November 28, 2000

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fourth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 28, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty-five senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (October 31) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett reported on a conference of the AAUP which she had recently attended. In the past, she had not been particularly impressed with these conferences, but this year’s turned out to be much more interesting. The theme of this conference was the challenges facing the academic world from outside of academia itself. The first was the challenge of acceptability. Eighty per cent of the American population are now eligible for college. This rapid growth was leading to pressures for yet more persons to be accepted, and to more degree programs to accommodate this growth. At the same time, there is an increased focus on job training, and on what is coming to be referred to as “distance learning.” These pressures, in turn, seem to be leading in many cases to an increased workload for many members of the teaching profession, to compromises in the classroom experience because of larger and larger classes, and to questions about the value of research, especially published research.

The academic world is also facing pressure to evolve toward a “corporate” model for decision-making, which is perceived as more efficient than the “shared” model of academic governance. This carries with it the danger of undermining the role of faculty in their institutions. Ironically, however, there is now growing evidence that the corporate model is not working very well for business and industry, who are actually in the process of broadening their mechanisms of governance in order to reach and include more of their constituents in the process of decision-making.
The AAUP is now working on a new copy of their handbook (the “red book”). The Speaker said that she felt fairly good about the standing of the College of Charleston in all this. Our structures of faculty governance seem to be working fairly well, and we have played a responsible role, for example, in choosing representatives to the Presidential Search Committee. We still have some distance to go, and real concerns about the ways some decisions are made, but on the whole, the picture is encouraging. As a matter of fact, we do pretty well when judged by a list called “The Criteria for Effective Faculty Senates” developed by participants at meetings of the AAHE’s National Network of Faculty Senates over the past ten years. This list was developed within the SUNY (State University of New York) system, which also has a state-wide faculty senate made up of representatives from the individual senates of the separate colleges and universities.

Effective faculty senates have:

– Permanent office space, files, archives
– Annual budget (travel, telephone, computer, supplies, etc.)
– Secretarial assistance
– Adjusted workload for officers
– Regular meetings with college president
– Consulted on creation of all non-senate committees
– Senate president (faculty officer) presides at senate meetings
– Bylaws specify areas where senate decisions are normally determinative, co-determinative, or advisory
– Meetings and activities advertised in advance and records of actions widely published
– Attracts both junior and senior faculty who are esteemed as academic leaders
– Is regarded by the campus as dealing with crucial issues
– Has effective representation on other key governance groups
– Senate leadership visible in the ceremonial and symbolic affairs of the campus
– Initiates a major portion of its agenda items
– Defends the core values of academic freedom, determines curriculum
– Provides an effective forum for controversial issues
–Is seen as an agent of necessary institutional change

–Grounds its practices in parliamentary procedure and published and endorsed principles of governance.

The Speaker concluded her report by noting that one of the nicest aspects of the AAUP conference had been that several of our own Trustees had attended. There was nothing, as yet, to report about the Presidential Search. But if senators or faculty know of outstanding candidates, they should please urge them to apply.

**New Business**

● Jorge Marban, speaking for the Post-Tenure Review Committee, introduced a series of recommendations for deletions and additions to the Post-Tenure Review Policy. The eight-page original document, as amended at the meeting, is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes. The recommended changes were discussed at some length, and may be summarized as follows.

**1. Formation of panels evaluating department chairs [passed]:**

When the department chair herself/himself is up for post-tenure review, the most senior tenured member of the department (other than the chair) will convene, and chair, a departmental post-tenure review panel consisting of three tenured faculty (including the panel chair). **Panel members will normally be drawn from the home department according to seniority.** When necessary to complete the panel, additions will be drawn, following the same criteria, from Departments with related areas of study. The panel may not include chairpersons from **external departments.** No tenured faculty member concurrently subject to post-tenure review may serve on this panel. The panel will exercise the same responsibility with respect to the department chair's candidacy that the chair exercises in all other cases. **This department panel will also review all other cases coming up for post-tenure review at the same time as the department chair.**

**2. Deletions:**

[passed]:

Page 1 Article 3:

{*In the event of subsequent approval of teaching portfolios as part of the post-tenure review process, starred elements may be incorporated as components of those portfolios.*}

{**In the event of subsequent approval of peer teaching evaluations as part of the post-tenure review process, these letters will include peer teaching evaluation comments.}

[[withdrawn; not voted on:

Page 3 Article 5:
5. Whenever the Post-Tenure Review Committee assigns a rating of ‘superior’, such a rating must be accompanied by a permanent merit increase normally not less than that given for promotion to the rank of Professor, effective the academic year following the year of evaluation.]]

