November 6, 2001

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The third regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston for the academic year 2001-2002 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 6, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Hugh Wilder presiding. Forty-five senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (October 2) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Provost

Andy Abrams reported that he had had numerous consultations and conversations with President Higdon, and that the transition to the new administration was now well in hand. There would shortly be an announcement of a national search to fill the office of Provost on a long term-basis. Mr. Abrams said that he himself would not be a candidate. He added that he had had many wonderful experiences in his lifetime, but that the opportunity of serving the faculty at the College of Charleston had been the most rewarding of all.

The President

President Higdon thanked the Provost for his outstanding contributions. Rarely, he said, had he seen an individual with as much dedication and passion for service. Mr. Abrams was a tireless worker on behalf of the institution and had provided tremendous assistance to him during the period of transition. They had become friends in a short period of time, and so he was very pleased that Andy wished to stay at the College. We are indeed fortunate that he will continue as Provost until a new one is appointed and will continue to serve after that as a key member of the senior administrative staff.

Because of our growing aspirations to become “a nationally preeminent public liberal arts and sciences university,” the appointment of the chief academic officer would be of crucial importance. The President looked forward to putting together a broadly representative search committee. He had not yet selected its members, but he had asked James Deavor, Professor of Chemistry and acting Dean of the School of Sciences and Mathematics, to serve as chair.

The Speaker
Mr. Wilder first introduced Judy Lindner, the new president-elect of the College of Charleston Alumni Association, who greeted the faculty warmly and said that one of her first priorities would be to increase the number of recent graduates joining the Association.

Several announcements followed. The senate would meet next semester on January 22, February 12, March 12, and April 2, with a continuation on April 16 if needed. The Spring faculty meeting would take place on Monday, April 22. There would be an important discussion of the Family Medical Leave Act at a question-and-answer session scheduled for 5:00 p.m. in ECTR 116.

These faculty will serve on the Convocation Committee:

Jane Clary (Economics)  
Kathy DeHaan (Communication)  
Tom Gilson (Library)  
Enrique Graf (Music)  
Candy Jaruszewicz (Elementary & Early Childhood)  
Susan Kattwinkel (Theater)  
Scott Peeples (English)  
Vincent Spicer (Psychology)  
Hugh Wilder (Philosophy)  
Jim Young (Mathematics)

There will, of course, be other members of the committee who are not faculty, such as Judy Lindner, the new head of the Alumni Association.

These faculty will serve on the Recycling & Environmental Responsibility Committee:

Erin Beutel (Geology)  
Tracy Burkett (Sociology)  
John Creed (Political Science)  
Martin Jones (Mathematics) - on leave 2001-2002  
Susan Morrison (Biology)  
Reid Wiseman (Biology)

On the Budget: Mr. Wilder reported that a 4% cut had gone into effect statewide. The College would probably be able to absorb this without a hiring freeze like the one just imposed at USC. A second round of cuts may be put in place in early January, 2002, however, and if this takes place, President Higdon has said that we might have to rethink our position and impose a freeze at that time.

As to the proposed changes in the grading system, approved by the senate last spring: Andy Abrams has not yet decided on his response, because he is still concerned with the fairness issue associated with the “numbers” attached to B+ and C+ in the new system. There seemed to be two
possibilities, as set out in the following table. The scale on the right, which is what the senate approved, would have to be implemented somewhat later, perhaps not until 2006; the scale on the left, with different values assigned to B+, C+, and D+, could be implemented sooner:

**GRADING SYSTEM: Two Possibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sooner (e.g., August 2003)</th>
<th>Later (e.g., August 2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>B+</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>C+</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>D+</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Business**

Doug Friedman introduced a series of twenty-six motions on behalf of the Curriculum Committee, as approved at their meeting on September 20, 2001. These passed without change:

1. F01-18 Hispanic Studies - Medieval Literature of the Iberian Peninsula - **New Course**
2. F01-17 Marketing and Management - Change Degree Requirements
3. F01-18 Computer Science - Summary of Changes
4. F01-19 Change Degree Req. - Bachelor of Science in Computer Science
5. F01-20 Change Degree Req. - Bachelor of Science in Computer Information Systems
6. F01-21 Change Degree Req. - Bachelor of Arts in Computer Science
7. F01-22 CSCI 332 Database Concepts - **New Course**
8. F01-23 CSCI 360 Software Architecture and Design - **New Course**
9. F01-24 CSCI 362 Software Engineering - **New Course**
10. F01-25 CSCI 380 User Interface Development - **New Course**
11. F01-26 CSCI 432 Concepts of Database Implementation - **New Course**
12. F01-27 CSCI 462 Software Engineering Practicum - **New Course**
13. F02-28 CSCI 320 Imperative Programming Languages - Change Course
14. F01-29 CSCI 325 Declarative Programming Languages - Change Course
15. F01-30 CSCI 330 Data Structures and Algorithms - Change Course
16. F01-31 CSCI 340 Operating Systems - Change Course
17. F01-32 CSCI 410 Automata and Formal Languages - Change Course
18. F01-33 CSCI 420 Principles of Compiler Design - Change Course
19. F01-34 CSCI 440 Computer Networks - Change Course
For the Graduate Education Committee, Maureen Hays proposed a change in the Graduate Program in Marine Biology, requiring completion of the program in four rather than five years. This, too, passed as circulated.

On behalf of the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics, Jeffrey Yost introduced a motion to regulate bulletin boards at the College of Charleston. After considerable discussion, many senators seemed to think that the regulations were too complicated to work. Deanna Caveny volunteered a friendly amendment calling for a separate category of bulletin boards that would be reserved for faculty and departmental use. Several representatives from the SGA were also present and opposed the motion because it seemed to restrict students but not persons from outside the campus. In the event, the proposal was remanded to committee for further study. (The motion to remand was made simultaneously by several senators, and passed unanimously, on a voice vote.)

Todd McNerney introduced a recommendation from the Academic Planning Committee to modify the General Education Humanities requirement by treating the separate departments in the School of the Arts as separate areas. This proposal was based on a letter sent to the faculty senate on March 15, 2001 by Dean Valerie B. Morris [see Minutes of the April 3, 2001 meeting, p. 4] containing this paragraph:

It is proposed that these three distinct disciplines of humanities courses ... under acronyms ARTH, MUSC, and THTR, which are presently lumped under the no longer appropriate term Fine Arts, be listed as three distinct areas, and that students be allowed to take six hours from any of the three disciplines, just as they may presently take six hours from Philosophy and six hours from religious studies, two “areas,” in fact, from the same department.

Mr. McNerney added that the Academic Planning Committee had supported this proposal by a vote of five to one, and he urged the senate’s approval.

**Rationale:**

The current General Education Humanities Requirements view the entire School of the Arts as being equivalent to the departments (or sometimes smaller divisions) in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. This does not appear to have been the result of a reasoned argument about the goals of the requirements, but rather an accidental consequence of the fact that the School of the Arts was once a single department and has since grown large enough to be divided into separate departments.
Our committee took the unusual step of voting separately on the motivation of the proposal. That is, prior to voting on the proposal itself, we unanimously supported the statement that the problem which the proposal seeks to address, the inequitable treatment of humanities courses based upon which school at the College offers them, is a real problem which needs to be addressed. Thus, if the School of the Arts Proposal is not passed, we would argue that another solution to the problem would have to be found.

We then voted to support the original proposal because it remedies the current inequity within the bounds of our current General Education system. In particular, it requires no changes to the requirements themselves apart from the division of the departments of the School of the Arts into separate areas. Moreover, it conforms with the precedent set by the division of the Department of Communications and the Department of English into separate humanities areas when the former split from the latter.

It should be noted that this proposal does not solve other existing problems with the present requirements, such as the fact that a student can meet the requirements with a selection of humanities courses that might not seem sufficiently broad. However, the proposal does create an equitable foundation on which to build further modifications that can correct these other problems.

During the discussion that followed, Phil Dustan opined that the real issue was a “turf war”: if passed, the proposal would allow the Humanities requirement, which was intended to broaden a student’s intellectual perspective, to be satisfied just by taking Fine Arts courses. Rick Heldrich noted that, as a member of the Committee, he had voted against the proposal. Faye Steuer wondered if the Curriculum Committee had studied its implications. Diane Johnson and Mark Landis both supported it, Mr. Landis pointing out that all the chairs had “signed off” on the basic idea. It was not, he insisted, a turf war at all, but a question of making valid distinctions between the various Arts themselves, which are at least as different one from another as Philosophy is from Religious Studies.

In the event, the motion passed, on a voice vote.

Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary