

**Motions Passed
by the USC Upstate General Faculty and Senate during
Academic Year 2019-2020**

August 19, 2019 General Faculty Meeting

No program motions

September 6, 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting

A. Program, Curriculum, Catalog, and Course Changes – Dr. Stolz

1. Proposed Changes to forms –

a. Academic Affairs Committee Memo & Revised Forms

- Dr. Stolz thanked Dr. Zack & Dr. Harris who led the charge on changing the forms. He highlighted that several signatures have been removed and cosmetic changes were made (e.g., adding lines, changing words). He then opened for questions.
 - Dr. Zack added context that the effort to revise these forms was part of an ongoing effort to make them more instructive and user friendly. They are also part of the broader effort to streamline some of the bureaucratic issues. The intention was for senate to provide feedback and then vote to approve form changes. Dr. Harris added that the change in academic regulations form has the most substantial edits, which were to make clear that you can submit a proposal, but it is ultimately the committee that makes the global approvals, which means the committee may request edits before they approve it and a failure to make edits might result in no committee approval.
 - Dr. Williams clarified that if a unit submits a change, will the AAC make changes under the unit's name? Dr. Harris responded that that will not occur.
 - Dr. Kamla requested a fillable PDF for these forms to avoid errors created by the Word document (e.g., columns cut short, typing doesn't match throughout). Dr. Harris indicated she can make them into fillable PDFs.
 - Dr. Zack added that these form changes are in conjuncture with website changes; there is now a table on the AAC webpage to make it easier and that they are working to get the whole process completely online/digitized. Dr. Harris added that there are instructions online for filling out these forms (e.g., cannot reuse a course number for 7 years).
- Dr. Meek motioned to approve the forms and Dr. Amendolair seconded. Form changes were approved unanimously.

B. Intercollegiate Athletics Committee – Dr. Jim Griffis

- Voting was held to elect a committee member to this ad-hoc advisory committee from nominations submitted via email. There was no clear majority from the initial vote on the 7 nominees so there was a run-off

between the top 2 that resulted in the final selection of Dr. Michelle Garland. The other nominees will be given to the Chancellor who must also appoint one additional member.

October 4, 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting

A. Faculty Manual Update

- Dr. Lizabeth Zack, Faculty Chair
 - Started by asking whether One Drive was successful for obtaining the agenda and no one specified any issues.
 - Faculty manual has been approved by the board of trustees and the new manual is now available online. You can reach it by navigating from the USC Upstate homepage, then proceed to either the A-Z index or clicking “Faculty/Staff” at the top of the page, then navigate to faculty governance, and then finally to faculty manual. There are links to individual chapters in addition to a PDF of the entire manual. In the future, this page will also include drafts of proposed changes. A summary of changes from the older version to the newer version include: table of contents, preamble, forward, mission/visions/values statement, appendix, chapters 1-4 revisions, and chapter 5 revisions and reorganization. Specifically, for Chapter 5 the faculty review is being treated as a coherent and integrated system where the component parts are the types of review we undergo: annual reviews, 3rd year, tenure & promotion, post-tenure, and instructor promotion. The rules and principles that govern these reviews are laid out in the manual and manual language is used with intent. Because the manual is in effect, the changes are now applicable. The pre-tenure review has been changed from 2nd & 4th to just a 3rd year review, although for only this year, faculty do have the choice between these two options. There is also a new master calendar in Appendix 7, but again, for just this year the calendar is being adjusted to accommodate the changes. Appendix 8 contains the revised Faculty Review Form, which will now be used for all reviews for all faculty. Dr. Zack acknowledged that there is an issue with unit criteria being on a 4-point scale now that this new faculty review form is on a 5-point scale, which is being discussed. File guidelines in the appendix are also new and intend to reduce the amount of material and number of binders down to a narrative to make the case for yourself and supporting documents for the narrative.
 - Dr. Amendolair inquired if the post-tenure review policy was changed and Dr. Zack confirmed that it was not.

November 1, 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting

1. IES – Informatics and Engineering Systems

- b. Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Worksheet or Program Description
- Bachelor of Arts Major in Information Management & Systems Accredited Concentration in Health Information Management (Proposed)
 - Bachelor of Arts Major in Information Management & Systems Accredited Concentration in Health Information Management (Current)
 - Changes include: “track” will change to “concentration”, capstone courses were moved below the electives, and noted a statement limiting the maximum credit hours that can be transferred in to 24 credits.
 - Dr. Griffis asked a clarification regarding the placement of the footnote for the 24 credit hours limitation from the previous 2 years, and suggested that the placement, which is under electives, seems misleading since only 18 elective credits are allowed. He made an amendment that the footnote should be moved to the beginning of the concentration description by superscript 1 since it is for the whole program.
 - Dr. Kamla motioned to accept these changes with the amendment by Dr. Griffis and Dr. Griffis seconded. The motion approved unanimously.
- c. Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Course Description
- AMMG U415 – Advanced Manufacturing Management
 - A prerequisite change is requested to add MATH U102 and AMMG U330 before taking AMMG U415. Dr. Griffis noted that since AMMG U300 is already a prerequisite for AMMG U330, that AMMG U300 should just be replaced with AMM300. Dr. Stolz noted that the repetition serves as a reminder for students. Dr. Griffis noted the atypicality of this, but Dr. Stolz said the redundancy would be helpful and would be kept. Dr. Amendolair motioned to approve the change, Dr. Harvey seconded and the motion was approved unanimously.

B. Faculty Manual Update – Dr. Lizabeth Zack, Faculty Chair

- The advisory committee met and determined 3 categories of changes to address: (1) smaller non-substantial changes (e.g., fixing committee descriptions), (2) more substantial changes (e.g., creation of the adjunct manual, updating language in the grievance chapter, formal procedures for changing the manual), and (3) revisiting the post-tenure review policy to see if a better model can be created to find a way of providing compensation after promotion to full professor. Similar to last year’s timeline, proposals for changes will be presented to Senate at the December meeting, and then in the spring semester we will have public comment followed by general voting.

