 - ◇ Remember to be kind to ourselves and each other.
 - ◇ Much to discuss: Strategic Plan, REI, but also external factors: ban on requiring vaccinations, consequences to changes in SC gun laws – campus can still ban guns on

campus, REACH Act (on tonight's agenda) which stifles faculty ability to control curriculum.

◇ Complimented President Hsu, the administration, IT folks and campus for their commitment to keeping us informed

- President Andrew Hsu

◇ Happy to see us in person since it's been since March 2020. Thank you for all the faculty has done to keep this "great institution going." College has had a very successful year despite the unusual year.

◇ COVID-19 Mitigation Policies

- ◆ We are still in crisis mode and struggling. Will need us all working together to lead to another successful year.
- ◆ This semester a bit more difficult as the state prevented us from requiring masks. Supreme Court reversed this and within 2 hours of that ruling the Board of Trustees passed ruling the College could require masks. Since 8/17/2021 the College has required masks while indoors. This will be reviewed monthly.
- ◆ Cannot require vaccinations for students/employees but as of today we are at almost 74% of our students who are vaccinated. This is better than many other state universities who are around 50%. MUSC is the exception at 95%. CofC is higher than all other institutions in the state.
- ◆ CofC has provided many incentives to encourage vaccination. 15 employees and 9 students were drawn to receive professional development and scholarship dollars respectively. Names of the winners are not allowed to be announced as that violates privacy rights because it reveals vaccination status, but the winners are encouraged to announce via social media.
- ◆ Holding vaccination clinics with Johnson&Johnson and Moderna vaccines on campus. Also, providing rapid testing kits to employees as available. 385 kits will be on campus tomorrow (Wednesday 9/1). People on campus are going to local pharmacies to buy kits to give to employees.
- ◆ Providing free face coverings and N-95 masks. Have 25,000 maroon cloth masks that can be given to students. Get them from Central Stores. Faculty can get those masks to give to students who are without.
- ◆ Asked students to upload proof of vaccination or negative test. 97% of students have complied. They are chasing the rest. Those students' Cougar Cards are no longer active and there is a hold on their account preventing registration. Dr. Hsu is also considering fines. He is not a fan of these punitive measures but must do things to keep the campus safe.
- ◆ Questions: (Response, as applicable, italicized)
 - a. Thomas Ivey – Senator from Mathematics – Students need to be reminded to wear masks over their noses. He asks that official announcements should encourage this. *President will get that added to Vax on Bricks and in future communications*
 - b. Lisa Covert – guest from History, president of AAUP – question about high temperatures in the classroom that make it difficult to teach – thinks the drop in masks being properly worn may be partly due to the heat of the room. What are the College's short-term plans? *President Hsu walked around to classrooms*

on Monday and went to Maybank first floor where temperatures were high. Spoke with VP for facilities who is searching for temporary solutions. This has been a problem in the fall each of the three semesters he has been here. He too is frustrated and ties it to the lack of budget earmarked for facilities work. Starting last year \$3M has been allocated for maintenance – note that paint and the look of buildings has improved, but it will take probably 5-10 years to fix all of the problems. Planning to put \$1M this year into HVAC preventative maintenance so that parts can be pre-ordered. John Morris added that Maybank has temporary replacement bearings, replacing chillers in Bell and Johnson Silcox. \$1M will renew some old infrastructures.

- c. Elisa Jones – guest, History - Has the College spoken with public health experts to give Chairs and faculty/instructors guidance for when class/community/campus spread indicates that it might be time to move a class online? Or alternatively, does the College have a situation in mind that is the tipping point for going online? It is great to give faculty flexibility to make that decision since it might depend on classrooms and the type of class, but guidance seems like it would prevent a major outbreak. – *President Hsu: giving faculty authority to move classes online as desired, consulting with health care experts – none able to give a number that says when to adjust to online, continue to consult and listen to CDC and DHEC; last year's high-water mark was 250 active Covid cases and CofC was able to handle the situation. Saw a spike at start of semester, as expected, which topped at 62 cases much less than last year's "high water mark"; hoping to never get as high as last year again. Hoping for best but prepared for the worst.*
- d. Jacob Steere-Williams – Guest, History -- Can faculty move class online? *Provost Austin: Yes if one or more students tests positive in the class. Also, if a faculty member has a family member that you are caring for at home, you can also move class online.*
- e. Irina Gigova, Senator, History – Is that the decision of individual faculty? Do I have to talk to my chair or just move it? *Provost Austin: She would hope a faculty member would let the chair know and would hope that the chair would notify the Dean, but only for their information. The decision is up to the faculty. President Hsu: Make certain to let your students know that it is only temporary during quarantine*
- f. Bob Mignone – SSM Senator, Math department – How will we know if a student has Covid? *Bridget McLernon-Sykes: Good system that has been in place for letting faculty know via the contact tracing team. They get data from registrar where they are looking for trends in classroom*
- g. David Hansen – Marketing and Management, guest – What if a faculty member doesn't feel safe? *Provost Austin: If faculty*

member has concerns about their own health, they should contact HR on the possibility of qualifying for an accommodation to allow them to teach online. 8 faculty have requested, 6 have been approved and 2 are waiting for physician paperwork.

- h. Lisa Covert – Wondering if more frequent testing on campus? *Bridget McLernon-Sykes: Encourage students with symptoms to reach out to Health Services as they can test all day long every day at Health Services. CofC has a Covid management team that can perhaps consider more tests, but the College hires a third party to do those tests.*

- Positive notes to end on –

- ◇ Last year, CofC did really well thanks to hard work of the faculty. Clemson had 15 furlough days, USC one-time pay cut, Winthrop and Coastal had 20 furlough days, and MUSC laid off 900 employees while the College of Charleston had a small surplus last year with no furloughs nor any reduction in take-home pay – only furloughs were volunteers including President Hsu and some of his leadership team to show that they were in support of the struggles. Not expecting any fiscal burden this year. This shows the importance of planning and vision and the strategic plan.

- ◇ Strategic Plan

- ◆ Pillar I – Student Success: Retention was the focus for last year: fall to spring retention improved and hoping fall to fall retention data is strong. Every 1% retention rate is worth \$.5M to bottom line. Software solutions being implemented to assist students in academic success. Focus on improving student well-being and have hired new Counseling Center Director who starts in October. Adding a second-year experience this fall.
 - ◆ Pillar II – Academic Distinction: Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning has been established with Margaret Hagood as director.
 - ◆ Pillar III – Employee Success: Employee tuition program, cost-of-living increases (3 % - 2.5% of which came from the state and .5% from the College), Strategic Merit Raise Exercise – in last year's survey 60% of faculty said they were underpaid – so also allocated some funds for merit raises. Capped raises at no more than 15%.

- ◇ New and Noteworthy:

- ◆ Passage of DP/U language in proviso to allow universities like CofC to offer up to 5 terminal degrees;
 - ◆ Increased state funding to 2008 funding level which was the high-water mark.
 - ◆ Athletics and Academics are winning awards
 - ◆ This past year was record-setting: applications were up from 12,477 in 2019 to over 20,000 applications in 2021. Decided to take more students this year and accepted a few more freshmen (2476), which is the highest number in College history. Future goal is still 2300 per year.
 - ◆ Philanthropy: \$20.2M in new commitments, the highest ever figure and up from \$17.7M last year which was itself an increase from \$15.8M in 2019; 6 seven-figure gifts received.

- ◇ Questions: (Response italicized)

- ◆ Jacob Steere-Williams – guest, History: Where I’m seeing a worrying disconnect, is that the R&D budget in my department has been slashed to a historic low in the last decade (\$1000 or less per faculty). How are we supposed to realize this success in light of decreased faculty R&D funds?
President Hsu: Didn’t realize this had been reduced, but this is controlled on departmental level not by the president. However, if College increases fundraising then there will be more funds for R&D. Administration is considering a new model where each School will become a revenue center (Responsibility Center [RCM] Model) and as long as your School raises and invests in R&D your R&D funds will increase.
- ◆ David Boucher - Biochemistry, Senator: Did pay increase extend to adjunct?
Hsu: No. Austin: Trying to see if we have financial ability to increase for this year.
- ◆ Irina Gigova – History, Senator: Will faculty be able to review the RCM model? Also, thanks to leadership for all they have done this year. *Hsu: Yes. We are leaning on external specialists to help with this. Plan on multiple town-hall meetings..*
- ◆ Nathaniel Walker, Senator for Art & Architectural History: Will schools have any control over the revenue gain system—in other words, for tuition rates?
Hsu: No local control on tuition rates; that is up to the Board of Trustees.

7. New Business

- <See above for new business related to votes moved to the start of the meeting>
- REACH Act – Claire Wofford – Associate Professor in Political Science, Guest – Reinforcing College Education on America’s Constitutional Heritage Act (REACH Act) – SC legislature requires 3-credit class in American History, American Government, or some other course where students must read at a minimum: Constitution, Declaration of Independence, Emancipation Proclamation, five essays from Federalist Papers, one document foundational to African American Freedom Struggle – Provost and Speaker identified 12 courses at CofC that would satisfy the Act for this year and were forced to identify these courses quickly because of the time line in place from SC legislature. Prof Wofford believes universities are traditionally protected from government legislature of curriculum, but with the REACH Act SC legislators have prescribed which parts of American history must be taught, violating faculty rights to academic freedom. The Act also violates the 1st Amendment in Prof. Wofford’s opinion – government isn’t allowed to regulate what you say or compel you to speak but she feels that the REACH Act does exactly that by compelling faculty to speak on certain prescribed texts and usurping our ability to determine if some other documents or projects might be more engaging or better suited than simply reading the documents prescribed; Most troubling is the “slippery slope” possibility that failing to challenge this Act could encourage the state legislature to dictate more content in future for other courses.

◇ Comments

- ◆ Lisa Covert, History, guest – Thanks for bringing the topic up. Dr. Covert encouraged Senators to consider a resolution related to the Act. It is on the agenda for the AAUP state-wide conference on September 11.
- ◆ Suanne Ansari, guest, Chair of General Education Committee, explained that her committee, in order to comply with the REACH Act, will have to review

course proposals to satisfy the Act. She hoped Faculty Senate will consent to review standards for approval in Curriculog.

◆ Speaker Lewis thanked committee chairs.

- Sustainable Literacy Institute – Laura Turner, Theater, guest – Based on what she hears, she believes Darcy Everett will retain her position but Todd LeVasseur will lose his job at the end of this year. (He did not ask her to speak.) QEP program is ending but she does not believe SLI should end. For example, QEP initiative led to FYE program and peer advisors. She noted our core commitments which include “sustainable solutions” and “diversity & equity”. Sustainability education creates gains in our students and allows for education of our faculty. She shared data showing that CofC students are at or above the national average in understanding sustainability concepts. Also concerned that sustainability content is being shifted to Facilities Management away from academics. Encourages retention of the SLI program and the retention of Todd LeVasseur who has “shouldered \$.5M QEP successfully while being a temporary employee”. Dissolving SLI seems counter to our College’s strategic plans. Hopes Senate will support this.

◇ Questions/Comments: <Responses italicized>

- ◆ Irina Gigova – history, senator: Didn’t know there were plans to close SLI, can we hear more? *Provost Austin: Thanks, Laura, for bringing forward. There are no plans to move away from the institution’s commitment to sustainability. Dean Knotts and others talking about creating a major in environmental studies and sustainability. The College is a SACS COC accredited institution, and SACS expects we will institutionalize results of QEP. We have 1.5 years to turn in that report and are then required to have the next QEP in place. Creating a major in this area is the way CofC is planning to institutionalize the current QEP. Further, moving the experiential piece to Facilities Management provides a way that students can have hands-on learning; this is in keeping with most other institutions. Margaret Hagood will be working with current QEP director to solidify. Since Provost Austin and Laura met last year, she was surprised to discover that a previous Provost had authorized a tenure-track position in this area – she’s researching this more. Dr. Austin stressed the takeaway: “There is a firm institutional commitment to doing more and doing better and making this a signature program at the College of Charleston.”*
- ◆ Allison Welch – Biology, guest: 90 faculty across 34 departments have been trained in Sustainability. Data from before the creation of the QEP showed that our students were mostly below national average. What is our plan to institutionalize the QEP? Dr Welch explained that her hope is to have 1) an SLI that helps educate faculty and 2) dedicated programs in sustainability.
- ◆ David Hansen, Management & Marketing, guest: SLI should not be moved to Facilities but should be in Academics. *Provost Austin: Agrees, academic concepts need to be taught in the classroom. The experiential piece, which may be managed through facilities or through the community, gives students an opportunity to experience what they learn in classroom.*
- ◆ Kris de Welde – Women & Gender Studies: (Copied from typed comment in Zoom) “It is confusing to me if there is a plan to institutionalize academic aspects of the QEP why the Director and sustainability affiliated faculty have

not been involved in these conversations such as about the shifting of the sustainable development center to facilities, when that particular siloing of “sustainability” is precisely what our QEP strove to change.” *Provost Austin: Brian Fisher was involved in many of these conversations as well as many faculty who are involved right now. Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost: The QEP was not designed as the center for sustainable development. There was also the Office of Sustainability in Business Affairs. The QEP and this office were merged into a center then renamed as the Sustainability Institute (SLI). The original institute was not broken apart but instead the melding occurred of QEP and Office of Sustainability, now there is a separation that occurred over a couple of years.*

- ◆ Laura Turner: How will the College maintain the levels of learning and understanding regarding sustainability that we have gained across campus thanks to SLI? We need someone at the helm. William & Mary, one of our peer institutions, has experiential piece in Institutional Effectiveness. Encourage the College to continue our momentum and be innovative. *Provost: Will continue to offer faculty development.*
- ◆ David Hansen offered to speak with Provost Austin to provide her with fuller history as he drafted the original QEP.

8. Constituents’ General Concerns

- Chris Day, Political Science, Director of African Studies, Senator – drew the Senate’s attention to the LCWA signature series called “Black Lives” with many events planned for fall and more coming in spring. Encouraged all to check out <https://blogs.cofc.edu/lcwa-signature-series-black-lives/> and invited all to attend the Ranky Tanky concert being held September 9 at 7 pm in the Cistern Yard.

9. The meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm.

On change to Article V, Advisory Committee on the First-Year Experience

- Agenda – December 8, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting
- By-laws proposal
- Minutes – December 8, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting
- Agenda – August 31, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting
- Minutes – August 31, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting

**Faculty Senate, Tuesday, December 8, 2020, 5:00 PM
Via Zoom**

Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the [November 10, 2020](#), minutes.
3. Announcements and Information
4. Reports
 - a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
 - b. Provost Suzanne Austin
 - c. Chief Diversity Officer Renard Harris: Diversity EDU [Presentation](#)
5. New Business
 - a. Approval of degree candidates (December)
 - b. Curriculum Committee (Nenad Radakovic, Chair)
 - 1) PSYC: Course change:
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2699/form>
 - 2) GLAT: Program change:
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2649/form>
 - 3) REAL: Program and course change
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:171/form>
 - 4) CPLT: Deactivating minor and two courses:
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:170/form>
 - 5) FINC: Course changes:

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:172/form>

c. Senator Jonathan Neufeld (Philosophy): Motion to reconstitute REI (Race, Equity, and Inclusion) Committee in order to bring a formal proposal for the REI curriculum requirement through Curriculog and the Faculty Curriculum Committee.

d. Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty-Administration Manual (Merissa Ferrara, Chair): Motion to delete from the By-Laws item c (implementation) under Section 3.B.20 (Advisory Committee on First-Year Experience). [Revision](#)

e. Senator Chris Warnick (HSS): Motion to form an ad hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness and Mentoring to serve through Fall 2022, with the following charge:

- Identify and implement more effective approaches for gathering formative and summative student feedback that better informs teaching effectiveness and promotes students' metacognitive engagement with their own learning;
- Develop guidelines for faculty end-of-course self-reflection that draw on formative and summative feedback from students and that can be used to demonstrate growth in annual reviews and major reviews;
- Incorporate a fourth evaluation category into the Faculty Administration Manual that rewards and incentivizes outstanding faculty advising and mentoring;
- Create an effective professional development infrastructure to support these project goals.

[Rationale and Proposed Timeline](#)

f. Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (Meta Van Sickle, Chair): Proposal to revise the policy on XXF Transcript Notation (Academic Dishonesty) [Presentation](#) / [Proposed Revision](#)

6. Constituents' General Concerns

7. Adjournment

Committee and other invited guests with expertise in a discipline, department, or program relevant to a particular course proposal.

- (4) The Committee shall forward all recommendations to the Faculty Senate.
- (5) In consultation with the Faculty Secretariat, the Committee shall maintain an archive of all materials submitted to it.
- (6) Requirements for a public process of course proposal review shall not interfere with the right of the Committee to enter into executive session.

- d. Appeals: No changes in the General Education Program shall be presented to the Faculty Senate without the Committee's action. Any decision of the Committee on General Education can be appealed to the Faculty Senate.
- e. Effective on the date on which this committee is established, no change to the General Education Program shall be approved without consideration by this committee.

20. Advisory Committee on First-Year Experience

- a. Composition: Seven regular faculty members, at least three of whom shall be teaching in the First-Year Experience program (*i.e.*, teaching either a First-Year Seminar or a Learning Communities Course) during the relevant academic year or have taught in the First-Year Experience program during the preceding academic year. Preferably, each academic school should be represented on the committee. The committee shall have one voting student member selected by the Student Government Association. The Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience (or other administrator designated by the Provost), the Assistant Vice President for New Student Programs (or other administrator designated by the Provost), the Dean of Students, and the Director of the First-Year Experience program are *ex officio*, non-voting members.
- b. Duties:
 - (1) In consultation with the relevant administrators, to support and advise the First-Year Experience program on all matters relevant to the program, including program development, budget requests, and other issues germane to program support;
 - (2) In consultation with the Director of the First-Year Experience program, to review and assess the First-Year Experience

program and to make non-binding recommendations for revisions to the program;

- (3) To request and review proposals for First-Year Experience courses (sections of FYSM 101 and Learning Communities); and
- (4) To assist the Director of the First-Year Experience program in recruiting students for First-Year Experience courses and to recruit and plan the training for new First-Year Experience faculty and peer facilitators for Learning Communities.

~~e. Implementation: The Advisory Committee on the First-Year Experience shall be constituted only if the Provost and the Speaker of the Faculty certify in a written notice addressed to the members of the Faculty Senate that a coordinated, comprehensive, and unified First-Year Experience program has received the necessary approvals and shall be implemented in a timely fashion. Such written notice shall be supplied no later than August 15, 2009, or the ratification for which Art. VI, Section 1 provides shall be null and void and this committee description shall be removed from the Faculty By-Laws.~~

21. Adjunct Oversight Committee

- a. Composition: Five faculty members, including one each from the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Faculty Compensation Committee, together with three elected faculty members, two of whom are regular faculty, and one of whom is an adjunct faculty member (as described in Article V, section 1.B). In addition, an *ex-officio* non-voting sixth member will be designated by the Provost.
- b. Duties:
 - (1) Receive and analyze reports: from the Office of Institutional Research on the number of adjuncts employed by the College, the number of credit hours delivered by adjunct faculty, adjunct faculty members' rank and status (part-time or full-time), and adjunct faculty compensation; and from the Provost's office on College policies for adjunct faculty.
 - (2) Solicit additional information on adjunct practices in use in schools, departments, and programs. To obtain this information, the committee may analyze published documents (*e.g.*, department websites or handbooks), interview deans and chairs, conduct surveys of adjunct faculty, and/or do additional research.
 - (3) Receive and response to information from the Provost's office and/or senior leadership regarding future plans for the College

Faculty Senate, Tuesday, December 8, 2020, 5:00 PM
Via Zoom

Voting results are in red.

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM.
2. The November 10, 2020, minutes were approved by unanimous consent.
3. Announcements and Information

Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis noted that, technically, senate meetings continue to be out of order because the by-laws do not contain a provision for meeting and voting online. Having tried a few times to arrange a brief, in-person Senate meeting to approve a change to the by-laws that would validate votes taken online, Speaker Lewis said that he may try one more time, the Friday before spring semester starts Jan 8. Otherwise, we may have to wait until we're back in person in the fall of 2021 to ratify the votes taken at online meetings during the pandemic.

He reminded faculty that grades are due by 5 pm Wednesday 12/16; the deadline for sustainability literacy course proposals has been extended until 12/21.

4. Reports

a. **Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis** thanked everyone for their dedication in getting through a difficult semester, with special acknowledgment to those whose family obligations made things even tougher. He noted that there had been occasions when false rumors threatened to sour the atmosphere, but he has perceived the general mood on the virtual campus to be positive. The College has continued to offer not only the basics of instruction and mentoring but also a variety of co- and extra-curricular offerings for students. Despite the fact that spring semester will be much the same in terms of COVID protocols, he hopes now that we have a clearer sense of the crisis having an end, as the days begin to get longer, our spirits will rise.

b. **Provost Suzanne Austin** echoed Speaker Lewis's thanks to everyone for their hard work throughout the semester. She expressed concern for our students, saying she worries that some of them have fallen into habits that we don't want to encourage. She wants us to think of the spring semester as a transition to a new normal.

Academic Affairs, schools, and departments are making coordinated efforts to "close the gap" on spring registrations. Many students and parents may still be waiting, though, to make a decision on spring enrollment. Ultimately, she believes most of our students will be back in the spring. Meanwhile, projections for fall 2021 enrollment are strong, with

applications up 6% for residents, 50% for nonresidents from a year ago. Virtual admissions events have been well-attended.

With thanks to Mark Del Mastro and others who served on a subcommittee, Provost Austin reported that there will be some guidance coming out in the next couple of days about attendance policies for the spring. The new language will reflect our effort to make spring 2020 a transitional one.

Following up on the memo sent jointly by herself and Speaker Lewis, Provost Austin reported that while the PS/NS (pass/fail) option was not renewed for the fall semester, in spring 2021 students will have the option to select one course as PS/NS.

The School of the Arts' Dean search is underway. Professor Mary Beth Heston is chairing the committee. With Godfrey Gibbison's departure, Provost Austin will launch an internal search for Dean of the Graduate School, with the committee to be chaired by EHHP Dean Fran Welch. Provost Austin said she would like to have someone in place by March 1. She has asked HSS Dean Gibbs Knotts to serve as Interim Dean until then.

The Provost's Office is working on a faculty survey as part of regular evaluation of deans. Faculty were last surveyed about deans' performance in 2017, so there is precedent. Provost Austin said that she would like the process to include deans preparing written responses to major themes that emerge from the survey results, followed by school-wide meetings to discuss those themes. This process would generate plans to address issues raised in the surveys.

"Shells" for courses in OAKS will be ready within days. She would like faculty to post a syllabus (in some form, possibly a draft or basic syllabus) one week before the beginning of classes.

c. **Chief Diversity Officer Renard Harris** gave a [Presentation](#) on the Diversity EDU program. The self-paced program takes about three hours to complete (divided into three modules). He said the goal is universal participation among faculty and staff, but he is not sure how to "enforce" compliance. He would like input from faculty on how to do that.

Senator Irina Gigova (HSS) noted that adjunct faculty are already overburdened, and she asked if it would be possible to pay them to complete the program. Dr. Harris responded that they had not considered that. Senator Gigova asked if departments might be able to pay adjuncts out of their own funds, and Dr. Harris replied that he assumes that would be up to deans and chairs.

Senator Ashley Pagnotta (Physics and Astronomy) asked if it is possible to get statistics on compliance by department, in which case it might be possible to create competition among departments. Dr. Harris said he is sure that's possible.

Senator Fran Scudese (Adjunct Rep, Teacher Education) reported that she has completed the program and found it informative and valuable.

5. New Business

a. Approval of degree candidates (December): **approved by unanimous consent.**

b. Curriculum Committee (Nenad Radakovic, Chair)

1) PSYC: Course change:

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2699/form> **Approved by online vote.**

2) GLAT: Program change:

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2649/form> **Approved by online vote.**

3) REAL: Program and course change

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:171/form> **Approved by online vote.**

4) CPLT: Deactivating minor and two courses:

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:170/form> **Approved by online vote.**

5) FINC: Course changes:

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:172/form> **Approved by online vote.**

c. **Senator Jonathan Neufeld (Philosophy):** Motion to reconstitute the ad hoc REI (Race, Equity, and Inclusion) Committee in order to bring a formal proposal for the REI curriculum requirement through Curriculog and the Faculty Curriculum Committee. The motion was seconded by Senator Merissa Ferrara (Communication). The members of the committee are as follows:

Anthony Greene (African American Studies) and Morgan Koerner (German), co-chairs; Julia McReynolds-Perez (Sociology), research subcommittee chair; Charissa Owens (Office of Institutional Diversity), Kristen Monet Graham (ICAN Curriculum Chair), Ghazi Abuhakema (Asian and Arabic Studies), Kristi Brian (Women's and Gender Studies), Nenad Radakovic (Teacher Education), Jason Vance (Biology), Chris Korey (Biology), Lancie Affonso (Honors College), James Malm (Finance), David Hansen (Entrepreneurship), Judy Millesen (Public Administration), Meg Goettsches (African Studies), Mark Del Mastro (Associate Provost), and Mary Bergstrom (Registrar).

The motion passed by online vote.

d. **Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty-Administration Manual** (Merissa Ferrara, Chair): Motion to delete from the By-Laws item c (implementation) under Section 3.B.20 (Advisory Committee on First-Year Experience). [Revision](#)

Senator Ferrara explained that this is essentially a “housekeeping” change; the provision being deleted is obsolete. The motion passed by online vote.

e. **Senator Chris Warnick (HSS)**: Motion to form an ad hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness and Mentoring to serve through Fall 2022, with the following charge:

- Identify and implement more effective approaches for gathering formative and summative student feedback that better informs teaching effectiveness and promotes students’ metacognitive engagement with their own learning;
- Develop guidelines for faculty end-of-course self-reflection that draw on formative and summative feedback from students and that can be used to demonstrate growth in annual reviews and major reviews;
- Incorporate a fourth evaluation category into the Faculty Administration Manual that rewards and incentivizes outstanding faculty advising and mentoring;
- Create an effective professional development infrastructure to support these project goals.

[Rationale and Proposed Timeline](#)

Senator Warnick reviewed the rationale and goals (see attachment). The motion was seconded by Senator Gretchen McLaine (Theatre and Dance).

Citing the second goal, which includes “self-reflection” and demonstrating growth in performance reviews, Senator Irina Gigova (HSS) expressed concern about creating more work for faculty. She asked whether that item was just something for the committee to consider or something they must endorse.

Senator Warnick replied that it’s something that other schools have done, but he can see how it could become busywork. He said it would be up to the committee to decide on the exact guidelines, but the group making this proposal wants there to be follow-up on evaluations.

Senator Gigova asked if faculty will be able to weigh in on these discussions with the committee --- for instance, through a survey.

Senator Warnick replied that the committee would do focus-group surveys with students and faculty and have conversations with department chairs and the tenure and promotion committee. He said this effort should be ground up, not top-down.

Senator Jessica Streit (Art and Architectural History) said she worries about mandatory “reflection,” especially when it is part of tenure-and-promotion process. It can easily become performative, she said. She is also concerned about the prospect of another merit category for tenure and promotion. While she and her department are wary about adding those requirements, they are in favor of revising the evaluations provided by students to try to mitigate bias against women and people of color. Senator Warnick responded that his group imagined that the “reflection piece” would not be an add-on but, rather, something to support faculty. Senator Streit said that in her experience with faculty reviews, “optional” usually becomes mandatory in practice.

Associate Provost Deanna Caveny reminded the Senate that the administrative portion of the Faculty-Administration Manual, which includes evaluation policies, is controlled by the Provost. The Provost’s Office has, in the past, sought feedback from relevant faculty committees, chairs and deans. But essentially for items in the administrative section in the manual, the Provost would have the final say.

Senator Ashley Pagnotta (Physics and Astronomy) asked, if a fourth pillar of evaluation (advising and mentoring) were to be added, will we get more pages for our tenure-and-promotion narrative? Senator Warnick replied that that would be determined by Academic Affairs. Associate Provost Caveny added that some of these measures would affect departments differently from one another, so her office would work with departments accordingly.

Professor Vince Benigni (Guest, Communication) suggested that we put the burden for supplying advising data on advisees rather than on faculty. He added that the College does not place enough importance on service as it is, and perhaps service and mentoring could be combined rather than creating a fourth “prong” of evaluation. Senator Warnick said that advising “shows up” in reviews under both teaching and service, so he hopes the committee would work on clarifying that.

Senator Brian Bossak (Heath and Human Performance) said that he sees this as a complicated question; there are benefits of this initiative, but he shares concerns expressed by others about where such well-intentioned proposals might lead.

Senator Warnick expressed hope that this proposal will spark discussion about course-instructor evaluations, but he also hopes that we can gather information about perceptions of teaching. The proposers want this committee to help us as an institution define what effective teaching is.

The proposal passed by online vote (26 yes, 14 no, 4 abstain).

f. **Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid** (Meta Van Sickle, Chair): Proposal to revise the policy on XXF Transcript Notation (Academic Dishonesty) [Presentation](#) / [Proposed Revision](#) The proposal was withdrawn by the committee.

6. Constituents' General Concerns

Senator Tom Carroll (EHHP) asked how members of the ad hoc REI Committee were chosen. Speaker Lewis replied that he and several others put the committee together in October 2019. Senator Carroll asked if there were a way for others to get involved in those conversations. Speaker Lewis said that the idea was to have representation across schools on the committee so that they could solicit input from across campus before a curricular proposal comes back to the Senate.

Senator Ashley Pagnotta (Physics and Astronomy) asked how the ad hoc Teaching Effectiveness and Mentoring would be chosen. Speaker Lewis replied that the selection would go through the Committee on Nominations and Elections, who will try to get as wide a range of faculty as possible.

Speaker Lewis thanked Katy Flynn, who is leaving the College after serving as Faculty Secretariat and Administrative Assistant in the Provost's Office for the past year. He also acknowledged Dean Valerie Morris, Dean Jeri Cabot, Dean Godfrey Gibbison, Professor Elaine Worzala, and Professor Chris Starr, all of whom are retiring or leaving the College this December.

7. The meeting adjourned at 6:18.

On changes to Sections VI.A through VI.D on tenure, promotion, and third-year review

- Memo and marked-up changes communicated June 2, 2021

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty colleagues, including department chairs and deans

FROM: Deanna M. Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs

DATE: June 2, 2021

RE: changes to language on major faculty reviews, effective with the 2021-2022 edition of the *Faculty/Administration Manual*

This memo summarizes changes to tenure, promotion, and third-year review expectations and processes as articulated in the *Faculty/Administration Manual* (hereafter, “*Manual*”). These changes are effective with 2021-2022 faculty reviews and will appear in the 2021-2022 edition of the *Manual*. This document provides a summary list, followed by a replica of Sections VI.A through VI.D of the *Manual*, with tracking to show the exact revisions from the 2020-2021 edition to the 2021-2022 edition. This document will be replaced by the full *Faculty/Administration Manual* and the 2021-2022 change log once those documents are finalized and posted.

The changes are as follows:

- External reviews of research: The new language provides more explicit guidance to Departmental Evaluation Panel chairs for soliciting external reviews of research, in cases where such reviews are used. The focus is on soliciting a review of the quality of a candidate’s research and professional development, rather than an overall assessment of whether the candidate would meet research expectations at the reviewer’s own institution. Additionally, the solicitation letter may reflect any quantitative or qualitative research expectations set by college-wide or approved school or departmental guidelines. See exact revisions in the *Faculty/Administration Manual*, Section VI.A.2.b.(2).ii.(b), a copy of which is attached.
- Presentation of certain professional activities: The new language clarifies an ambiguity in past editions of the *Manual* and clearly communicates that certain professional activities can be presented by the candidate as either professional development or service. See *Manual*, Section VI.A.2.b.(5) and Section VI.A.3.a, a copy of which is attached.

VI. EVALUATION OF FACULTY

A. **Third-year Review, Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-Track and Tenured Instructional Faculty** (Rev. April 2012)

The President retains the power of approval for third-year review determinations, conferrals of tenure, and promotions. The Provost, acting in accordance with the provisions stated in this *Faculty/Administration Manual*, is responsible for making the final recommendation to the President in respect to all such matters.

Tenure and promotion require substantial evidence of consistently high professional competence in teaching, research and professional development, and service. In addition, evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the three specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development is required. Tenure is a long-term commitment by the College; it is not merely a reward for work accomplished, but it is an award given with the expectation that consistently high professional competence will continue.
(Rev. April 2009)

A third-year review should substantiate whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made. There should be evidence of effective teaching, a continuing research program, and active participation in service. A candidate should be informed in detail of any weakness that, if not corrected, might lead to a negative tenure decision. If there are serious doubts as to whether the candidate will be able to meet the criteria prior to a required tenure decision, a recommendation against retention should be given.

A tenure decision is made only once, no later than the sixth year. Up to two years credit toward tenure and promotion may be awarded at the time of initial appointment for teaching and research on a full-time basis at other four-year and graduate colleges and universities or for full-time employment at faculty positions of special status at the College of Charleston. A person receiving the maximum of two years credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fourth year at the College. A person receiving one year of credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fifth year at the College.
(Rev. April 2007)

Six years in rank is normally required for an Assistant Professor to be eligible for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Seven years in rank is normally required for an Associate Professor to be eligible for promotion to Professor.

In exceptional cases a faculty member may wish to petition for early tenure or promotion provided the action has the prior written approval of the Provost, the Dean and the Departmental Chair.

Faculty are evaluated in the three categories of Teaching Effectiveness, Research and Professional Development, and Professional Service to the Community. Because teaching is the primary responsibility of any faculty member, evidence of effective teaching is expected for tenure and for promotion. Because research and professional development are essential to the mission of the College, evidence of a sustained research program and a continuing scholarly commitment must be provided for tenure and for promotion. Because faculty should be contributing members of the College community and, where appropriate, the community at large, evidence of service to the community is expected.

While quantifiable data (numerical items from student evaluations, numbers of papers published, number of committees, etc.) are important, decisions about tenure and promotion must ultimately rely on sound professional judgment.

What follow are the general standards and evidence that remain constant throughout the four levels of institutional evaluation, namely third-year review, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor. A separate evaluation process, with its own standards and evidence, is used for the honorary rank of University Professor (see Art. VI, Sect. I). (Rev. Aug. 2015)

1. Teaching Effectiveness

a. Standard

Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty at the College of Charleston. Teaching involves communicating knowledge to students and fostering in them the intellectual curiosity necessary to continue the quest for knowledge. The effective teacher exhibits a sustained concern for teaching, which is reflected in teaching materials, classroom performance, academic advising, critical evaluation of students, and adequate preparation of students for later undergraduate and/or graduate work. Course materials should be well-conceived, well-organized and well-written. Students should be exposed to current scholarship or research in the field, if appropriate. Student evaluations should be consistently good. A teacher should be prepared to provide sound advice to students and to newer colleagues on academic matters.

b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include:

- (1) Chair's evaluations since faculty member has been in rank. Chair must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate's being considered for promotion/tenure.

(2) (i) Departmental colleague letters evaluating teaching are required.

(ii) Letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions evaluating teaching are optional.

(Ins. April 2007)

(3) Evaluatee's narrative of teaching philosophy, methodology, and accomplishments in teaching, advising and other similar activities.

(4) Recent graduate evaluations on teaching: either all majors or a sample of at least 40 students selected randomly from among all majors in the department who have graduated within the past five years and whom the candidate has taught; additional students whom the candidate has taught, who need not be majors in the department, may be added by the candidate in consultation with the Chair. Students must list all courses taken from the evaluatee and the grade(s) received in these courses. In addition, the student must sign the form or letter used for evaluation. The Chair must designate which students are recommended by the evaluatee. In cases where a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than 40 graduates, the Department Chair should indicate that this has occurred. In these cases it may be appropriate to substitute evaluations from non-majors. The Chair should endeavor to collect at least twenty responses from recent graduates, keeping in mind that it is appropriate to send reminders or solicit feedback from more than forty students if response rates are low. (Rev. Aug. 2015)

Without exception, each Department's graduate evaluation form shall include a standardized section designed only to provide and solicit demographic information about each individual graduate completing the form. This standardized section of the form shall be designed and distributed each year by the Office of the Provost and must be used without alteration by each department.

(Ins. April 2007)

Recent Graduate Evaluations are optional for Third-Year Review and may be requested by the departmental evaluation panel or the candidate.

(Rev. Apr. 2007)

(5) Student ratings and summaries:

(i) Student ratings from all courses evaluated. Student course evaluations will be completed for every section of every course, every semester, with the exception of a course that has only one student enrolled. If it is a department's policy to require the inclusion of the comments portion of the student ratings, the department must develop procedures for collecting and reviewing this portion of the student ratings form. A copy of the procedures should be on file in the Provost's Office. In the absence of these procedures, a faculty member undergoing review may choose to include these comments as part of the packet, having explained in the written narrative about teaching whether all the comments or a selection of the comments have been included.
(Rev. Aug. 2018)

(ii) The Summary Rating for all courses in the Department for each semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder with the summary student evaluations. The summary ratings for the department will be distributed to the faculty in the department each semester.
(Rev. Apr. 2007)

(6) Evidence of teaching effectiveness may also include but is not limited to:

- (i) Syllabi, reading lists or bibliographies, policy statements, grading procedures, course goals and objectives.
- (ii) Samples of evaluatee-prepared and/or supplementary course materials.
- (iii) Samples of tests, exams, essays or other assignments.
- (iv) Participation in curriculum development.
- (v) Participation in interdisciplinary courses and programs.

- (vi) Participation in peer coaching activities and/or observation of classroom performance by colleagues.
- (vii) Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops and field trips.

2. Research and Professional Development

a. Standard

Research and professional development are essential to a professor's ability to carry out the College's educational mission. Research and professional development involve the various activities that increase the faculty member's knowledge and that exemplify scholarly or artistic expertise. It includes, but is not limited to, original contributions to the discipline, creative activities in practice and performance in the fine arts, research in pedagogy, and appropriate studies within and outside one's specialties. The professional educator undertakes research for scholarly or creative production, to maintain currency in the content of courses taught, and to improve pedagogical techniques. The professional educator sustains professional contact with colleagues and engages in continuing professional activities to upgrade and augment existing skills or develop new ones.

b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include:

- (1) Evaluatee's narrative of research and professional development activities.
- (2) Colleague letters (departmental and optional external)
 - (i) Departmental colleague letters evaluating research and professional development are required.
 - (ii) Optional evaluation of research and professional development includes:
 - (a) letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston evaluating research and professional development and
(Rev. Apr. 2012)

- (b) independent external reviews of research. Departments that choose to conduct such external reviews must follow the process outlined here.

Instructions for External Reviews of Research:

The external reviewers chosen should be appropriately qualified to conduct an independent review of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements. Candidates should submit the names of at least three professionals from outside the College by late August. Evaluation panel chairs, in consultation with departmental panel members, should present additional names of external reviewers in order to obtain no fewer than two independent reviews of the quality of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements. The Departmental Evaluation Panel chair may solicit names of potential additional reviews from people named on the candidate's list. No more than half of the reviews should be secured from the candidate's own list. The candidate is allowed to strike one name from the panel chair's list. Under no circumstances and at no point in time shall a candidate contact a potential or actual reviewer about any aspect of such a review. Panel Chair should specify in writing, for inclusion in the packet, how each reviewer was selected. (Rev. Apr. 2012; Rev. Aug. 2015)

After the external reviewers have been determined, a cover letter from the panel chair should accompany the review materials sent to them, stating that the College seeks a review of the quality of a candidate's research and professional development ~~and not merely a testimonial to the candidate's accomplishments, rather than an overall assessment of whether the candidate would meet research expectations at the reviewer's own institution.~~ A copy of the candidate's academic curriculum vitae and copies of the relevant scholarly and/or creative works agreed upon by the candidate and evaluation panel chair should be sent to each of the outside reviewers. ~~Copies of the relevant portions of the Faculty/Administration~~

~~Manual about research and professional development as well as any additional departmental criteria on file in the Office of the Provost should be included.~~ Letters to external reviewers may also reflect any quantitative or qualitative research expectations set by college-wide or approved school or departmental guidelines. For instance, the following excerpts from the *Faculty/Administration Manual* could be included in such letters, “Because research and professional development are essential to the mission of the College, evidence of a sustained research program and a continuing scholarly commitment much be provided for tenure and promotion,” and for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must present “... clear evidence of high promise for continued quality scholarship and professional activity. Since peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality, the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). All evidence must be evaluated rigorously.” Additional supporting review materials may also be submitted by the panel chair or the candidate, provided that these materials are included in the packet.

Reviewers should be asked to identify what relationship, if any, they have with the candidate and to return their review in a timely manner for the deliberations of the departmental panel. To make it possible that reviews are available prior to those deliberations, external reviews must be solicited sufficiently in advance of panel deliberations.

The panel chair must include in the candidate's packet: 1.) a description of the process by which the outside letters were obtained, 2.) each reviewer's institutional and departmental affiliation, and rank or other institutional title, a description of the academic specialization of the reviewer, and other relevant information about the reviewer, which may be useful to those unfamiliar with the field, 3.) a copy of the letter of solicitation by the panel chair, and 4.) the confidential outside reviews.

(Ins. Apr. 2007)

- (3) Chair's evaluations since faculty member has been in rank. Chair must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate's being considered for promotion/tenure.
- (4) Evidence of scholarship may include but is not limited to:
 - (i) professionally published scholarly books
 - (ii) academic journal articles
 - (iii) chapters in scholarly books
 - (iv) edited volumes
 - (v) review essays
 - (vi) creative literary and artistic works and other creative works
 - (vii) research grants
 - (viii) conference papers
 - (ix) reviews of candidate's books, performances, etc.
 - (x) scholarly reviews by candidate of books, performances, etc.
 - (xi) invited or juried exhibits, concerts, performances, etc.
 - (xii) technical reports
 - (xiii) textbooks, workbooks, study guides and other published pedagogical materials
 - (xix) draft manuscripts
 - (xx) professional bibliographies
- (5) ~~Evidence of professional activities may include but is not limited to:~~ The professional activities listed below can be included as evidence either in the category of Research and Professional Development, or in the category of Service.

Evidence of professional activities may include but is not limited to:

- (i) serving as an officer or a member of a board or committee of an international, national, regional or state professional organization
- (ii) serving on an editorial board of a scholarly journal
- (iii) reviewing manuscripts for journals and publishers; evaluating proposals for granting agencies
- (iv) chairing or serving as a discussant on a panel at a professional meeting
- (v) preparing grant proposals and reports
- (vi) conducting professional workshops, seminars, and field trips
- (vii) participating in professional meetings, seminars, workshops, field trips, etc.
- (viii) undertaking post-doctoral studies
- (ix) receiving fellowships and awards
- (x) serving as a professional consultant
- (xi) serving as Department Chair, Program Director, or Associate Dean (Ins. Aug. 2015)

3. Professional Service to the Community

a. Standard

Service to the College and/or community falls within the responsibilities of a faculty member and is essential to the fulfillment of the College's responsibilities to the academic community and to the attainment of institutional goals. Each faculty member is expected to cooperate in supporting the mission and the goals of the department and the College. Service includes involvement in standing or *ad hoc* committees of the College faculty, in departmental committees or offices, and in special committees or task forces.

Service includes working with student organizations and non-academic advising; working with community, state, regional or national organizations; utilizing professional expertise; and working on institutional advancement projects. Service can also include those professional activities listed in Section VI.A.2.b.(5), which addresses evidence of professional development.

- b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include but is not limited to:
 - (1) Evaluatee's narrative of service activities.
 - (2) Departmental and extra-departmental colleague letters:
 - (i) Departmental colleague letters evaluating service are required.
 - (ii) Letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions evaluating service are required.

(Ins. Apr. 2007)

- (3) Chair's evaluations since the faculty member has been in rank. Chair must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate's being considered for promotion/tenure.

4. Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

What follow are minimum criteria for tenure and promotion. Departments and schools may develop additional criteria. Any such proposed criteria will require review and approval by the appropriate academic dean and Provost's Office to ensure consistency with college-wide guidelines and procedures. Additionally, they shall be reviewed by the originating body every five years and will require review and approval by the dean and the Provost's Office when modified.

(Rev. Apr. 2012)

a. Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is normally awarded simultaneously with tenure. The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The Associate Professor will normally hold the highest appropriate terminal degree. Evidence of exemplary performance

in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development is required.

(Ins. Apr. 2007; Rev. Apr. 2009)

- (1) Tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor require sustained effectiveness in teaching.
- (2) There must be clear evidence of high promise for continued quality scholarship and professional activity. Since peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality, the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). All evidence should be evaluated rigorously.
- (3) There should be active and sustained service to the College or there should be active and sustained service in the candidate's professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.

b. Tenure for Associate Professors

A faculty member hired as an untenured Associate Professor must meet the same criteria for tenure as in section a (immediately above). Evidence of exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development is required.

(Ins. Apr. 2007; Rev. Apr. 2009)

c. Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of continuing quality teaching, research and service. The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to Professor. The Professor must hold the highest appropriate terminal degree. Evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in all three areas is required.

(Ins. Apr. 2007; Rev. Apr. 2009)

- (1) Promotion to the rank of Professor requires sustained high quality and effective teaching.
(Rev. Apr. 2009)

- (2) Because Professor is the highest rank, there must be clear evidence of continuing quality scholarship. Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professional evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). In addition to scholarship, sustained professional activity is expected. All evidence should be rigorously evaluated.
- (3) There should be active and sustained service to the College. Leadership should be demonstrated either in college service or in the candidate's professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.

d. Tenure for Professors

A faculty member hired as an untenured Professor must meet the same criteria for tenure as in section a (above).
(Rev. Apr. 2012)

5. Nomination of Instructional Faculty to a Higher Rank

When a faculty member becomes eligible for nomination to a higher rank, a nomination may be submitted in the form of a petition from one or more of the following:

- a. the Department Chair, after consultation with the tenured members of the department, to the Provost;
- b. a majority of the tenured members of the department to the Provost;
- c. the individual faculty member to the Provost;
- d. the Provost to the Department Chair;
- e. the Dean to the Department Chair.

Normally, a petition nominating a faculty member to a higher rank should be made not later than August 15 of the academic year in which a decision on promotion is to be made. The faculty member will then be evaluated under the provisions outlined in Art. VI.D. entitled "Procedures for Third-Year Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty."
(Rev. Apr. 2007)

It should be clearly understood by all faculty members that promotion does not come automatically after the passage of a fixed period of time, but it is recognition of outstanding performance and service at the College.

B. Third-Year Review and Promotion of Instructors and Renewal of Senior Instructors

The President retains the power of approval for third-year review determinations, promotions, and renewals. The Provost, acting in accordance with the provisions stated in this Faculty/Administration Manual, is responsible for making the final recommendation to the President in respect to all such matters

A third-year review should substantiate whether satisfactory progress toward promotion to Senior Instructor has been made. A candidate should be informed in detail of any weakness that, if not corrected, might lead to a negative promotion decision. If there are serious doubts as to whether the candidate will be able to meet the criteria prior to a required promotion decision, a recommendation against retention should be given.

Promotion to Senior Instructor is awarded to eligible instructors at the College of Charleston for meritorious achievement in the three areas: teaching, professional development and service. A promotion decision is made only once normally in the sixth year. A review for renewal as Senior Instructor normally takes place every seventh year¹.

(Inst. Apr. 2011; Rev Aug. 2014)

1. Specific Criteria for Promotion to and Renewal as Senior Instructor
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to and renewal as Senior Instructor:

- a. Promotion to and renewal in the rank of Senior Instructor requires sustained exemplary performance in teaching.
- b. Continued vitality as a teacher is intimately related to professional development. There must be clear evidence of promise for continued development in pedagogy.
- c. There should be active and sustained participation in service to the College, and, where appropriate, to the community.

¹In 2014-15, Senior Instructors eligible for renewal in the fifth year under previous rules and procedures may decide, in consultation with their chair, whether to proceed for renewal in the fifth or to defer renewal till the seventh year. A Senior Instructor formerly eligible for renewal in 2015-16 may request through their chair and dean an evaluation in that year.

2. Teaching Effectiveness

a. Standard

Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty at the College of Charleston. Teaching involves communicating knowledge to students and fostering in them the intellectual curiosity necessary to continue the quest for knowledge. The effective teacher exhibits a sustained concern for teaching, which is reflected in teaching materials, classroom performance, academic advising, critical evaluation of students, and adequate preparation of students for later undergraduate work. Course materials should be well conceived, well organized and well written. Instructors should be accessible to students both inside and outside of class, provide frequent constructive feedback to students, and involve them actively in the learning process. Instructors should attempt to use a variety of teaching techniques including innovations involving modern technology, where appropriate, and maintain currency in the pedagogy of their disciplines. Students should be exposed to current scholarship or research in the field, if appropriate. Student evaluations should be consistently good. An instructor should be prepared to provide sound advice to students and to newer colleagues on academic matters.

b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include:

- (1) Chair's evaluations since faculty member has been at the College.
- (2) Internal and/or external colleague statements on teaching.
- (3) Evaluatee's narrative of teaching philosophy, methodology, and accomplishments in teaching, advising, and other similar activities.
- (4) Recent graduate evaluations on teaching: either all majors or a sample of at least 40 students selected randomly from among all majors in the department who have graduated within the past five years and whom the candidate has taught; departments may choose to use a sample of at least 40 graduates selected randomly from among students in service courses taught by the evaluatee. Additional students whom the candidate has taught may be added by the candidate in consultation with the Chair. Students must

list all courses taken from the evaluatee and the grade(s) received in these courses. In addition, the students must sign the form or letter used for evaluation. The Chair must designate which students are recommended by the evaluatee. In cases where a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than 40 graduates, the Department Chair should indicate that this has occurred. In these cases it may be appropriate to substitute evaluations from non-majors.

- (5) Student ratings and summaries:
 - (a) Student ratings from all courses evaluated. Student course evaluations will be completed for every section of every course, every semester, with the exception of a course that has only one student enrolled. If it is a department's policy to require the inclusion of the comments portion of the student ratings, the department must develop procedures for collecting and reviewing this portion of the student ratings form. A copy of the procedures should be on file in the Provost's Office. In the absence of these procedures, a faculty member undergoing review may choose to include these comments as part of the packet, having explained in their narrative about teaching whether all the comments or a selection of the comments have been included. (Rev. Aug. 2018)
 - (b) The Summary Rating for all courses in the Department for each semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder with the summary student evaluations. The summary ratings for the department will be distributed to the faculty in the department each semester. (Inst. Apr. 2011)
- (6) Evidence of teaching effectiveness may also include but is not limited to:
 - (a) Syllabi, reading lists or bibliographies, policy statements, grading procedures, course goals and objectives.
 - (b) Samples of evaluatee-prepared and/or other supplementary course material.

- (c) Samples of tests, exams, essays or other assignments, including some graded work.
- (d) Participation in curriculum development.
- (e) Participation in interdisciplinary courses and programs.
- (f) Participation in peer coaching activities and/or observation of classroom performance by colleagues. Each department will develop a procedure for peer observations of candidates for promotion to Senior Instructor.
- (g) Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops and field trips.
- (h) Participation in departmental advising as directed by the Department Chair.

3. Professional Development

a. Standard

Professional development is essential to an instructor's ability to carry out the College's educational mission. Professional development involves the various activities that increase the faculty member's knowledge and exemplify pedagogical or artistic expertise. It includes, but is not limited to, research in pedagogy, appropriate studies within and outside one's specialties, and creative activities in practice and performance in the fine arts. Instructors maintain currency in the content of courses taught and in pedagogical techniques. They sustain professional contact with colleagues and engage in continuing professional activities to maintain, upgrade, and augment existing skills or develop new ones.

b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include:

- (1) Evaluatee's narrative of professional development activities.
- (2) Internal and/or external colleague statements on professional activities.

- (3) Chair's evaluations since faculty member has been at the College.
- (4) Evidence of professional development may include but is not limited to:
 - (a) serving as an officer or a member of a board or committee of a local, state, regional, national or international professional organization;
 - (b) chairing or serving as a discussant on a panel at a professional meeting;
 - (c) preparing grant proposals and reports;
 - (d) conducting professional workshops and seminars;
 - (e) participating in professional meetings, seminars, workshops, et cetera;
 - (f) completing graduate studies or course work relevant to professional competency;
 - (g) receiving fellowships and awards;
 - (h) serving as a professional consultant;
 - (i) attending workshops, symposia, meetings of regional and national organizations, et cetera;
 - (j) producing scholarly and creative works that are pedagogical in nature, such as media productions, and compiling significant bibliographies, guidebooks, catalogs, study guides, textbooks or workbooks;
 - (k) all activities appropriate at the professorial ranks.

4. Professional Service to the Community

a. Standard

Service to the College and/or the community falls within the responsibilities of a faculty member and is essential to the fulfillment of the College's responsibilities to the academic

community and to the attainment of institutional goals. Each faculty member is expected to cooperate in supporting the mission and the goals of the department and the College. Service includes holding departmental offices, serving on departmental committees, and participating in campus and community activities related to the College and to one's professional role. It also includes involvement with standing or *ad hoc* committees of the College, and special committees or task forces. Service includes working with student organizations and non-academic advising; working with community, state, regional or national organizations; utilizing professional expertise; and working on institutional advancement projects.

- b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include but is not limited to:
 - (1) Evaluatee's narrative of accomplishments in service while in the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor.
 - (2) Internal and/or external colleague statements and letters of testimony. The letters shall be solicited by the panel chair. Authors of letters shall be agreed upon by both the panel chair and the evaluatee.
 - (3) Chair's evaluations since the faculty member has been at the College.

C. Third-Year Review, Tenure and Promotion of the Library Faculty
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

The President retains the power of approval for third-year review determinations, conferrals of tenure and promotions. The Provost, acting in accordance with the provisions stated in this *Faculty/Administration Manual*, is responsible for making the final recommendation to the President in respect to all such matters.

Tenure and promotion require substantial evidence of consistently high performance in professional competency, professional growth and development, and service. In addition, evidence of exemplary performance is required in the professional competency area. Tenure is a long-term commitment by the College; it is not merely a reward for work accomplished, but it is an award given with the expectation that consistently high performance will continue.

Promotion to the rank of Librarian II (if necessary) is awarded simultaneously with the third-year review. A third-year review should substantiate whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made. There should be evidence of effective professional competency, a continuing research and development

program, and active participation in service. A candidate should be informed in detail of any weakness that, if not corrected, might lead to a negative tenure decision. If there are serious doubts as to whether the candidate will be able to meet the criteria prior to a required tenure decision, a recommendation against retention should be given.

A tenure decision is made only once, no later than the sixth year. Up to two years credit toward tenure and promotion may be awarded at the time of initial appointment for previous professional library experience elsewhere, or for full-time employment at professional library positions of special status at the College of Charleston. A person receiving the maximum of two years credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fourth year at the College. (Rev. Apr. 2007)

Three years in rank is normally required for a Librarian I to be promoted to a Librarian II (which is done simultaneously with the Third-year Review). Six years in rank is normally required for a Librarian II to be promoted to a Librarian III. Seven years in rank is normally required for a Librarian III to be promoted to a Librarian IV. In exceptional cases a librarian may wish to petition for early tenure or promotion provided that action has the prior written approval of the Provost and the Dean.

Librarians are evaluated in the three categories of professional competency, professional growth and development, and professional service to the community. Because professional competency is the primary responsibility of any librarian, evidence of exemplary professional competency is expected for tenure and promotion. Because professional growth and development are essential to the mission of the College, evidence of a sustained quality research program and a continuing scholarly commitment must be provided for tenure and promotion. Because librarians should be contributing members of the College community and, where appropriate, the community at large, evidence of service to the community is expected.

While quantifiable data are important, decisions about tenure and promotion must ultimately rely on sound professional judgment.

What follow are the general standards and evidence that remain constant throughout the five levels of institutional evaluation, namely third-year review, tenure and promotion to Librarian II, III and IV. A separate evaluation process, with its own standards and evidence, is used for the honorary rank of University Librarian IV (see Art. VI, Sect. I). (Rev. Aug. 2015)

1. Professional Competency

a. Standard

The successful librarian contributes to the educational mission and priorities of the College and the Library by providing and promoting quality services and operations to the academic community. Professional competency includes a mastery of requisite professional skills and knowledge within each librarian's specific job description. Professional competency for librarians is the achievement of and commitment to intellectual freedom, accessibility of information (which includes the selection, acquisition, organization, preservation, instruction in the use of, and promotion of appropriate collections to support teaching and other educational activities), and supporting the curricular and research efforts of the academic community.

b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include, but is not limited to:

- (1) Evaluatee's statement of accomplishments based on annual goals and objectives;
- (2) Annual evaluations;
- (3) Letters addressing the criteria from departmental colleagues, from non-library faculty, from person(s) supervised (directly or indirectly) by evaluatee, from extra-College librarians, and, in the case of the Marine Resources Librarian, additionally from administrators and research associates of the South Carolina Marine Resources Center; (Rev. Aug. 2015)
- (4) Support materials, such as reports, working documents, statistical measures, policy statements, procedure manuals, annual reports, Library 105 and other instructional materials (to include syllabi, policy statements, grading procedures, tests, sample assignments, study or research guides), student evaluations, in-house publications, brochures, media, et cetera.

2. Professional Growth and Development

a. Standard

The professional growth and development of librarians is essential to the College's ability to carry out its educational mission. A librarian's continued vitality is intimately related to professional growth and development. Therefore, librarians are expected to conduct research or engage in other creative forms of professional growth and development. Professional growth and development involves the various professional activities that increase the librarian's knowledge and that exemplify scholarly or artistic expertise. It includes, but is not limited to, original contributions to the discipline, creative activities in librarianship, research in pedagogy, and appropriate studies within and outside one's specialties.

b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include but is not limited to:

- (1) Evaluatee's narrative of professional growth and development activities;
- (2) Both internal and external colleague statements on professional growth and development activities;
- (3) Dean's evaluations since librarian has been in rank. Dean must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate's being considered for promotion or tenure.
- (4) Evidence of scholarship includes:
 - (i) professionally published scholarly books;
 - (ii) academic journal articles
 - (iii) chapters in scholarly books;
 - (iv) edited volumes;
 - (v) review essays;
 - (vi) creative works, including media production, compilation of significant bibliographies, guidebooks, catalogs, study guides, textbooks or workbooks;

- (vii) research grants;
- (viii) conference papers;
- (ix) reviews of candidate's books, et cetera;
- (x) reviews by candidate of books, et cetera;
- (xi) exhibits exemplifying scholarly endeavors;
- (xii) technical reports;
- (xiii) draft manuscripts.

(5) Evidence of professional activities include:

- (i) serving as an officer or a member of a board or committee of an international, national, regional, state or local professional organization;
- (ii) serving on an editorial board of a scholarly journal;
- (iii) reviewing manuscripts for journal and publishers;
- (iv) chairing or serving as a discussant on a panel at a professional meeting;
- (v) preparing grant proposals and reports;
- (vi) conducting professional workshops and seminars;
- (vii) participating in professional meetings, seminars, workshops, et cetera;
- (viii) completing graduate studies or course work relevant to professional competency;
- (ix) receiving fellowships and awards;
- (x) serving as a professional consultant.

3. Professional Service to the Community

a. Standard

Service to the College and/or the community falls within the responsibilities of a librarian and is essential to the fulfillment of the College's responsibilities to the academic community and to the attainment of institutional goals. Each librarian is expected to cooperate in supporting the mission and the goals of the Library and the College. Service includes involvement in standing or *ad hoc* committees of the College faculty, in departmental committees or offices, and in special committees or task forces. Service includes working with student organizations and academic advising; working with community, state, regional or national organizations; utilizing professional expertise; and working on institutional advancement projects.

b. Evidence should include but is not limited to:

- (1) Evaluatee's narrative of service activities.
- (2) Internal and/or external colleague statements on service activities.
- (3) Chair's evaluations since the faculty member has been in rank. Chair must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate's being considered for promotion or tenure.

4. Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

a. Promotion to the Rank of Librarian II/Third-year Review

Promotion to the rank of Librarian II is awarded simultaneously with the third-year review. A third-year review should substantiate whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made. A third-year review may be conducted for untenured librarians at other ranks. The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to Librarian II and/or third-year review.

- (1) Promotion to the rank of Librarian II requires evidence of progress toward meeting the tenure requirement of exemplary performance in the area of professional competency.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

- (2) Continued vitality as librarians is intimately associated with scholarship and related professional activities. There must be clear evidence of progress toward meeting the tenure requirement for professional growth and development.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)
- (3) There should be active and sustained service to the College or there should be active and sustained service in the candidate's professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

b. Tenure for Librarians

The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for tenure for library faculty.

- (1) Tenure for library faculty requires exemplary performance in the area of professional competency.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)
- (2) Continued vitality as librarians is intimately associated with scholarship and related professional activities. Traditional publication is not the only medium through which the library profession exchanges information and research findings, although librarianship possesses a growing body of scholarly literature. Workshops, symposia, seminars, meetings of regional and national organizations, et cetera, are also major means of communication within the discipline. Therefore, a candidate's contributions in these areas should be considered the equivalent of traditional scholarship. In addition, there must be clear evidence of promise for continued professional growth and development.
- (3) There should be active and sustained service to the College or there should be active and sustained service in the candidate's professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

c. Promotion to the Rank of Librarian III

The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to Librarian III. Evidence of exemplary professional

competency and significant achievement in the area of professional growth and development, or service is required.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

- (1) Promotion to the rank of Librarian III requires sustained and exemplary performance in the area of professional competency.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)
- (2) There must be clear evidence of high promise for continued quality of scholarship and professional activities. Since peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality, typically the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications). All evidence should be evaluated rigorously.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)
- (3) There should be active and sustained service to the College or there should be active and sustained service in the candidate's professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

d. Promotion to the Rank of Librarian IV

Promotion to the rank of Librarian IV requires evidence of continuing quality professional competency, professional growth and development, and service. The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to Librarian IV. Evidence of exemplary performance in the area of professional competence and significant achievement in the areas of professional growth and development, and service is required.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

- (1) Promotion to the rank of Librarian IV requires exemplary professional competency.
- (2) Because Librarian IV is the highest rank, there must be clear evidence of continuing quality scholarship. Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore, the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications). In addition to scholarship, sustained professional activity is expected. All evidence should be rigorously evaluated.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

- (3) There should be active and sustained service to the College. Leadership should be demonstrated either in college service or in the candidate's professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

e. Nomination of Library Faculty to a Higher Rank

It should be clearly understood by all library faculty members that promotion does not come automatically after the passage of a fixed period of time, but is a recognition of outstanding performance and service at the College.

- (1) Source of Nomination. When a library faculty member becomes eligible for nomination to a higher rank, a nomination may be submitted in the form of a petition from:
 - (i) the Dean of Libraries, after consultation with the tenured members of the library faculty, to the Provost;
 - (ii) a majority of the tenured members of the library faculty to the Provost;
 - (iii) a majority of the members of the library faculty to the Provost;
 - (iv) the individual library faculty member to the Provost;
 - (v) the Provost to the Dean of the library.
- (2) Deadline for Nomination. Normally, a petition nominating a library faculty member for promotion to a higher rank should be made not later than August 15 of the academic year in which a decision on promotion is to be made.

D. Procedures for Third-Year Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty

1. Introduction

The third-year evaluation is a significant decision point in a faculty member's career at the College of Charleston. The result of the third-year evaluation is a decision whether to reappoint a faculty member. For a

faculty member with two years of credit toward tenure, a third-year evaluation will take place in the fall semester of the third year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place in the fall of the fourth year. For a faculty member with one year of credit toward tenure, a third-year evaluation will take place in the fall semester of the third year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place in the fall of the fifth year.
(Rev. Apr. 2007)

Candidates hired at mid-year will undergo the third-year review during the fall semester of the third academic year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place during the fall semester of the sixth academic year. The evaluations for third-year review and for tenure will be adjusted accordingly for candidates hired at mid-year and granted credit for prior experience.
(Ins. Apr. 2007)

Tenure and promotion are awarded to eligible faculty at the College of Charleston for meritorious achievement in the three areas of teaching (for library faculty, “professional competence”), research and professional development, and service. Tenure is awarded to faculty to assure that they have freedom in teaching, research and extramural activities and a sufficient degree of economic security to make teaching at the College of Charleston attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and society.²

After the expiration of a probationary period, which is stated in the initial employment and is normally six years (some faculty are hired with up to two years credit for teaching in other institutions of higher education), faculty should become eligible for consideration for tenure and, upon its reward, should be terminated only for adequate cause.
(Rev. Apr. 2007)

Eligibility requirements and nomination procedures are described in Section VI.A. Candidates are reminded that these time-in-rank requirements are minimal. The established criteria for promotion to the various ranks are also minimal requirements. In particular, faculty are encouraged to seek promotion to professor when they feel confident about their eligibility and performance, not merely because minimal requirements are met.

By August 15, each Department Chair should provide the appropriate Academic Dean and the Provost with a list of faculty members to be considered. The Dean of Libraries should provide a list of eligible library faculty members to the Provost.

² “On Academic Freedom and Tenure,” (AAUP 1940 Statement of Principle, readopted 1982)

(Rev. Apr. 2007)

The faculty member undergoing third-year evaluation must prepare and submit a packet of evidence to demonstrate that the faculty member has met the standards and criteria for this level of evaluation during that individual's first two years at the College. (Rev. Aug. 2018)

2. Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member's Contribution to the Packet

A faculty member shall submit to the Chair of the Departmental Evaluation Panel by the announced deadline a packet containing a current curriculum vitae and evidence assembled to demonstrate that the standards and criteria have been met. The review process begins once the faculty member's contribution to the packet has been formally submitted for departmental evaluation.

3. Standards, Criteria and Evidence. See *Faculty/Administration Manual*, Art. VI, Sect. A (for Tenure-Track and Tenured Instructional Faculty), Sect. B (for Instructors and Senior Instructors) and Sect. C (for Library Faculty). (Rev. Apr. 2011)

4. Composition of the Departmental Evaluation Panel

For each faculty member to be evaluated, an appropriate departmental evaluation panel will be formed to make a summary presentation to the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries concerning the candidate. The Chair of the department will provide the appropriate Academic Dean with the names of the panel members and Chair as soon as possible. Any member of the department who is being considered for promotion is disqualified from serving on that member's own review panel or that of a colleague who is being considered for promotion to the same or higher rank within the department. (Rev. Aug. 2018)

The Departmental Evaluation Panel will be composed of at least five tenured faculty members. All tenured departmental faculty will serve on the evaluation panel. Exceptions for faculty on sabbatical or leave are described in Art. X.A. The appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries may sit with the Departmental Evaluation Panel throughout the review process; however, the Dean not required to sit with the Departmental Evaluation Panel. (Rev. Aug. 2018)

Where the department consists of five or more tenured faculty members, one tenured faculty member from outside the department shall be added to the panel. If a department is reviewing more than one candidate for tenure, promotion or third-year evaluation, the same individual from

outside the department sits with the departmental panel members for all cases, unless the department has six or more candidates due for panel evaluation. In such cases, departmental members of the panel may appoint no more than two extra-departmental panel members to sit with the panel in different cases, with the cases divided such that a single extra-departmental panel member shall serve in all cases under review for the same rank. If a department's membership is such that the panel has fewer than five members, additional tenured members of the faculty, from related fields if possible, will be selected to give the panel a total membership of five. In all cases, each year vacancies in the evaluation panel will be filled by having the departmental members of the panel provide a slate of potential evaluation panel members to each of the candidates for third-year reappointment, tenure and promotion who will rank order the slate first to last. The slate will consist of at least five names or twice the number of positions on the panel to be filled (whichever is larger). The rankings of all candidates will be averaged and the panel will be completed by offering the positions to the highest ranked candidates until the panel is completed. (Rev. Aug. 2011; Mar. 2012)

Where there are no members of the department eligible to serve on the panel, all members of the department will meet and select by majority vote a slate of 10 tenured faculty (from related fields if possible) and present it to the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries. The appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries will appoint the five members of the panel from the slate and will designate one of the five to serve as the panel chair.

When unusual circumstances justify and where requested by the Department Chair, the evaluatee, the evaluation panel, the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries or the Provost, the Provost may appoint an outside advisor to assist the evaluation panel in its task. Ideally, said advisor will be a tenured faculty member in the evaluatee's discipline from another institution of higher education.

After consultation with the evaluatee, Department Chair, all members of the panel, and the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries, the Provost will define in writing the role and extent of participation in the process of their outside advisor and furnish copies to all parties.

5. Departmental Evaluation Panel Chair

If the Department Chair is a member of the panel, then the Department Chair is the panel chair. If the Department Chair is not a panel member, the panel chair will be the senior departmental member serving on the panel. The senior departmental member is the one of highest rank who has held that rank longest while at the College. Because the Library does

not have a Department Chair, the tenured Library faculty will elect a Departmental Evaluation Panel Chair. (Rev. Aug. 2018)

6. Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel

The departmental evaluation panel will base its recommendation on the following information:

- a. Faculty member's contribution to the packet, as assembled by the candidate, to provide evidence that the faculty member meets the criteria for teaching, research and development, and service. (Rev. Aug. 2018)
- b. Letters by the departmental colleagues addressing whether the evaluatee has met the stated criteria. Normally, all tenured faculty members in a department, excluding the department chair, must provide colleague evaluation letters; however, any member of the department may submit a colleague letter, except that candidates do not write letters of evaluation on their departmental colleagues who are being evaluated for the same purpose. Colleagues should study thoroughly the candidate's contributions to the packet before writing their colleague letters. Colleague letters should be explicit and detailed and should address the criteria. To say "the candidate meets the criteria" is inadequate. College of Charleston personnel are to treat these colleague letters as confidential. They shall be available only to those authorized to use them as part of the evaluation process. (Rev. Apr. 2007; Apr. 2012)
- c. Student Rating Averages from all courses evaluated and Summary Ratings for all courses in the Department or Program. (Normally, course evaluation ratings are included by the candidate in the packet; however, some or all of these documents may be provided by the department chair in the event the candidate is unable to do so.) (Rev. Apr. 2007)
- d. Letters of evaluation from extra-departmental College of Charleston colleagues and, where appropriate, from colleagues at other institutions familiar with the candidate's teaching, and/or research and professional development, and/or service; these letters are solicited by the department chair at the request of the candidate.

An independent external review of the candidate's scholarly work by experts in the candidate's field of work is optional, and the required protocol for this review is included in Section VI.A.2.b.(2).

Extra-departmental colleague letters are optional for third-year review and may be requested by the departmental evaluation panel or the candidate.

(Rev. Apr. 2007)

- e. All annual evaluation narratives and rating letters, as well as any letters that the evaluatee has written in response to the annual evaluations.
- f. Recent graduate evaluations addressing the criteria shall be solicited by the panel Chair. Each department shall have established procedures to be used by evaluation panels for the solicitation of recent graduate evaluations. A written statement of this procedure shall be on file in the appropriate Academic Dean and the Provost's office. Recent graduate evaluations are optional for Third-Year Review and may be requested by the departmental evaluation panel or the candidate.
(Rev. Apr. 2007)
- g. A personal interview of the candidate by the department evaluation panel.
- h. Such other data and interviews as the panel feels would be valuable.

7. Reporting Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel

After due deliberation, the panel shall take its vote by written ballot. The chair shall draft a statement for the members of the panel to sign that reports the recommendation and vote of the panel. This statement should include justification for the panel's recommendation. While maintaining the confidentiality of any meetings, the statement will summarize the discussion that took place among panel members, including positive and negative deliberations.

The chair of the panel shall meet with the faculty member being evaluated to provide the faculty member with a copy of the panel's written statement, which shall include actual vote splits and the signatures of all the panel members. The signatures of the panel members acknowledge only that the panel members participated in panel deliberation and had the opportunity to contribute to the development of the written statement. The faculty member shall sign a copy of the statement, with the signed copy to be retained by the chair of the panel for submission to the appropriate Academic Dean. The signature of the faculty member acknowledges only that a copy of the statement has been received by the faculty member.

(Rev. Apr. 2009)

If the panel's written statement provided to the candidate contains an error of fact, the panel chair may correct this error through an addendum to the original panel statement (with notice to the candidate) or the candidate may provide a written correction for the inclusion in the packet for consideration at higher levels of review within five working days of the provision of the recommendation. The written correction should be forwarded to the Dean with a copy to the chair of the departmental panel. The written correction should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence.³
(Ins. Apr. 2012)

The panel chair shall forward the panel's statement to the appropriate Academic Dean by the announced deadline. In the case of tenure and promotion recommendations, this deadline is typically at the end of October. In the case of third-year reappointment recommendations, this deadline is typically near mid-January.
(Rev. Apr. 2007; Rev. Apr. 2009)

8. Dean's Role for Third-year Candidates

The appropriate Dean shall review the faculty member's packet and the departmental evaluation panel's recommendation. Information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested by the Dean from the Departmental Evaluation Panel Chair or through that chair to the candidate. Requests should be written and responses should be brief and also in writing, addressing only the requested issues, and shall become part of the packet. The Dean shall interview each candidate.
(Rev. Apr. 2009; Rev. Apr. 2012)

The Dean shall provide the candidate and the chair of the departmental panel a copy of the Dean's assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the Provost. The Dean shall submit all recommendations in writing to the Provost and forward all materials to the Provost's Office by the announced deadlines, which are typically at the end of January. (Rev. Apr. 2009; Apr. 2012; Aug. 2018)

³ This and other changes in procedure to allow for the correction of errors of fact, in place since AY2012-13, will be reviewed every three years by Academic Affairs in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review and the Faculty Welfare Committee to assess the extent and appropriateness of their use. These groups will jointly report this analysis to the Faculty Senate.

9. Dean's Role for Tenure and Promotion Candidates

The appropriate Dean will review the evaluation panel recommendations and the candidate's packet. Information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested by the Dean from the Departmental Evaluation Panel Chair or through that chair to the candidate. Requests should be written and responses should be brief and also in writing, addressing only the requested issue, and shall become part of the packet. The Dean may choose to interview candidates.

(Rev. Apr. 2007; Rev. Apr. 2009; Rev. Apr. 2012)

The Dean will provide the candidate and the chair of the departmental panel a copy of the Dean's own assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the Provost. The Dean shall provide these recommendations in writing to the Provost and forward all materials to a designated room for review by the Provost and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-year Review by the announced deadlines, which are typically at the end of November. (Rev. Apr. 2007; Apr. 2009; Apr. 2012; Aug. 2018)

10. Correction of Errors in Dean's Recommendation

If a recommendation provided to the candidate by a Dean contains an error of fact, the Dean may correct this error through an addendum to the Dean's original letter of recommendation (with notice to the candidate and chair of the departmental panel) or the candidate may provide a written correction for the inclusion in the packet for consideration at higher levels of review within five working days of the provision of the recommendation. The written correction should be forwarded to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs with a copy to the Dean and chair of the departmental panel. The written correction should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence.⁴ (Ins. Apr. 2012; Rev. Aug. 2018)

11. Faculty Advisory Committee Action

The Provost shall make packets of all candidates for tenure and promotion available to the members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review. The Faculty Advisory Committee shall provide the candidate, chair of the departmental panel, Dean, and

⁴ This and other changes in procedure to allow for the correction of errors of fact, in place since AY2012-13, will be reviewed every three years by Academic Affairs in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review and the Faculty Welfare Committee to assess the extent and appropriateness of their use. These groups will jointly report this analysis to the Faculty Senate.

Provost a copy of their assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the President by the announced deadlines. (Rev. Apr. 2012)

The Committee shall also review third-year candidates on all negative departmental recommendations or if requested to do so by the candidate, any member of the departmental panel, the appropriate Dean or the Provost. In cases where either the Dean's recommendation or the departmental evaluation panel vote is negative, the Dean shall refer the case to the Faculty Advisory Committee for their recommendations. The Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee shall interview each candidate for third-year reappointment when the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries recommendation is different from the Departmental Evaluation Panel or the Departmental Evaluation Panel vote is negative. The Faculty Advisory Committee's recommendations in cases where they act shall be submitted in writing to the President by the announced deadlines. (Rev. Apr. 2009; Apr. 2011)

Information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested by the Chair of the Advisory Committee from the Dean, Departmental Evaluation Panel Chair, or through that chair to the candidate. Requests should be written and responses should be brief and also in writing, addressing only the requested issue, and shall become part of the packet. Both the request for information and the response should also be sent, for information, to levels of review between the Advisory Committee and the responding body. (Ins. Apr. 2012)

If a recommendation provided to the candidate by the Advisory Committee contains an error of fact, the candidate may provide a written correction for inclusion in the packet for consideration at higher levels of review within five working days of the provision of the recommendation. The written correction should be forwarded to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs with a copy to the chair of the Advisory Committee, the Dean and the chair of the departmental panel. The written correction should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence.⁵ (Ins. Apr. 2012)

⁵ This and other changes in procedure to allow for the correction of errors of fact, in place since AY2012-13, will be reviewed every three years by Academic Affairs in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review and the Faculty Welfare Committee to assess the extent and appropriateness of their use. These groups will jointly report this analysis to the Faculty Senate.

12. Provost's Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion Candidates

After the Advisory Committee has made its written recommendation to the President, the Provost may interview the candidate as part of the Provost's independent evaluation of the candidate. The Provost's recommendation shall be submitted in writing to the President by the announced deadlines. In all cases in which the Provost's recommendation is negative or reverses an earlier decision, the Provost will provide a copy of the Provost's recommendation to the candidate, chair, Dean, and chair of the Advisory Committee simultaneously with notice to the candidate of the President's decision. (Rev. Apr. 2009; Apr. 2012; Aug. 2018)

13. President's Decision

The President shall make a final determination within twelve working days after the President receives recommendations from all of the following: the department evaluation panel, the appropriate Dean, the Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Provost. All such recommendations shall be submitted to the President no later than March 1 of each year.⁶ In addition to these recommendations, the President shall also have access to, and may consider, other materials used by any or all of the foregoing during the course of their respective evaluations. Once a final decision is made by the President, and within the twelve working days after the last recommendation is received (listed above), the President shall inform the candidate, the Provost, the Dean, and the evaluation panel chair in writing, of the President's decision. (Rev. Apr. 2009; Aug. 2018)

13. Appeal to the Faculty Hearing Committee

- a. A denial may only be appealed to the Faculty Hearing Committee when the faculty member alleges that the denial was based upon any of the following three grounds:
 - (1). Discrimination, defined as differential treatment based upon gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, race, color, religion, national origin, veterans' status, genetic information, or disability⁷; or,
 - (2). Violation of academic freedom, as it relates to freedom of expression; or,

⁶ Deadlines for earlier stages of the review process are prior to March 1 and are announced by Academic Affairs each year.

⁷ This list was revised in August 2017 to reflect the College's policy on *Prohibition of Discrimination and Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment and Abuse*.

- (3). Violation of due process, as provided in the College's published rules, regulations, policies and procedures.
 - b. The appeal shall be heard as a grievance before a panel of the Faculty Hearing Committee, and the faculty member should follow the procedures of the Hearing Committee in requesting a hearing. The notice requesting a hearing must be filed with the Hearing Committee within 20 working days of receipt of the President's written decision.
(Rev. Aug. 2018)
 - c. The President's decision will be made within ten working days after receipt of the recommendation of the panel of the Faculty Hearing Committee, and receipt of any objections about the conduct of the hearing or correction of errors of fact from the grievant, or notice of waiver of that right by the grievant.
(Rev. Aug. 2018)
14. Discretionary Appeal to College of Charleston Board of Trustees⁸
- a. The President's decision in cases heard by the Faculty Hearing Committee may be appealed to the College of Charleston Board of Trustees. The decision as to whether or not to accept the appeal is within the sole discretion of the Board.
 - b. When an appeal to the College of Charleston Board of Trustees is sought, the faculty member must file a Notice of Appeal within 10 working days of receipt of the President's decision. This Notice must be in writing and sent to the Chair of the Board, with a copy to the President. The Notice of Appeal must identify the issues to be raised in the appeal and the grounds for the appeal.
 - c. If the Board decides to hear the appeal, the Chair of the Board will establish a reasonable timetable for disposition of the appeal, which will be communicated to all parties.
 - d. At the Chair's discretion, appeals will be heard by the entire Board or by a committee of not less than three Board members appointed by the Chair for that purpose.
 - e. Appeals will be heard on the record established in the Faculty Hearing Committee. The Board shall have available for its review all recordings, statements, documents and evidence accumulated

⁸ The College of Charleston Board of Trustees passed this policy concerning appeals by faculty members in January 1985. This list was revised in August 2017 to reflect the College's policy *Prohibition of Discrimination and Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment and Abuse*.

during the appeal process. Briefs and oral arguments will be permitted but are not required. Oral arguments may be made by the parties or by their attorneys. (Rev. Aug. 2018)

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

15. Disposition of Packet Material

When the evaluation process has resulted in a positive decision, within three months of that decision the packet materials submitted by the faculty member shall be returned to the faculty member; colleague letters will be returned to the authors; and recent graduate evaluation forms will be returned to the Department Chair.

When the decision is negative, the Provost will retain the originals of all packet materials for five years. A faculty member may request and receive from the Provost a copy of the faculty member's contribution to the packet. (Rev. Aug. 2018)

On eliminating the WA grade option

- Agenda – January 14, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting
- Proposal to eliminate WA grade option
- Highlights – January 14, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting
- Minutes – January 14, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting

Faculty Senate, Tuesday, January 14, 2020, 5:00 PM
Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)

Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of [Dec. 3, 2019](#), minutes
3. Announcements and Information
4. Reports
 - a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
 - b. Interim Provost Fran Welch
 - c. VP of Facilities Management John P. Morris
5. New Business
 - a. Curriculum Committee (Andrew Przeworski, Chair)

Please note: All College of Charleston faculty may view curricular proposals in Curriculog. PDF copies of individual proposals are available to non-faculty guests upon request (peepleess@cofc.edu).

1) BIOL - New courses: BIOL 213, 213D, 454, 454L; Course description change: BIOL 211; Program changes; BIOL Core, MBIO
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:110/form>

2) CSCI - Course prerequisite change: CSCI 230
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1942/form>

3) GEOL - New course: GEOL 495; Course prerequisite change: GEOL 402
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:109/form>

4) MATH - New course: MATH 101S
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2038/form>

5) MEIW - Change minor: MEIW
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2005/form>

6) RELS - New courses: RELS 106, 117, 118
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:108/form>

b. Committee on General Education (Susan Kattwinkel, Chair):
Approval of three RELS 106, 117, and 118 for Humanities credit in General Education:

RELS106: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2072/form>

RELS117: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2062/form>

RELS118: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2064/form>

c. Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (Deborah Boyle, Chair): Motion to eliminate the “WA” as a grade option [PDF](#)

6. Constituents’ General Concerns

7. Adjournment

Please note that the meeting will be followed by a reception sponsored by Academic Affairs in the Tate 202 gallery.

Motion to eliminate the "WA" as a grade option

Faculty Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (FCAS)

January 2020

Introduction

The "WA" grade is assigned to students who have exceeded the course attendance policy, or stopped attending class, but who did not officially drop or withdraw. The "WA" does not withdraw a student from a course.

Prior to the days of financial aid for higher education, the "WA" resulted in a student being withdrawn from the course. This is not the case today, as only students may initiate a withdrawal from a course. Many faculty and staff continue to believe (incorrectly) that a student may not return to class after a "WA" is granted. However, there is no policy that prevents a student's attendance after a "WA" has been earned. The Registrar's Office often receives faculty inquiries about a student's continuing attendance in a course and despite receiving a "WA" grade: "I submitted the form, but the student keeps showing up." As a result, the RO ends up addressing issues with students that should be addressed by the professor.

Most faculty submit their "WA" grades at the end of the term; data from the last nine years indicate approximately 79% of "WA" grades were submitted during the final grading period. While the RO makes every effort to provide faculty with instruction, each term faculty continue to submit "WA" grades prior to the withdrawal deadline for the semester. Faculty have also erroneously submitted "WA" grades during attendance verification. These mistakes result in a conversation with the faculty member, cancellation of the workflow request, and resubmission. Some faculty have argued that the RO does not have the right to prohibit the awarding of a "WA" at any point during the semester, particularly prior to the withdrawal deadline.

The Registrar's Office also fields questions from recipients of official transcripts who inquire as to whether the "WA" means absences due to medical reasons, ceased attendance, or a violation of the instructor's policy. The RO's response defaults to a violation of the instructor's attendance policy because the RO does not track or store such information. No current policies have been identified that reflect a requirement to indicate what "type of F" the student earns.

Three Options

The following three options were presented in September 2019 to FCAS by Registrar Mary Bergstrom and Associate Provost Mark del Mastro:

Option 1: "WA" Grades are Only Submitted During the Official Midterm and Final Grading Periods

By adopting **Option 1**, the "WA" grade submission period would be during the official semester midterm and final grading periods. The faculty member would be responsible for communicating with students the course attendance policy and the consequences for violations. Faculty could use the midterm grade to signal to the student that the final grade will be a "WA" unless they withdraw from the course. The RO would then be eliminated from the notification process.

Option 2: Eliminate “WA” as a Grade Option and Award an “F”

By adopting Option 2, the “WA” grade would be eliminated as a grade option, and faculty would award a final grade of “F” for students whose excessive absences merit the failing grade.

Option 3: Keep the Current “WA” Process, Re-train Faculty on The Process and Their Responsibilities, and Amend the Current Attendance Policy

The current attendance policy does not indicate that the student who receives a “WA” may not continue attending the class. By adopting **Option 3**, the College would amend the attendance policy to indicate a student may not continue attending a course after a “WA” has been awarded. The email notification from the RO would include the policy but would continue to refer student contact to the professor. Academic Affairs would provide faculty with additional training and resources regarding the “WA” process, policy, and communication with students.

Members of FCAS discussed these options at the October 3 and 17 meetings, and unanimously preferred Option 2. The committee Chair sent requests for feedback to the email lists for Chairs/Program Directors and Deans. Of 11 replies, 8 favored Option 2 (eliminating the WA).

Motion:

Eliminate the WA as a grade option.

Rationale

There is widespread confusion among both faculty and students about what the WA grade means. Some students believe (incorrectly) that receiving a WA as a midterm grade means that they have thereby been removed from the course, and so they do not withdraw from the course by the withdrawal deadline. A grade of "F" would be clearer; students would realize that they should withdraw, or at least that they should consult with their instructor about what to do. Sometimes students do not realize that a WA counts as an F in calculating the GPA; again, a grade of "F" would be clearer. There is also some misunderstanding among the faculty regarding when the WA can be assigned, as well as confusion among recipients of students' official transcripts (such as graduate programs to which students are applying) about what the WA designates. Eliminating the WA option would eliminate all such confusion.

Faculty Senate, Tuesday, January 14, 2020, 5:00 PM
Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)

Highlights (Full minutes to follow)

Motions with voting results are in red.

1. Call to Order
2. Minutes of the [Dec. 3, 2019](#), meeting were approved.
3. Announcements and Information
4. Reports

a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis reflected on the transitional moment the College finds itself in, turning 250 with a new president and searches ongoing for a new provost and multiple deans. Speaker Lewis discussed the recent ModernThink survey, which indicated (among other things) a lack of trust in senior leadership on the part of faculty and staff, but he also expressed appreciation for the new administration's sharing that survey data at an open forum. He encouraged faculty to put aside cynicism and "risk trust" in President Hsu and senior leadership, while reminding administrators that ongoing trust must be earned.

b. Interim Provost Fran Welch, who had circulated her report in advance of the meeting, supported Speaker Lewis's assessment and took questions from the floor. [PDF](#)

c. VP of Facilities Management John P. Morris provided an overview of the work and current state of Facilities Management. [PDF](#)

5. New Business

- a. Curriculum Committee (Andrew Przeworski, Chair)

Please note: All College of Charleston faculty may view curricular proposals in Curriculog. PDF copies of individual proposals are available to non-faculty guests upon request (peepleess@cofc.edu).

- 1) BIOL - New courses: BIOL 213, 213D, 454, 454L; Course description change: BIOL 211; Program changes; BIOL Core, MBIO

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:110/form>

Passed by voice vote.

2) CSCI - Course prerequisite change: CSCI 230
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1942/form>
Passed by voice vote.

3) GEOL - New course: GEOL 495; Course prerequisite change: GEOL 402
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:109/form>
Passed by voice vote.

4) MATH - New course: MATH 101S
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2038/form>
Passed by voice vote.

5) MEIW - Change minor: MEIW
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2005/form>
Passed by voice vote.

6) RELS - New courses: RELS 106, 117, 118
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:108/form>
Passed by voice vote.

b. Committee on General Education (Susan Kattwinkel, Chair):
Approval of three RELS 106 for Humanities credit; RELS 117 and 118 for History credit
in General Education:

RELS106: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2072/form>

RELS117: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2062/form>

RELS118: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2064/form>
Passed by voice vote.

c. Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (Deborah Boyle,
Chair): Motion to eliminate the “WA” as a grade option [PDF](#)

After extended discussion, the motion passed by a show of hands.

6. Constituents’ General Concerns

7. Adjournment

Faculty Senate, Tuesday, January 14, 2020, 5:00 PM
Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)

Motions with voting results are in red.

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:02.
2. Minutes of the [Dec. 3, 2019](#), meeting were approved.
3. Announcements and Information: Speaker Lewis announced that the Board of Trustees will be meeting on campus Thursday and Friday, Jan. 23-24. He also reminded attendees of a reception following the meeting, sponsored by Academic Affairs, in the Tate Center 202 gallery.
4. Reports

a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis reflected on the transitional moment the College finds itself in, turning 250 with a new president and searches ongoing for a new provost and multiple deans. He noted a sense of energy and optimism among faculty but stressed that this is a pivotal semester, as the strategic plan is being crafted and so much upper-level hiring is taking place.

Speaker Lewis discussed the recent ModernThink survey, which indicated two major drags on morale: (under)compensation and a lack of trust in senior leadership on the part of faculty and staff. But he also expressed appreciation for the new administration's sharing that survey data at a well attended open forum that was run by a ModernThink representative rather than by a College administrator. He encouraged faculty, at this crucial juncture, to put aside cynicism and "risk trust" in President Hsu and senior leadership, while reminding administrators that ongoing trust must be earned. He further stressed that the College's 250th anniversary is a rare opportunity to gain national and international attention.

b. Interim Provost Fran Welch, who had circulated her report in advance of the meeting [[PDF](#)], supported Speaker Lewis's assessment and took questions from the floor.

Senator Todd Grantham (HSS) asked how she plans to respond to the lack of trust in the administration, reflected in the ModernThink survey, this semester.

Interim Provost Welch responded that along with Michelle Smith (Director of Institutional Research) and Alicia Caudill (EVP of Student Affairs), she plans to meet with other senior leaders and deans to determine, quickly, how to respond.

Senator Linda Jones (SSM) said that she hopes faculty and staff will be included in those meetings. Interim Provost Welch responded that the response needs to be coordinated

across campus, that she would like first for meetings to take place with heads of divisions and deans, but that faculty will be involved at a later time.

Senator Irina Gigova (HSS) asked what the College is doing to make its case for budgeting priorities with the South Carolina legislature.

Interim Provost Welch responded that we have hired a new consulting firm for that purpose, and that President Hsu has been meeting with the General Assembly and the Commission on Higher Education.

Senator Michaela Rupert Smith (Adjunct Senator, German and Russian Studies) added that increased compensation for adjunct faculty should be included in our budget priorities.

c. Vice President of Facilities Management John P. Morris provided an overview of the work and current state of Facilities Management. [PDF](#)

Senator Tom Carroll (EHHP) commented on how difficult it is to work, and for students to study, in the Silcox Center, citing lack of soundproofing and temperature control. VP Morris acknowledged the poor condition of Silcox and stated that full renovation is being planned.

Senator Elaine Worzala (Finance) pointed to perennial complaints from first-year students about sickness due to mold. Professor Dan Greenberg (Guest) asked about ongoing safety issues in the recently renovated RITA (Rita Liddy Hollings Science Center). VP Morris acknowledged these problems and said that Facilities Management was working on them.

5. New Business

a. Curriculum Committee (Andrew Przeworski, Chair)

Please note: All College of Charleston faculty may view curricular proposals in Curriculog. PDF copies of individual proposals are available to non-faculty guests upon request (peepless@cofc.edu).

Prof. Przeworski explained the rationale for each proposal prior to discussion and voting.

1) BIOL - New courses: BIOL 213, 213D, 454, 454L; Course description change: BIOL 211; Program changes; BIOL Core, MBIO
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:110/form>

Senator Kristin Krantzman asked if these changes to the program would create new prerequisites. Prof. Przeworski replied that there were no changes to the prerequisites for existing courses.

The proposal passed by voice vote.

2) CSCI - Course prerequisite change: CSCI 230
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1942/form>

The proposal passed by voice vote.

3) GEOL - New course: GEOL 495; Course prerequisite change: GEOL 402
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:109/form>

The proposal passed by voice vote.

4) MATH - New course: MATH 101S
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2038/form>

Senator David Desplaces (Management and Marketing) asked if the new placement system for Mathematics would place students into either MATH 101 or 101S, based on their proficiency, and Prof. Przeworski replied that it would.

Senator Chris Starr asked how little math a student would have to know in order to be placed in MATH 101S. Prof. Przeworski said that placement would be based more on high school records and SAT/GRE scores, and that this question would be clarified in a placement proposal that will be coming before the Senate next month.

The proposal passed by voice vote.

5) MEIW - Change minor: MEIW
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2005/form>

The proposal passed by voice vote.

6) RELS - New courses: RELS 106, 117, 118
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:108/form>

The proposal passed by voice vote.

- b. Committee on General Education (Susan Kattwinkel, Chair):
Approval of three RELS 106 for Humanities credit; RELS 117 and 118 for History credit in General Education:

RELS106: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2072/form>

RELS117: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2062/form>

RELS118: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2064/form>

Prof. Lynne Ford, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, represented the General Education Committee in Prof. Kattwinkel's absence.

Senator Carroll (EHHP) asked about the anticipated demand and staffing needs for these courses, since they will fulfill a general education requirement. Prof. Elijah Sigler (Chair of RELS, Guest) said that they are planning to start with two sections in the Fall. Speaker Lewis cited the letter of support from Prof. Phyllis Jestice (Chair of HIST), stating that having these courses count for gen-ed History would take a little pressure off of her department in terms of staffing.

Senator Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism Management) asked why RELS 117 and 118 couldn't also count for gen-ed Humanities, since many History courses fulfill the Humanities requirement. AVP Ford replied that any course may satisfy only a single gen-ed requirement, and RELS designed and proposed these courses for the History requirement.

The proposal passed by voice vote.

c. Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (Deborah Boyle, Chair): Motion to eliminate the "WA" as a grade option [PDF](#)

Prof. Boyle reviewed the motion, pointing out that while eliminating the "WA" altogether is the committee's recommendation, other alternatives have been outlined.

Prof. Todd McNerney (Theatre and Dance, Guest), speaking for himself and on behalf of Senator Gretchen McLaine (Theatre and Dance), who could not attend, argued against the motion. For Dance faculty, the WA grade differentiates between failure for absences and failure due to poor quality of work. The WA grade informs students that they have failed the course at the time they have exceeded the allowable number of absences, rather than having them continue needlessly in the course until final grades are posted. Prof. McNerney cited his own experience prior to making use of the WA grade: without it, he found it difficult to fail a student who had a combination of excused and unexcused absences that totaled over one third of the class meetings. Prof. Boyle suggested that he (or anyone) could still include an absence policy on the syllabus that included a grade of F for excessive absences. Prof. McNerney maintained that it is useful to have grades that differentiate between failure for poor quality of work and failure for not showing up. He cited other institutions that have variations of our current WA policy.

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) noted that WA is the only grade that is submitted outside the midterm/final grading periods, which creates some problems. She pointed out that other options include retaining the WA grade but only at the midterm or final grading periods.

Prof. McNerney described a student who kept attending class after receiving the WA, which led to a complaint and appeal from a parent who thought the student's work justified a change of grade. Since then, Prof. McNerney has made it clear to students that once they have the WA, they are "invisible" if they choose to continue to attend. He stated that the College's withdrawal policy is very generous, another reason the WA grade is fair and appropriate.

Prof. Boyle said that the Academic Standards committee sensed that students would be more likely to initiate a late withdrawal if they saw an F on their transcript than if they saw a WA, partly because many students don't seem to know what a WA means.

In response to questions from Senator Paul Young (Mathematics) and Senator Andy Shedlock (Biology), Registrar Bergstrom and AVP Ford clarified that all midterm grades, including WA, are advisory, not final. They also clarified the timing: the withdrawal deadline follows posting of midterm grades, and the WA grade cannot be assigned until after the withdrawal deadline.

In response to a question from Senator Jen Cole Wright (HSS), Prof. Boyle reviewed alternatives to the recommendation of the committee. One is to continue to allow WA grades but only during the midterm and final grading periods. The other is to keep the current policy but try to educate faculty about how it works, and possibly forbid students from attending class after the WA has been assigned.

Senator Wright, along with AVP Ford, clarified that faculty who use the WA must spell it out in the syllabus; faculty have options regarding their absence policies, but they must make that policy clear to students.

In response to other questions, AVP Ford pointed out that many students do not withdraw from classes after they receive a WA at midterm, and she explained that class roll verification, which faculty perform early each semester, is not part of the grading system.

Senator Irina Erman (German and Russian Studies) said that she favored the second option, the one recommended by the committee, because she finds the current policy confusing. She acknowledged that the WA grade potentially saves some labor for the professor, who does not have to grade a student's work after the WA has been posted, but that benefit is outweighed by the simplicity and clarity of the F.

Senator Irinia Gigova (HSS) asked if any office within the college tracks or makes use of the WA-versus-F distinction. Registrar Bergstrom replied that no one uses that information.

Senator Krantzman (SSM) said that there is a useful distinction between the meaning of a WA and the meaning of an F, and asked if the WA could still be posted but then turn into an F on student transcripts.

Senator Carroll (EHHP) pointed out that even without the WA, instructors can still stipulate on their syllabi that a certain number of absences results in an F.

Senator Sarah Hatteburg (Sociology and Anthropology) cited her earlier work on an ad hoc committee charged with reviewing FAM policies on how faculty treat excused and unexcused absences. The FAM includes language describing the WA, making clear that faculty members set their own attendance policies. She wanted to know if that language would be retained, or if some language in the FAM would make clear that faculty control their own attendance policies.

Sen. Litvin (Hosp. and Tourism Mgmt.) spoke in favor of the proposal, citing the clarity of the F as opposed to the WA. Sen. Kathleen Foody (LCWA) questioned how students interpret the WA. She would like to know if they tend to see a midterm F as salvageable, and if they understand that a WA at midterm means they have in effect already failed the class. Senator Desplaces (Management and Marketing) added that he doesn't think students understand the WA; he assigns F's for excessive absences. He suggested the possibility of a midterm grade of FA to indicate excessive absences but a final grade of F.

