

COLLEGE of CHARLESTON

Summary of Changes to the By-laws and *Faculty/Administration Manual* for 2020-2021 edition

Last Revised: October 12, 2020

Changes to Faculty By-Laws

- **Article V, Section 3.B.2.a:** Addition of two faculty members to Committee on Graduate Education. Originally recommended by the 2019-2020 Committee on Graduate Education. Brought by the Committee on the By-Laws and *Faculty/Administration Manual* to October 1, 2019 Faculty Senate meeting, where it was approved. Ratified by the full faculty in November 2019.

Changes to Administrative Sections

- **Section VI.H, Post-Tenure Review:** Changes proposed by the Committee on the By-Laws and *Faculty/Administration Manual* and endorsed by the Faculty Senate at April 2020 meeting.
 - Requiring that written recommendations from the Department Chair, Dean, and Post-Tenure Review Committee are provided to the post-tenure review candidate seeking a superior rating.
 - Establishing a process for requests for corrections of errors of faculty in letters from Department Chair, Dean, or Post-Tenure Review Committee. At the department level, this change replaces a limited departmental level rebuttal process.
 - Establishing a process for the Post-Tenure Review Committee to request factual information necessary for the determination of a recommendation, to replace the open-ended and less proscriptive process allowing the Post-Tenure Review Committee to ask any questions in the process of their deliberations.
- Substantial reformatting and some correction of errors in position titles and office names.

Motion to Expand Committee on Graduate Education

FAM By-Laws Committee
Senate Motion
Submitted 9/17/19

Motion to expand the Committee on Graduate Education

Current FAM language (3.B.2.a.):

“Composition: Five regular faculty members, at least three of whom are also members of the Graduate Faculty, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Registrar, the Provost, and the Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and 19 Strategic Planning, or their designees, are non-voting ex-officio members.”

Proposed FAM language:

“Composition: Seven regular faculty members, at least three of whom are also members of the Graduate Faculty, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Registrar, the Provost, and the Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and 19 Strategic Planning, or their designees, are non-voting ex-officio members.”

Rationale:

This committee’s work has expanded in terms of the number of proposals they review as well as broader responsibilities (including accreditation oversight and curriculum management).

Pending a successful vote by both the Faculty Senate and the full faculty, the Committee on Graduate Education plans to seek two additional members immediately.

Faculty Senate Minutes for October 1, 2019

To reflect action on Motion to Expand Committee on Graduate Education

**Faculty Senate, Tuesday, October 1, 2019, 5:00 PM
Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)**

Votes taken by the Faculty Senate appear in red.

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:05.
2. Announcements and Information: Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis announced that a new Faculty Secretariat should be hired before the November meeting and thanked Michelle McGrew (Provost's Office) for helping out at the first two meetings. He welcomed new Senators Kristin Krantzman, Andy Shedlock, and Michaela Ruppert Smith.
3. The [Sept. 10, 2019 Minutes](#) were approved by voice vote.
4. Reports

- a. Speaker Lewis encouraged faculty and staff to send names of potential candidates for Provost and Chief Financial Officer to him or to Alicia Caudill, EVP of Student Affairs.

The Academic Planning Committee is exploring possible adjustments to future Fall Semester schedules to account for the likelihood of storm-related closures.

Speaker Lewis also acknowledged the ongoing work of the Student Success and Retention Committee and the Committee on Engagement.

He highlighted a number of recent student and faculty accomplishments, and thanked faculty who mentor and write letters on behalf of students pursuing nationally competitive awards such as Rhodes and Fulbright. He will be featuring faculty accomplishments in his report to the Board of Trustees.

October 25 marks the inauguration of President Hsu and the groundbreaking for the International African American Museum.

November will mark the kickoff of the College's 250th anniversary; the First-Year Experience has issued a call for courses related to the anniversary and the theme of "History. Made. Here." The deadline is October 30.

The Speaker expressed concern over the recent "stickering" of the campus by a white supremacist/neo-Nazi group. He encouraged faculty to engage students with the College Reads book *Rising Out of Hatred*, citing the role college classmates had in shifting Derek Black away from white supremacy and white nationalism.

Finally, Speaker Lewis acknowledged the sad loss of Professors Charles Beam and Ben Cox, and read tributes to them from colleagues.

5. New Business

a. Curriculum Committee (Andrew Przeworski, Chair)

PSYCH 410 -- Prerequisite Change: addition of "instructor permission" to the list of prerequisites. [PDF](#) **The motion passed by voice vote.**

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

Motion to expand the Committee on Graduate Education from five to seven regular faculty members. (See below for full text.)

Professor Jon Hakkila (Guest, Associate Dean of the Graduate School) spoke in favor of the motion, saying that it would provide perspectives from more constituencies and make it easier to get a quorum for the committee's meetings.

The motion passed by voice vote.

6. Constituents' General Concerns: There were none.

7. The meeting adjourned at 5:26.

Appendix: Motion from the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual:

Motion to expand the Committee on Graduate Education

Current FAM language (3.B.2.a.):

"Composition: Five regular faculty members, at least three of whom are also members of the Graduate Faculty, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Registrar, the Provost, and the Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, or their designees, are non-voting ex-officio members."

Proposed FAM language:

"Composition: Seven regular faculty members, at least three of whom are also members of the Graduate Faculty, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Registrar, the Provost, and the Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, or their designees, are non-voting ex-officio members."

Rationale:

This committee's work has expanded in terms of the number of proposals they review as well as broader responsibilities (including accreditation oversight and curriculum management).

Pending a successful vote by both the Faculty Senate and the full faculty, the Committee on Graduate Education plans to seek two additional members immediately.

Proposed Revisions to Faculty/Administration Manual, VI.H, Post-Tenure Review

FAM By-Laws Committee
Amending PTR

Rationale:

The post-tenure review process is quite streamlined compared to the tenure and promotion process. Satisfactory post-tenure reviews stop at the dean, and no letter is required of the dean assuming the department chair's judgment of the candidate is agreeable. There is, however, some vagueness in the existing PTR language especially concerning requests for additional information and corrections of fact. The proposed additions aim for the following: (1) Remove language regarding the rebuttal letter. (2) Ensure that copies of each recommending letter (from Chair, Dean, and Post-Tenure Review Committee, if any such letter) go to the candidate. (3) Provide for requests for corrections of errors of fact, aligned with tenure and promotion process. (4) Provide for appropriate opportunities for reviewers to request factual information necessary for the determination of a recommendation.

Original IV.H.2b

The Post-Tenure Review Committee operates on a presumption of satisfactory performance. That is, the burden of proof (clear and convincing evidence) for a superior performance lies with the candidate, and the burden of proof for an unsatisfactory performance, including with completion of a remediation plan, lies with the Department Chair (or department post-tenure review panel). When a faculty member is not appointed to an academic department, the relevant Program Director shall serve in the role of Department Chair for purposes of the post-tenure review. The Post-Tenure Review Committee can request additional information at any time during their deliberations.

Proposed IV.H.2b

The Post-Tenure Review Committee operates on a presumption of satisfactory performance. That is, the burden of proof (clear and convincing evidence) for a superior performance lies with the candidate, and the burden of proof for an unsatisfactory performance, including with completion of a remediation plan, lies with the Department Chair (or department post-tenure review panel). When a faculty member is not appointed to an academic department, the relevant Program Director shall serve in the role of Department Chair for purposes of the post-tenure review. ~~The Post-Tenure Review Committee can request additional information at any time during their deliberations.~~

Original IV.H.7

In the case of a candidate requesting a superior rating, the Department Chair (or the departmental panel) shall forward to the candidate's Dean by the announced deadline the candidate's packet with a letter justifying the Chair's (or panel's) concurrence or failure to concur with the candidate's self-evaluation. At this time a copy of the letter shall be forwarded to the candidate. Should the rating of the Chair (or departmental panel) be satisfactory rather than superior, the candidate may forward a letter of rebuttal to the Candidate's Dean and Department Chair no later

than five (5) days before the first day of the beginning of the Spring Semester. The Deans will review packets and forward written recommendations to the Office of the Provost.

In the case of a candidate being considered for a satisfactory rating, the Department Chair shall meet with the Dean to discuss a summary of the candidate's annual performance evaluations. In addition, the Chair or panel will forward to the candidate's Dean a written statement that the candidate meets the criteria for a satisfactory rating or a brief summary of the ratings received on annual performance evaluations in the area of teaching and a statement that the candidate receives an unsatisfactory rating.