December 6, 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting

A. Program, Curriculum, Catalog, and Course Changes

- Dr. Zack gave a special thanks to Dr. Stolz and the Academic Affairs Committee for preparing a memo for the Senate to approve in order to make reviewing requested changes faster, while still providing the more detailed supporting documentation.
- MBSON – Mary Black School of Nursing – The MBSON requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Course Description
 - NURS U230 – This course is cross-listed with BIO U230
 - Proposal to remove ENGL U102 as a pre-requisite.
 - NURS U308
 - Proposal to add the pre-requisite of C or better in BIOL U243 & U244.
- MCS – Mathematics and Computer Science – The MCS requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Course Description
 - CSCI U139, U315, U325, & U441
 - Proposal to delete courses as they have been replaced by INFO courses and thus, are no longer used.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Worksheet or Program Description
 - Computer Information & Computer Science
 - Proposal to remove reference to CSCI U139, U315, U325, & U441
 - Request for New Undergraduate Course
 - CSCI U236 – Python Programming
 - Proposal to add as an elective for Math majors and as an option for CS and CIS degree programs
- NSE – Natural Sciences and Engineering – The NSE requests below were approved unanimously with NURS U230 approval noted above.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Course Description
 - BIO U230
 - Proposal to remove ENGL U102 as a pre-requisite.
- SOEHPH – School of Education, Human Performance and Health – The SOEHPH requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Worksheet or Program Description
 - Exercise and Sport
 - Proposal to remove that statement that requires certification exam.
 - Request for New Graduate Courses
 - EDTE U732 – Introduction to Project-Based Learning, U733 – Comparative Study of Project-Based Learning Applications, & U734 Practicum in Project-Based Learning.

- Proposal to add these courses so that students can get the project-based learning endorsement from the SC State Department of Education.
-

B. Faculty Manual Update

- Dr. Zack indicated she had hoped to have proposed changes for today's meeting, but that the advisory committee is still discussing the changes.

January 24, 2020 Faculty Senate Meeting

A. Program, Curriculum, Catalog, and Course Changes

- FACS – Fine Arts and Communication Studies – The FACS requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Course Description
 - ARTH U301
 - Title change from “Women and Art” to “Women and Gender in Art”.
 - JOUR U350
 - Change in course description to account for evolution in media use, journalism, PR, and marketing.
 - MUSC U115, U116, U215, U216
 - 4-course sequence – adjusting topics, prerequisites, and order, to address program goals and student learning outcomes.
 - Dr. Griffis noted that the prerequisites for U215 and U216 are higher course numbers than U215 and U216 (i.e., U255) and that this is not preferred. Dr. Stolz indicated that the committee had suggested that rather than adding the class piano (U255) pre-requisite to add a lab (U115L, U116L) that replaces U255. They intend to make that adjustment in the future.
 - Dr. Griffis additionally questioned the rationale for the inclusions of “or consent of the instructor” to the U116 course description. Dr. Stolz and Dr. Woodwarth clarified that it was related to course logistic issues that may arise involving students taking courses out-of-sequence. Dr. Griffis suggested that MUSC make it clear to students what is meant by “or consent of the instructor”.
 - MUSC U134 (freshman and sophomores), U334 (advanced students)
 - Descriptions now include technology component and song chart preparation component. Advanced course also requires preparation of notated sheet music and not merely the reading of sheet music, as well as learning to lead an ensemble.
 - MUSC U325
 - Change of prerequisites from basic music reading ability to MUSC U215 to prevent non-majors and freshman and sophomores from taking this advanced course without appropriate preparation.
 - MUSC U362

- Removes prerequisites that do not prepare students for the course and adds the more appropriate prerequisite of MUSC U162. Also changed prerequisite of basic music reading skills to MUSC U101.
- ii. Request for New Undergraduate Courses
 - SPCH U379 – “Health Narrative”
 - Briefly described as stories by those with long-term or chronic illness told by professional healthcare providers or non-professional caretakers. This course will allow for service learning opportunities. The course will also be part of the proposed Critical Disability Studies certificate.
 - MUSC U303
 - Merges U301 & U302.
- JCBE – George Dean Johnson Jr. College of Business and Economics – The JCBE requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Course Description
 - ACCT U435
 - Changing prerequisite from ECON U292 to ECON U292 or MATH U202, which helps to eliminate the large number of overrides needed for transfer students with appropriate experience.
 - Request for New Undergraduate Degree Program (Converting the six concentrations of the Business Administration major into separate majors)
 - Accounting, Economics and Finance, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, Logistics and Supply Chain Management, Management, and Marketing.
 - Dr. Griffis noted that language of “this would allow students to dual major in the college of business” is problematic because we do not have dual majors, but rather dual degrees or double majors in this system. Thus, this should be corrected before paperwork goes to CHE. Mary-David Fox clarified that a dual degree example would be BA in English and BS in Biology. This JCBE change would, as an example, allow for a double major of Accounting and Marketing. Dr. Griffis asked if the double major would require the additional 18 hours like a dual degree? Mary-David Fox confirmed that it would. Dr. Griffis subsequently noted that there is no language in the catalog for dual majors, only language for dual degrees and that we should clarify that. Dr. Zack indicated that the Academic Affairs Committee would need to consider this. Dr. Stolz noted that the wording can also be changed in the forms for these majors.
 - Bachelor of Science in Business Administration Student Worksheet
 - Changes to reflect addition of above.
- LLC – Languages, Literature and Composition – The LLC requests below were approved with majority.
 - Request for New Undergraduate Courses that will also be a part of the proposed Critical Disability Studies certificate.
 - ENGL U347 – “Accessibility and Profession Writing”
 - Focuses on writing in a professional environment but with an emphasis in accessibility.

- ENGL U375 – “Disability and Rhetoric”
 - Includes topics of discourse analysis, disability studies, the disability rhetoric movement, application of disability and rhetoric and public advocacy.
- ENGL U388 – “Disability and Literature”
 - Representations of disability in historical or contemporary literary text and their relationship to social policies and attitudes toward disabled people.
 - Committee discussed the use of “disabled people” vs. “people with disabilities” terminology. Disability services was consulted and said the preferred term would be “people” first. However, AAC voted to keep “disabled people” after their committee discussion.
 - Dr. Williams explained that as it is stated in the memo included with the Senate meeting materials, both terms have a particular meaning and they were mindful in their selection. Dr. Johnson added that the decision is between people first language and identity first language, and that there are many disabled people who feel that people first language retains a sensation of stigma attached to disability by assuming that it should be backgrounded and that the memo notes that their disability is in fact such a central part of their everyday experience that to put “disabled” last is disingenuous.
- MCS – Mathematics and Computer Science – The MCS requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Course Description
 - CSCI U200
 - Addition of prerequisite of MATH U126 and for the course description a spelling error was fixed and two topics were removed that are better suited for other courses.
 - CSCI U239, U370, U526, U556.
 - To be deleted because they are no longer taught.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Worksheet or Program Description
 - Computer Information Systems
 - Replace U234 (visual basic) with U236 (python).
- NSE – Natural Sciences and Engineering – The NSE requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Course Description
 - GEOL U121, GEOL U123L, GEOL U131, GEOL U241, and GEOL U310
 - Deleted because they have not been taught in at least 9 years.
- SCW – Sociology, Criminal Justice, and Women’s and Gender Studies – The SCW requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Worksheet or Program Description
 - Women’s and Gender Studies minor

- Update introductory statement, remove SOCY U339 as it is no longer taught, inclusion of other existing and proposed courses from below.
- Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Course Description
 - WGST U345
 - Adding an apostrophe to make “girls” possessive.
- Request for New Undergraduate Courses
 - WGST U365 – “LGBTQ studies”
 - Covers social, historical, and theoretical context.
 - WGST U375 – “Feminist disability studies”
 - Covers the understanding disability as a gendered phenomenon including alternative models generated by disabled feminist.
 - WGST U380 – “Gender, disability, and eugenics: US and Germany, 1900-1945”
 - Compares various eugenics practices. Issues of gender are included by eugenics on women, children, and LGBT people.
 - WGST U385 – “Mad feminism”
 - Deals with understanding psychiatric disability as a gendered phenomenon and it will contrast medical model of psychiatric disability with alternative models.
- Request for New Undergraduate Certificate
 - WGS UM22 – Certificate in Women’s and Gender Studies
 - 12 credits: 1 upper level WGS course from those listed and 3 from other areas that are related (specific lists given).
 - University College, 8C – Certificate in Critical Disability Studies
 - Memo from Dr. George Williams – Language and Critical Disability Studies Certificate.
 - Includes 4 American sign language options, 3 ENGL courses proposed today, health narrative course proposed today from FACS, and 3 WGS courses proposed today. Students would have a mix of courses from different disciplines.

B. Faculty Manual Update

- **Dr. Lizabeth Zack, Faculty Chair**
 - Began by reminding faculty that the post-tenure review has been revised from the policy proposed the previous year. Dr. Zack clarified that the post-tenure review is for faculty development, compensation, retention, and not intended to be a re-evaluation of tenure. She showed the current review statement in the current manual and then highlighted changes that are suggested to both clarify and improve the review process (e.g., timing, criteria for review, compensation). The implementation of the process and guidance for compensation would be addressed in separate documents. Should the policy pass it would be rolled out in stages for those already post-tenure and the first year would be a transition year. It was noted that if the current administration signs off on the drafted policy, then the policy is obligated to be presented to

the board of trustees even if the current administration has left USC Upstate. Dr. Zack did indicate that the incoming provost is in full support of a post-tenure review policy that includes compensation with meaningful review. Financial planning will occur to accommodate the proposed changes, but the drafted policy is feasible. Chancellor Kelly added that there is currently no financial incentive for long-term service at USC Upstate and he encouraged that such a policy be put in place that provides incentive with a meaningful review.

- Dr. Kamla asked if the review process could be voluntary because of how cumbersome it is to put together files for review?
 - Chancellor Kelly responded that a voluntary policy would not pass the Board of Trustees. To be fair to everyone we have to take the current structure of review and incorporate it into a post-tenure system.
 - Dr. Zack added that the process should be easier now that the amount of documentation to submit has been reduced. The new policy also addresses the previous objection of an annual review to only every 3 years, which also reduces the burden.
 - Chancellor Kelly indicated that we can continue to work to revise the process to make it even less cumbersome, but a post-tenure review policy needs to be in place before we can address the process of demonstrating performance.
- Dr. Godfrey inquired as to if the decisions of a post-tenure review for someone in the associate position would be used if the individual subsequently went up for full professor. Meaning could a poor review at year 6 be used against you or vice versa, that there could be a good review at year 6 but then if you were not promoted to full is there legal recourse for being denied promotion?
 - Chancellor Kelly responded that a post-tenure review would not be required to be added to materials for promotion to full, so there is no relationship between the two. There is not legal recourse for being denied promotion, only tenure. By having multiple people looking at the files we should also avoid such situations.
- Dr. Pae noted that previous peer review process did not look to see if performance was exemplary or excellent but only looked at “at rank” or not. She also asked if “post-tenure” means “tenure and rank”, meaning does the clock for post-tenure review start at the beginning of the last promotion.
 - Chancellor Kelly responded that administrative review and not the peer review creates the new three tiers and that we will reset the clock during the roll-out process. Dr. Zack clarified that a promotion to full would indeed reset the clock for the post-tenure review.
- Dr. Woodard commented that if we have continued assessment it will make our reputation stronger and strengthen our foothold and promote our name in the community, which is something to be proud of.
 - Dr. Zack also reinforced that we should be proud of this cutting-edge work that focuses on compensation and accountability.

- Dr. Smalls seconded Dr. Zack and noted that the suggested model is one of the best he has ever seen to close the gap between faculty development and the value that faculty bring to this institution after they've been tenured.
- Dr. Leonardi asked if there will be a similar program for instructors?
 - Chancellor Kelly indicated that he hopes this will be the case and would encourage that. Dr. Zack also noted her support.
- Approval process was then discussed. An announcement to the general faculty will be made on Monday, January 27th. A 30-day comment period is initiated by this announcement during which people would have a variety of opportunities to ask questions and discuss the policy. The next Senate meeting will be a time that we could discuss the feedback received and the voting mechanism. The process needs to be completed by the end of February in order for the current administration to be able to sign-off on it.
- Dr. Griffis noted that Chapter 2 of the current faculty manual states that voting on promotion and tenure policies must occur at a general faculty meeting. Voting electronically outside a general faculty meeting would violate the current faculty manual.
 - Dr. Zack suggested that as a Senate body we could vote to suspend that rule and vote electronically. However, Dr. Griffis questioned the power of Senate to do this given that the current manual does not allow for that and thus a meeting of the general faculty would need to be called for the last Friday in February to discuss if we wanted to vote electronically.
 - Dr. Leonardi asked if the manual clearly specified that a general faculty meeting had to be “in-person” or if a general faculty meeting could be electronic. Dr. Amendolair added that this lack of clarity was part of the rationale used by the Senate in the previous year to justify an electronic vote. Dr. Griffis indicated if it was possible to come together face-to-face electronically in order to debate, potentially make amendments and vote on such amendments, then there may be no objection. But to just vote electronically without the general faculty getting together cannot take place.
 - Dr. Kamla noted that last year’s senate vote was not unanimous in favor of using an electronic voting mechanism and thus we should have a faculty gathering to have conversation in this shortened amount of time.
 - Dr. Woodard inquired as to how many voices will not be heard if we have to attend a meeting to vote but are unable to do so due to other conflicts (e.g. conferences, teaching obligations). If the manual is vague we should try to find an option that allows us to hear from as many faculty members as possible. Dr. Zack added that the most important argument for the electronic vote is that it enfranchises as many people as possible, whereas requiring a meeting disenfranchises people. Dr. Griffis drew the parallel with senate stating that you cannot vote if you are not present at the senate meeting, which means

we are violating the manual if we do not vote in person. Dr. Johnson suggested that voting electronically is a reinterpretation of the manual language rather than changing it since people often attend meetings virtually. However, Dr. Griffis reminded senate that last year there was not a virtual meeting either.

- Dr. Amendolair reiterated that the faculty comment period is a time to make their voice known, debate, and discuss this policy.
- Ms. Merryman suggested that a general faculty meeting be called on February 21st to have the conversation and debate and then open the electronic voting on that day and allow it to be open for a few days. Dr. Kofoed reiterated that not being present at the general faculty meeting doesn't mean a faculty member doesn't want to vote and the language in the current faculty manual does not exclude electronic voting. Dr. Webber supported both of these comments and inquired as to whether senate members could go back to their departments to determine general feelings toward an electronic vote and then come to the February senate meeting and represent their interests in that specific matter. This would allow for verbal face-to-face discussion in a February 21st general faculty meeting, but then the electronic voting could provide an opportunity that allows more individuals to vote.
- Dr. Ruppel suggested that the senate members represent their department and so in theory senate members could vote. Dr. Griffis noted that while this is a good rationale that because the content being voted on is in Chapter 5 the general faculty has to vote.
- Dr. Kamla suggested that if we have a general faculty meeting on February 21st, then at that time the general faculty could vote on an amendment to vote electronically.
- Dr. Kusch added that this policy is a modified version of the previous policy put forth that has been discussed in depth, so less in-person discussion over the whole year is likely needed.
- Dr. Christ reminded faculty that due to the 30-day comment period the general faculty would not be able to vote on February 21st if a meeting were to be called that day. She also suggested that senate vote to change the policy of voting on promotion and tenure described in chapter 2, which would not violate the manual. Dr. Zack added that this also contributed to the rationale discussed last year for using an electronic vote. However, Dr. Doyle noted that while senate has that power, we would have to have Board of Trustee approval before implementing that change to be used. But she supported the change of this policy in chapter 2 for the future.
- Dr. Pae reminded senate members that if we do end up deciding to have an electronic vote the minimum two-thirds required for the policy to pass would be based on the total number of faculty and not on the number of people who voted electronically. Dr. Ruppel added that this

was also part of the rationale for an electronic vote last year because it would be harder for the policy to be approved using an electronic vote.

- Dr. Webber asked how the faculty comments were included last year. Dr. Zack responded that faculty comments were gathered before the voting and made available to the general faculty in order to inform their voting prior to opening the electronic vote. Comments were then subsequently used for revisions to the current policy.
- Dr. Godfrey noted that chapter 2 of the faculty manual states that “voting on non-personnel matters may be done electronically”, which might suggest that if a general faculty meeting is held on February 21st then electronic voting could take place after the 30-day comment period. However, Dr. Griffis noted that due to the other language in chapter 2 regarding that for tenure and promotion the manual states that voting must occur at a general faculty meeting, electronic voting cannot be applied outside of the general faculty meeting.
- Dr. Godfrey moved to “change the February 21st senate meeting to a general faculty meeting to discuss the issue and at that meeting we can explain the options for the vote and set a time for when that will happen after the 26th”. Dr. Schwartz inquired how the senate would accomplish their necessary work if it was changed to a general faculty meeting. Dr. Godfrey amended her motion to “have senate before the general faculty meeting”. Dr. Doyle seconded the motion. Dr. Stolz indicated that he thought it would be possible to accomplish voting on materials from the AAC during a short senate meeting held prior to a general faculty meeting. Dr. Griffis made an amendment “that at this general faculty meeting we will vote on whether or not to conduct an electronic vote that is open to everybody, even to those who are not at that meeting”. Dr. Godfrey accepted the amendment. Dr. Ruppel asked if the voting by the general faculty to use an electronic voting process would be a one-time exception and not a permanent change? Dr. Schwartz noted that we would need to consider when we would hold the vote on the post-tenure review policy should the vote to use electronic voting be voted down at the February 21st meeting. Dr. Johnson seconded this concern and indicated that we would need to set a second general faculty meeting now to occur the week after February 21st to allow for this possibility. Dr. Flynn suggest that Roberts rules would allow the senate to suspend the 30-day comment period to allow for one meeting on the Feb. 21st date that depending on the outcome of the electronic vote, voting on the post-tenure policy could occur that day or during a subsequent period electronically. Dr. Doyle called for a vote. A vote to suspend discussion was unanimous. The motion was restated by Dr. Christ for clarity, which was to “add a general faculty meeting to the February 21st senate meeting to discuss the post-tenure review policy and to vote on whether or not to have an electronic vote” and the motion passed with majority vote.

- Dr. Schwartz motioned to suspend the 30-day rule to have the option to vote on the policy on Feb. 21st. Dr. Doyle seconded. Ms. Merryman said that if this motion passes then the general faculty must be made aware immediately that a vote on the post-tenure review may occur prior to the 30 days, which Dr. Zack committed to doing. Dr. Kamla sought clarification for the possible voting options if we suspended the 30-day rule and Dr. Zack clarified that it would give us the option on February 21st as to whether we would vote on the post-tenure review policy on that day or at a later time either electronically or in-person. Dr. Richardson sought clarification on whether voting could occur before February 21st, but Dr. Zack indicated that she would not provide an opportunity for voting before that time. Dr. Ruppel stated a concern that confusion would be created if there was only a possibility of voting on the 21st. Dr. Godfrey noted that this motion would just allow us another option rather than having to call for a second general faculty meeting should the general faculty not vote in favor of using an electronic vote for the post-tenure review policy. The motion was withdrawn.
- Dr. Zack committed to informing faculty on Monday that at the general faculty meeting on February 21st we will discuss the policy and the voting procedures to determine if the vote on the post-tenure review policy that occurs the following week needs to take place in person or if it can occur electronically.
- Dr. Egbue motioned to adjourn the meeting and Dr. Ruppel seconded. Dr. Godfrey request a few more minutes to fully finalize the plans for the 21st. The motion was withdrawn.
- Dr. Godfrey motioned “to suspend the rule that general faculty must be present to vote on the post-tenure review policy and that an electronic vote be permitted for this policy” Dr. Woodard seconded. Dr. Griffis reiterated that senate cannot decide this for the general faculty according to the faculty manual and thus the motion is out of order. Dr. Ruppel noted that we already have an electronic vote option as part of the previous motion and that the current motion of the senate voting to suspend the in-person rule is a slippery slope. Instead, and in accordance with the earlier motion, a general faculty meeting will be called for February 21st and a second meeting will need to be called for the end of the 30-day comment period, then if the faculty vote to allow an electronic vote of the post-tenure review policy, the second general faculty meeting can be cancelled. The motion did not pass.

February 21, 2020 Faculty Senate Meeting

A. Program, Curriculum, Catalog, and Course Changes

- JCBE – George Dean Johnson Jr. College of Business and Economics – The requests below with the additional amendment were approved unanimously.

- Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Worksheet or Program Description
 - Request to change graduation requirements for BSBA from a minimum of “C” in major courses to allowing one “D” in a 200-level course.
 - Dr. Stolz noted that an error was made by JCBE in the initial request resulting in the requirement that 50% of the credit hours applied toward graduation must be awarded by USC Upstate, which would require the last two years to be at USC Upstate. However, this goes against the catalog and JCBE had actually intended that the policy only be that 50% of the Business and Economics courses being applied toward graduation must be awarded by USC Upstate. They requested a motion be made to allow this amendment. Dr. Griffis moved that this amendment be made and Dr. Smalls seconded.
- LLC – Language, Literature and Composition – The requests below with the additional amendment were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Course Description
 - ENGL U348 (Digital Storytelling), ENGL U359 (Advanced Written Argumentation), and SPAN U360 (Topics in Hispanic Film)
 - It was noted that AAC discussed ENGL U348 be cross-listed with DGST U348, and thus this request may be forthcoming from FACS.
 - LLC also intends to develop a film course to be cross-listed with SPAN U360.
 - Dr. Griffis moved to strike the phrase “an introduction to” from the ENGL U348 course description to be consistent with past policy of AAC. The motion was seconded by Dr. Egbue.
- MCS – Mathematics and Computer Science – The requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Worksheet or Program Description
 - Computer Science: Modification of program to replace CSCI U234 with U236, to remove three focus areas, to remove the cognate requirement, and to move the MATH elective from supporting courses to the new upper-level electives section.
 - Dr. Griffis asked if MCS considered the implication of removing the cognate requirement as it would make it more difficult to achieve a minor because students would need an additional six credits beyond what is required. Dr. Schwartz indicated that students can use some of their elective credits to help but that most students majoring in computer science do not want a minor and thus it shouldn’t have a large effect.
 - Dr. Harris suggested that perhaps the language could be changed to “cognate” or “elective” credits, which might encourage students to get close to a minor. Also, it is possible that through combined elective and general education credits a minor could be achieved.
 - Dr. Stolz added that there are other programs that also do not have room for electives and minors and thus this is not unprecedented.

- SOEHPH – School of Education, Human Performance, and Health – The requests below with the added amendment were approved unanimously.
 - Request for New Undergraduate Course
 - EDPH U165 (Officiating of Sports; 3-credits)
 - Dr. Griffis noted that Mark Ritter is currently listed as the proposed primary instructor and Jim Kamla as the alternate instructor. He proposed that, due to the standard practice that full-time faculty always be listed as the primary instructor. Jim Kamla stated he would be fine with the change.
 - Dr. Harris added that although Dr. Griffis is correct, American Sign Language went against this precedence the previous year, with contingent faculty being the only faculty listed on the course.
 - Dr. Griffis moved to place Jim Kamla as the proposed primary instructor and Mark Ritter as the alternate instructor for EDPH U165. The amendment was seconded by Dr. Omoike.
 - Dr. Amendolair inquired if we are then setting the precedence that only full-time faculty be listed as the proposed primary instructor on courses and if there is procedural activity that requires this? Dr. Johnson responded that academic affairs team that is currently working to clarify the process for making new proposals could take this up. Dr. Webber suggested that we indeed need full-time faculty to be willing to teach the class, and thus be listed on proposed courses, or we could get a lot of courses added that never get taught with changes in adjunct faculty.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Course Description
 - EDPH U175 (Team-Building Activities; due to lack of interest) & U265 (Officiating of Sports; being replaced by EDPH U165 proposed above)
 - Undergraduate Change in Curriculum or Program
 - Content Concentration – replace EDPH U175 (due to deletion request above) with EDPH U165 (new course request above).

B. Faculty Manual Update

- **Dr. Lizabeth Zack, Faculty Chair**
 - Discussion of this item was moved to the general faculty meeting to be held from 3:45pm-5pm.

March 20, 2020 Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting cancelled due to COVID-19; combined with April 17, 2020

April 17, 2020 Faculty Senate Meeting

- C. Old Business - Program, Curriculum, Catalog, and Course Changes- from cancelled March 20, 2020 meeting
 - FACS – Fine Arts & Communication Studies – The requests below were approved unanimously.

- Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Course Description
 - SPCH U201 & SPCH U201R – proposal is to combine them to make one 3-credit course labeled as SPCH U201, change prerequisite from ENGL U102 to U101, and change title to “Foundations in Oral Communication”.
 - SPCH U210 – Course is to replace CPCH U310 since it is better suited at the 200-level and intends to be proposed as a general education course. Prerequisite will also be changed to only ENGL U101.
 - SPCH U310 – Delete since it will be replaced by U210.
- Request for New Undergraduate Course
 - SPCH U311 – Dark Side of Interpersonal Communication. It will have prerequisites of SPCH U201 and proposed U210
- Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Worksheet or Program Description
 - B.A. in Communication Studies – Delete U201R and U310, add SPCH U311 and U379, and re-instate C-or-better requirement for cognate courses
 - Minor in Communication Studies – Change U310 to U210 and add U311 and U379
 - Minor in Health Communication – Delete U310 and add U311 and U379
- IDS – Interdisciplinary Studies – The requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Worksheet or Program Description
 - B.A. in Interdisciplinary Studies – change from B.A. and B.S. to B.I.S. CHE will be notified of this change and the change will be reflected at the top of the degree worksheet and program description.
- JCBE – George Dean Johnson Jr. College of Business and Economics – The requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Graduate Course Description
 - MSBA U750 – Change of course description to be more accurate and remove MSBA U700 co/pre-requisite.
 - Request for New Graduate Course
 - MSBA U798 – Independent Study
- NSE – Natural Sciences and Engineering – The requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Worksheet or Program Description
 - Biology major - adding CHEM U371/L as alternative to CHEM U332/L
- PSY – Psychology – The requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Course Description
 - PSYC U300, U398, U400, and U499 – language modified to clarify that students may repeat courses as long as topics change.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Worksheet or Program Description
 - Psychology major – adding LIBR U201 as option for general education category VII, general education elective

- SCW – Sociology, Criminal Justice, and Women’s and Gender Studies – The requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request for New Undergraduate Course
 - a. CRJU U390 – The Death Penalty with prerequisite of CRJU U101
- SOEHPH – School of Education, Human Performance, and Health – The requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Change Undergraduate Academic Regulation or General Catalog Description
 - Admission to the Professional Program – Change of requirements that include deletion of SPCH U201R and math requirement (expect early childhood and elementary), replacement of EDFO U210 with U200, additional section for both Early Childhood with specific requirements and Middle Level and Secondary Education with specific requirements, and additional small language changes.
- SON – School of Nursing – The requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Course Description
 - NURS U410P – minimum number of hours is 84 instead of 56
 - Request to Modify or Delete Graduate Course Description
 - NURS U707 – change of title to Instruction & Evaluation Strategies and reword course description.
 - NURS U721 – modification of course description
 - Request for New Graduate Course
 - NURS U739 “Advanced Management of Health” and its practicum corequisite NURS U740 and U799 Independent Study
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Worksheet or Program Description
 - Nursing major – change in BSN program – “objectives” renamed to program goals, which are all similar but re-written

II. New Business

A. Program, Curriculum, Catalog, and Course Changes

- General Catalog Policies – The requests below were approved.
 - Request to Change Undergraduate Academic Regulation or General Catalog Description (*Registration – 1-credit hour*): Adding language to indicate that 1-credit hour courses correspond to a minimum of 45 hours of work for the semester. This was based on the U.S. Department of Education’s Definition of a credit hour. The section will also describe the number of hours for a typical 15-credit semester load, typical weekly workloads, and workloads based on varying semester lengths.
 - Dr. Amendolair asked if there was any difference between the definition for graduate vs. undergraduate programs? Dr. Stolz answered that there is not a separate minimum.
 - Request to Change Graduate Academic Regulation or General Catalog Description (*Dropping a Course*): Timeline to withdraw from graduate courses will be changed to match the undergraduate timeline (week 10 of week 15).

- FACS – Fine Arts & Communication Studies – The requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Undergraduate Worksheet or Program Description
 - Commercial Music Program Description
 - Commercial Music Catalog – Adjusts number of credits in the core and in the performance track, requires a C in cognate courses and all MUSC courses not used as electives, adds the option of a certificate, and revises program description
- JCBE – George Dean Johnson Jr. College of Business and Economics – The requests below were approved unanimously.
 - Request to Modify or Delete Graduate Course Description
 - MSBA U740 – change title to “Prescriptive Analytics”
 - MBSA U745 – change description to be more current
 - Request for New Graduate Course
 - MSBA U796 – “Topics in Business Analytics”
- SOEHPH – School of Education, Human Performance, and Health – The requests below were approved.
 - Request for New Graduate Degree Program Master of Science in Exercise and Sport Science – Internal Forms
 - Dr. Griffis asked if the proposal was for different concentrations and how can the department would be able to accommodate the three tracks without new faculty? How will faculty know what courses to teach/offer for year 2. Dr. Reynolds and Dr. Tanyel indicated they did have faculty recently added to the department and so they have no doubt that they have enough to teach the courses. Additionally, the program was created in conjunction with the healthcare systems to meet a community need.
 - New Program Proposal Form (CHE) – 2-year program that begins with 15 credits of core courses followed by 18 credits in one of three tracks (Psychosocial Kinesiology, Exercise Physiology, Cardiac Rehabilitation).
 - Dr. Griffis asked for clarification regarding when students would choose their track/specialty so that faculty would know what classes would need to be taught. Dr. Reynolds & Dr. Tanyel indicated the track can be chosen on enrollment, but that the initial coursework is the same for each concentration so there will be flexibility to switch specialty as there may be changes in community demand. Community partnership will also assist with this flexibility.
 - Request for New Graduate Course
 - EXSC U700 – Research Methods in Exercise Science
 - EXSC U720 – Epidemiology Research & Practice
 - EXSC U730 – Stats Analysis in Health Application
 - EXSC U740 – Advanced Exercise Physiology
 - EXSC U750 – Advanced Sport Psychology
 - EXSC U755 – Exercise and Brain Health
 - EXSC U760 – Lab Techniques in Exercise Science
 - EXSC U765 – Neuromuscular Endocrine Physiology

- EXSC U770 – Advanced Cardiorespiratory Physiology
- EXSC U775 – Cardiopulmonary Pathophysiology
- EXSC U780 – Advanced Exercise Assessment & Prescription
- EXSC U785 – Chronic Disease Management
- EXSC U798 – Special Topics in Exercise Science
- EXSC U800 – Internship I
- EXSC U801 – Internship II
- EXSC U810 – Research Project I
- EXSC U811 – Research Project II

B. Faculty Manual Update

- Dr. Lizabeth Zack, Faculty Chair
 - Dr. Zack indicated that in light of the pandemic, in consultation with faculty advisory, formal voting on any changes will be suspended and instead will be considered in the fall. However, we still want to improve the faculty manual including the post-tenure review policy. More information regarding plans for gathering additional feedback will be reported at the general faculty meeting and additional detail will be added to the website.

May 1, 2020 General Faculty Meeting

I. New Business

A. Faculty Governance Elections

- Ms. Virginia Cononie (LIB) was elected through vote of acclamation for recording secretary.
- Dr. Jeff Edwards (PSYC) & Dr. Elham Sohrabi (MCS) were elected as graduate committee members through vote of acclamation.
- Dr. Jennifer Gray (PSYC) was elected for the seat on the student services committee by majority vote (63.6%). Voting would be reviewed to ensure that this vote is accurate.
- Dr. Holly Pae (HPH) – Thanked Dr. Zack for her service as faculty chair and congratulated her on becoming the next chair of SCW. She then made the motion to nominate Dr. Jim Griffis (HPPA) to serve as the 2020-2021 Past Chair of the Faculty Senate effective day after Graduation (Wednesday) when all other Senate and Faculty Committee positions begin serving for the upcoming academic year. She noted that the rationale for the motion was that you cannot be a department chair and a member of senate, which means Dr. Zack would no longer be eligible to hold the role of past chair. She also noted that Dr. Griffis had previously been a past chair so he would be an appropriate selection. Dr. Zack asked Dr. Pae to provide the specific section of the faculty manual that she was referring to. Dr. Pae cited the description under faculty senate of the manual that was approved last year [“Membership in the Faculty Senate is confined to full-time faculty members, except for those in administrative roles (Chancellor, Provost, Deans, Assistant and Associate Deans, and Chairs).” pg. 15]. Dr. Coberly seconded the motion.
- Discussion of the motion followed.

- Dr. Zack disagreed with Dr. Pae's interpretation of the manual that she is not eligible to serve in the two roles due to chairs being administrators. She stated that the manual is unclear and inconsistent in the way it defines department chairs and faculty members. Department chairs in Chapter 1 of the faculty manual are not described as administrators and the description of administrators does not include faculty chairs. The passage on pg. 15 refers more to the elected senators that are representatives of their unit, which appears in the bylaws. She further noted that these faculty manual inconsistencies touch on the profound ambivalence on the campus about the role of the department chair and there remains a need to discuss whether the chair should be defined as administration. Discussion on this point should continue over the next academic year. She rejected the idea that she needs to step down as a result of the lack of clarity and inconsistencies in the manual.
- Dr. Lee Neibert (FACS) inquired as to whether a faculty chair had ever been department chair before, and that if not, then we would treat this as a special circumstance rather than assume dismissal. Perhaps exceptions should be made though, such that she cannot vote on senate business.
- Dr. Carmen Harris (HPPA) indicated there was a subsequent sentence in the same paragraph quoted by Dr. Pae that the past chair is a voting member of the senate, so the past chair needs to be considered as a senate member. Therefore, if a department chair cannot be a member of the senate, then a department chair cannot be past chair of the faculty. As far as precedence, the past chair is a new position, but department chairs have previously stepped out of other committee chair roles before, so she did not believe it was ambiguous. Dr. Harris did indicate that if Dr. Zack decided to delay becoming department chair for a year, then she could continue as past chair.
- Dr. Warren Bareiss (FACS) remembered from being on faculty advisory a few years ago that Dr. Flynn had said that a department chair is both faculty and administration. Therefore, if you are half administration then that person should probably not be past-chair.
- Dr. Lee Neibert (FACS) reiterated his point that this is a unique situation and since the past chair is to help with the transition of the incoming chair, then Dr. Griffis would not be as well prepared as Dr. Zack and so we should consider other possibilities, again such as not having Dr. Zack vote. Dr. Jim Kamla (SOE) responded to Dr. Neibert that the faculty manual needs to be abided by and not changed with special circumstances. Dr. Neibert responded that the manual was unclear and thus failing us in this unique situation. Dr. Kamla agreed, but indicated we still couldn't change the manual.
- Dr. Andrew Beer (PSYC) asked what the specific concern was regarding the past chair role being filled by someone who was half an administrator. He also inquired as to whether it is more important that there is continuity of collaborative effort or not having a 50% administrator in the role.

- Dr. Colby King (SCW) asked if there could be more discussion on who would take her place and suggested that it should be a separate motion. Dr. Tim Ellis (IES) agreed that this is two separate motions and made a friendly amendment to the motion to remove the part about electing Dr. Griffis automatically. Dr. Richard Combes (HPPA) spoke for Dr. Pae and accepted that as a friendly amendment.
- Dr. Michelle Garland (FACS) asked for clarification if this discussion applied across all committees and not just to faculty senate, meaning that a department chair could not be a chair or past chair of any university committee (e.g., general education committee). Dr. Zack responded that faculty officers (chair, chair-elect, past-chair, recording secretary) are for the entire faculty, but also for senate as well, playing the same role for both of those bodies. The manual tends to treat them as officers for both those bodies, but it does make distinctions between those officers and the senators when it comes to their roles in the faculty senate.
- Dr. Darlene Amendolair (MSN) affirmed the statement in the faculty manual that administrators are not members of the shared governance, standing committees, or senate.
- Dr. Richard Combes (HPPA) addressed Dr. Beer's questions by stating that in the upcoming year, both Dr. Zack (current chair) and Dr. Lisa Johnson (chair-elect) are from the same unit and if Dr. Zack continued to past chair, they would both be engaged in deliberations with the chancellor and the vice chancellor, which means deliberations could be biased with their unit's self-interests.
- Dr. Celena Kusch (CAIFS director) spoke against the motion since the term administration is unclearly used in the faculty manual. She noted the definition of department chair is listed under university leadership and the second sentence of that definition states those who occupy key administrative roles and execute managerial and supervisory functions are within this group. It indicates that the positions of the provost, chancellors, and deans should refrain from voting and under the list of leadership roles it goes all the way down to assistant chairs, yet no one has made claims that assistant chairs, assistant deans, directors, etc. are administrators and not faculty. She stated that department chairs are not designated by HR as administrative positions, but rather they are considered 9-month faculty with summer stipends and they teach 2 courses per term, which is more than some others that are considered faculty, among their other academic roles. She also opposed the motion because she believed the motion is a symptom of a toxic subculture that faculty governance should take place without the taint and presence of administration, which is not possible since staff and administrator input make for better faculty governance. She indicated that the motion implies that those willing to talk to administrators have a conflict of interest and she believes this sets a poor example for junior faculty that suggests we have leadership that is untrustworthy. She shared that she has never seen an administration that had its own self-interest above that of the institution

and that our mission is to better students, so the notion that those who have conversations with administrators are then not faculty is counterproductive to our community. She believed the furthest we could take the interpretation of the faculty manual is that Dr. Zack would not be allowed to vote. However, she generally believed the motion takes us in a wrong direction of defining the department chair and shared governance.

- Dr. Lisa Johnson (faculty chair-elect) opposed the motion because the faculty manual is inconsistent, incomplete, and often self-contradictory, which means it warrants more work and hopes this demonstrates the importance to the faculty of why we need to work on it every fall to improve it. She believes a lot about this question depends on how we define department chairs (administrator vs. faculty) and she indicated there is a profound ambivalence about department chairs on our campus. She stated that most faculty members who are not department chairs view department chairs as administrators and perceive wrongly that they are carrying out instructions from administration. She indicated that she also noticed over this past year that department chairs have indicated that they didn't want to be categorized as administrators and that if they lose their right to vote as part of the faculty, then they might resign as department chair. Department chairs are more accurately part-time administrators. This discussion might be different if we were considering an incoming faculty chair, which is a leadership role, but we are talking about past chair, which is a more advisory than leadership role. She indicated the different roles of these two positions should not be underacknowledged. While the sentence quoted by Dr. Pae to support her motion seems clear and would suggest that the chair should not be part of senate, the information on either side of it indicates other evidence about the rights and responsibilities of the past chair and faculty members in general and the first sentence should not negate later sentences. Dr. Johnson stated that she did not believe it was right that Dr. Zack should lose her rights as a faculty member by stepping into the role of a department chair and that anyone could enter into the position of past-faculty chair as a biased individual regardless of being department chair since no one is 100% objective. She also didn't perceive administration as being likely to find any conflict of interest that might arise due to bias stemming from one unit acceptable. She also indicated that the benefits of having the current chair continue to past chair far outweigh ungrounded concerns of conflict of interest and she would not want to proceed as the current chair without having a past chair serving with her that she had been working closely with on important matters this past year, especially given the most recent circumstances. Finally, she stated that the decision to unseat a senate officer based on perceived custom in the absence of clear-cut policy would suggest a lack of collegiality, civility, and practicality. She noted her appreciation of the remarks made by Dr. Kusch that administration and faculty are in adversarial roles of each other. She has seen many positive

things so far shadowing Dr. Zack and without clear resolve she didn't see a reason to change the system currently set in place.

- Dr. George Williams (LLC) spoke against the motion because the faculty manual is unclear if chair is definitively an administration (pg. 11) and he seconded the HR comment made by Dr. Kusch is an important one.
- Dr. Ben Montgomery (NSE) spoke as a chair himself and so he believes he understands the possible conflict that may arise, but if we apply this logic to all roles, then that would mean department chairs could serve as members of other committees and senate members. He shared concern that while we may be discussing something small that we were setting precedence for something much larger. As a chair, he indicated his appreciation that he must step down from a stranding committee when he became chair since it was a lot to ask administratively. He asked Dr. Zack if she would be willing to comment on the possibility that she not be able to vote if she continues as past-chair to assuage concerns. Finally, he commented on the time (almost 5:30pm) as it was past the time limit of the scheduled meeting.
- Dr. Susan Ruppel (PSYC) asked for clarification regarding if faculty officers were considered to be members of senate; if they are, then she believed the manual seems clear. Dr. Johnson spoke to the comment indicating that there does seem to be a distinction between how senate members are defined (representatives of their unit) and how senate officers are defined (not representatives of any unit, but of the full faculty). Dr. Zack also referred Dr. Ruppel to Appendix 2 in the bylaws for a definition of senate membership as full-time faculty members elected from each academic unit, which suggests that members of the senate are only those elected from each unit and thus distinct from faculty officers.
- Dr. Christa Christ (PSYC) asked Dr. Zack to also speak to the timeline indicated in the motion since she believed that a decision regarding whether or not a department chair could be past-chair was independent of the decision that Dr. Zack automatically be removed as past-chair, but rather should be given the opportunity to consider the possibility of delaying becoming her department chair, as Dr. Harris had mentioned, and that a deadline of the day after graduation would not be enough time to consider the option.
- Dr. Carmen Harris (HPPA) indicated the offense taken that the motion has something to do with post-tenure review and that this is not related; it is not personal. But rather she believes we need to follow the faculty manual since it states the past-chair is a member of the senate and chairs cannot be members of senate. She further stated that Dr. Zack resigning as past chair would not keep her from being able to provide advice to Dr. Johnson. Following this comment a 5-minute intermission was taken to address technical issues of faculty being unable to access the Blackboard meeting room and for Dr. Zack and Dr. Johnson to discuss faculty concerns that the meeting was extending well beyond its scheduled time.

- At 5:45pm it was noted that we do not have a quorum and thus a vote would not be permissible so the discussion and motion was tabled until the next meeting in August.
- Dr. Carolina Webber (FACS) asked for a faculty vote that a special meeting be called for the following Friday to continue discussion. Dr. Zack indicated she was unsure if, given the current unusual and exhausting circumstances, faculty could be fully prepared in one week to consider the complexities of the criteria relevant to this important motion and come together to have a meaningful discussion. However, if we hold off until August we would be in a better position to have this conversation. Dr. Webber requested the vote be conducted to see if faculty agree with that sentiment.
- Dr. Jim Kamla (SOE) suggested a motion that we vote whether to virtually meet next week and that if we have a quorum next Friday, then a vote on the motion presented by Dr. Pae would occur, and if we do not have a quorum then we wait until August.
- Dr. Carolina Webber (FACS) made a motion to table discussion until next Friday, May 8th at 2:45pm. Dr. Stefanie Keen (PSYC) seconded the motion. Dr. Colleen Kilgore (MBSN) requested the meeting be moved earlier due to a conflicting meeting in the Nursing department. The motion was amended for 1-3pm after some additional faculty input. Dr. Scott Meek (PSYC) indicated that summer session A would be in session next Friday, so he made a friendly amendment that the meeting take place from 1:30-3pm. Dr. Celena Kusch (CAIFS director) called the question.
- Dr. Lee Neibert (FACS) clarified that a vote of no would mean the discussion is tabled until August. Dr. Johnson indicated that was correct.
- The vote was 67 yes to 23 no.
- Dr. Zack stated that Tom Davis suggested a faculty discussion board on Blackboard could be created to further discussion during the week.
- Dr. Briget Doyle (NSE) asked that a secret ballot be used if we have a vote on the original motion next week. Dr. Zack indicated we can set up a Qualtrics survey to be completely anonymous.
- Dr. Ona Egbue (IES) asked that an abstain option be provided in all future polls for these virtual meetings so we don't assume non-responses indicate abstaining.