Prof. Dan Greenberg (Psychology, Guest) said that if we get rid of the WA as an option, there should be language in the catalog to show that failing a class because of absences is a possibility.

Prof. McNerney argued that students probably see a WA as better than an F because it doesn't signify that the student did poor work but rather just didn't attend class enough.

Senator Todd Grantham (HSS) cited the constant battle to educate students and faculty about the WA and asserted that the F is cleaner and simpler.

Senator Carroll called the question. **The motion to call the question passed by a voice vote.**

The motion to eliminate the WA grade passed by a show of hands (20 in favor, 9 opposed).

6. Constituents' General Concerns

In response to questions, Registrar Bergstrom and Associate Provost Mark Del Mastro assured the Senate that revised language in the FAM and the College Catalog would reflect the change just voted on, making clear that students can fail a course because of excessive absences as determined by the instructor.

7. The meeting adjourned at 6:52 PM.

Interim Provost Update for Faculty and Staff – January 15, 2020

Great Colleges Survey Results

President Hsu and I are quite pleased that we had “standing room only” faculty and staff participation in the Town Hall presentation by Rich Boyer from Modern Think last Friday afternoon. With the President’s approval, I have included the PPT presentation Rich shared. The Senior Leadership Team also met with Rich separately on Friday afternoon. This report relates particularly well to the work of one of the Strategic Plan working groups on employee success. We have work to do and look forward to discussing plans moving forward in the near future.

250th Celebration

We’re excited to celebrate the College’s 250th Anniversary on January 30, 2020, and I hope faculty, staff, students, alumni, friends and supporters of the College will join in the festivities. CofC Day includes an unveiling of a South Carolina historical marker, a 24-hour fundraising drive, global alumni club events, and a block party with food, festivities and entertainment for all ages. For more information celebrating this historic milestone, check out the following websites and be on the lookout for additional details from President Hsu soon.

<https://cofcday.cofc.edu/>

<https://250.cofc.edu/>

The Lowcountry CofC Alumni Club invites alumni, parents, and friends to celebrate CofC Day on the College's 250th anniversary, Thursday, January 30, from 6-8 pm, in Towell Library (in Cistern Yard). Your ticket includes delicious hors d'oeuvres, a limited edition #CofC250 t-shirt, wine, beer, sodas, and fabulous door prizes.

Register: <https://alumni.cofc.edu/lowcountry-cofc-day>. Note that you must register in advance in order to attend.

Student Success and Retention (SSR) Steering Committee Update

This Committee is co-chaired by Lynne Ford and Alicia Caudill and works closely with Michelle Smith in Institutional Research. Other members of the Steering Committee are: Jim Allison, Melantha Ardrey, Mary Bergstrom, Jeri Cabot, Lisa Chestney, Jimmie Foster, Michelle Futrell, Zach Hartje, Karen Hauschild, Rochelle Johnson, Tim Johnson, Tripp Keeffe, Page Keller, Chris Korey, John Morris, and Sebastian van Delden. This Steering Committee has been hard at work last semester and will continue this semester and into the future. Recently, the co-chairs sent me a thorough progress report. In late August, I charged the committee as follows:

Learn best practices regarding student success and retention; collect and review current data at the College of Charleston; analyze current practices and resources allocated to

student success and retention; recommend a goal and timeline to improve retention and graduation rates.

Last semester, this Steering Committee reviewed best practices related to student success and retention relative to what we currently have in place and what might be developed or enhanced in the future. They also reviewed retention trends at the College relative to peers and aspirant institutions, considered the current context for improving retention at the College, and recommend a new retention goal of 87% by 2026. Please be thinking of ways you can help us achieve this goal.

The Steering Committee will continue in the spring to review the data associated with 4, 5, and 6-year graduation rates to establish a 2026 goal. They have also created five working groups to focus attention on preparing for the selection and implementation of an SSR Customer Relationship Management (CRM) software program and to make progress on some areas in need of immediate attention.

Dean Searches

The Dean Search Chairs are: Valerie Morris, SSM; John White, HSS, and Gibbs Knotts. Honors College Dean Search applicants are encouraged to submit materials by **February 15, 2020**, at <https://jobs.cofc.edu/postings/9593>. HSS and SSM applicants are encouraged to submit their materials to R. William Funk and Associates by **February 28, 2020**, to receive full consideration. Details about these searches, the committee members, materials to be submitted, application addresses etc. can be found at <http://academicaffairs.cofc.edu/recruiting/index.php>.

Strategic Plan Update

The Strategic Plan Steering Committee has broken into three groups to work on areas of the plan with working titles: employee success; public national university with liberal arts curricular foundation in the context of next century expectations; and student success. These are working titles only and likely to change as discussions about goals, metrics, and initiatives continue developing. Drafts of the revised mission and vision statements and other aspects of the plan will be shared to campus shortly via an email from President Hsu. Information including data survey results, materials from the strategic planning workshops, and a video of President Hsu's "Tradition and Transformation" presentation will be accessible to faculty and staff using their CofC credentials, both through links provided in the email and posted on the [Strategic Planning website](#). The next on-campus meeting of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee is February 12.

Center for Sustainable Development

With support from President Hsu and the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs, the Office of Sustainability and Sustainability Literacy Institute have embraced a new, singular identity as the Center for Sustainable Development.

The Center's scope and purpose reflect the Sustainable Development Goals outlined by the United Nations with a focus on regional partnerships designed to build inclusive sustainable development. These goals intend to solve challenges felt both globally and locally in communities like Charleston, particularly poverty, hunger, overconsumption, gender and racial equality, environmental degradation, and climate change. The Center for Sustainable Development will also advance the five core components of The College's Sustainability Action Plan: Carbon Neutrality, Zero Waste, Sustainability Culture, Sustainability Literacy, and Institutional Resilience.

Under the leadership of Dr. Brian Fisher, the Center stewards sustainability literacy and serves as a hub for study, practical application and the professional development of diverse, innovative students. As thought leaders and sustainability experts, its team builds and fosters strong, service-oriented partnerships in the Charleston community and on campus, and advocates for policies and practices that enable our university to advance its climate and zero waste goals.

This renewed identity helps signal the Center's mission to provide students, faculty and staff with the knowledge and tools to transform the present and positively influence the future. To learn more about the Center or to get involved, please reach out to Brian or visit the Center at 14 Green Way.

College Reads Book 2020

The College Reads Committee is chaired by Lynne Ford, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience. Committee membership is broad based and includes faculty (current and retired), staff, students and representatives from the broader community.

The committee reviewed 120 books and recommended *The Line Becomes a River* by Francisco Cantu as next year's book selection. This book is a memoir of Cantu's experience growing up around the border in the desert southwest, studying the border as an international relations major at American University, and his decision to join the Border Patrol (2008-2012) in an attempt to better understand the dynamics of the US southern border.

A clip of Cantu presenting at the 2018 FYE Conference is available at:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p5iR9_tnUpM

Cantu will visit campus next October to speak, visit classes, and meet with students.

On introduction of new award and changes to existing awards

- Marked up changes to *Faculty/Administration Manual* language

Proposed Change:

Several years ago, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs convened an *ad hoc* committee of past chairs of the distinguished faculty award selection committees to make recommendations regarding the College's six existing campus-wide faculty awards. Most of the committee's recommendations were refinements to the award selection processes, including the processes for soliciting nominations and nominee-provided materials. Those recommendations have been largely implemented and have improved our award processes. One exception is changes to the award schedule, which will be executed in Fall 2021 to align with the *ad hoc* committee's recommendations.

The other exception is the following changes, all of which required review by the Board of Trustees. Those recommendations are as follows:

- That no faculty member be allowed to receive one of these awards more than once.
- That a faculty member receiving the William V. Moore Distinguished Teacher-Scholar Award not be eligible for the Distinguished Teaching Award or the Distinguished Research Award during the first five years after receipt of the William V. Moore Distinguished Teacher-Scholar Award.
- That a faculty member receiving the Distinguished Teaching Award or the Distinguished Research Award not be eligible for the William V. Moore Distinguished Teacher-Scholar Award during the first three (3) years after receipt of either of those two awards.

The following excerpt from the *Faculty/Administration Manual* reflects how these changes would be executed in the 2021-2020 *Manual*.

IX. FACULTY AWARDS

A. Distinguished Teaching Award

The College of Charleston Distinguished Teaching Award is made to one individual during the spring semester. The Distinguished Teaching Award honors those roster faculty members who have been designated by their colleagues as typifying high standards and commitment to teaching excellence throughout their careers. The recipient is recommended to the Provost by an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the Provost and consisting of the five most recent available recipients of the award and the Student Government Association President. The award is a framed certificate and a cash award.

No faculty member may receive this award more than once. Faculty members who receive this award are not eligible for consideration for the William V. Moore Distinguished Teacher-Scholar Award for the first three (3) academic years after receipt of this award.

B. Distinguished Adjunct Faculty Teaching Award

The College of Charleston Distinguished Adjunct Faculty Teaching Award is made to one individual during the spring semester. This award honors those adjunct faculty members who have been designated by faculty colleagues as typifying high standards and commitment to teaching excellence throughout their careers. The recipient is recommended to the Provost by an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the Provost and consisting of five recent recipients of either the Distinguished Teaching Award or the Distinguished Adjunct Faculty Teaching Award, including at least one adjunct faculty member, and the Student Government Association President. The award is a framed certificate and a cash award. (Rev. Aug. 2014)

No faculty member may receive this award more than once.

C. Distinguished Research Award

The College of Charleston Distinguished Research Award is made to one member of the faculty during the spring semester. The Distinguished Research Award honors roster faculty colleagues who have distinguished themselves by a career of significant research. The Faculty Research and Development Committee recommends the faculty recipient to the Provost. The award is a framed certificate and a cash award.

No faculty member may receive this award more than once. Faculty members who receive this award are not eligible for consideration for the William V. Moore Distinguished Teacher-Scholar Award for the first three (3) academic years after receipt of this award.

D. Distinguished Service Award

The College of Charleston Distinguished Service Award is made to a roster faculty member or administrator during the spring semester. The Distinguished Service Award recognizes the outstanding contribution of a colleague who, beyond his or her required duties, has a sustained career of serving the college community in an outstanding and distinguished manner. The recipient is recommended to the Provost by an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the Provost and including former recipients of the award and the Student Government Association President or a representative from the Student Government Association appointed by their President. The award is a framed certificate and a cash award.

No faculty member may receive this award more than once.

E. Distinguished Advising Award

The College of Charleston Distinguished Advising Award is presented to a roster faculty member during the spring semester. The Distinguished Advising Award

honors those roster faculty members who have demonstrated a sustained dedication to students in the area of academic advising. A recommendation is made to the Provost by an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the Provost and comprised of former recipients and the Director of the Academic Advising and Planning Center. The award is a framed certificate and a cash award.

No faculty member may receive this award more than once.

F. William V. Moore Distinguished Teacher/Scholar Award

The College of Charleston William V. Moore Distinguished Teacher-Scholar Award is made to one roster faculty member during the spring semester. The William V. Moore Distinguished Teacher-Scholar Award honors faculty members who have been selected by their peers as exemplifying the teacher-scholar model. The recipients' exemplary scholarship and exemplary teaching have enriched the intellectual lives of our students throughout their careers. The recipient is recommended to the Provost by an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the Provost and consisting of five recent recipients of the award. The award is a framed certificate and a cash award.

No faculty member may receive this award more than once. Faculty members who receive this award are not eligible for consideration for the Distinguished Teaching Award or the Distinguished Research Award for the first five (5) academic years after receipt of this award.

On change to Section X.I.3, regarding grievances before the Faculty Hearing Committee

- Agenda – April 6, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting
- Proposal
- Minutes – April 6, 2021 Faculty Senate minutes

Faculty Senate, Tuesday, April 6, 2021, 5:00 PM
Via Zoom

Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the [March 2, 2021](#), minutes.
3. Announcements and Information
4. Reports
 - a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis
 - b. Provost Suzanne Austin
 - c. Registrar Mary Bergstrom: PS/NS Option for Spring 2021
5. New Business
 - a. Provost Austin: Approval of degree candidates for Spring 2021 Commencement
 - b. Committee on Nominations and Elections (RoxAnn Stalvey, Chair): [Committee slates](#)
[Please note that Academic Planning, Budget, and By-laws/FAM are the three Senate committees; these require a vote.]
 - c. Curriculum Committee (Nenad Radakovic, Chair)
 - 1) ARTH is updating a course description and proposing alternatives to their Capstone course: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:220/form>
 - 2) CLAS is adding a course to their AB program and expanding the capstone opportunities for AB majors: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:222/form>
 - 3) DANC has created seven new courses and these were approved at the last Senate meeting. Now they are adding these courses and some existing courses to their minor, major, and concentration:

Part 1: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:212/form> (only items 8-10 on this agenda need to be reviewed)

Part 2: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3157/form>

4) ENSS is adding courses to the minor:
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3171/form>

5) MEDH is adding courses to their minor:
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3101/form>

6) THTR is adding courses to the minor:
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3189/form>

d. Committee on Graduate Education (Sandy Slater, Chair)

1) Business Administration, MBA
Program change: new emphasis – Business Analytics, add courses; rename existing emphasis. <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2991/form>

2) Community Planning, Policy, and Design, MA

ARTH 535: course title and description change
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3186/form>

ARTH 565: course title and description change
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3187/form>

3) Data Science and Analytics, MS
Program change: reduce degree hours from 36 to 30, change from summer to fall start, remove required courses, add electives.
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3060/form>

4) Performing Arts, MAT
Program change: reduce degree hours from 45 to 42, remove required course, add courses to core course options.
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3167/form>

5) Teaching, Learning, and Advocacy, MED
Diverse Learners Concentration: add courses.
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3191/form>

e. Committee on General Education (Richard Lavrich, Chair)

1) Courses Proposed for Humanities Credit:

CLAS 200 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2755/form>
CLAS 215 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3096/form>

ENGL 241 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:223/form>

HISP 250 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2888/form>

HISP 251 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2889/form>

HISP 252 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2890/form>

HIST 228 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3148/form>

HIST 229 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3105/form>

HIST 248 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3109/form>

HIST 249 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3111/form>

HIST 255 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3113/form>

HIST 257 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3107/form>

HIST 302 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3144/form>

HIST 335 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3141/form>

LTRS 170 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3053/form>

SOST 241 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3074/form>

THTR 175 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3154/form>

THTR 177 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3156/form>

WGST 228 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3149/form>

WGST 229 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3139/form>

WGST 255 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:224/form>

Courses Proposed for Social Science Credit:

ANTH 111 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3094/form>

SOCY 107 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3095/form>

f. Senator Brumby McLeod (School of Business): [Resolution](#) condemning the Governor's Executive Order requiring state employees to return to work in person

g. Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (Prof. Meta Van Sickle, Chair): Motion to endorse changes to [XXF policy Presentation](#)

h. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual (Merissa Ferrara, Chair): [Motion](#) to endorse a revision to the FAM's procedures for the Faculty Hearing Committee

6. Constituents' General Concerns

7. Adjournment

Motion on Hearings Granted by the Faculty Hearing Committee

Motion

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

"The assigned hearing panel will meet within seven working days after receipt of the Notice of Grievance by the Chair in order to determine whether the grievance has been properly and timely filed, ~~and~~ whether the nature of the grievance is within the jurisdiction of the Hearing Committee, **and whether the facts alleged by the grievant, if accepted as true, would support a judgment of the violation alleged by the grievant.** If the hearing panel decides that the grievance should be heard, it shall set a date for the hearing, which must be held within twenty working days of the panel meeting. The panel shall also decide, taking into account the preferences expressed, whether the hearing will be open or closed." (FAM X, I, 3, p. 149)

Rationale

The current FAM language makes clear that once the committee receives a notice of grievance, they must consider two things: (1) whether the grievant has followed all the proper procedures (FAM X, I, 2, p. 149); and (2) whether what the grievant is alleging is one of the types of conduct the committee is explicitly entitled to consider (FAM X, I, 1, pp. 148-149). The clear message is that if these two conditions are met, the committee ought to grant the grievant a hearing.

The Hearing Committee, however, sometimes receives cases that are properly and timely filed, and that allege a violation of one of the explicitly listed types, but also clearly have no chance of succeeding on the merits. Typically, that is because even if all the facts alleged by the grievant were true, the relevant action does not constitute a violation of the alleged type (e.g., a violation of academic freedom or non-discrimination). But because the grievant alleges that the action is such a violation, some committee members take themselves to be obligated to grant a hearing. On this view, the language above mandates that the committee hear any properly and timely grievance that alleges any one of the designated types of violations, no matter how implausible that allegation is on its face.

Alternately, the committee sometimes grants hearings in which it proscribes various kinds of arguments, thereby exercising judgment about which allegations have chances of success. (it is fairly common for grievants to be maximal about the types of violations they allege.) In these cases, the committee is making judgments that go beyond the two explicit provisions in the FAM. In practice, then, the committee is already operating with a third standard, a standard for a plausible case.

The proposed language writes a version of this standard into the FAM. It has been reviewed and endorsed by the By-Laws and Faculty Hearing Committees, and it is based on a advice from the College's counsel, Angela Mulholland. The language is modeled on Rule 12(b)(6) of the federal code of civil procedure, which allows a defendant to move for a dismissal on the grounds that a plaintiff's allegations, even if accepted as true, do not constitute a violation of law. If a court finds that the allegations even might constitute a violation, the court is bound to reject the motion to dismiss. In practice, Rule 12(b)(6) motions to dismiss often or even typically fail. It is unlikely, therefore, that the insertion of this language will prevent the Faculty Hearing Committee will prevent any potentially worthy grievances from being heard. What it will prevent are hearings where the grievant has no real chance of success, hearing which are bound to be time-consuming and frustrating for the grievants along with everyone else involved.

Because this passage belongs to the administrative portion of the FAM, this motion is only to recommend that the administration insert these proposed changes.

Faculty Senate, Tuesday, April 6, 2021, 5:00 PM
Via Zoom

Voting items appear in red.

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:02.
2. The March 2, 2021, minutes were approved.
3. Announcements and Information from Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis:

The deadline for completing the Great Colleges to Work For survey is April 9; the deadline for faculty award nominations is April 12; and the deadline for Fall book orders is April 15. The Board of Trustees is meeting at Stono Preserve April 8-9; meetings are public except during executive session.

Speaker Lewis informed the Senate that changes approved at the Senate meeting on April 7, 2020, to the BS/AB in Physical Education, Teacher Education Concentration, then endorsed by the CHE's Advisory Committee on Academic Programs on June 9, 2020, were not approved by the SC Department of Education. Provost Austin has authorized the suspension of the aforementioned program changes with the understanding that another proposal will be forthcoming in AY 2021-22 from our Teacher Education Program and the School of Health and Human Performance.

Speaker Lewis thanked everyone who volunteered for 2021-22 committee service and acknowledged senators whose terms are ending with this meeting: Todd Grantham, Irina Gigova, Adem Ali, Gretchen McLaine, Steve Litvin, Brian Bossak, Brian Lanahan, Annette Watson, Mike Ruscio, John Huddlestun, Sarah Hatteberg, Jen Gerrish, Irina Erman, Carmen Grace, Andy Shedlock, Brandon Lewter, and Fran Scudese. He recognized Scott Peeples upon completion of his third and final year as Secretary of the Faculty.

4. Reports

a. Speaker Lewis said that his report to the Board of Trustees would focus on three themes: how we as a college have managed to survive the past year; how, amidst the crisis, we have managed to look forward; and our Strategic Plan's focus on academic distinction. He elaborated on these themes, emphasizing the broad and deep effort across campus to function under very difficult conditions and acknowledging the efforts of instructional faculty as well as staff colleagues in IT, health services, building and equipment maintenance, and others. He stressed the fact that many faculty initiatives this year --- including ad hoc committees on teaching effectiveness, mentoring and advising; on race, equity, and inclusion; and on curbing gun violence --- are explicitly aligned with strategic plan and core values generally. Meanwhile, we have maintained an impressive

array of co- and extra-curricular activities and events. Faculty research has been strong this past year, and we continue to attract large and impressive applicant pools for faculty positions.

b. Provost Suzanne Austin thanked faculty for their work over the “incredible” past year and said that we have shown great resilience during this time. She announced that Professor Kameelah Martin will step into her new role as Dean of the Graduate School on June 1. She congratulated everyone who earned tenure, promotion, sabbatical leave, successful third-year review and post-tenure review this year.

Provost Austin said she has been working with the ad hoc committee on teaching effectiveness, mentoring, and advising to address the effects of the pandemic on the review process; they’re preparing a memo. One accommodation will be to include language about the pandemic’s effects when we solicit reviews from faculty outside the College. She affirmed that our faculty will receive credit for conference presentations, exhibitions, and performances that were accepted but had to be cancelled due to COVID. She stressed the importance of making travel and research funds available to junior faculty in the wake of the pandemic year.

Provost Austin expressed concern about some academic departments’ overly rigid interpretations of what counts as research toward promotion and tenure, specifically publications in rank that grow out of dissertation research. She is working toward providing specific guidance and codifying how to regard such publications for tenure and promotion in the FAM or other relevant documents.

She will soon be appointing a search committee for a faculty director of the planned Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, which she hopes will be up and running in the fall.

Senator Irina Erman (German and Russian Studies) asked for further explanation regarding the “overly rigid interpretations” of policy on dissertation-related research, and whether the new guidance on that issue would be a temporary COVID-related measure or something more permanent. Provost Austin replied that it is not just pandemic-related. She has heard that departments count work growing from dissertations in various ways, in some cases discouraging untenured faculty from publishing dissertation-related work. While not advocating the publication of unrevised dissertations, she believes that Assistant Professors revising and expanding dissertation work for publication is widely accepted and encouraged at other institutions. Senator Erman expressed enthusiasm for this initiative.

c. Registrar Mary Bergstrom reported on the PS/NS Option for Spring 2021. She boiled it down to three things faculty need to know. 1) Dates: Grades are due May 3, and students can use the PS/NS option on May 4-5. 2) Link to FAQ’s:

<https://registrar.cofc.edu/grades/covid-19-spring-2021-grading-policy.php>. 3) This [Guide](#) to PS/NS for faculty.

5. New Business

- a. Provost Austin: Approval of degree candidates for Spring 2021 Commencement. **The candidates were approved by acclamation.**
- b. Committee on Nominations and Elections (RoxAnn Stalvey, Chair): Professor Stalvey provided an overview of the nomination process and gave some advice to pass along to colleagues regarding committee requests. [Presentation](#)

She conducted elections for the two Senate committees that received additional nominations to the N&E slates: Academic Planning and By-Laws/FAM. The results of those votes were as follows: For Academic Planning, Kathleen DeHaan, Daniel Greenberg, David Hansen, Bob Mignone, Nenad Radakovic, Amy Rogers, and Thomas Spade were elected; for By-Laws/FAM, Wendy Cory, Merissa Ferrara, and Josette Pelzer were elected.

[Committee Slate](#) (updated April 20)

- c. Curriculum Committee (Nenad Radakovic, Chair):

The committee proposals were considered as one motion, which passed by online vote, 46 yes, 0 no.

1) ARTH is updating a course description and proposing alternatives to their Capstone course: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:220/form>

2) CLAS is adding a course to their AB program and expanding the capstone opportunities for AB majors: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:222/form>

3) DANC has created seven new courses and these were approved at the last Senate meeting. Now they are adding these courses and some existing courses to their minor, major, and concentration:

Part 1: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:212/form> (only items 8-10 on this agenda need to be reviewed)

Part 2: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3157/form>

4) ENSS is adding courses to the minor:
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3171/form>

5) MEDH is adding courses to their minor:

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3101/form>

6) THTR is adding courses to the minor:

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3189/form>

d. Committee on Graduate Education (Sandy Slater, Chair)

The committee proposals were considered as one motion, which passed by online vote, 45 yes, 0 no.

1) Business Administration, MBA

Program change: new emphasis – Business Analytics, add courses; rename existing emphasis. <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2991/form>

2) Community Planning, Policy, and Design, MA

ARTH 535: course title and description change

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3186/form>

ARTH 565: course title and description change

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3187/form>

3) Data Science and Analytics, MS

Program change: reduce degree hours from 36 to 30, change from summer to fall start, remove required courses, add electives.

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3060/form>

4) Performing Arts, MAT

Program change: reduce degree hours from 45 to 42, remove required course, add courses to core course options.

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3167/form>

5) Teaching, Learning, and Advocacy, MED

Diverse Learners Concentration: add courses.

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3191/form>

e. Committee on General Education (Richard Lavrich, Chair)

The committee proposals were considered as one motion, which passed by online vote, 46 yes, 0 no.

1) Courses Proposed for Humanities Credit:

CLAS 200 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2755/form>

CLAS 215 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3096/form>

ENGL 241 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:223/form>

HISP 250 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2888/form>

HISP 251 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2889/form>

HISP 252 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2890/form>

HIST 228 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3148/form>

HIST 229 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3105/form>

HIST 248 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3109/form>

HIST 249 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3111/form>

HIST 255 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3113/form>

HIST 257 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3107/form>

HIST 302 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3144/form>

HIST 335 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3141/form>

LTRS 170 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3053/form>

SOST 241 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3074/form>

THTR 175 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3154/form>

THTR 177 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3156/form>

WGST 228 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3149/form>

WGST 229 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3139/form>

WGST 255 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:224/form>

Courses Proposed for Social Science Credit:

ANTH 111 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3094/form>

SOCY 107 <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3095/form>

- f. Senator Brumby McLeod (School of Business): [Resolution](#) condemning the Governor's Executive Order requiring state employees to return to work in person

Senator McLeod invited Professor Kelly Shaver (Guest) to speak in favor of the motion. Professor Shaver provided the following statement (submitted in advance): I have three things to say in favor of this resolution. First, governors are granted emergency powers for

the purpose of *protecting* the residents of their states. I ask you to imagine the public outcry and ridicule that would follow a Governor's emergency declaration ordering all state employees to travel immediately to Charleston to be here for the Category 5 hurricane about to come ashore on Folly Beach. EO 2021-12 is just that irresponsible. Second, regardless of whether schools are open, it is shockingly callous to order parents back to work whether they have childcare in place or not. Third, it is difficult to imagine a workplace more toxic than one that forces people to their desks by threat of a fine of \$100 or thirty days in jail or both. For all of these reasons I urge the Senate to follow one of the six elements of the South Carolina Republican Creed, namely, "I will never cower before any master, save my God." Do not cower. Vote to condemn the Governor's illegitimate Executive Order. Professor Shaver added that the resolution was endorsed by his department, Management and Marketing.

Ana Gilpatrick (Guest), representing the Staff Advisory Committee to the President, said that her committee endorses the motion.

Professor Lisa Covert (Guest), representing the C of C chapter of the American Association of University Professors, said that the state AAUP had made a similar statement, which the C of C chapter endorsed.

Senator Hector Qirko (HSS) moved that the word "protest" replace the word "condemnation" in the document's title and "protests" replace "condemns" in the last sentence of the document. Senator Renée McCauley seconded the motion. Sen. Qirko explained that he supports the resolution but believes "protest" is a more appropriate term, in part because it suggests further action rather than finality. Senator Todd Grantham spoke in favor of the amendment, echoing Senator Qirko's rationale. Professor Shaver (Guest) spoke against the amendment, saying that he chose the word "condemnation" intentionally.

The motion to replace "condemnation" with "protest" (and "condemns" with "protests") passed by online vote, 33 yes, 10 no, 4 abstain.

Returning to the main motion, Senator Paul Sanchez suggested several non-substantive corrections, which Speaker Lewis said would be adopted.

Ana Gilpatrick (Guest) expressed the staff's full support for the amended motion.

[Amended Resolution](#)

The motion passed by online vote, 41 yes, 3 no, 2 abstain.

g. Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (Prof. Meta Van Sickle, Chair): Motion to endorse changes to [XXF policy Presentation](#)

Professor Van Sickle provided an overview of the changes (see presentation above).

The motion passed by online vote, 39 yes, 1 no, 4 abstain.

h. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual (Merissa Ferrara, Chair): [Motion](#) to endorse a revision to the FAM's procedures for the Faculty Hearing Committee

Senator John Huddleston (Religious Studies), a former member of the Hearing Committee, said that this language puts more of the onus on the grievant. He added that the FAM is vague regarding what kind of supporting materials a grievant should submit and when. He said that he supports this motion but would like to see more clarification in the FAM.

Professor Larry Krasnoff (Guest, Member of the By-Laws/FAM Committee) said that at the stage of the process where this language applies, the grievant does not need to supply evidence but simply needs to establish that, if evidence were to demonstrate that their claim is true, it would constitute a violation. The bar isn't raised for the grievant, he said; the language clarifies what is required for a case to proceed.

Prof. Krasnoff reminded the Senate that its vote is advisory; the Provost controls the administrative portion of the FAM. He said that the language establishes a minimal standard to ensure that grievants do not spend time and effort assembling a case that has no chance of success. He added that this language describes the way the committee already tends to operate in practice.

The motion passed by online vote, 40 yes, 2 no, 4 abstain.

6. Constituents' General Concerns

Senator Moshe Rhodes (SSM) reported that in September 2020, he heard an advertisement for the College of Charleston on a talk radio program that featured misinformation about COVID-19. Being concerned about the association of the College with such misinformation, he brought the issue to Speaker Lewis, who conveyed the concern to the Office of University Marketing. Sen. Rhodes said that he heard the same ad on a similar program in February 2021. Speaker Lewis, noting that the concern was now on record, said that he would pursue it.

Speaker Lewis suggested using the April 13 time slot, scheduled in the event that this meeting was not completed tonight, for a Strategic Plan forum with President Hsu and Provost Austin. They have expressed interest in holding such a forum. There was no objection, so Speaker Lewis said that he would set it up for 5:00 PM on April 13.

7. The meeting adjourned at 6:43 PM.

Resolution of Condemnation
Kelly G. Shaver
Department of Management and Marketing
School of Business
March 17, 2021

Despite the fact that some faculty are by their own choice teaching “in person,” it is important for the Faculty to express its collective outrage over the Governor’s recent Executive Order (Section 5 Paragraph D) forcing state employees to return to the workplace in person. That Executive Order fails on public health grounds, on General Duty grounds, and on moral grounds. Expressing empathy for our staff colleagues is appropriate, but hardly sufficient. There are several reasons that the Faculty Senate should issue a formal vote of Condemnation.

Whereas, the Governor’s decision contradicts current guidelines from both the CDC and the SC OSHA guidance for Workplace Re-Entry (5/14/2020),

Whereas, the Executive Order runs counter to the General Duty Clause of the South Carolina Code of Regulations **§71-112A** (which reads “Employers shall maintain a place of employment which *is free of recognized hazards which may cause death or serious physical harm* [emphasis added] to his employees and he shall comply with this regulation and other occupational safety and health rules and regulations promulgated under Chapter 15 of Title 41, Code of Laws, State of South Carolina, 1976, as amended.”),

Whereas, although Charleston County’s level of community transmission was decreasing between 3/7/21 and 3/12/21, according to the CDC Covid Tracker, the danger remains HIGH and the percent positivity is INCREASING,

Whereas, the College’s strategic plan offers as its first Core Value: ““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.” Not to mention “Public Mission: We demonstrate social responsibility in meeting the educational and professional needs of our state, our nation and the world,”

Be it therefore RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston formally condemns Paragraph D of Section 5 of Governor McMaster’s Executive Order 2012-12 dated March 5, 2021.

Resolution of Protest
Kelly G. Shaver
Department of Management and Marketing
School of Business
April 6, 2021

Despite the fact that some faculty are by their own choice teaching “in person,” it is important for the Faculty to express its collective outrage over the Governor’s recent Executive Order (Section 5 Paragraph D) forcing state employees to return to the workplace in person. That Executive Order fails on public health grounds, on General Duty grounds, and on moral grounds. Expressing empathy for our staff colleagues is appropriate but hardly sufficient. There are several reasons that the Faculty Senate should issue a formal vote of protest.

Whereas, the Governor’s decision contradicts current guidelines from both the CDC and the SC OSHA guidance for Workplace Re-Entry (5/14/2020);

Whereas, the Executive Order runs counter to the General Duty Clause of the South Carolina Code of Regulations **§71-112A** (which reads “Employers shall maintain a place of employment which *is free of recognized hazards which may cause death or serious physical harm* [emphasis added] to his employees and he shall comply with this regulation and other occupational safety and health rules and regulations promulgated under Chapter 15 of Title 41, Code of Laws, State of South Carolina, 1976, as amended.”);

Whereas, although Charleston County’s level of community transmission was decreasing between 3/7/21 and 3/12/21, according to the CDC Covid Tracker, the danger remains HIGH and the percent positivity is INCREASING;

Whereas, the College’s strategic plan offers as its first Core Value “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.” Not to mention “Public Mission: We demonstrate social responsibility in meeting the educational and professional needs of our community, our state, our nation and the world”;

Be it therefore RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston formally protests Paragraph D of Section 5 of Governor McMaster’s Executive Order 2012-12, dated March 5, 2021.