USC LANCASTER FACULTY ORGANIZATION
MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 25, 2013

*****Specially-called meeting to discuss and vote on two motions presented by the USCL Curriculum Committee**

I. Meeting called to order: 11:50am
II. September and October meeting minutes approved
III. Chair dispenses with reports and moves on to Unfinished Business
    a. Two motions from USCL Curriculum Committee (distributed electronically prior to meeting)—**SEE APPENDIX #1**
    b. Discussion of first motion
    (Nims) Speaking in support of common curriculum—**SEE APPENDIX #2;** urges faculty to vote for compromise and amendments.
    (Yingst) It's the job of the chair to clarify language in the motion. For example, "including MATH 111" sounds like you must take MATH 111." We might change the wording to something like "MATH 111 is approved."
    (Cox) My understanding is that MATH 111 fulfills ARP requirement, but if student takes MATH 122 that also fulfills the requirement.
    (Yingst) But MATH 122 is approved for ARP—MATH 111 is not.
    (Cox) So the wording means any ARP approved course, including MATH 111. Changing the wording means changing the curriculum approved by other campuses.
    (Bundy) We should wait to deal with this when we get to the amendment motion.
    (Nims) I agree.
    (Obi-Johnson) We're voting today—have other campuses voted?
    (Nims) Union, Salkehatchie, and Extended University have voted yes.
    (Yingst) They voted yes on the Ad-hoc committee's proposed curriculum. The document up for vote today is not the same.
    (Alhaddad) Can you pull up that document?
    (Yingst) Yes [projects Ad-hoc committee report on screen].
    (Bohonak) I asked Fran to clarify this: the AA and AS degrees do include a testing option.
    (Yingst) The motion should say what it means.
    (Alhaddad) Which one did the other campuses vote on?
    (Yingst) Ad-hoc committee's proposal.
    (Priest) I remember her saying that they forgot to copy/paste.
    (Yingst) We remember; we need to put it back.
    (Cox) What do you propose?
    (Yings) "Or MATH 111 allowed"
    (Obi-Johnson) Does it not allow all math?
    (Yingst) No, that's another confusing part.
    (Penuel) Why "or"?
    (Yingst) Because MATH 111 is not an approved ARP course.
    (Scarlett) Don't we have similar issues with PHIL?
    (Cox) But it only includes approved classes. If MATH 111 counts, can't we assume that MATH 111i counts?
    (Yingst) Math faculty think we shouldn't change the definitions of "ARP"—111 is not ARP. This is not a common curriculum.
    (Cox) This should be dealt with at senate.
    (Yingst) I want to add "or approved courses" all over the place.

(Several) Document already says “approved courses” at the end.
(Obi-Johnson) The intent is there; clarification is not substantive; pass it on to senate.
(Yingst) Senate will wait until by-laws are changed.
(Cox) Right now, we’re authorized to allow our students to count MATH 115 instead of MATH 111—unless math faculty objects.
(Yingst) I guess I’m letting it drop.
(Cox) Refer to list of concerns [Motion #2]: the 111 and 115 issues are already there.
(Brown) We want to remove MATH 111.
(Cox) Oh—this is the consensus of the math faculty?
(Alhaddad, Brown, Yingst) Yes
[Yingst changes wording in document for math requirement—**SEE APPENDIX #3**]
(Alhaddad) PHIL 110 does count, 111 does not. Are we assuming that all sequences count?
(Catalano) PHIL 110 and PHIL 111 *are* approved.
(Yingst) Discussion of Science? Do listed concerns address all of the concerns of science faculty? [Yingst changes some wording for science requirement—**SEE APPENDIX #3**]
(Cox) We want to request to require one SCI course—let other one be flexible.
(Yingst) Yes, we should require one SCI course, but in order to allow for other lab courses, we could change the wording so that it allows for one course unapproved for core.
(Cox) We do have a process for getting a course approved if it isn’t on the list.
(Yingst) Problem: Basic course and subsequent courses should be approved.
(Cox) All of our CHEM courses are currently approved or under consideration.
(Bundy) Leave it in there for curriculum discussions in senate.
(Sellhorst) We don’t have all of the information on Core; I don’t have a problem with putting things in concerns; at some point, we have to assume that this is a compromise made in good faith and that this will be a collaborative effort until there is a FINAL Core.
(Yingst) That won’t ever happen; there will always be more changes.
(Bundy) Yes, this can be modified as the Core is modified.
(Yingst) This will already be modified as the Core is modified, because it says “approved courses.” I’m not saying change degree plan; I’m saying we need to list our concerns more clearly. Don’t expect System Affairs to figure out what you mean.
(Sellhorst) Move to vote on first motion.
(Obi-Johnson) Second.
(Yingst) Is there any further discussion of the first motion? Hearing none, we’ll put the question to the first motion [reads motion]. I’m concerned about the wording of the motion, because we don’t have the third column that is included in the Ad-hoc committee report, and we inserted the placement test scores.
(Cox) The Baccalaureate track is not a degree plan.
(Yingst) But it doesn’t say that in the motion.
(Cox) It is not a curriculum.
(Yingst) It doesn’t say that in the Ad-hoc committee report either.
(Bundy) So we’re being asked to approve the AA and AS degrees—not the entire curriculum as proposed by the Ad-hoc committee? That’s exactly the way it reads.
(Yingst) In which case, the score of 2 or more on the language placement test is unclear.
(Cox) Janet has clarified this as being understood from the beginning.
(Yingst) Then that’s what we should vote in.
(Cox) Then scratch “score of 2 or better.”
(Yingst) I don’t want to do that. Is that what you’re proposing?
(Cox) That’s your objection, isn’t it?

(Yingst) I want to say...I want to delete this ["as presented by the Ad Hoc Regional Campuses Curriculum Committee Summer 2013"], and change it to "below". This is the motion that we are voting on.
(W. Collins) Ron, can you clarify Janet's response?
(Cox) She wrote "yes."
(W. Collins) What did you ask?
(Cox) Does a score of 2 or better meet the ARP requirement for the common AA/AS?
(Yingst) But the chart says you have to take 3 hours.
(Cox) Not ARP.
(Yingst) I would like to change this to "below," so that it's clear that we're voting on the chart included in this motion. We've had discussion. Is there any further discussion of this motion?
(Wolochwianski) I have three questions: (1) Why does the AA require 7-8 hours of science, but only 3 hours of foreign language?; (2) it was my understanding that this change was made because the other campuses don't have faculty—but the same teacher can teach 109 and 110; and (3) Are we going backward in order to retain more students?
(Nims) This is a compromise. The original proposed curriculum didn't include any foreign language. This may not be what we want, but it's better than what we had.
(Davaut) Yes, but 109 is half of level one.
(Yingst) This is half of a bachelor's degree.
(Wolochwianski) We are talking about high school level spanish. Why more science than foreign language? The second language in the U.S. is spanish. Students need spanish.
(Sellhorst) Students need science, math, too. If we only require 6 hours for bachelor's degree, it makes sense to have 3 hours for associate's degree.
(Wolochwianski) But are students "communicating effectively" in 109?
(Davaut) [reads GFL outcome description] At the end of 109, students absolutely are not communicating effectively.
(Nims) Call the question [for the first motion]
[motion passes]

c. Discussion of Second Motion
(Yingst) Discussion of second motion?
(Obi-Johnson) This document is incomplete. We don't have all departments represented. I wouldn't want to forward this as-is to the faculty senate. Will these concerns be used to update the common curriculum?
(Yingst) In System Affairs we're talking about putting together a common subset of the Core that would allow each campus to have control over their own degree plan as long as they include these 15 core requirements. I would like this document to be specific, so that if that happens by the end of the spring, we can say "these are the things we want to change." And if this doesn't happen in the spring, I would like for us to have said out loud, "these are the things we want to change." We're not making a list of demands. We're just listing what we'd like to see. Then if every campus feels that way, we can make that change. Having it written down is the beginning of a productive conversation with the other campuses.
(Bundy) Do we have time to revise and refine?
(Yingst) Yes, but this is the motion on the table.
(Penuel) Have we heard back from Plyler [about what is meant by "subset of Core"]?
(Cox) No.
(Nims) At the meeting with Elkins, I asked about time pressure. She indicated that she is willing to be patient as faculty senate takes on new responsibilities.