Proposed IV.H.7

In the case of a candidate requesting a superior rating, the Department Chair (or the departmental panel) shall forward to the candidate's Dean by the announced deadline the candidate's packet with a letter justifying the Chair's (or panel's) concurrence or failure to concur with the candidate's self-evaluation. At this time a copy of the letter shall be forwarded to the candidate. ~~Should the rating of the Chair (or departmental panel) be satisfactory rather than superior, the candidate may forward a letter of rebuttal to the Candidate's Dean and Department Chair no later than five (5) days before the first day of the beginning of the Spring Semester. The Deans will review packets and forward written recommendations to the Office of the Provost.~~

In the case of a candidate being considered for a satisfactory rating, the Department Chair shall meet with the Dean to discuss a summary of the candidate's annual performance evaluations. In addition, the Chair or panel will forward to the candidate's Dean a written statement that the candidate meets the criteria for a satisfactory rating or a brief summary of the ratings received on annual performance evaluations in the area of teaching and a statement that the candidate receives an unsatisfactory rating. *At this time, a copy of the letter shall be forwarded to the candidate.*

In either case, irrespective of the rating sought by the candidate, if the Chair's written statement (or the departmental panel's written statement) provided to the candidate contains an error of fact, the Chair (or departmental panel chair) may correct this error through an addendum to the original 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 provision of the recommendation. The written correction should be forwarded to the Dean with a copy to the Chair (or 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.

New IV.H.8

In the case of a candidate seeking a superior rating, the Dean will review the packet and forward both the Chair's (or departmental panel's) and their own written recommendation to the Office of the Provost, with a copy of the Dean's recommendation also provided to the candidate and the Chair. Information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested by the Dean from the 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. Aug. 2018, Aug. 2020)

If the Dean's written recommendation 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) 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. The written correction should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence.

(Ins. Aug 2020)

In the case of a candidate being considered for a satisfactory rating, if the Dean concurs with the Chair's summary of the candidate's annual performance evaluations and the Chair's written statement that the candidate meets the criteria for a satisfactory rating, then the Dean notifies the candidate and the Provost, in writing, of that decision and the review concludes.

As outlined above, if the candidate has received two or more unsatisfactory ratings in teaching (or, for a librarian, two or more unsatisfactory ratings in professional competence) over the six-year review period, the candidate is deemed to have received an unsatisfactory rating for post-tenure review. Formal written notice from the Department Chair to the faculty member, Dean and Post-Tenure Review Committee of an unsatisfactory rating and need to develop a remediation plan will take place by March 15 of each academic year. In the case of an unsatisfactory rating, the Dean will provide written notice to the Provost, copied to the candidate, Chair, and Post-Tenure Review Committee.

Original IV.H.8a

The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall review and forward its recommendations on applications for superior ratings to the Provost by the announced deadline, typically at the end of February. The Provost may make a recommendation and shall forward all recommendations to the President by the announced deadline.

Proposed IV.H.9a

The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall review and forward its recommendations on applications for superior ratings to the Provost, **Dean, Chair, and candidate** by the announced deadline, typically at the end of February. The Provost may make a recommendation and shall forward all recommendations to the President by the announced deadline.

Information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested by the Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee from the Dean, 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 Post-Tenure Review Committee and the responding body.

If a recommendation provided to the candidate by the Post-Tenure Review 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 Post-Tenure Review Committee, the Dean, and the Chair. The written correction should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence.

Faculty Senate Minutes for April 7, 2020

To reflect Senate position on proposed revisions to FAM, VI.H - Post-Tenure Review

**Faculty Senate, Tuesday, April 7, 2020, 5:00 PM (Continued on April 14, 2020, 5:00 PM)
Via Zoom**

Voting/unanimous consent items appear in red.

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

Speaker Lewis conveyed the sad news that Professor Gustavo Urdaneta Velasquez (Hispanic Studies) passed away the previous week and read a tribute by Professor Michael Gomez, Chair of Hispanic Studies.

President Hsu will be conducting virtual town hall meetings on the College's response to the Covid-19 pandemic and the Strategic Planning process.

Interim Provost Fran Welch is assembling a task force to think through different scenarios for fall semester instruction.

The application deadline for faculty research and development grants (round three) has been extended to April 17. The deadline for nominations to the Nominations and Elections Committee is April 13. Those nominations go to Speaker Lewis.

4. Reports

a. Speaker Lewis thanked everyone for coping with the unprecedented circumstances. He noted that faculty and administration have been working together to develop emergency policies on everything from T&P to grading to budget. Our community is weathering this storm and continuing to operate within a framework of shared governance.

b. President Andrew Hsu thanked the provost and the faculty for their work during the crisis, particularly on transitioning to distance education and creating an emergency grading policy. We have one of the most student-friendly faculties in the country, he said.

