MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 2002 MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fourth regular meeting of the 2002-2003 Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, December 3rd, in ECTR 116. Fifty-two Senators attended.

Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order, and thanked Trish Ward (English) for taking notes in the absence of the Faculty Secretary. He also thanked the College Bookstore for providing Senators with cookies. The minutes of the November meeting were approved with no discussion.

Reports

Provost Search Committee
Jim Deavor, chair of the Provost Search Committee, reported that the search has been extended. The College made an offer to two finalists, both of whom declined. Mr. Deavor said that the Committee will retain its search consultant, and that it hopes to bring in candidates before Spring Break and appoint a new provost to begin duties in Fall 2003. Mr. Deavor thanked the faculty for attending forums during the search, and invited us to forward the names of potential candidates to the Committee. Some Senators suggested running a new ad. Jim Carew (Geology) asked why the candidates didn’t accept. Mr. Deavor said these candidates had decided they did not wish to accept after they learned more about the College and challenges it is facing. Bev Diamond (Mathematics), who is also on the Committee, said the two candidates offered the job were very different and had different reasons for declining.

College Bookstore
Becky Currin encouraged faculty who needed to have coursepacks printed to use XanEdu course packs, arranged through the bookstore. Ms. Currin gave a Power Point presentation which stressed that XanEdu takes charge of all copyright permissions and is liable for any legal infractions. She also reminded faculty that the bookstore contributes to the College’s financial aid pool. She provided Senators with brochures about XanEdu and noted that she would be happy to meet with departments to discuss specific needs.

The Speaker
Mr. Wilder invited Senators to admire the quality of our new projector, and also encouraged faculty to participate in December graduation, December 15 at 2:30 in North Charleston Coliseum. He noted that faculty should RSVP to Lynn Cherry by noon on Friday the 13th. Faculty should arrive by 1:30 to assemble at 2:00. The December Commencement speaker is novelist Padgett Powell (C of C class of 1974).

New Business

Committee on Tenure and Promotion
Glenn Lesses (Philosophy), chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion, reported that his Committee recommends a change to the Faculty-Administration Manual:
The Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review moves that the Faculty Senate recommend the following changes to the Faculty/Administration Manual.

In the current edition of the Faculty/Administration Manual, delete the following sentence in section IV. J. 2. b. (2):
Both internal and external colleague statements on research and professional activities.

Insert in its place:
(2) Internal colleague statements on research and professional activities.

and

(3) For candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and for promotion to Professor, confidential letters of evaluation on research and professional development from appropriate professionals outside of the College of Charleston.

and renumber current items (3) and (4) as (4) and (5).

In the current edition of the Faculty/Administration Manual, renumber items in section IV. M. 6. c. through 6. h. to 6. d. to 6. i. and insert a new 6. c. to read:

For candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and for promotion to Professor, confidential letters of evaluation on research and professional development from appropriate professionals outside of the College of Charleston. By Sept. 1, candidates should submit the names of at least three professionals from outside the College. Evaluation panel chairs in consultation with departmental panel members should present additional names of external reviewers in order to obtain no fewer than two and no more than five independent reviews of the quality of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements. No more than half of the reviews should be secured from the candidate's own list. The candidate is allowed to strike one name from the panel chair's list. The external reviewers chosen should be appropriately qualified to conduct an independent review of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements.

After the external reviewers have been determined, a cover letter from the panel chair should accompany the review materials sent to them, stating that the College seeks a review of the quality of a candidate's research and professional development and not merely a testimonial to the candidate's accomplishments. A copy of the candidate's academic curriculum vitae and copies of the relevant scholarly and/or creative works agreed upon by the candidate and evaluation panel chair should be sent to each of the outside reviewers. Copies of the relevant portions of the Faculty/Administration Manual about research and professional development (currently, IV. J. Introduction, IV. J. 2., and IV. J. 4.) as well any additional departmental criteria on file in the Office of the Provost should be included. Additional supporting review materials may also be submitted by the panel chair or the candidate, provided that these materials are included in the packet.

Reviewers should be asked to identify what relationship, if any, they have with the candidate and to return their review in a timely manner for the deliberations of the
departmental panel. To make it possible that reviews are available prior to those deliberations, external reviews must be solicited sufficiently in advance of panel deliberations.

The panel chair must include in the candidate's packet: (1) a description of the process by which the outside letters were obtained, (2) each reviewer's institutional and departmental affiliation, and rank or other institutional title, a description of the academic specialization of the reviewer, and other relevant information about the reviewer, which may be useful to those unfamiliar with the field, (3) a copy of the letter of solicitation by the panel chair, and (4) the confidential outside reviews.

Rationale:

Professionals from outside the College working in the same field of expertise as the candidate can offer valuable information in helping determine whether candidates meet the qualitative standards in research and professional development for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Professor. Accordingly, external review of scholarship and research will benefit the evaluation process. Moreover, independent review of scholarship and creative achievement is the mainstream practice among strong liberal arts and sciences colleges and universities.

-------------

Mr. Lesses reminded the Senate that this motion was narrowly approved by the Faculty Senate in 1999, but the Provost decided not to implement it. The Senate cannot change the Faculty-Administration manual, but can recommend that the Administration do so. Mr. Lesses reported that his Committee believes this change will “enhance” the process of tenure and promotion. He also said that President Higdon is familiar with the debate and understands that “mainstream” liberal arts and sciences universities use this practice of external review.

A lengthy discussion ensued. Terry Bowers (English) noted that his department is vehemently opposed to the proposal. Mr. Bowers reported that the English department believes, first, that the proposal is a needless duplication, since publications are already refereed. Asking others to review articles that have already been published seems to add a needless, burdensome layer to the process. The department can evaluate the quality of these published articles on its own, and a candidate may always choose to include outside letters in a packet. He also wondered whether this practice is really “mainstream” or widely used. Mr. Lesses responded that many institutions that we wish to be like—Miami, William and Mary, Mount Holyoke--solicit external reviews. Many C of C faculty are external reviewers for other institutions, he said.

Larry Carlson (English) asked whether we as an institution really wished to elevate research via these new criteria. Mr. Lesses said that President Higdon was in favor of the criteria, and that the criteria were not being changed; only the evidence of whether the criteria were satisfied was changing. Mr. Carlson pointed out that some departments still have 12-hour loads across the board. Do the schools we wish to emulate have such a
teaching load, he wondered. This point was raised as well by Tim Carens (English), who said that all faculty needed sufficient time to do this level of research, and that he believed we should find out the teaching load at institutions who have this requirement in place. Mr. Carens also said he thought departments were capable of evaluating the quality of their colleagues’ research. To this point, Jim Carew (Geology) said, “Departments lie.” He said that when he was on the T&P committee in the past, the committee had to make an independent assessment of a candidate rather than believing the department; therefore, they needed outside evidence.

Richard Nunan (Philosophy) noted that the T&P committee, in its annual letter to candidates, has continued to urge them to get external evaluations. Mr. Nunan thinks that if the motion isn’t approved, this advice should be removed from the T&P letter. He also suggested that the current language needs to be rephrased to spell out the process used in cases when external reviews are requested. He also said he thought mandating external review was a mistake. We are not a research institution. The practice may be used for institutions that require cutting-edge research, but the T&P Committee isn’t going to be able to determine if scholarship is cutting-edge, he said. However, in departments where it is hard to evaluate a colleague’s work (a split-discipline department or someone with a specialized subfield), external evaluation may be useful; therefore, it’s a good idea to have a standardized procedure without mandating. Regarding the amount of work these reviews require, Mr. Nunan said it was “a modest burden” to the department, but it is difficult to solicit these external evaluations because some people do turn down the request. Fulfilling the request, he said, was a big burden for the reviewers, and the results may not be worth the trouble. Mr. Lesses called such concerns “paternalistic” and noted that reviewers take on the task voluntarily. He added that the annual letter to candidates says that reviews are not required, but that they are extremely helpful.

Rich Bodek (History) said there were 2 separate issues here. He was in favor of requiring external letters because that is already the practice in History, and this regularizes that practice. He also noted, though, that many of his colleagues in other departments want to know where the release time is for them to get their research done. Bob Mignone (Mathematics) spoke in favor of the proposal. He noted that in the Faculty Senate in 1999, 60% of vote was in favor of it. A motion to rescind the motion failed. The Math department has used external reviews for a long time, he said, and they find it provides critical and useful information. Herb Silverman (Mathematics) said that the College now mandates extradepartmental colleague letters on service, and they don’t make much difference. Letters on research do make a difference, he said, especially if a candidate is questionable.

Liz Martinez (Hispanic Studies) said that, like Terry Bowers, she believes the proposed process is repetitive, because publications are already refereed. External evaluation questions that process, she said. Mr. Lesses said that the proposed letter is a different kind of evaluation. It explains how the work contributes to the field, so the letter benefits the candidate. The external review says why the scholarship is significant. Frank Kinard (Chemistry) said he would be concerned if a faculty member “can’t find three colleagues who would write a nice letter” about him or her.
Darryl Phillips (Classics) said he thought it was admirable for the College to bring more of its practices in line with strong liberal arts and sciences universities, but we don’t fit that model when many of us teach 4 courses and 3 preps. Let’s begin by revising the teaching standards first, Mr. Phillips suggested. Mr. Lesses said that some external reviewers have teaching loads as heavy as or heavier than ours. Mr. Phillips said that if we want to be like “mainstream” nationally recognized institutions, let’s begin with our teaching load. Miami’s is 3-3 and William and Mary’s is 2-3, he noted.

Meta Lee Van Sickle (EDFS) said she did not think external reviews were usually very helpful, since often they are written by people who know the candidate. She also said she would like to see a study of the impact of external evaluations on decisions. Tom Kunkle (Mathematics) said that some faculty were concerned that we would have to do research comparable to that done at research universities, but that reviewers of C of C faculty understand our situation. Bev Diamond (Mathematics), speaking as a member of this year’s T&P committee, noted that the proposal says the candidate only suggests some of the names of external reviewers, not all of them, and that departments can solicit letters from scholars who are not friends with the candidate. Mr. Lesses noted that at Miami, the dean and the chair alone choose the external reviewers, so the proposed C of C process is “friendlier.”

Sheila Seaman noted that when she wrote an external review, she found it instructive, but also an enormous burden. Andrew Sobiesuo (Hispanic Studies) asked how many departments already required outside letters. He said he believed the requirement constituted a major change, and that Senators should discuss this matter with their departments before voting. Mr. Lesses repeated that the change is a change of procedure and not a change of criteria. Alex Kasman said that if some people believed external review was useful, then that outweighed objections of those who thought it wasn’t useful, and that he supported it.

Trisha Folds-Bennett (Psychology) said she thought it would be useful, and that if we aspire to be nationally pre-eminent, then maybe we should use external letters. But, she said, this practice will change the criteria. It will place more pressure on faculty seeking tenure and promotion. She also noted that the departments who are most opposed to the proposal are the ones with the highest teaching loads. Faculty in Psychology routinely teach 120-160 students per semester, she said. The pressure of facing external review of one’s work after it has been published will affect the way faculty spend their time, encouraging them to spend less time in working with students or attending meetings. External review will cause a shift in the way faculty view the T&P process and will thereby ratchet up the requirements, said Ms. Folds-Bennett. Mr. Lesses said the proposal involves no change in requirements.

Mary Beth Heston (Art History) said she was uncomfortable voting on the matter at tonight’s meeting. She said she was not opposed herself, but she wanted to have a chance to converse with colleagues before the Senate makes a decision on it. Peter McCandless (History) agreed, and said that we should not pass the proposal unless it were contingent
upon an equal teaching load across campus. Terry Bowers said he would like to have more information on peer institutions who use external review.

Jim Carew asked Senators to put themselves in the position of the T&P committee member who has no idea of the quality of a candidate’s work, and may even think it is not very good. Marion Doig agreed, saying that when he served on T&P, he never recalled the letters being anything but good for the candidate. John Huddleston (Religious Studies) then asked, if people never write anything negative in T&P letters, why do we even have them? Mr. Lesses said that some letters are less than positive, and that most reviewers used sound professional judgment.

Diane Johnson (Art History) said she wished to discuss the matter with her colleagues, and moved to postpone the vote until the February 11 Senate meeting. The motion carried, by a voice vote.

**Graduate Committee:**
The following motions were presented by Maureen Hayes. Each passed on voice vote.

**TWO NEW PROPOSED GRADUATE POLICIES**

1. **GPA Policy**
   Degree-seeking graduate students in the Graduate School of the College of Charleston are required to maintain a 3.0 Grade Point Average (GPA) in their graduate coursework. In addition some students may have specified GPA’s for undergraduate coursework required by their graduate programs.
   The GPA is calculated on the basis of all graduate coursework identified in a student’s Program-of-Study (POS), as well as any additional coursework which is acceptable to the degree program.
   College of Charleston coursework taken prior to acceptance into degree-seeking status, will not be used in the calculation of the student’s GPA unless accepted as part of the student’s POS. Such coursework must be identified at the time the student is accepted into the program.
   Decisions concerning an academic action such as probation, academic dismissal and graduation will be based on the courses and GPA as described above.

   **Justification:** The present student information database at the College of Charleston (SIS-Plus) provides a running GPA of a student’s work from the first course onward. In many cases, students have changed majors or have taken courses in the distant past none of which would count toward graduation in their present program. This policy would clearly inform students of the basis for the evaluation of their body of work toward graduation and would aid the Graduate Office in defining the coursework on which to base any academic action such as probation or dismissal.

