March 12, 2002

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The seventh 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, March 12, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Hugh Wilder presiding. Forty-two senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (February 12) were provisionally approved, as electronically circulated: printed copies had not been delivered to all departments.

Reports

The Speaker

The Speaker reminded faculty about upcoming deadlines for making committee requests (March 13), for electing departmental senators (March 15), and for being placed on the agenda of the April senate meeting (March 21). The Presidential Inauguration would take place on Tuesday, March 26, in the Sottile Theater; faculty will receive invitations and will be welcome to join the procession if they wish. Mr. Wilder also reported on the forthcoming perimeter parking plan, which was expected to go into effect on a trial basis in August. More specific information should be available by late April, but the seniority system for assigning spaces will continue to be in effect, and fees will increase with proximity to the central campus. Spaces in outlying areas will be served by free shuttle-bus service, and fees will be substantially lower. Frank Kinard commented that the College should provide parking like any other downtown business, and that parking space should be made part of all building plans from now on. One senator asked what the hours of shuttle service would be, and the answer was 7:00-10:00 a.m. and 3:00-7:00 p.m. The Speaker noted that President Hidgon is committed to making the parking plan work.

On another matter: the Curriculum Committee will improve their website and will post detailed procedures for making curricular changes. There seems to be a general lack of information about how to go about this at the moment. Eventually, the senate website will be used for the bulky agenda packets that are now printed and circulated through the campus mail -- a small step toward saving the forests of the world.

New Business

For the Graduate Education Committee, Maureen Hays moved the passage of a two new graduate certificate programs (ESOL Certificate I and II), together with ten accompanying new courses (EDFS 670, 671, 672, 673; 680, 681, 682, 704, 683, 684). On a point of order, Hugh Haynsworth noted that graduate certificate programs, in keeping with the senate's vote of April 21, 1998, do not need the approval of the senate. The two programs were therefore presented for
information, and the ten new courses, which did require approval, passed on a voice vote. In detail:

NEW GRADUATE CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS
AND
SUPPORTING NEW GRADUATE COURSES

1. ESOL Certificate I Proposal (Initial) [for information]

2. ESOL Certificate I New Courses
   a. EDFS 670 – Principles and Strategies for Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
   b. EDFS 671 – Teaching Reading and Writing to K-12 Speakers of Other Languages
   c. EDFS 672 – Linguistic and Cultural Diversity in Education
   d. EDFS 673 – Assessing Student Performance

3. ESOL Certificate II Proposal (Advanced) [for information]

4. ESOL Certificate II New Courses
   a. EDFS 680 – Teaching English Through the Content Areas (or Content Modification for ESOL Students K-12)
   b. EDFS 681 – Second Language Acquisition for Teachers of Elementary and Secondary Learners
   c. EDFS 682 – ESOL Curriculum Design and Materials Development for K-12 Students
   d. EDFS 704 – Practicum in the Instruction of English as a Second Language to Elementary and Secondary Learners
   e. EDFS 683 – English Grammar / Structure (for ESOL Teachers)
   f. EDFS 684 – ESOL / Talented and Gifted and Special Education Issues

In addition, it was announced that proposals for two new Master’s programs (M.Ed. in Languages and M.Ed. in Middle Level Education, just received) would be forwarded to the Senate Budget Committee and the Academic Planning Committee.

Doug Friedman introduced fifty-four measures from the Curriculum Committee, including twenty-four new courses in Elementary and Early Childhood Education, and nine in Communication. (The new Majors in education were not sent on to the Senate Budget Committee or the Academic Planning Committee, as would normally happen, because they are mandated by CHE and further review would serve no purpose.) Tom Kunkle commented that the Mathematics Department would like to take part in the discussion, design, and implementation of courses that address the teaching of mathematics, such as those under consideration here (items 1-38), and Linda Fitzharris, Chair of Elementary and Early Childhood Education, was agreeable to this general request. All motions were approved. The only change was in the proposal for EDEE 323, the title of which (“Mathematics: The Language of Logic”) would be modified later,
after consultation between the Mathematics and Education Departments. Special Topics courses in Chemistry and Computer Science (CHEM 583, CSCI 199) were for information. The complete list, as approved earlier at the 22 February, 2002 Meeting of the College Curriculum Committee, is as follows:

5. S02-030 Summary of Changes in Elementary and Early Childhood Education
6. S02-031 Bachelor of Science in Middle Grades Education - New Major
7. S02-032 Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education - New Major
8. S02-033 Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education - Change of Major
9. S02-034 EDEE 326 Health and Physical Education - Change course #
10. S02-035 EDEE 325 Language and Literacy Development - New Course
11. S02-036 EDEE 327 Learner Development and Context Learning - New Course
12. S02-037 EDEE 323 Mathematics: The Language of Logic - New Course: title provisional
13. S02-038 EDEE 375 Reading / Learning Strategies: PreK-Grade 3 - New Course
14. S02-039 EDEE 371 Teaching Social Studies and Humanities: PreK - Grade 3 - New Course
15. S02-040 EDEE 367 Teaching Science: PreK - Grade 3 - New Course
16. S02-041 EDEE 365 Teaching Mathematics: PreK - Grade 3 - New Course
17. S02-042 EDEE 373 Teaching Social Studies and Humanities: Grades 2-8 - New Course
18. S02-043 EDEE 377 Reading / Learning Strategies: Grades 2-8 - New Course
19. S02-044 EDEE 368 Teaching Science: Grades 2-8 - New Course
20. S02-045 EDEE 366 Teaching Mathematics: Grades 2-8 – New Course
21. S02-046 EDEE 380 Application of Curriculum and Instruction: Grades PreK-Grade 3 - New C.
22. S02-047 EDEE 382 Application of Curriculum and Instruction: Grades 2-6 - New Course
23. S02-048 EDEE 384 Application of Curriculum and Instruction: Grades 5-8 - New Course
24. S02-049 EDEE 403 Visual and Performing Arts - New Course
25. S02-050 EDEE 407 Creating Learning Environments - New Course
26. S02-051 EDEE 401 Literacy Assessment - New Course
27. S02-052 EDEE 409 Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners - New Course
28. S02-053 EDEE 415 Curriculum Instruction and Assessment: PreK-Grade3 - New Course
29. S02-054 EDEE 416 Curriculum Instruction and Assessment: Grades 2-6 - New Course
30. S02-055 EDEE 417 Curriculum Instruction and Assessment: Grades 5-8 - New Course
31. S02-056 EDEE 459 Middle Grades Student Teaching - New Course
32. S02-057 EDEE 457 Elementary Grades Student Teaching - New Course
33. S02-058 EDEE 455 Early Childhood Student Teaching - New Course
34. S02-059 EDEE 307 Managing Instruction for Effective Teaching - Delete Course
35. S02-060 EDEE 315 Individualizing Instruction - Delete Course
36. S02-061 EDEE 316 Creative Arts - Delete Course
37. S02-062 EDEE 385 Teaching Language Arts - Delete Course
38. S02-063 EDEE 390 Teaching Social Studies - Delete Course
39. S02-064 EDEE 432 Teaching Science in the Elementary School - Delete Course
40. S02-065 Change in degree requirements for Majors
41. S02-066 EDEE 430 Teaching Reading in the Elementary School - Delete Course
42. S02-067 EDEE 431 Teaching Mathematics in the Elementary School - Delete Course
44. S02-071 CSCI 199 Special Topics in Computing - for Information
45. S02-073 COMM 301 Communications Research Methods - New Course
46. S02-074 COMM 304 Training and Development - New Course
47. S02-075 COMM 324 Speechwriting - **New Course**
48. S02-076 COMM 326 Organizational Communication - **New Course**
49. S02-077 COMM 327 Sports Writing - **New Course**
50. S02-078 COMM 335 Public Relations Writing - **New Course**
51. S02-079 COMM 370 Gender and Communication - **New Course**
52. S02-080 COMM 435 Public Relations Campaigns - **New Course**
53. S02-081 COMM 482 Rhetoric and Identity - **New Course**
54. S02-082 Communication Degree Changes - Concentration in Corporate Communication
55. S02-083 Communication Degree Changes - Concentration in Media Studies
56. S02-084 Communication Degree Changes - Concentration in Communications Studies
53. S02-085 COMM 235 Public Relations Practices - Change course description
54. S02-086 COMM 225 Introduction to Organizational Communication - Delete course

---

"--- The Post-Tenure Review Committee introduced a “Proposal for the Rewording and Changing the PTR Policy.” This was immediately referred to the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, who will make a recommendation at the April meeting.

The original document, as circulated to the Senate, is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.

---

"--- For the Faculty Welfare Committee, Julia Eichelberger introduced this motion:

**We move that the SGA’s proposed questions be attached to the current course evaluation form, and that the responses to these added questions be made available to the SGA for distribution to students through a searchable PDF file on the College’s website. This proposal would go into effect in Fall 2003. The attached documents explain the SGA’s proposal in more detail.**
Proposal For A Student-Produced Course Information Publication (SCIP)

I. The Problem
Concurrent with the dramatic increase in the student population at the College over the last decade, there has been a strong, ongoing growth in the number of programs, courses, class sections and teaching staff. There are currently close to 500 faculty teaching over 1,800 course sections in a typical semester. While College policy holds each student ultimately responsible for making course registration decisions which meet their individual educational needs, currently very little about the methods of instruction and testing employed in any particular course or course section is available to students. SGA has been aware of widespread student concern with this shortage of information for over four years, and increased growth in programs has only worsened the problem. A survey recently conducted by SGA found over 98% of over 400 randomly selected students support making additional information about the teaching and testing methods employed in particular course sections available.

II. Our Proposal
We propose that a short survey (Attachment 1) of questions about teaching methods, testing methods, and overall course content be distributed to students in all classes along with the current teacher evaluation survey (which remains confidential). The students’ responses, made on the reverse side of the current SCANTRON survey form, would be analyzed by Administrative Computing and Telecom Services here at the College. Because Administrative Computing is the only entity that will actually see the completed survey forms (rather than the students), the confidentiality of non-SCIP results is assured, and results for groups such as first-year teachers can be obviated upon request during processing. The results for each course, broken down by section, would be made available online through the College’s website (Cougar Trail) as a large .PDF file. The .PDF format would allow the viewer to jump directly to the desired pages by using the “Find” tool to search the document for the course title (e.g. ‘ENGL 101’). Only the most recent results, displayed as the percentage of respondents for each question-option (see sample: Attachment 2), for a particular Course/Section will be available (no archive of multiple years’ results for the same Course/Section). The cost of this project is expected to be low, primarily lying in start-up expenses, such as having a new printer-plate made for the SCANTRON survey form ($898.00, plus tax). These one-time materials costs will be covered by SGA from its budget.

III. The Benefits
The benefits of this proposal include allowing students to better match their learning styles and desires for their education to the content and teaching methods employed in the College’s courses. Better matching would result in higher student satisfaction and (hopefully) lower drop and fail rates. The availability of comprehensive, reliable course information would also reduce students’ dependence on the unregulated and often highly biased opinions of other students in making registration decisions, on the theory that good information will drive out bad in a free marketplace, and encourage students to take courses which their peers may have found difficult, but which meet their personal desires.
The fact that the College makes this information available to its students could also be used to give potential applicants a more favorable impression of the College.

IV. Conclusion
We believe that implementation of the SCIP proposal would produce considerable benefits for the students, faculty, and the College in general. We would like to emphasize that this proposal does not allow students to ‘rate’ or otherwise comment directly on an instructor’s teaching ability or the difficulty of the course. Our desire is simply to make more reliable information available to the students so they can make better decisions about what classes best suit their needs and abilities.

**Questionnaire for Student Course Information Publication (SCIP)**

1. Which of the following are major components of this course? (Mark all that apply)
   A. Lecture
   B. Class discussion
   C. Visual presentations
   D. Student presentations
   E. Assigned reading material
   F. Workshops/Study sessions
   G. Study guides
   H. Frequent quizzes and/or tests
   I. Regular homework assignments
   J. Major writing assignments
   K. Out-of-class projects
   L. Office hours and conferences
   M. Hands-on experiments and/or activities
   N. Kinesthetic (physical) experiences
   O. Group projects
   P. Online course supplements/WebCT

2. Do tests primarily reflect materials covered in: (Mark one)
   a. class/lecture  b. reading/texts  c. both  d. tests are not administered

3. What are the primary methods of assessment? (Mark all that apply)
   a. multiple choice tests  b. short answer tests  c. essay tests
d. labs/applications  e. papers  f. performances
g. attendance/participation

4. The professor is readily accessible via: (Mark all that apply)
a. e-mail  b. online (chat, etc.)  c. telephone  d. office hours

e. Professor was not readily available.  f. I did not attempt to contact the professor.

Mark the following statements according to your degree of agreement:

5. The professor encourages questions and discussion during class.
   5-highly agree  4-agree  3-neutral/indifferent  2-disagree  1-highly disagree

6. [Deleted: I would give this course a positive rating.]
   5-highly agree  4-agree  3-neutral/indifferent  2-disagree  1-highly disagree

During the discussion, Julia Eichelberger pointed out that the proposal now being presented had been developed over a long period, and had much thought and discussion behind it. She asked Brian England from the SGA to comment. Mr. England said that work had started some four years ago, and that the proposal was based on a wide-spread feeling that students would like to have more information about courses before they sign up for them. Of the four hundred students recently surveyed, more than 98% had been in favor what was being proposed. Several senators, however, objected to the sixth question (“I would give this course a positive rating”) because they thought it would provide subjective opinion rather than real information, and, in effect, turn the questionnaire into a “popularity contest.” Bob Mignone thought the data should be aggregated, in order to separate course content from the instructor. Rob Dillon moved to remand the motion for further study.

Rhodes Bailey, speaking for the students, urged the faculty not to send the motion back, since it had been worked on for so long, but to consider an amendment instead. Accordingly, Mr. Dillon retracted his motion to remand, and replaced it with a friendly amendment to approve the first five questions, leaving out the sixth. This met with general approval. Susan Morrison asked when the proposal would go into effect, and than answer was, not until the Fall of 2003. The question was called, and the amended motion passed, on a voice vote.

Finally, three recommendations from the Academic Standards Committee, about language courses, the College residency requirement, and the date of implementation of the new grading system approved by
the Senate last year, were approved as follows (the date recommended is August of 2006):
Faculty Committee on Academic Standards

Recommendation #1

Add the following statement to the Undergraduate Catalog in the Courses section of each foreign language.

**Note:** For foreign language courses that range from 101-202, successful completion of a higher level course prohibits a student from taking a lower level course in the same language for credit.

Rationale:

A student enrolled and completed a 202 language class without first taking 201. After passing the 202 course the student, enrolled in the 201 course for credit. The language departments support this clarification.

Recommendation #2

Change the residency requirement in the major on page 17 of the Undergraduate Catalog.

“At least 15 hours in the major at the 200 level or above must be earned at the College of Charleston.”

Rationale:

Presently the requirement is 12 hours in the major at the College. This change would be consistent with the residency requirement for the minor which is 9 hours out of a minimum of 18 hours for a minor. This recommendation had the unanimous support of departments responding to an E-mail asking for comments.

Recommendation #3
The FCAS recommends that the grading system passed by the Senate last year be instituted in August of 2006. A statement noting the adoption date of the new grading system should be included in future Undergraduate Catalogs. The committee declined to provide verbal descriptors for every grade, but recommends retention of the existing verbal descriptors for the major grade classifications (A, B, C, D, F).

Rationale:

The full range of plus/minus grades gives faculty more options in reporting student performance. A survey of Southern Conference, Colonial Conference, Atlantic Coast Conference, and COPLAC colleges indicated that the use of plus/minus grades was the predominant grading system. Adoption in August of 2006 will impact few current students. Verbal descriptors for all grades are rarely if ever used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southern Conference</th>
<th>A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F</th>
<th>4, 3.7, 3.3, 3, 2.7, 2.3, 2, 1.7, 1, 0.7, 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>App State, Davidson, Furman, Wofford, UNCG, ETSU</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, F</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citadel, VMI, Georgia Southern, UT Chattanooga</td>
<td>A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F</td>
<td>4, 3.66, 3.33, 3, 2.66, 2.33, 2, 1.66, 1.33, 1, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Carolina</td>
<td>A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F</td>
<td>4, 3.7, 3.3, 3, 2.7, 2.3, 2, 1.7, 1, 0.7, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Conference</td>
<td>A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F</td>
<td>4, 3.7, 3.3, 3, 2.7, 2.3, 2, 1.7, 1, 0.7, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstra, James Madison, William &amp; Mary, Old Dominion</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, F</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel, Virginia Commonwealth</td>
<td>A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F</td>
<td>4, 3.66, 3.33, 3, 2.66, 2.33, 2, 1.66, 1.33, 1, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCW, George Mason, Delaware, Towson</td>
<td>A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F</td>
<td>4, 3.7, 3.3, 3, 2.7, 2.3, 2, 1.7, 1, 0.7, 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Duke, UNC, Virginia
A, B, C, D, F 4, 3, 2, 1, 0

Georgia Tech, Clemson
A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F 4, 3, 2, 1, 0  (two year trial)

Maryland
A+, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F 41/3, 4, 32/3, etc

North Carolina State
A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, F 4, 3.66, 3.33, 3, 2.66, 2.33, 2, 1.66, 1.33, 1, 0

Wake Forest
A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F 4, 3.75, 3.25, 3.275, 2.25, 2, 1.75, 1.25, 1, 0.75, 0

Florida State

**COPLAC**
A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F 4, 3.7, 3.3, 3, 2.7, 2.3, 2, 1.7, 1, 0.7, 0

Maryland Tech, St. Mary’s College, MD, Mary Washington
A, B, C, D, F 4, 3, 2, 1, 0

U Montevallo, Henderson St. U, Truman St, UNCA
A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F 4, 3.66, 3.33, 3, 2.66, 2.33, 2, 1.66, 1.33, 1, 0

UW-Superior, UM-Morris,
A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F 4, 3.75, 3.25, 3.275, 2.25, 2, 1.75, 1.25, 1, 0.75, 0

Ft. Lewis College
A, AB, B, BC, C, CD, D, F 4, 3.5, 3, 2.5, 2, 1.5, 1, 0

Keene State

**Constituents’ Concerns**

Further concerns were raised about parking, one senator commenting that where a faculty member parks does have an influence on classroom instruction, especially if you have to carry heavy or bulky teaching materials a long way to the campus. One senator suggested that
temporary “close-in” parking permits should be available for circumstance like this.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned a little after six-thirty.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary
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