He addressed several measures that the senior leadership team has taken: all summer school classes, including Maymester, will be held online. Refunds to students for housing, meal plans, and parking will be calculated at a pro-rated rate. The cost of the refunds is about six million dollars.

He noted that the largest portion of contributions to the student emergency fund so far has come from the faculty ranks.

Online learning for spring continues with largely positive responses.

Student Affairs and Campus Housing Staff deserve recognition for the tremendous work they have done. As of April 7, only 39 students remained in residence halls, and they are required to practice social distancing. About 700 students' personal items remain in their rooms.

The FAST (Faculty/Staff Assisting Students in Trouble) form has been expanded to include concerns about retention.

The spring commencement ceremony has been postponed. A survey has been sent to graduating seniors regarding possible alternatives. The Class of 2020 and the campus community deserve a grand celebration; we're trying to find a way to achieve that.

[As of April 7] About 10% of employees are coming to campus, a figure in line with other higher education institutions in the state.

The new budgetary constraints have necessitated a hiring freeze and spending controls. The College's lobbying team is working to ensure that we can access federal aid.

Senator Oleg Smirnov (SSM) asked about removing the distance-education training requirement for summer courses, given the fact that faculty are all teaching online already and that they do not have the option of teaching face-to-face this summer. President Hsu asked Interim Provost Fran Welch to respond: the DE steering committee is allowing a self-paced express DE readiness course to substitute for the traditional course, and they are working an additional alternate verification path for faculty. The new guidelines, she said, would be flexible.

Senator Ashley Pagnotta (Physics and Astronomy) asked if internal grant recipients would be allowed to roll grant funding over into next year if they are unable to use the grant this year because of travel restrictions and other pandemic-related limitations. Provost Welch replied that such requests would have to be handled on a case-by-case basis.

President Hsu asked Professor William Veal (Teacher Education) to report on behalf of Senate Budget Committee. Professor Veal reported that while the College is fiscally healthy (state appropriations have increased, operating reserves and fund balances are positive), two serious concerns remain, namely a 2019-20 budget deficit projected at \$2.8 million and a recurring structural deficit of \$15.5 million in Education and General Fund (E and G) expenditures. Regarding the latter, the goal, he said, is to place these deficit-producing expenditures in the annual budget, permanently. He reported that the administration recognizes the need to correct these problems, has shared a great deal of information with the Budget Committee, and is working cooperatively with the Budget Committee on these issues.

Professor Julia Eichelberger (guest), speaking as a former chair of the Budget Committee, thanked the current committee and the administration for demonstrating this level of collaboration, especially during a time of crisis. Speaker Lewis and Professor (and Associate Dean of the Graduate School) Jon Hakkila (guest) added their appreciation to both the committee and the administration.

c. The report from the Ad Hoc Committee for Intellectual Property Policy Review (Chris Starr, Chair) was postponed.

d. Academic Planning Committee (Dan Greenberg, Chair) --- Online Exams

Professor Greenberg reviewed the committee's recommendations for offering exams online. He noted that SNAP accommodations still apply. The committee strongly recommends asynchronous testing and discourages online proctoring. [PDF](#)

e. Ad Hoc Committee for Diversity/Race Equity and Inclusion Requirement (Anthony Greene and Morgan Koerner, Co-Chairs) [PDF](#)

Professors Koerner and Greene provided an overview of the committee's recommendation (see PDF).

Professor Grant Gilmore (guest) asked if any thought had been given to integrating this requirement and the current Founding Documents requirement. Professor Koerner replied that the committee did want it to be treated as a requirement not contained within the general education curriculum, which would look similar to the Founding Documents requirement in Degree Works. Prof. Gilmore clarified that he meant that the integration with Founding Documents would be in addition to the curricular component the ad hoc committee is proposing. Registrar Mary Bergstrom confirmed that this new requirement would look similar to the Founding Documents requirement on Degree Works.

Registrar Bergstrom expressed concern about adding six credit hours to graduation requirements. Prof. Koerner said that the courses used to satisfy the new REI requirement would double-count with other courses; the committee does not want to add hours to graduation requirements.

Prof. Hakkila said that it would be difficult for some majors (such as Physics and Engineering) to work these courses in; the implementation would need to be planned carefully so that the new requirement doesn't negatively impact some majors. Prof. Koerner responded that the committee's membership did include Professor Jason Vance from Biology. He added that the committee wants to keep all departments and programs involved in the process, and agreed that we need to be careful about implementation.

Senator Gretchen McLaine (Theatre and Dance) pointed out that many courses that already count for gen ed credits in Humanities and Social Sciences will likely fulfill the REI requirements. Responding to a chat comment, Prof. Koerner said that while the committee wants courses to focus on intersectionality and not deal exclusively with race, they believe that race is significant enough as a portion of this diversity goal that it needs to be part of the requirement. Prof. Greene added that the committee wants to make sure that race isn't left out of the discussion. He said that their intention is not to leave out other marginalized groups but to ensure that race is part of the diversity effort.

Prof. Eichelberger asserted that the REI should be considered a general education requirement, though the REI requirement can be met in a number of ways. She suggested having it overseen by the General Education Committee once it is up and running. Prof. Koerner replied that her comment reflects the committee's discussion, adding that opinion on whether the General Education Committee should oversee the REI requirement was split about 50/50. Prof. Julia McReynolds-Perez (guest, member of the ad hoc committee) added that keeping this requirement separate from gen ed does not mean that the requirement wouldn't be satisfied by gen ed courses.

The discussion returned to Prof. Hakkila's earlier comment on the difficulty of devoting 1/3 of a course in some fields, specifically the sciences, to race and racism. mutindi ndunda expressed hope that we can include diversity and global awareness into all our subjects. Sebastian Van Delden, Interim Dean of the School of Science and Mathematics, asked if the 1/3 figure was negotiable, and Prof. Koerner replied that the committee is "pretty locked in" on 1/3. He suggested that students majoring in the sciences would probably meet the new requirement by doubling REI courses with general education courses. Some commenting on the issue suggested in various ways that the requirement was do-able through gen-ed double counting and that some courses in the sciences could in fact meet the 1/3 race/racism requirement. Others reiterated the difficulty of integrating 1/3 race/racism content into a science, mathematics, or computing course. Prof. Pam Riggs-Gelasco (guest) suggested the possibility of a one-hour course dealing exclusively with diversity issues in a given discipline. Prof. Robert Podolsky (guest) suggested that the committee try to get more participation and buy-in from departments that are unlikely to be able to design courses with 1/3 REI content. Prof. Koerner gratefully acknowledged these suggestions.

Prof. Susan Kattwinkel (guest) gave her perspective as Chair of the General Education Committee. In terms of workload, she believes adding the oversight of this requirement to that committee's duties is reasonable. She also predicted that the vast majority of REI courses would double-count with gen-ed humanities courses, and she wondered how that might alter the gen-ed humanities landscape. There are too many humanities courses counting for gen ed currently, she said, a situation that has hurt some departments' enrollments. This requirement might help with that problem, or at least benefit departments that can quickly create courses that would double-count; but it also might make the chaotic situation with gen-ed humanities courses even more chaotic.

Registrar Bergstrom expressed concern about the effect on transfer students. It will often be difficult, she said, to determine if courses from other institutions meet the REI criteria, which could disadvantage transfer students.

Senator Tom Carroll (EHHP) said that some programs would need to go through an approval process with accreditors in order to make the proposed changes to courses and curriculum. He also asked what metrics the committee was using to evaluate the program. Julia McReynolds-Perez (guest, ad hoc committee member) responded that the committee had tried to get information from other institutions about the success of their diversity requirements, but there is not much publicly available data. She said there is some evidence from schools that added a single one-hour course that the one-hour requirement was insufficient. Grant Gilmore (guest) asserted that the College should lead the way on this issue and in changing accreditors' standards in regard to diversity education.

Speaker Lewis thanked the committee and noted that this proposal will be included in discussions of the strategic planning committee.

5. New Business

a. **The list of degree candidates for Spring Commencement (introduced by Interim Provost Welch) was approved by unanimous consent.**

b. Committee on Nominations and Elections (RoxAnn Stalvey, Chair) [PDF1](#) [PDF2](#)

Prof. Stalvey read the names of the nominees for Senate committees and asked if there were any additional nominations from the floor. None were added, and **the slates of nominees to the Academic Planning, Budget, and By-Laws/FAM Committees were approved by online poll.**

c. 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).

After Speaker Lewis asked if any senator wanted to separate out any individual proposal, all proposals from the Curriculum Committee were considered as a single motion. **The motion to approve all Curriculum Committee proposals was approved by a vote conducted via live online poll.**

[Summary of each item](#)

- a) BADM: Program change: BADM
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2491/form>
- b) BIOL: Course change: BIOL 204
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2435/form>
- c) CHEM: New courses: CHEM 261, 423, 435; Program change: BIOC
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:149/form>
- d) CSCI: Course change: CSCI 360
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2485/form>
- e) DATA: Program change: DATA
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2120/form>
- f) ECON: Program change: ECON
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2119/form>
- g) ENSS: New course: ENVT 363; Change minor: ENSS
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:152/form>
- h) FREN: Course changes: FREN 101, 101C, 102, 102C, 201, 201C, 202, 202C, 313, 314
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:136/form>
- i) GEOL: New course: GEOL 253
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2509/form>
- j) GLTR: Deactivate minor: GLTR
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1920/form>
- k) HONS: New course: HONS 172; Change courses: HONS 110, 115, 151, 151L, 152, 152L, 155, 155L, 156, 156L, 163, 174; Deactivate courses: HONS 122, 132, 246
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:153/form>
- l) INTL: Program changes: INTL-INAF, INTL-INAS, INTL-INCL, INTL-INGS, INTL-INEU, INTL-INLA
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:155/form>
- m) ITAL: Course changes: ITAL 101, 102, 201, 202, 313, 314; New course: ITAL 398
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:144/form>
- n) JWST: Program change: JWST
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2129/form>
- o) LACS: Program change: LACS; Change minor; LACS
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:142/form>
- p) MEDH: Change minor: MEDH

<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2074/form>

q) MGMT/MKTG: Program changes: BADM-ENTR, BADM-LDSU; Change minors: ENTR, LDSS
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:150/form>

r) PETE: Program change: PETE
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2397/form>

s) PORT: Course change: PORT 291
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2532/form>

t) PSYC: New courses: PSYC 319, 373; Deactivate course: PSYC 378; Program changes: PSYC BS, PSYC BA
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:146/form>

u) RELS: Program change: RELS; Change minor: RELS
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:145/form>

v) TEDU: New course: EDFS 106; Change course: EDFS 201; Program change: EDFL
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:151/form>

w) THTR: New courses: THTR 218, 379, 385, 477; Program change: THTR-TPER
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:143/form>

x) WGST: Program change: WGST; Change minor: WGST
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:147/form>

d. Committee on Graduate Education (Sandra Slater, Chair):

a) English, MA

1. Change to English MA program requirements
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2437/form>

Approved by online vote.

b) Public Administration

1. PUBA - 523 - Housing Policy
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2328/form>
2. PUBA - 550 - Nonprofit Leadership and Governance
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2389/form>

Two additional items were added, by unanimous consent, to the Public Administration bundle. These were prerequisite changes to align with Graduate School policy for two courses: PUBA 521 and PUBA 701.

The four items under Public Administration were then approved by online vote.

c) Community Planning, Policy, and Design

1. Community Planning, Policy, and Design, M.A. - MA-CPAD
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2278/form>
2. CPAD 700 Independent Study
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2402/form>
3. CPAD 710 Internship
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2405/form>

Approved by online vote.

d) Science and Math for Teachers

1. Science and Math for Teachers, M.Ed. - MED-SMFT
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2600/form>
2. SMFT - 699 - Capstone Project
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2365/form>
3. SMFT - 635 - Topics in Ecology and Conservation Biology
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2003/form>
4. SMFT - 637 – Biotechnology
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2357/form>
5. SMFT - 640 - Coastal and Marine Science for Teachers
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2162/form>

Approved by online vote.

e) Data Science and Analytics

1. Data 591 Independent Study
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2482/form>
2. Data Science and Analytics, M.S. - MS-MDSA
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2123/form>

Approved by online vote.

f) Environmental and Sustainability Studies, M.S. - MS-ENSS

1. ENSS Elective Change
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2508/form>
2. Environmental and Sustainability Studies, M.S. Admission Requirement
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2504/form>
3. EVSS - 552 - Managing Resilient Landscapes
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2512/form>

Approved by online vote.

g) Computer and Information Sciences

1. Computer and Information Sciences, MS-CSIS
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2582/form>
2. CSIS - 605 - Applied Algorithms
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2441/form>
3. CSIS - 635 - Fundamentals of Agile Project Management
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2479/form>
4. Information Systems Graduate Certificate – INSY
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2379/form>
5. Software Engineering Graduate Certificate – SOEN
<https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2495/form>

Approved by online vote.

Sen. Slater asked to add two items to her portion of the agenda, both terminations of programs due to lack of enrollment.

1. Information Systems Certificate program termination.
2. Middle Grades Education MAT program termination.

These items were added to the agenda by unanimous consent. Then they were approved together by online vote.

Sen. Slater reported on admissions changes made to graduate programs over the course of the 2019-20 academic year. [PDF](#)

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

1. Humanities:
HIST253: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2445/form>
MUSC227: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2498/form>
HONS172: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2597/form>

THTR218: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2601/form>

Approved by online vote.

2. Social Science:

LING210: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2559/form>

LING240: <https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2583/form>

Approved by online vote.

At 7:07, the meeting adjourned, to be resumed on April 14 at 5:00 PM.

Resumption of meeting, April 14, 2020, 5:00 PM

Without objection, the Senate returned to the fifth item of New Business (Graduate Education Committee) and considered a proposal to terminate the Special Education Post-Masters Certificate program. **The proposal passed by online vote.**

Sen. Slater informed the Senate of an addition to the list of changes to graduate admission requirements presented on April 7. The additional admission changes concern the History MA program. PDF

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

1. Proposed Amendment to the FAM regarding Class Attendance Policy [PDF](#)

Senator Paul Young (SSM) introduced the motion in Prof. Lee's absence.

Prof. Heath Hoffmann (guest) commented first on the proposed changes, which he authored in his role as a Faculty Fellow with the Center for Academic Performance and Persistence. The proposal grew out of concerns about inconsistencies in the ways faculty members work with students who are struggling in class and a desire to clarify policies and practices for new faculty. He added that student retention is at the heart of what we do as a faculty.

Prof. Deborah Boyle (guest), Chair of the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, reported that her committee reviewed a much earlier version of the proposal but didn't have an opportunity to discuss it formally before this Senate meeting. She raised the following concerns from the committee, however:

1. They were not sure whether deans and chairs have a chance to comment on this proposal.
2. Some departments might need some discretion to modify the policy.
3. The distinction between “formal” and “informal” assignments might need to be modified, specifically for disciplines involving graded fieldwork.
4. The new expectations for accommodating students who miss class may increase faculty workload.
5. Athletes are presumably allowed to miss many more classes than other students.
6. The language on page 4 of the proposal, indicating that professors establish criteria for determining whether absences are excused or unexcused, appears to contradict language on page 3, which stipulates college-wide criteria for “excused.”

Professor Hoffmann responded to these concerns:

He did not specifically consult deans and chairs, but the FAM/By-Laws does not require such consultation, and, he said, it is not the usual practice with proposed FAM revisions to solicit their feedback. However, most deans are present at this meeting and they are welcome to comment. Regarding the final point about faculty discretion, he said that faculty would continue to announce on their syllabi how their grading policy relates to the College’s absence policy, and that faculty have discretion over which assignments are “formal” and which are “informal.” Regarding workload, he said that the proposal acknowledges the work that many faculty members are already doing in accommodating students. About athletes having more absences than other students, he said that the Athletic Department tries to schedule events outside of student-athletes’ typical class times, and that he has not personally experienced athletes having significantly more absences than other students.

Senator Tom Carroll (EHHP) noted that science labs, language classes, and activity classes include a “huge” participation factor that is vital to sequential learning. In these classes, credit for participation is very important; missing multiple classes, even when there is no test being given on those days, affects students’ grades. The distinction between formal and informal might not be as clear when participation grades are a big part of the course. Prof. Hoffmann responded that these are areas where faculty members still have discretion, and that faculty can still have an excessive absence policy.

Senator David Desplaces (Management and Marketing) expressed concern about codifying excused versus unexcused absences, noting that students can be very litigious. He described his own system for quiz grades, where a certain number of quizzes (2 out of 12, in his case) are dropped to accommodate legitimate absences. Requiring instructors to determine whether absences are excused and then to allow students to make up quizzes could mean significant extra work, especially for

instructors with large numbers of students. While agreeing with the intention of being fair to students, he worries that we may be making too many rules to cover a small number of cases.

Prof. Hoffmann replied that these excuses are going to be documented and verified by colleagues in the appropriate offices on campus. In his view, two of Sen. Desplaces's claims cancel each other out: if we are making this change for a small number of cases, how would it significantly increase faculty workload? Having to figure these situations out on our own does an injustice to students and to ourselves. He understands the concern about faculty freedom, but he is not in favor of faculty discretion in this regard. He gave as an example a case in which a student is sexually assaulted; three of that student's professors are helpful and understanding, but others insist on additional assignments or additional documentation.

Prof. Jon Hakkila (guest) noted the complexity of the problem. For instance, an absence in a science course may constitute an entire week, and labs sometimes have equipment set up for just that time slot, so it's not easy to provide an opportunity to make up work. When it comes to grading, we account for students missing a few labs, but how do we accommodate when they miss more than a few? He said he appreciates the table that shows who verifies which kinds of absences. But even with these generic guidelines, we will still have to work with students on a case-by-case basis, especially with students who miss multiple classes and then reappear with an excuse. He shares the concern about over-codifying the policy.

Senator Chris Starr (School of Business) questioned the notion that we are making policy for a small number of cases. He suggested possibly adopting this policy in a way that centralizes the process of reporting to faculty but still allows faculty the ability to respond to individual situations. He also expressed a workload concern: while it does not take long to respond to one student, the number of students and the number of mandates to faculty multiply.

Professor Jessica Streit (guest) thanked Prof. Hoffmann for his work on this project. She described her own practice of tracking but not requiring attendance in large lecture classes, explaining to students that, as adults, they must make these decisions themselves. This policy works well for the most part, but some students do miss multiple classes and then expect the professor to catch them up. She said she appreciates the part of the proposal that clarifies the documentation process, but she worries that it will turn into an obligation on the part of professors to catch students up. She is also concerned that students will tend to bring documentation directly to professors to evaluate rather than going to the appropriate office.

Senator Desplaces moved to postpone discussion until the September 2020 meeting. The motion was seconded by Senator Gretchen McLaine (Theatre and Dance).

Senator Irina Ermin (German and Russian Studies) said she understands why people might be apprehensive about the proposal, but the document concerns only larger assignments; it doesn't say that faculty are required to go over course content again. She asked if the meaning of "reasonable accommodations" could be clarified.

Speaker Lewis said that he would like to limit discussion to Senator Desplaces's motion to postpone.

Senator Hoffmann spoke against the motion to postpone, saying he would prefer an up-or-down vote at this meeting. It is important, he said, to get the amended language into the catalog for next year.

The motion to postpone further discussion until the September 2020 meeting passed by online vote.

2. Proposed Clarifications to Post-Tenure Review Language in FAM [PDF](#)

Professor Mike Lee, Chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and FAM, reviewed the intent of the proposal.

Senator Irina Gigova (HSS) spoke in favor of the revised language, calling it clear and logical.

The proposal was approved by online vote.

6. Constituents' General Concerns

a) Prof. Deborah Boyle previewed the Course Alternative Math Policy Proposal from the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid. The proposal will come to the Senate for a vote in September. [PDF](#)

b) Senator Gigova presented three concerns:

1. Faculty who have children in ECDC want to know if they are going to be refunded tuition for April/May.
2. She would like the administration to consider how to accommodate faculty with young children if we are required to continue distance education for all classes in the fall.
3. She asked for an update on a proposal to pay adjunct faculty for the additional time they devoted to the adjustment to online classes. She has heard that the effort has stalled at the provost office.

Speaker Lewis said that the second issue would normally go to the Faculty Welfare committee, though at this point in the semester he doesn't know what they can do.

Interim Provost Welch reported that there has been no decision yet on ECDC, but we are trying to decide what is a fair policy, consistent with other institutions that have similar programs. She said that ECDC tuition would be reduced. Regarding adjunct pay: HSS wanted to pay their adjuncts for participating in workshops related to distance education over spring break. She decided not to allow it because she didn't think it was fair to other adjuncts in the other schools, which did not request additional pay.

c) Senator Andrew Shedlock (Biology) said that a number of science faculty are advising senior graduate students who don't have laboratory access because of the campus shutdown. These students paid for thesis research hours this semester but can't do the research, so he would like to hear from the Graduate School about possibly allowing those credits to transfer to the Fall, when they can actually perform the research. Godfrey Gibbison, Interim Dean of the Graduate School, replied that they haven't had a chance to talk about what is fair and reasonable in that situation, but the Graduate School is aware of the problem. They are trying to accommodate students who are in a position to graduate this semester.

(returning to b) Senator Michaela Ruppert Smith (Adjunct Representative) asked that the issue of additional adjunct pay be revisited. She suggested giving other schools besides HSS the opportunity to offer the additional pay rather than denying pay to HSS adjuncts.

Senator Ashley Pagnotta (Physics and Astronomy) asked if there is some way to continue the discussion of additional pay for adjunct faculty this semester. In response, Senator Jessica Streit (Art and Architectural History), outgoing Chair of the Adjunct Oversight Committee, said that she thought the committee would be interested in pursuing the issue, though time is running out this semester.

7. The meeting adjourned at 6:14.