2. **Newly Accepted Graduate Student Enrollment Policy**
   If an applicant has been accepted for a specific term and does not enroll for that term, the applicant’s matriculation will be ended and he/she will be obligated to reapply to the program. Applicants wishing to defer initial enrollment must receive the graduate
program director’s written approval stipulating a new start date, before the first day of class of the term in which they were originally accepted.

**Justification:** This policy will enable programs to have a clear understanding of who will be attending from each new cohort, thus enabling them to plan more efficiently for faculty advising, future teaching loads and course offerings.

**THREE PROPOSED PROGRAM CHANGES**
1. Elimination of Master of Environmental Studies (MES) graduate program tracks
2. Adding 6 - 10 hours of observation to EDFS 710 - Introduction to Exceptional Children and Youth
3. Changing the name of EDFS 797 from Student Teaching in Special Education to Clinical Practice in Special Education

**FOUR NEW GRADUATE COURSE PROPOSALS**
1. EDFS 651 - Orientation to the Profession of Special Education
2. EDFS 705 - Evaluation of Developmental Field-Based Experience
3. EDFS 714 - Introduction to Curriculum and Instruction in Special Education
4. EDFS 724 - Reading and Language Arts Instruction for Students with Disabilities

**Curriculum Committee**
Norris Preyer presented the following items for approval. All were approved.

1. F02-33 RELS 210 Theories in the Study of Religions - New Course Proposal
2. F02-34 BA in Religious Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
3. F02-35 RELS 405 Advanced Studies in Religion – Proposal to Change a Course
4. F02-36 RELS 450 Theories and Methods in the Study of Religion – Proposal to Change a Course
5. F02-37 RELS 499 Bachelor’s Essay – Proposal to Change a Course
6. F02-41 CLAS 399 Tutorial – New Course Proposal
7. F02-42 CLAS 499 Bachelor’s Essay – New Course Proposal
8. F02-43 GRMN 220 Special Assignment Abroad – Proposal to Delete a Course
9. F02-44 GRMN 324 German Civilization and Culture – Proposal to Delete a Course
10. F02-45 GRMN 370 Studies in German Film and Literature – Proposal to Delete a Course
11. F02-46 GRMN 463 Nineteenth Century Literature – Proposal to Delete a Course
12. F02-47 GRMN 464 Literature From 1900-1945 – Proposal to Delete a Course
13. F02-48 GRMN 465 Literature Since 1945 – Proposal to Delete a Course
14. F02-49 GRMN 466 Age of Goethe – Proposal to Delete a Course
15. F02-50 GRMN 470 The Novelle – Proposal to Delete a Course
16. F02-51 LTGR 350 Literature in Translation: A Foreign Author – Proposal to Delete a Course
17. F02-52 LTGR 370 Studies in German Film and Literature – Proposal to Delete a Course
18. F02-53 GRMN 313 German Conversation and Composition – Proposal to Change a Course
19. F02-54 LTGR 250 Literature in Translation: A Foreign Literature – Proposal to Change a Course
20. F02-55 BA with a Major in German – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
21. F02-56 BA with a Minor in German – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
22. F02-57 BA with a Minor in German Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
23. F02-58 GRMN 320 Special Assignment Abroad – New Course Proposal
24. F02-59 GRMN 315 Advanced German Reading – New Course Proposal
25. F02-60 GRMN 326 German Media – New Course Proposal
26. F02-61 GRMN 413 Advanced German Conversation – New Course Proposal
27. F02-62 GRMN 424 German Civilization and Culture – New Course Proposal
28. F02-63 GRMN 460 German Literary Heritage – New Course Proposal
29. F02-64 GRMN 468 Studies in Modern German Literature – New Course Proposal
30. F02-65 GRMN 472 Studies in German Cinema – New Course Proposal
31. F02-66 LTGR 270 Studies in German Film – New Course Proposal
32. F02-67 Minor in Italian Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
33. F02-68 RUSS 101C, 102C (Elementary Russian Conversation) – New Course Proposal
34. F02-69 RUSS 201C, 202C (Intermediate Russian Conversation) – New Course Proposal
35. F02-70 RUSS 313C, 314C (Advanced Russian Conversation) – New Course Proposal
36. F02-71 ARTH 190 Selected Topics in Art History – New Course Proposal

Constituents’ Concerns
Frank Kinard noted the 30th anniversary of Jack’s Café, and displayed pictures of Jack being presented with a College of Charleston chair, thanks to Professor Earl Rickerson.

Adjournment
With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary