MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The sixth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 13 in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Forty-three senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (January 23) were approved as circulated, with one addition: Faye Steuer suggested adding the word “new” toward the end of the first paragraph on p. 2 to emphasize that the “new Library” is “fully funded,” and hence protected from anticipated cuts in funding, but presumably not the library budget in general.

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett reported briefly on the efforts of the Presidential Search Committee, and urged the faculty to get in touch with any member with suggestions or questions. A professional consultant has now been hired to aid in the search process. She mentioned the Student Government Association’s invitation to members of the Senate to attend a reception at the President’s house on February 22, and said she hoped there would be a substantial turnout. In addition, a substantial “challenge grant” had been offered for a scholarship, with the condition that 50% or more of the faculty contributed to the annual College of Charleston Foundation fund drive. She concluded her report by urging faculty to make nominations for the Distinguished Teaching, Research, Service, and Advising awards.

Old Business

Jorge Marban was recognized for the Post-Tenure Review Committee and recommended two policy changes which had been discussed at the November meeting and remanded for further study:

Senate Agenda Item: Meeting of February 13, 2001
From: Post Tenure Review Committee

Recommendations for Additions to Post-Tenure Review Policy

1. The Senate at its November 28 2000 meeting remanded to the 2000-2001 Post-Tenure Review Committee the issue of the rating of candidates who failed to receive the requested superior rating. The original proposal did not clarify who would assign the rating.

After careful evaluation the Committee recommends the addition of this article to the Post-
Tenure Review Policy:

**In the event that a candidate who has applied for a rating fails to receive that rating, a different rating must be assigned at each level of review.**

*Rationale:* A final rating should be given to a candidate who has failed to receive a requested rating. A rating assigned at each level of review (Chair, Dean, PTR Committee, Provost) should be helpful to the President in determining the final rating that must be assigned by law to each candidate.

2. At the November 28, 2000 Senate Meeting, Mike Katuna suggested that an article be added to the Post-Tenure Review Policy indicating that this committee is the “central office” handling all petitions and correspondence related to post-tenure review. After careful consideration of this item the Committee recommends the addition of this article to the Deferment section of the Post-Tenure Review Policy:

**All petitions for a deferment or a waiver of post-tenure review due to an announced retirement must be addressed to the Post-Tenure Review Committee. All official communications regarding postponements or waivers of reviews will be issued by said committee.**

*Rationale:* This new article clarifies that the Post-Tenure Review Committee is the central office receiving and issuing all official communications related to post-tenure reviews.

**Both motions passed** unanimously, on a voice vote.

**New Business**

- Lynn Cherry then introduced a series of motions on behalf of the Curriculum Committee:

  
  F00018 – PSYC 410 - Change in number of hours for credit  
  S01046 – EDFS 351 - Change in course title  
  S01047 – EDFS 353 - Change in course title  
  S01048 – EDFS 354 - Change in course title  
  S01049 – EDFS 411 - Change in course title  
  S01050 – EDFS 412 - Change in course title  
  S01051 – EDFS 413 - Change in course title  
  S01052 – Classics: - Change in degree requirements for the B.A. in Classics  

  [For Information Only:  
  PHYS 298 - ST: Medical Spectroscopy  
  ENGL 395 - ST: British Literature in an Age of Empire]
These motions passed right away, with no changes.

Jorge Marban then recommended an additional change in Post-Tenure Review Policy, as an item of New Business:

**Senate Agenda Item: Meeting of February 13, 2001**  
**From: Post-Tenure Review Committee**

**Recommendation for a Change in Wording in the Post-Tenure Review Policy**

The 2000-2001 Post-Tenure Review Committee recommends unanimously a change in wording of the first section of article 4 of the Post-Tenure Review Policy (“Evaluations of the Post-Tenure Review committee can take one of three forms:”)

**From**

‘Superior’

Candidate has continued to perform at the level expected for promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the standards of the Faculty-Administration Manual. Tenured Assistant and Associate Professors and Librarians who lack a terminal degree but who otherwise meet the standards of promotion to the rank of Professor or Librarian IV are eligible for superior ratings.

**To:**

**Candidate has attained the rank of Professor or Librarian IV and** has continued to perform at the level expected for promotion to **that rank**, in accordance with the standards of the Faculty-Administration Manual. Tenured Assistant and Associate Professors and Librarians who lack a terminal degree but who otherwise meet the standards of promotion to the rank of Professor or Librarian IV are eligible for superior ratings.

*Rationale: All the members of the 2000-2001 Post-Tenure Review Committee believe that the current Post-Tenure Review Policy restricts eligibility for the Superior rating, among candidates with a terminal degree, to Full Professors. The proposed change of wording will avoid any possible confusion with regard to eligibility for the Superior rating.*

Richard Nunan then began the discussion with an alternative recommendation. This was treated as an amendment to the main motion, so that both proposals could be discussed on equal terms.

**Amendment to P-T Review Committee Senate Motion:**

Instead of adding the proposed language to Article 4 of the Post-Tenure
Review Policy, append the following sentence at the end of the paragraph describing a ‘Superior' rating:

A Superior rating requires performance at the level of Full Professor, but does not require a tenured faculty member to hold the rank of Full Professor.

In support of this amendment, Mr. Nunan made the following points:

• The current policy does not explicitly state that Associate Professors with a terminal degree are excluded from consideration for a "Superior" rating.

• The current policy does however state that faculty who do not hold terminal degrees are eligible for consideration for a Superior rating if they are performing at the level of Full Professor. Why shouldn't the same be true for those with terminal degrees?

• Some departments on campus have higher standards for promotion to Full Professor than the College requires. Tenured Associate Professors in these departments should still be eligible for a Superior rating in the Post Tenure Review process, evaluated in terms of a college-wide standard for such a rating.

• The Tenure and Promotion process is a separate and distinct process from that of Post Tenure Review. These enterprises ought to remain separate, especially in light of the fact that the decision to seek promotion to Full Professor is never compulsory and is exercised solely at the discretion of each individual faculty member. Since promotion is not compulsory, failure to apply for promotion should not be used to deny a Superior rating.

• The Post-Tenure Review Committee's function is to review the evidence presented in support of a faculty member's self-evaluation (particularly in the case of Superior ratings) and make a recommendation to the Provost that either concurs with the self-evaluation or details the reasons for their negative decision. It is not the function of that Committee to decline to exercise its judgment in this matter, in order to implement some other administrative policy that falls outside its charge as a Committee.

Discussion of the main motion, and the amendment, then began in earnest, and occupied close to an hour and forty-five minutes. The central argument in support of the main motion was that the text of the existing Post-Tenure Review policy, as passed by the Senate and approved by the Administration, leaves no choice but to interpret it in the way suggested, and that to change the rules of eligibility more than half-way through the academic year would create a very difficult legal and administrative situation. The main argument in favor of the opposing amendment was a
common-sense perception that the faculty, in its collective wisdom, cannot have intended to say that only Full Professors are capable of performing at a superior level.

Mr. Marban introduced the following arguments against accepting the amendment:

**Misreading of the Post-Tenure Review Policy in the Sponsored Motion to Change the PTR Policy**

1. Proponent states: “According to policy, a faculty member’s self evaluation may take one of three forms: Superior, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory.”

The Post-Tenure Review Policy states: “Evaluations of the Post-Tenure Review Committee can take one of three forms: ‘Superior’…’Unsatisfactory’…’Satisfactory’.

2. Proponent states: “In order to ensure that all roster faculty are eligible for consideration for “Superior” ratings, any tenured faculty who do not have terminal degrees are eligible for consideration for a Superior rating if they are performing at the level of Full Professor, without regard to their current rank or their ability to hold the rank of Full Professor in the future. It is inconsistent with the broad intent of this facet of the policy to exclude similarly outstanding faculty who are also performing at the level of Full Professor, simply because they hold a terminal degree.”

Proponent is equating the language in the first sentence of the PTR policy’s section on Superior with the second one. The first sentence reads: “Candidate has continued to perform at the level expected for promotion to the rank of Professor or Librarian IV…”

This is an important distinction that should not be ignored. Candidates and Department chairs may think that a certain candidate is “performing” at the level of professor. We can only say objectively that a candidate is performing at the rank of Professor after he/she has been awarded the rank of Professor following a full review. Therefore, “has continued to perform” can only refer to candidates who have attained the rank of Professor.

The second sentence in the Superior section of the Policy refers to “Tenured Assistant and Associate Professors or Librarians who lack a terminal degree but who otherwise meet the standards of promotion to the rank of Professor or Librarian IV…” This is an exclusionary clause that further confirms that faculty members holding the above ranks with a terminal degree are not eligible to apply for a Superior rating.

**Reasons for Excluding Associate Professors with a Terminal Degree from Eligibility for a Superior Rating.**

The Post-Tenure review process has two main purposes:
a) to correct the deficiencies of tenured faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory;

b) to reward tenured faculty members whose outstanding performance should be recognized.

Associate Professors holding a terminal degree and whose performance is outstanding can be recognized by being promoted to the highest rank, a promotion which entails a significant boost in salary.

Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Librarians without a terminal degree as well as Full Professors cannot rise in rank. A Superior rating with a salary boost is the only way (besides the limited number of annual awards) that their outstanding performance may be recognized.

If approved, the sponsored motion could have these repercussions:

1. It will create an unequal and inequitable situation in which Associate Professors with a terminal degree could have three chances in six years to boost their salaries while Full Professors and tenured faculty members without a terminal degree would have only two:

   ASSOC. PROF.  2001 (PTR) 2002 (Prom.) 2007 (PTR)
   FULL PROF.      2001 (PTR)                       2007 (PTR)

2. It could increase dramatically the potential number of applicants for Superior, reducing the chance of a sizeable increase of the small salary boost now given ($500).

And, the worst and most worrisome consequence would be...

3. It would affect the process of promotion to Full Professor. A candidate who receives a Superior rating before petitioning for promotion to Full Professor could use that previous rating as leverage to influence the T and P committee. This could conceivably put two College committees (using the same standards of evaluation) at odds with each other. If denied promotion by the T and P committee, the faculty member who had received a Superior rating could use that rating as support for an appeal or legal action.

Mr. Marban then quoted from the records of a 1998 meeting of the original Ad Hoc Committee on Post-Tenure Review, to indicate that his position had been part of the original conception of PTR since the very beginning:

Post-Tenure Review  Development of Superior Standards
Marion (Doig) proposed that no one could get a superior rating until after promotion to Full Professor (reasoning that, under our conception, the standard is the same for each anyway. To which Richard [Nunan] asked: What about faculty who are tenured, but not promotable to Full Professor, because they don’t have terminal degrees? (Marion said: satisfy requirement for their last promotable level).

In addition, Mr. Marban quoted or referred to several other memoranda, and to statements made at meetings of the Faculty Senate over the past several years. One such statement was made by Robert Mignone at the Senate meeting of December 7, 1999 that “in general, only Full Professors would qualify for a Superior rating.” (The full text of these memoranda and statements is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes).

Finally, after further discussion, Beverly Diamond called for the question on the amendment. Mr. Nunan’s amendment to the main motion passed by a vote of 21 to 20, on a written ballot.

James Carew then asked for a quorum count; a quorum was present. At length, the question was called on Mr. Marban’s motion, as amended by Mr. Nunan. The amended motion failed, on a tie vote of 19 to 19, on a written ballot. This deadlock could not be resolved because the Speaker had had to leave just before the end of the meeting, and Hugh Wilder, Speaker pro tempore, had already cast a ballot and could not vote a second time to break the tie.

Mr. Nunan had intended to introduce the following resolution, as devised by Lynn Ford and previously circulated with the agenda for the meeting:

The Senate requests that the Faculty Committee on Post-Tenure Review approach its work in the 2000-01 academic year consistent with the intent and spirit of the motion passed by the Senate. All tenured faculty requesting a "Superior" rating should be reviewed according to the policy guidelines and criteria, regardless of their rank.

Since, however, the motion was not “passed by the Senate,” this resolution became moot.

Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment

After a very brief discussion of constituents’ concerns, the meeting adjourned shortly after 7:00 o’clock.

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