3. Additions:

[passed]:

Add to Article 1 (page 1) after the sentence which ends “…like other standing committees”:

A faculty member whose packet comes before the Post-Tenure Review Committee cannot serve on this committee during the academic year in which he/she is being evaluated.

[[Proposed new Article 6: remanded to committee; not voted on.

6. In the event that a candidate who has applied for a Superior rating fails to receive all the necessary endorsements, his/her rating will revert to Satisfactory.]]

[passed as amended]:

A new section on Deferments (with friendly amendments in sections 2 and 3 suggested by Beverly Diamond and David Gentry, incorporated in this text):

Deferments

1. Faculty members may petition the Post-Tenure Review Committee for postponement of their post-tenure reviews based on extenuating personal circumstances, exceptional professional commitments, or valid medical reasons which must be documented in the petition. Petitions must be endorsed by the faculty member’s Chair and Dean. Postponements will be approved only under extraordinary circumstances and will not normally extend more than one academic year. Decisions by the PTR Committee regarding deferments may be appealed to the Provost within one week of the candidate’s notification. The Provost’s decision shall be final.

2. Faculty members who announce their decision to retire within three years of their scheduled time for post-tenure review (by submission of a letter to the Dean of his/her school and the Provost) will not have to undergo that review. However, if a faculty member postpones the announced time of retirement for more than one year, he/she will be evaluated in the year of that announcement.

3. A faculty member scheduled for post-tenure review in a given year will not have to undergo that review if he/she petitions for promotion to Associate or Full Professor that same year or announces (in writing) his/her intention to do so during the following academic year. However, if the promotion process is postponed, a post-tenure review will take place no later than one year after the originally scheduled time for post-tenure review.
4. Administrators (such as Deans) rejoining the ranks of the faculty will undergo post-tenure review within three years of their return to faculty status.

5. If a faculty member takes a sabbatical or a leave of absence in the same academic year he/she is scheduled for post-tenure review, the post-tenure review will take place during the following academic year, unless the faculty member decides to undergo the review at the originally scheduled time.

4. Changes in the PTR calendar [passed]:

1. A new deadline in Post-Tenure Review Calendar to be inserted after first entry (Sept. 11):
   
   Sept. 18 Deadline for submission of requests for post-tenure review deferments to the Post-Tenure Review Committee.

2. A change in the sixth deadline entry in the calendar.

   From: Dec. 18 Department Chair or Panel Chair will inform the candidate of the departmental recommendation and forward the candidate’s packet with either a brief acknowledgment of the chair’s or panel’s concurrence with the candidate’s self-evaluation, or a detailed negative evaluation letter, to the appropriate dean.

   To: Dec. 18 Department Chair or Panel Chair will inform the candidate of the departmental recommendation and forward to the appropriate office the candidate’s packet with either a brief acknowledgment of the chair’s or panel’s concurrence with the candidate’s self-evaluation, or a detailed negative evaluation letter. Normally, packets of candidates receiving the requested Satisfactory rating from the Chair or Panel Chair will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs. Other packets will be forwarded to the appropriate Dean.

Lynn Cherry, on behalf of the Curriculum Committee, recommended a new Language course. This was approved without discussion:

New Course: SPAN 447 Spanish Dialectology (3hrs.)

Rohn England, for the Committee on Graduate Education, introduced three motions, which passed without change:

1. New Course Proposals:
   a. SMFT 639 - Genetics and Molecular Biology for Teachers (3hrs.)
   b. CSCI 601 - Data Modeling (3)
   c. CSCI 603 - Object-Oriented Design Patterns (3)
   d. CSCI 614 - Advanced Operating Systems (3)
   e. CSCI 632 - Data Communications and Networking (3)
f. CSCI 638 - Data Base Design (3)
g. CSCI 672 - Human Computer Interaction (3)

2. Course Change Proposals:
   a. CSCI 620 to 602
   b. CSCI 640 to 604

3. Program Change Proposal (Master of Environmental Studies)
   MES Policy Track: change required number of hours from 38 to 41.

●●●● Speaking for the Academic Standards Committee, Walter Pharr introduced a motion on Attendance Policy, affecting p. 19 of the Undergraduate Catalogue and p. 121 of the Faculty/Administration Manual. During the brief discussion, William Moore commented that the requirement that a student notify his instructors on the very first day of class about when he would be absent was simply unworkable. Caroline Hunt said that professors need to state their absence policies, whatever they are, more clearly than is often the case. Lynn Cherry objected that some students (not just athletes) might not know when they would need to be absent on the first day of classes – members of the Debate Team, for example. Accordingly, Hugh Wilder proposed two separate amendments. These were approved, and the main motion passed, as follows:

Since class attendance is a crucial part of any course, students are expected to attend all classes and laboratory meetings of each course in which they enroll. During the first week of classes instructors will announce and distribute their attendance policies, [insert, at the suggestion of Hugh Wilder: including criteria to be used in determining excused absences]. The professor determines whether absences are excused or unexcused, whether make-up work will be permitted, and whether both excused and unexcused absences count in determining the basis for a grade of "WA." If attendance is used for grading purposes, the professor is responsible for keeping accurate attendance records. Each student, whether absent or not, is responsible for all information disseminated in the course. If a student has more than the maximum allowed absences, as defined in the course syllabus, the professor may instruct the registrar to record a grade of "WA" for the student. The grade of "WA" is a failing grade. The procedure for assignment of this grade requires that the professor provide written notification to the Registrar on or before the last meeting day of the class. The registrar will then send a courtesy copy of the notice to the student. The student is responsible for keeping addresses current through the Office of the Registrar.

If students who participate in athletics competitions or other college-sponsored events want to be assured that they are in compliance with the faculty member's attendance policy, they must provide written notification to all course instructors of dates and times when regularly scheduled classes and labs will be missed. [Delete last sentence: This notification must be]
provided by the first day of class; an instructor unwilling to excuse the student for such absences must notify the student before the end of drop/add.]

Julia Eichelberger then introduced a motion for the Faculty Welfare Committee, aimed at improving benefits for Adjunct Faculty. The Committee proposes:

That the College of Charleston provide health insurance to all adjunct faculty teaching three or more courses per semester, and to all full-time visitors or other full-time faculty not occupying state lines. We move that the College provide these faculty with health insurance coverage comparable to the coverage provided to roster faculty.

The Welfare Committee had reached the conclusion that this proposal was financially workable. It would probably cost, she said, just under $400,000 to implement, and the College appears to have at its disposal over sixty-five million dollars in unrestricted funds. Lynn Cherry supported the proposal, but said that she hoped it would not disqualify adjuncts from other proposals to improve their working conditions. Basically, this proposal is about the least we should do for them. One senator commented that if adjuncts cost more, they might be less likely to be used as a “cash cow” and exploited by the administration. Was there any reaction from the Office of Academic Affairs? Yes; they had concluded that the proposal was not feasible.

Michael Katuna was worried about the logistics of implementation. Some adjuncts teach three, as opposed to two, courses, and some drop in and out of health insurance programs from one semester to another. Also, there would be a problem with summer employment, because of the state law about nine-month contracts, and so forth. Susan Morrison pointed out that many adjuncts have spouses with better health coverage than anything offered by the College of Charleston, and so not all of them would be likely to participate; this would skew the statistics being used to estimate the cost of the plan. Hugh Wilder countered that we should let the Human Resources Office handle the implementation issues. What was important was to go on record affirming the principle that the College should do better by its adjunct faculty. Caroline Hunt thought it would be premature for the Faculty Senate to endorse such a proposal without really knowing what its legal and financial ramifications would be, and she moved to remand it to the Welfare Committee. Richard Nunan disagreed, saying the present arrangement for adjuncts is, quite simply, abominable. Caroline Hunt agreed, but said that we would look like idiots if we vote for something that is simply illegal. She would happily vote for a Resolution to help adjuncts, but not for a specific proposal that might not, as Academic Affairs suggested, be feasible.

Peter McCandless urged the senate to endorse the proposal as a moral issue, and Stephanie Low agreed. Hugh Wilder remembered that some similar ideas had been bruited about at a meeting of the AAUP last spring, and that Andy Abrams had said at the time that, yes, the College of Charleston could put such a proposal into practice if it really wanted to. The motion to remand failed. After a further call for clarification from Mr. Katuna, the question was called, and the main motion carried, on a voice vote.
Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment

Several senators joined in asking the Speaker to obtain accurate and comprehensive statistics on the current use of adjuncts at the College, and to find out how the present situation compares with seven or eight years ago. In particular, it would be useful to get a breakdown of these statistics by School, as well as Department.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about twenty past seven.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary

******

2000-2001 Senate Meetings:
September 5, October 3, October 31, November 28;
January 23, February 13, March 13, April 3 (second part, April 17)
Faculty Meetings: September 11, 2000; April 23, 2001