(Yingst) I'd feel uncomfortable voting for the first motion without voting on the second. Some have said that they voted for the first BECAUSE of the second.
(Harris) Ron did ask everyone for responses. If they didn't respond the first time, who's to say they'll respond now?
(Bonner) Can we rewrite the concerns so that it's in a uniform voice? Would the curriculum committee be willing to do that?
(Cox) Is the chair charging us with that task?
(Yingst) No.
(Nims) Is it appropriate to ask for any additions now, so we can vote on the motion?
(Yingst) Yes
[Discussion of specific concerns in second motion; several changes made to wording in all areas—for clarification and to present as the desire of USCL rather than the faculty of specific disciplines. **SEE APPENDIX #3 FOR ALL CHANGES TO DOCUMENT]**
(Nims) Call the question.
(Yingst) Motion to adopt resolution and pass up to RCFS Student Affairs Committee. I will send by email after this meeting if it passes.
[**motion passes]**

IV. Meeting adjourned at 12:59pm

Submitted by Dana Lawrence
USCL Faculty Organization Secretary

ATTENDING: Alhaddad, Bohonak, Bonner, Brown, Bundrick, Bundy, Castiglia, Catalano, R. Collins, W. Collins, Covington, Cox, Davaut, Easley, Emanuel, Freeman, Harris, Hassell, Holloway, Holt, Jenkins, Johnson, Judge, Kendrick, D. Lawrence, N. Lawrence, Moon-Kelly, Nims, Pangburn, Parker, Penuel, Priest, Richardson, Roberts, Rutledge, Scarlett, Sellhorst, Taylor-Driggers, Wolochwianski, Yingst.

APPENDIX #1: Motions from the USCL Curriculum Committee

The USC Lancaster Curriculum Committee moves that the USC Lancaster Faculty Organization approve the proposed "common curriculum" for the AA and AS degrees as presented by the Ad Hoc Regional Campuses Curriculum Committee Summer 2013, and that the "common curriculum" be implemented for students entering the University in the FALL 2014 semester and thereafter.

PROPOSED CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS FOR SHARED USC REGIONAL CAMPUSES ASSOCIATES OF ARTS AND ASSOCIATES OF SCIENCE DEGREES

	LEARNING OUTCOMES	AA DEGREE PROPOSED	AS DEGREE PROPOSED
1	**CMW:** Effective, Engaged, and Persuasive Communication: Written Component	6 Hours (ENGL 101 & 102)* *grade of "C" or better	6 Hours (ENGL 101 & 102)* *grade of C or better
2	**ARP:** Analytical Reasoning and Problem Solving	03 Hours (MATH, CSCE, PHIL, STAT) (including MATH 111)	06 Hours (MATH, CSCE, PHIL, STAT) (including MATH 111)
3	**SCI:** Scientific Literacy	07-08 Hours (must include at least 1 laboratory course)	08-12 hours (must include at least 2 laboratory courses)
4	**GFL:** Global Citizenship and Multicultural Understanding: Foreign Language	03 hours (or score of 2 or better on language placement test)	03 hours (or score of 2 or better on language placement test)
5	**GHS:** Global Citizenship and Multicultural Understanding: Historical Thinking	03 Hours	03 Hours
6	**GSS:** Global Citizenship and Multicultural Understanding: Social Sciences	06 Hours	06 Hours
7	**AIU:** Aesthetic and Interpretive Understanding	06 Hours	03 Hours
8	**CMS:** Effective, Engaged, and Persuasive Communication: Spoken Component	03 Hours from one of the three Learning Outcomes	03 Hours from one of the three Learning Outcomes
9	**INF:** Information Literacy		
10	**VSR:** Values, Ethics, and Social Responsibility		
	LEARNING OUTCOMES	**8 TOTAL**	**8 TOTAL**
	SPECIFIED CREDITS	**37-38 Hours**	**38-42 Hours**
	ELECTIVE CREDITS	**22-23 Hours**	**18-22 Hours**
	DEGREE TOTAL	**60 Hours**	**60 Hours**

Course Hours are from the Approved List of courses for each Carolina Core Learning Outcome:
http://www.sc.edu/carolinacore/courses.php

The USC Lancaster Curriculum Committee moves that the USC Lancaster Faculty Organization adopt and forward the attached list of concerns and recommendations regarding the "common curriculum" to the System Affairs Committee of the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate for action.

CMW	
ARP	"The USCL math faculty believe that full agreement with the Carolina Core as approved by the Columbia Senate, including its representatives from the regional campuses, is desirable. Therefore, we propose the removal of MATH 111 from the ARP learning outcome for the AA/AS degrees until the course is approved by the Columbia Senate for ARP credit." From the science faculty: The presentation of the math courses is confusing. "Including Math 111" is not clear in that does this madate 111 or make it available?
SCI	If a course is in sequence, the basic course and the courses following should be approved for the curriculum. Ex: Chem 111 leads to Chem 112 so if Chem 111 is approved then Chem 112 should also be approved. There needs to be a minimum but also some flexibility in the system. As it stands now, the limitations to Carolina Core courses restrict the science selection. The approval process for courses in the Carolina Core needs to be made known and streamlined.
GFL	
GHS	
GSS	
AIU	The AIU disciplines include English, art, theater, and music. We do not have a consensus in the strict sense of that word. What's below is the condensed version of AIU faculty responses. • **Two** report no concerns. • **Two** mention appreciating "the way this proposed curriculum uses the language of the Carolina Core to highlight the ways our degrees fit with other SC system degrees," despite problems they see in the proposal (noted below). • **Six** note a preference that the AA include a requirement for a 200-level course. One of those six prefers that the 200-level course be an English course. The other five do not specify whether the course should be English. Instead, they voice concern about the latest proposal's lack of required 200-level AIU courses and 200-level courses in general. Two of those say that two-year students should have more than one 200-level course, and two mention that not requiring coursework above the 100 level could strain a student's transition to four-year programs. One of those last two notes that the proposed AA would increase the likelihood that an AA graduate was unprepared for BLS coursework, for example, which includes 39 required hours at the 300+ level. Of the six AIU faculty who think the AA should include a 200-level requirement (or who would merely like for it to do that), the strengths of their sentiments range from quite mild to quite adamant. • **Six** faculty did not respond. One of those six indicated that a lack of time prevented her response. The email discussion including all the AIU faculty didn't begin until late Monday night, 9/30; until then, not all AIU faculty had been informed that the Curriculum Committee needed feedback before Friday 10/4.
CMS	
INF	
VSR	

APPENDIX #2: ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MOTIONS (NIMS)

Reasons for Supporting the Common Curriculum Compromise

1. **The Common Curriculum is the only the latest step in a twenty-year process of consolidation of the Regional Campuses with USC-Columbia**
   a. **USC Lancaster's last independent re-accreditation—1990**
   b. **The CHE attempt to merge the Regional campuses with the technical colleges in the early 1990s**
   c. **The administrative re-organization of the campus under the Provost in the mid-1990s in response to the CHE threat**
   d. **Re-accreditation under the USC-Columbia umbrella in 2000**
   e. **Negotiation of enhanced hiring and T&P expectations for faculty: 1995-2008**
   f. **Successful re-accreditation, but with new attention from SACS concerning RC role—2011**
   g. **Huron Report and Palmetto College—2011-2012**
   h. **Present action on common curriculum—2013**

2. **The Advantages of the Common Curriculum Compromise**
   a. **Phil Moore's administrative justification of the need for the Common Curriculum is authoritative; no one knew more about what SACS requires**
   b. **USC Lancaster was correct to vote against the Sumter curriculum offered as an expedient**
   c. **The USC Lancaster rejection paved the way for the Ad Hoc Committee's far superior compromise Common Curriculum**

      i. **The compromise Common Curriculum meets USCL's major objections to the Sumter curriculum**

      ii. **The work of the Ad Hoc Committee was thorough, thoughtful, and models exactly the kind of collaborative spirit of compromise that will be necessary to build faculty governance for Palmetto College**

3. **Support for the Common Curriculum opens the way for a new faculty governance structure for Palmetto College**
   a. **The RCFS interim chair has already charged the RR Committee, with Lisa Hammond's help, to begin identifying all sections of the Faculty Manual, especially the By-laws, that would have to change in order for the RCFS to take over the A.A. and A.S. Common Curriculum and change the name of the Senate to the Palmetto College Senate.**
   b. **Retention of students for four years through Palmetto College will have enormous benefits for our students, our community, and the long-term financial prospects of our campus**

APPENDIX #3: USCL CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MOTIONS WITH REVISIONS TO LANGUAGE—APPROVED BY USCL FACULTY ORGANIZATION AT OCTOBER 25 MEETING

The USC Lancaster Curriculum Committee moves that the USC Lancaster Faculty Organization approve the proposed "common curriculum" for the AA and AS degrees below, and that the "common curriculum" be implemented for students entering the University in the FALL 2014 semester and thereafter.

PROPOSED CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS FOR SHARED USC REGIONAL CAMPUSES ASSOCIATES OF ARTS AND ASSOCIATES OF SCIENCE DEGREES

	LEARNING OUTCOMES	AA DEGREE PROPOSED	AS DEGREE PROPOSED
1	**CMW:** Effective, Engaged, and Persuasive Communication: Written Component	6 Hours (ENGL 101 & 102)* *grade of "C" or better	6 Hours (ENGL 101 & 102)* *grade of C or better
2	**ARP:** Analytical Reasoning and Problem Solving	03 Hours (MATH, CSCE, PHIL, STAT) (including MATH 111)	06 Hours (MATH, CSCE, PHIL, STAT) (including MATH 111)
3	**SCI:** Scientific Literacy	07-08 Hours (must include at least 1 laboratory course)	08-12 hours (must include at least 2 laboratory courses)
4	**GFL:** Global Citizenship and Multicultural Understanding: Foreign Language	03 hours (or score of 2 or better on language placement test)	03 hours (or score of 2 or better on language placement test)
5	**GHS:** Global Citizenship and Multicultural Understanding: Historical Thinking	03 Hours	03 Hours
6	**GSS:** Global Citizenship and Multicultural Understanding: Social Sciences	06 Hours	06 Hours
7	**AIU:** Aesthetic and Interpretive Understanding	06 Hours	03 Hours
8	**CMS:** Effective, Engaged, and Persuasive Communication: Spoken Component	03 Hours from one of the three Learning Outcomes	03 Hours from one of the three Learning Outcomes
9	**INF:** Information Literacy		
10	**VSR:** Values, Ethics, and Social Responsibility		
	LEARNING OUTCOMES	**8 TOTAL**	**8 TOTAL**
	SPECIFIED CREDITS	**37-38 Hours**	**38-42 Hours**
	ELECTIVE CREDITS	**22-23 Hours**	**18-22 Hours**
	DEGREE TOTAL	**60 Hours**	**60 Hours**

Course Hours are from the Approved List of courses for each Carolina Core Learning Outcome: http://www.sc.edu/carolinacore/courses.php

The USC Lancaster Curriculum Committee moves that the USC Lancaster Faculty Organization adopt and forward the attached list of concerns and recommendations regarding the "common curriculum" to the System Affairs Committee of the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate for action.

CMW	
ARP	The USCL faculty believe that full agreement with the Carolina Core as approved by the Columbia Senate, including its representatives from the regional campuses, is desirable. Therefore, we propose the removal of MATH 111 from the ARP learning outcome for the AA/AS degrees until the course is approved by the Columbia Senate for ARP credit. Alternatively, if 111 does count, 111i, 115, and 112 should count as well. Further, the phrasing "111 included" is ambiguous in that it sounds like 111 must be included and should be clarified.
SCI	If a course is in sequence, the basic course and the courses following should be approved for the curriculum. Ex: Chem 111 leads to Chem 112 so if Chem 111 is approved then Chem 112 should also be approved. There needs to be a minimum but also some flexibility in the system. As it stands now, the limitations to Carolina Core courses restrict the science selection. The approval process for courses in the Carolina Core needs to be made known and streamlined. AA: "SCI 4 hours must include at least one approved SCI laboratory course Plus 3 hours additional science course." AS: "SCI 4 hours must include at least one approved SCI laboratory course Plus 4 hours additional lab science course."
GFL	USCL prefers that the requirement be 6 hours GFL for both degrees. (Or a score of 2 or better.)
GHS	USCL prefers that the requirement be 6 hours GHS for both degrees.
GSS	USCL prefers that the requirement be 3 hours GSS for both degrees.
AIU	USCL prefers that the AA should include a requirement for a 200-level AIU course.
CMS	
INF	
VSR	