Fall 2002 Faculty and Senate Meetings

Fall 2002 Faculty Meeting: Monday, September 9, 5:00 PM, Physicians Auditorium (agenda deadline 3:00 PM, Wednesday, August 28).

Fall 2002 Faculty Senate Meetings, First Tuesdays, 5:00 PM, ECTR 116:

- September 3 (agenda deadline 3:00 PM, Thursday, August 22);
- October 1 (agenda deadline 3:00 PM, Thursday, September 19);
- November 5 (agenda deadline 3:00 PM, Thursday, October 24);
- December 3 (agenda deadline 3:00 PM, Thursday, November 21).

Agenda items should be sent to Julia Eichelberger, Faculty Secretary (Department of English, eichelberger@cofc.edu, 953-5646).

2002 Convocation

The fall 2002 Convocation will take place on Monday, August 19, at 4:00 PM, in the Kresse Arena. Convocation is the formal occasion at which the president and faculty welcome new students to the College. All new undergraduate and graduate students will attend. All faculty are expected to attend, and will process in academic regalia. This year’s Convocation speaker is Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Dean of the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania. The Convocation reading is Professor Jamieson’s book, *Everything You Think You Know About Politics...And Why You’re Wrong.*

Each new student will receive a copy of the book and reading guide (which was written by a group of College faculty and staff members). The reading guide will also be posted on the web, and copies of the book will soon be available to faculty and staff; watch for e-mail announcements. Academic regalia is available for rent or purchase at the College Bookstore.

2001-2002 Committee Reports

Academic Planning Committee (Todd McNerney, Chair)

The Academic Planning Committee (APC), after much discussion and research, presented to the Senate a recommendation for the School of the Arts Proposal regarding General Education definitions presented to the Senate for consideration by Dean Morris. The following rationale was delivered to the Senate, and the proposal was subsequently passed by the Senate at its November meeting:

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. 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 Communication 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.

In the spring semester, the primary business before the APC was studying and offering recommendations on two new Masters of Education programs. The programs were a M.Ed. in Languages and a M.Ed. in Middle Level Education. After discussion and meetings with Laura Hines and Hugh Haynsworth of the Graduate Office and Rick Rickerson from Languages, both programs were given recommendations of approval and subsequently passed by the Senate.

The final task of the APC was to hold a meeting to elect next year’s officers. The newly elected Chair is Alex Kasman. The newly elected secretary is Larry Krasnoff.

****

Budget Committee (Beverly Diamond, Chair)

The Budget Committee discussed three issues this academic year.

The Senate requested that the Committee consider the requirement instituted by the College administration in August 2001 requiring most travel plans to be made through a single travel agency. The Committee decided to request the collection of certain sorts of information from departments to determine whether the financial effects of this policy were positive or negative. The travel policy was rescinded in October, making the collection of this data unnecessary.
President Higdon and Andy Abrams met several times with either the Chair of the Budget Committee or the entire committee during the early spring to discuss the projected costs of the Fourth Century Initiative.

The Budget Committee discussed the reasonableness of the budgets of two proposed graduate degree programs, approving both with changes resulting from the discussion.

****

Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty-Administration Manual (Bob Mignone, Chair)

The By-Laws Committee dealt with one main issue this year: the recommendations on post-tenure reviews proposed by the Post-Tenure Review Committee. We forwarded to the Senate a lengthy list of item by item recommendations to accept or not accept the recommendations of the Post-Tenure Review Committee, including one by-laws change.

****

Committee on Nominations and Elections (Bob Mignone, Chair)

The Committee on Nominations and Elections developed and recommended a slate of candidates to serve on the Provost Search Committee requested by President Higdon through the Speaker of the Faculty. The Committee also conducted the subsequent election in the Senate that narrowed the slate down to the number requested by the President. The Committee also developed slates for and conducted elections for Speaker, Secretary, at-large senators, standing Senate committees, standing faculty committees and a ratification of a by-laws change relating to the duties of the PTR Committee.

****

Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs (Maureen Hays, Chair)

During The 2001-2002 academic year the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs discussed and approved 2 new graduate programs, 4 program changes, 2 new certificate programs, 21 new course proposals, and 6 course changes. In addition, the committee aided in drafting and approving several Graduate School policy changes.

Highlights of the year include the approval of two new graduate programs and two new certificate programs. A new Masters of Education in Languages was approved. This is a multi-track degree with concentrations in Spanish, French, Latin, and English for Speakers of Other Languages. This program responds to a state-wide need for well trained language teachers at all levels. The Master of Education in Middle Level Education prepares teachers to meet the unique developmental needs of young adolescents ages 10-14. This masters degree program requires specialization in two content areas.

The two certificate programs, English to Speakers of Other Languages Initial and Advanced, respond to the changing language needs of the Lowcountry. The number of non-English speaking students in South Carolina is steadily increasing. The
state now has the means to certify ESOL teachers.

The Committee approved several Graduate School policy changes. Currently, all graduate degree granting programs must require their students complete a minimum of 30 semester credit hours of graduate work to be awarded a masters degree. In light of the September 11th tragedy, the Graduate School now has an official “Military Duty-Leave of Absence Policy”.

Changes to programs were minor and new courses are too numerous to list in a short report. These are, however, documented in the Faculty Senate minutes.

Maureen Hays (Anthropology) was elected Chair of the 2002-2003 committee and Shawn Morrison (French) was elected Secretary.

****

Committee on the Library (Lisa Thomson Ross, Chair)

10/2/01 Meeting
Addlestone Library Update
- Over 5 million dollars have been raised.
- The archaeological survey is underway for laying the foundation; this has postponed the start date for construction.
- Construction will begin in October;
- The planned completion date is spring 2004.

Statistical Profile of the Library
- Dean Cohen distributed photocopied documents concerning the library’s statistical assessments, including total circulations, books circulated, library materials budget, reference questions, total catalogued book volumes, College of Charleston Libraries compared to the Association of College and Research Libraries Standards, and Comprehensive Library Statistics 1999-2000. In addition, we received these 1999-2000 data from the South Carolina Academic Libraries: Student/librarian Ratios, Book Volumes per Student, Materials/Total Expenditures.

Overview of Additional Databases the Library is Considering
- Dean Cohen and Robert Neville provided detailed information regarding the current status of and financial expenditures for electronic databases. We currently have 9000 electronic titles (at a cost of $200,000 per year), compared to 3000 print titles (at a cost of $400,000 per year).
- Electronic resources are priced like print journals, therefore they are an annual recurring cost.
- Decisions are made each November regarding which ones to keep/obtain, and subscriptions begin each January.
- Susan Balinsky and Lucy Moreira expressed concern about budget issues and the impact of possible budget cuts on new resource procurement.
- Michael Finefrock, Lisa Thomson Ross, and Dean Cohen considered ways to keep faculty active in the process of procuring new databases.
- A decision was made that our present process is adequate but that we need to remind faculty to give
input regarding their preferences each year.

• Lucy Moreira inquired as to how aware faculty members are of electronic holdings; Dean Cohen replied we have extensive Research Guides that list current databases. Dean Cohen also suggested the possibility of a class or workshop to inform faculty of our holdings and of approaching various departments directly to present this information.

Overview of Collection Development Policy
• Dean Cohen distributed the Collection Development Policy Revision, which details how books, journals and databases are selected.

11/27/01 Meeting
Addlestone Library Update
• Dean Cohen reported that test pilings were being driven at the construction site.
• Dean Cohen conveyed President Higdon’s landscaping ideas.
• Drawings of the final library site were displayed and discussed, including the issues of lost parking spaces and the uses for the open areas near the library.

Collection Development Calendar
• Dean Cohen distributed and explained calendars for monograph and serial ordering for the 2001-2002 year.

Collection Development Policy
• Dean Cohen distributed and explained a comprehensive, revised Collection Development Policy.
• This policy includes: collection evaluation and analysis, simplifications, non-print media for circulation, electronic databases, the deselection process, and the deselection committee.

New Databases
• Dean Cohen distributed and explained a listing of new databases that will become available in January, 2002.

Addlestone Library Visit
• Members walked to the construction site for an official Faculty Committee on the Library photograph.

4/4/02 Meeting
Update on the Addlestone Library
• All fund raising goals ($6 million) have been met by the January 30th deadline.
• The landscaping plan has been okayed.
• The building is on schedule.
• Decisions are being made concerning furniture and moving.

Databases Update
• We received a handout of new databases for the library.

Budget Update
• We reviewed at length and approved the new budget for the 2002-2003 year, which is pending legislative approval in July.

****

Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics (Marie Fitzwilliam, Chair)

This year was a busy one for the Student Affairs and Athletics Committee. We were
asked to formulate a policy for bulletin boards on campus. In keeping with the spirit of the College of Charleston as a center of free expression and intellectual exploration, our primary goal was to focus on regulating placement, rather than the content, of campus advertising. A secondary goal of our policy centered on preserving the attractiveness of our historic campus by minimizing property damage and unsightly postings. After several meetings with the Dean of Students (now Senior Vice-President of Student Affairs), research of bulletin board policies at comparable colleges in the southeast, and communication with representatives from SGA, we formulated a draft and brought it before the Senate. Acting upon suggestions from Senate representatives that the policy was too restrictive, we went back to the drawing board and produced a shorter, more flexible draft. By the end of the spring 2002 semester, we had conferred with the Senior Vice President of Student Affairs, the Deputy Director of Maintenance at Physical Plant, and a SGA senator who gave verbal agreement that the amended draft was acceptable to their organizations. At this point, the committee is ready to submit the revised policy to the Senate early in the fall semester.

Other duties of this committee included selecting candidates for Who’s Who on the strength of academics, leadership, and service, and choosing a graduating senior with an outstanding record of service to the College and its students for the Alexander Chambliss Connelley Award. The chair of the Student Affairs and Athletics Committee also participated on the selection committee of the Bishop Robert Smith and the Charlie Post Memorial awards.

Elections were held for the upcoming academic year, and the chair for the 2002-2003 committee is Mary Rivers, and the secretary is Jeff Yost.

****

Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid (Gary Asleson, Chair)

The Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid met twice in the summer and 15 times during the academic year on an “every-other-week” schedule. The business of the committee was devoted almost exclusively to matters of academic standards and student petitions dealing with Academic Standard’s issues.

Student petitions were primarily of two types. The most common petition requested permission to take more than seven of the last 37 hours away from the College. The next most common petition requested late withdrawal from courses in a previous semester. The committee approved 40 petitions and denied 18 petitions.

The committee worked with Bobbie Lindstrom to clarify grievance procedures for students with disability-related grievances.

The committee submitted three proposals to the Faculty Senate which were passed by the Senate. The first was a catalog statement clarifying the sequential nature of the 101-102 foreign language courses. The second was an increase in the residency requirement for a major from 12 to 15 hours. The third was the new grading scale (A, A-, B+, etc.) to be implemented in August 2006.

****
Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review (GlennLesses, Chair)

The 2001-2002 Tenure and Promotion Committee reviewed and made recommendations to President Higdon about the following cases:

- Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (17)
- Tenure (1)
- Promotion to Librarian III (1)
- Promotion to Professor (7)
- Promotion to Senior Instructor (7)
- Retention as Senior Instructor (1)

The Committee considered about 42% more cases than in 1999-2000 and about 88% more cases than in 2000-2001.

Curriculum Committee (Doug Friedman, Chair)

If I were to list all the accomplishments of the Committee this year this report would be in excess of 200 pages. The minutes of the Senate reflect the bulk of the work of the committee this year and should be sufficient. The Committee worked very efficiently on this massive work-load and many thanks go to the diligence of the members in preparing well for our monthly meetings and to the departments and programs who cooperated and provided all the information the Committee needed to perform its duties.

In this report, I will focus on the less routine activities of the Committee this year and what continuing commitments it has made for itself. One of the chief projects the Committee has worked on over the last three years has been devising a set of guidelines for interdisciplinary minors (and majors). The proliferation of these programs over the last 4 or 5 years and the – let me say “incompleteness” of many of the proposals – led to first the suggestion and this year the effort to set some standards for new proposals and existing programs. This was accomplished this year in the proposal – one that included input from director/coordinators of these programs – that passed the Senate in the spring. In addition, the Committee suggested and the Senate proposed and approved a provision for providing release time and/or a stipend for directors/coordinators of interdisciplinary minors.

Another initiative of the Committee was to do something about the difficulty in monitoring special topics courses. The process devised by the Committee and Senate in the past simply did not work. Over 90% of special topics courses never received Committee/Senate review and therefore it was impossible to determine if a course violated the Senate’s 3 time rule. Working together, the Committee, Senate and Speaker have hopefully devised a better procedure where the registrar monitors these courses and reports to the Speaker. The Committee will be involved in the coming year (and continuing) identifying special topics courses for the registrar to monitor.

Last, after it was discovered that there were serious discrepancies between the SIS and catalog versions of the curriculum, the Committee, Speaker and registrar have devised an ongoing plan to resolve the differences using the existing catalog as the base. This project should provide the Committee with much to do in the coming year.
Faculty Advisory Committee to the President (Edward Hart, Chair)

The Faculty Advisory Committee to the President held eight meetings during the 2001/2002 school year. Edward Hart served as Chair and Marc Regnier was Secretary. Our Committee’s first order of business was to get to know President Higdon and his vision of our relationship. The Committee was very pleased to learn that the President truly valued the “advisory” role of our group. Unlike previous Advisory Committees, the President attended every meeting (with one exception).

Over the course of the year our Committee discussed many topics with the President, including deferred maintenance, future and current building projects, faculty research, the tenure system, commencement, and public relations. The President was particularly interested in our thoughts on a comprehensive campus calendar. He instructed us to conduct a special meeting to discuss the details and uses of such a calendar. A report including results of our discussion along with a list of recommendations was submitted to the President shortly after this meeting.

The final meeting of the year included the election of Jason Overby as Chair and Dorothy Marban as Secretary.

Our Committee appreciated the open and frank nature of our discussions with the President. Next year’s Committee should enjoy the same productive relationship.

****

Faculty Research and Development Committee (Annalisa Calini, Chair)

At the beginning of Fall 2001, the R&D Committee produced a revised evaluation form, to help improve the efficiency and thoroughness of the evaluation process.

During the academic year, the Committee met three times (one in Fall 2001 and two in Spring 2002) to evaluate three rounds of Faculty Research and Development grant proposals. There were 30 successful applications from a pool of 38 proposals. The total amount awarded was $65,200.80 (of which $53,586.00 was within the budget year 2001-2002).

During Fall 2001 the Committee met and established a procedure for evaluation of faculty sabbatical proposals, consisting of a two-tier ranking (excellent/good) of acceptable proposals, and a non-acceptable option, accompanied by a written evaluation. As is the case for faculty R&D proposals, the Committee decided to purely evaluate the Research and Professional Development components of each sabbatical application (and not, e.g., the pedagogical component).

In a subsequent meeting, the R&D Committee evaluated a total of 34 faculty sabbatical proposals and submitted its evaluations to Academic Affairs.

At the beginning of Spring 2002 the R&D Committee met and discussed two issues: 1) a raise of the maximum award for R&D grants over a 2-year period; 2) a revision of regulations concerning research involving human or vertebrate animal subjects. The Committee moved to recommend: 1) raising the maximum award to $3200; 2) requiring
applicants of grant proposals involving human or vertebrate animal subjects to secure IRB/IACUC approval before submission (approval is at any rate required before funds can be released).

During Spring 2002, the Committee met to establish a procedure for selecting the recipient of the Distinguished Research Award, based on guidelines received from Academic Affairs.

After reviewing the nominees' packets, the Committee met to discuss them, and selected Dr. Renling Jin (Mathematics) as the recipient of the 2002 Distinguished Research Award.

During the last meeting of the academic year, the Committee met with Provost Andy Abrams and secured approval for a new $3200 maximum award. Provost Abrams also announced an increase in the R&D budget of approximately 20% for the academic year 2002-2003.

During the same meeting, the Committee revised its previous recommendation about IRB/IACUC approval, due to concerns raised by the Office of Research and Grants. The Committee approved modifications of the wording in the current guidelines to encourage (instead of require) applicants whose research involves human or animal vertebrate subjects to secure IRB/IACUC approval by the time of the grant application. Those applicants will be required to include a statement describing the status of IRB/IACUC application with the R&D grant application.

****

Honors Program Committee (Amy Thompson McCandless, Chair)

The Honors Program Committee works with the Director of the Honors Program 1) to review student applications and select students for admission to the program; 2) to review faculty course proposals and select Honors Program courses; 3) to receive and act upon written requests from students, faculty, schools or departments for exceptions from Honors Program regulations and requirements, changes in the curriculum, and changes in Honors Program regulations and policies; 4) to review and make policy decisions concerning the Honors Program curriculum, admission and retention standards, course selection procedures, and faculty stipends; and 5) to review information from the Director concerning Honors Program admissions, retention, curriculum, etc.

The Honors Program Committee met every two weeks during the 2001-2002 academic year. The Committee regularly reviewed applications for admission to the program, reading student essays and teacher recommendations as well as examining SAT scores, high school courses, and class rank. Generally speaking, applicants to the Program tended to be self-selecting. Of the 307 students who applied this year, 258 - or slightly over 84 percent - were accepted into the Program. Of these 258, 192 have accepted our offer. The Committee reviewed the application itself during the spring semester and decided to keep the existing format for another year.

The Committee solicited and reviewed proposals for Honors courses for the coming academic year. Year-long classes approved include Honors English, Honors Colloquium in Western Civilization, Honors Biology,

One of the advantages of reviewing the syllabi for new and continuing courses is that it makes advising Honors students easier. Not only can advisors comment on the course content, but they can also provide information on the class structure and on the types of assignments.

The Committee discussed an appeal to President Higdon from an Honors student requesting a change in the Honors Program calculus requirement. The Committee felt that nothing else could replace the breadth and depth of calculus in the curriculum, and the student members on the committee agreed that the existing requirement was beneficial. Professor Liz Jurisich of the Mathematics Department agreed to draft a letter explaining the importance of calculus for humanities as well as science majors.

The Committee also discussed ways for the Honors Program to build upon the intellectual foundations of the Convocation address. In addition to the selected book for all freshmen, Everything You Think You Know About Politics..., the Committee also looked at Spinning into Butter, a short play about racial perceptions, and The Nine Parts of Desire, a book about women in the Muslim world. Director John Newell will be mailing special honors readings to all freshmen and will arrange group discussions on the readings. The 2002-2003 Committee may want to become more involved in this freshman experience.

The Honors Program at the College celebrated its twenty-fifth year in existence this year with the largest graduating class in the history of the Program. Over 25 percent of these students received the Outstanding Student Award in their major department, over 40 percent of them graduated with Departmental Honors, and over half graduated summa cum laude or magna cum laude. An Honors Program student won the Low Country Phi Beta Kappa Award, the Phi Kappa Phi Outstanding Graduate Award, and the Phi Kappa Phi Essay Award. This was an exciting year for the Honors Program and for the Honors Program Committee.

****

Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness (William F. Danaher, Chair)

This report outlines the accomplishments of the 2001-2002 Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness. The faculty committee consisted of two subcommittees: the Majors subcommittee and the General Education subcommittee. Their accomplishments are listed below.

The General Education subcommittee continued consideration of issues surrounding evaluation of the general
education curriculum.

The Majors subcommittee continued the assessment of academic departments by:

1) conducting introductory and advanced Assessment and Planning Workshops in coordination with the Office of Assessment and Planning. We distributed and presented a revised version of the Guide to Assessment to attendees and sent guides to department heads unable to attend;

2) reviewing departmental reports from Communications, Economics & Finance, French, History, Management & Marketing, and Music;

3) reviewing departmental Preliminary Assessment Plans for Management & Marketing and Music.

I would like to thank the members of the committee Sean Chen, Pat Kelly, Kathy Johnson, Charles Kaiser, and Silvia Rodriquez for their participation. I would like to extend a special thanks to Marcie Desrocher (Majors Subcommittee Chair) and Sue Turner (General Education Subcommittee Chair) for taking on the extra responsibilities of coordinating and organizing.

The Office of Assessment and Planning was in its second year and proved invaluable in the assessment process. Pam Niesslein and Pam King worked with the faculty committee to archive old assessment materials, conduct workshops, and continue ongoing assessment of academic departments.

Post-Tenure Review Committee (Lou Burnett, Chair)

The members of the 2001-2002 Post Tenure Review committee consisted of Lou Burnett (committee chair), Tony LeClerc, Liz Martinez, Richard Nunan, and Dinesh Sarvate. Richard Nunan served on the committee in the Fall 2001 semester and then realized that being Chair of his department disqualified him from serving on the committee. I contacted Bob Mignone about a course of action and he recommended that Richard Nunan be replaced by Lee Irwin, who was a committee alternate from the same department as Richard. Thus, Lee Irwin served on this committee in the Spring 2002 semester.

The committee spent significant time throughout the year clarifying the PTR policy and generating recommendations for some major and minor changes in the policy that were ultimately considered by the Senate in its last meeting this year. These recommendations are already a matter of record.

The committee also recommended to Academic Affairs that faculty be notified of their upcoming Post Tenure Review in the spring prior to the fall due date for the packet to give the faculty member plenty of time to assemble a packet.

Ratings for 2001-2002

The committee received three requests for deferments and approved all three. Five deferments were granted automatically according to the policy for reasons of upcoming retirement or upcoming consideration for promotion.
A total of 18 Satisfactory ratings were requested and, according to policy, the PTR committee did not review these packets. A total of 9 Professors requested Superior ratings and the committee approved 8 of these and recommended one for a satisfactory rating.

****

**Educational Technology Committee (Jeff Wragg, Chair)**

The Faculty Committee on Educational Technology was created by the Senate in the spring of 2001. It is composed of seven faculty members and one student. Nonvoting, ex-officio members are the Provost and the Dean of Libraries.

A brief organization meeting (minus the student member who would not be appointed until the fall) was held on 8 May 2001. Jeff Wragg was elected Chair. Bob Nusbaum was elected Secretary.

Meetings held:

- 17 August 2001
- 4 September
- 18 September
- 27 October
- 6 November
- 20 November
- 7 February 2002
- 14 February
- 14 March
- 18 April

Actions or items of note:

1. A great deal of time was spent defining "educational technology" and the scope of our duties and vision. To these ends, an excellent resource for focusing was http://www.educause.edu. The Educause Consumer Guide to Evaluating Information Technology provided valuable questions and statistical comparisons with other institutions.

2. A student representative never attended our meetings, despite repeated contacts with the SGA and their appointed representatives to this committee.

3. We addressed concerns expressed by David Mann about smart classroom access. As a result of our deliberations, administrative contact information is being posted on each smart classroom, the SIS database has been updated, as has the web page (http://www.cofc.edu/technology/facilities/classrooms.html)

4. We discussed the use and potential standardization of hand held devices (i.e., Palm, Handspring, etc.). It was concluded that it was neither possible nor desirable to establish a framework for standardization.

5. We agreed that efficient use of computer technology on campus would require improved, if not seamless, interaction between Academic and Administrative Computing.

6. We were educated on the technology plan for the new library.

7. We administered the Ed Tech survey to the faculty. Web, e-mail, and written responses were received. The most noticeable result was that the committee is a very good microcosm of the respondents. Common themes evident in the results included the need for increased availability of smart classrooms, better and more training opportunities for faculty.

The Questions --
Q1) Do you have technology resources sufficient to meet your teaching objectives?

   Follow-up Q1) How could you improve your teaching with additional technology resources?

Q2) Do your students have technology resources sufficient to meet their learning objectives?

   Follow-up Q2) How could students improve their learning with additional technology resources?

Q3) Do you have access to technical support and education to facilitate your use of technology?

   Follow-up Q3) How can your access to technical support and your engagement in technical education be improved?

8. We established a plan for spending significant one-time money on Ed Tech. The request was that we formulate a priority plan for spending $2 million (non recurring) on educational technology in $1 million annual increments. Our recommendation was to use consultants in year 1 to develop a customized plan for our campus and in year 2 we would implement the plan.

9. It was recommended that departments should, at the beginning of each semester, include a briefing to their faculty on available educational technology.

10. We recommended to the Provost that annual budgeting for faculty and academic staff office computers should allow replacement on a four-year cycle.

11. We discussed the draft documents on Student Computer Literacy: Deans' White Paper and its companion Basic Computer Literacy. Our comments on this important effort were forwarded to the Provost via David Cohen. Comments included separating literacy goals into those expected of entering freshmen and exiting graduates. We need to establish mechanisms for evaluation and remediation for entering students, as well as clearly defining the general and discipline specific literacy of graduates.

   ****