The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, March 16, at 5:00 p.m. in ECTR 116. Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order and received approval of the February minutes.

Reports

SC Council of Chairs
Before giving his own report, the speaker recognized Bob Mignone (Mathematics), who serves as our representative on the South Carolina Council of Chairs. Mr. Mignone reported to the Senate that he attended a retreat held by the Council of Chairs to discuss recommended changes in South Carolina’s higher education system. Present were board members of the state’s Commission on Higher Education (CHE), SC college presidents, and SC Council of Chairs members. There was much discussion about whether CHE will continue to be the ruling body for higher education in SC, or whether, as was suggested in a recent report from Columbia, some other ruling body will be created to take its place. Mr. Mignone also said that he has learned that some state officials are planning to replace “Performance Funding” [an elaborate scheme for determining how schools qualify for state monies] with smaller accountability measures. The state’s higher ed institutions are working with CHE on these proposed measures. Mr. Mignone has asked Conrad Festa (formerly our Provost, now head of CHE) that the SC Council of Chairs be allowed send representatives to these conversations.

The Speaker
Mr. Wilder reminded Senators of the Forums being held on the College’s Statement of Core Values. He had attended the first one yesterday, and reported that the discussions were “very worthwhile and substantive,” so he urged Senators to attend the one being held later this week. Next, he alerted faculty to the existence of a State of SC employee database. Updated annually, most recently on March 10th, this database contains information on salaries of state employees. In years past, the Welfare committee has made this available to the faculty by placing a copy on reserve in the library. Now, however, the State newspaper is maintaining this database on its website [http://thestateonline.screads.com/salaries/index.php with our institution identified as “University of Charleston.”] Finally, the Speaker noted that there would be only one more meeting of the Faculty Senate this year. The last scheduled meeting is April 13th, agenda deadline April 1st. If we don’t get through the agenda by the 13th, we’ll continue the meeting on the 20th.

Old Business

By-Laws Committee
The By-Laws Committee presented a motion “to revise the Faculty Organization and By-Laws to Create a new standing College Committee on Faculty Compensation.” Mr. Wilder reminded Senators that this motion had been introduced at the February Senate meeting, and that the Senate had approved the idea of removing duties relating to faculty
salaries from Welfare and creating a new standing committee for these duties. As a matter of course, this was sent to the Bylaws Committee. Ultimately, in order to change our by-laws, a proposal needs a 2/3 vote by Senate, and after that it would go to all faculty as a mail ballot. Bishop Hunt (At-large), representing the committee, reported that they have endorsed this proposal. They gave consideration to a request, made during the Senate discussion in February, to include a separate reference to Librarians’ status, but decided not to do that. The other concern expressed in February had to do with the duties of Welfare, Mr. Hunt said. The committee’s amendments follow:

The By-Laws Committee recommends that the motion proposed by Senator Bev Diamond on behalf of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation on February 10, 2004 be approved with certain minor adjustments in wording, as indicated below:

**Motion to Revise the Faculty Organization and By-Laws to Create a New Standing College Committee on Faculty Compensation**

I. REVISE the Faculty-Administration Manual, Section III, V, 3, B, 3 (Faculty Welfare Committee):

1. Strike section 3.b.5 (“compensation [both direct and indirect]”) and renumber accordingly;
2. Revise section 3.b concluding paragraph to read:

The Committee shall also report to the Senate annually regarding current and pending legislation, regulations and programs concerning fringe benefits. The committee shall gather statistics and report benefits for other state and peer institutions.

[replace this paragraph with: The Committee shall also report to the Senate annually on current and pending legislation, regulations, and programs related to faculty welfare, including fringe benefits. The committee shall gather statistics and report to the faculty annually regarding such benefits at other state institutions and peer institutions.]

II. ADD to the Faculty-Administration Manual, Section III, V, 17:

17. Faculty Compensation Committee

a. Composition

Seven faculty members.

b. Duties

(1) To review and recommend changes as needed to College Policies concerning faculty compensation (both direct and indirect);

[eliminate: (both direct and indirect) ]

(2) To review and recommend changes as needed to College policies concerning adjunct faculty compensation (both direct and indirect);

[eliminate: (both direct and indirect) ]

(3) To conduct or recommend faculty salary and/or compensation studies and report the results to the faculty; these studies may be internal and/or external; they may address such issues as internal equity,
appropriate entry-level salaries, salary compression, and comparisons with peer institutions;

(4) To recommend measures taken in response to findings of any faculty salary and/or compensation studies;

(5) To advise the administration concerning the development and implementation of any special compensation enhancement program (programs which go beyond any regular annual salary increases);

(6) To monitor the effects of any special compensation enhancement programs, recommend modifications as necessary in the implementation of long-term programs, and report to the faculty the results of such programs;

(7) To review and recommend adjustments as needed to College policies concerning salary [substitute “increases” for “bonuses”] for the awarding of tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review ratings of "superior."

Rationale

[add a sentence to the Rationale:]

The two-part motion creates a new standing college committee on Faculty Compensation, shifting responsibilities concerning compensation from the Faculty Welfare Committee. This recommendation is made in the report of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation. The change is warranted by the importance and complexity of faculty compensation issues, as well as by the heavy current workload of the Welfare Committee. (It is understood, however, that “fringe benefits,” which are mandated at the state level, will generally remain within the purview of the Welfare Committee.) We believe it makes sense to create a new standing faculty committee dedicated to faculty compensation matters.

After a brief discussion of exactly who would be responsible for what (Welfare will continue to have oversight over faculty benefits and any other matters relating to faculty welfare that it chooses to study; this committee will be solely responsible for keeping up with salary), the motion carried unanimously.

Committee on Graduate Education

Sarah Owens presented three new course proposals from the Committee on Graduate Education (LATN 620, LATN 621, LATN 624). All were approved, as was a proposal to change the MA in History program by adding a concentration in African American studies.

Report from Daniel Dukes

At this point in the meeting, the Speaker recognized Daniel Dukes, Senior Vice-President for Government Affairs, who had just arrived. Pressing business in Columbia had twice prevented Mr. Dukes from appearing at previous Senate meetings; Mr. Wilder thanked him for coming tonight. With the General Assembly session partially completed, Mr. Dukes told the Senate about some of the legislative matters that he was monitoring on the College’s behalf. “As you know, state revenues in the past few years have been declining, Mr. Dukes reported. This year’s revenue is 800 million dollars less than last year’s, he said. The General Assembly was still 350 million short in its most recent
session, and as a result, C of C appropriations were cut by 2.3% in a recent House bill—about $600,000. Almost all State agencies have suffered deeper cuts than our institution has, Mr. Dukes added. On the positive side, the Lowcountry Graduate Center was fully funded, as were requests for technology funding to be taken from lottery profits—we’ll get about 1.3 million for our institution for this purpose, which is an increase from last year. Mr. Dukes added that our requests for scholarships were fully funded, and additional money was put into needs-based scholarships. All FTE-funded lines were approved, as was a 2% pay raise for classified employees, and an average raise of 2% for unclassified employees.

Mr. Dukes noted that the S.C. Senate would begin its business in two weeks, and they could change some of the things the House has done; he said the House’s version of the budget was one President Higdon would be happy with. Regarding facilities funding, Mr. Dukes reported that the new Science Center had received more money from both the federal government (9.4 million) and the state (4 million), but that we still need more. The estimated cost for a new science center is 45 million, and Mr. Dukes said he hoped to get more federal funding for the facility next year. The Life Sciences Bill would also help the college since it would send us money for deferred maintenance. In addition, Mr. Dukes reported that colleges and universities were still seeking to relax some of the regulations currently in place, but that no agreement had been worked out yet. In response to a question from Frank Morris, Mr. Dukes reported that the TERI retirement plan was still in place. He added, “If there is an attempt to remove the TERI plan I will email the campus immediately. If not, I’ll be crucified.” Joe Benich asked if Mr. Dukes knew if the TERI plan were revenue-neutral, and Mr. Dukes said he would try to find out the answer to that question. Mr. Wilder thanked Mr. Dukes for “doing good work for us” and for presenting this update.

Curriculum Committee
Norris Preyer presented a list of items for approval. The first three passed:
1. F03-25 POLS 350 Contemporary Liberalism – New Course Proposal
2. S04-01 POLS 104/GEOG 101 World Geography – Proposal to Change a Course
3. S04-02 MATH 103 Contemporary Mathematics with Applications – Proposal to Change a Course

The next group, from Mathematics, generated some discussion. Tom Kunkle (Mathematics) asked that an error in the course description for Item 6 be corrected, and Mr. Preyer accepted this as a friendly amendment. George Pothering (At-Large) asked about the stipulation that a student could not receive credit for both Math 120 (Calculus) and Hons 115 (Honors Calculus). “If a student takes both, which will count?” he asked. Mr. Kunkle explained that by default, the first one would count, but a student could ask the registrar to count the second one instead. These proposals were then approved, as well as changes to the Minor in Linguistics:
4. S04-03 MATH 105 Calculus for Business and the Social Sciences – Proposal to Change a Course
5. S04-04 MATH 120 Introductory Calculus – Proposal to Change a Course
6. S04-05 MATH 220 Calculus II – Proposal to Change a Course
7. S04-06 MATH 245 Numerical Methods and Mathematical Computing – Proposal to Change a Course
8. S04-07 MATH 311 Advanced Calculus I – Proposal to Change a Course
9. S04-08 MATH 411 Advanced Calculus II – Proposal to Change a Course
10. S04-09 HONS 115 Honors Calculus – Proposal to Change a Course
Mr. Preyer explained that item 16 had been removed at the request of Computer Science, since the department has now decided it does not wish to make this change after all. The other CSCI proposals passed, as did the change to SPAN 344.

13. S04-13 GEOG 119 Special Topics in Geography – New Course Proposal
14. S04-14 CSCI 221 Computer Programming II – Proposal to Change a Course
15. S04-15 CSCI 250 Introduction to Computer Organization and Assembly – Proposal to Change a Course
16. S04-16 CSCI 230 Data Structures and Algorithms – Proposal to Change a Course (Proposal withdrawn)
17. S04-17 CSCI 350 Digital Logic and Computer Organization – Proposal to Change a Course
18. F03-46 CSCI 110 Computing Concepts and Applications – Proposal to Change a Course
19. F03-49 SPAN 344 Advanced Grammar and Lexicon – Proposal to Change a Course

Faculty Welfare Committee
Lisa Thomson Ross (Psychology) presented two proposals on behalf of the committee. The first was designed to make the Faculty-Administration Manual (FAM) consistent with the College’s policy on FMLA (Family Medical Leave Act) for faculty, which states that faculty who have taken FMLA leave may request an extension on tenure decisions. Ms. Ross said that this proposal is meant to spell out this new policy in the manual. Mr. Wilder noted that the Senate and Faculty do not control the FAM, but that, if passed, our proposal would be sent to the By-Laws Committee for their input on the wording, then ultimately sent as a recommendation to the Provost and the President. Provost Elise Jorgens spoke in favor of this proposal, adding that she would like to require more notice if a faculty member plans to use the extension. Ms. Ross suggested that instead of a March 15th deadline, the manual could stipulate that this extension be requested within 6 months of the faculty member’s return from a leave. Chip Voorneveld (EDFS) asked whether this policy was inconsistent with the Americans With Disability Act (ADA). Joe Kelly (At-Large) moved that the proposal be amended. He believed a faculty member should have 12 months rather than 6 months to ask for an extension, since, he said, faculty members returning from leave could be so overwhelmed with their new parenting responsibilities that it might take more than 6 months for them to be able to assess whether their research program was still on schedule for tenure and promotion. The Provost suggested that since faculty members have more advance notice of becoming a parent than they do of other family medical emergencies, they could be expected to have a shorter window in which to ask for a “stop-the-clock” on the time remaining before going up for tenure. Bev Diamond (Mathematics) thought the committee might need to reconsider whether these different leave conditions ought to be treated separately. The question (on Joe Kelly’s amendment) was called, and it was passed.

Returning to the main motion, Frank Kinard (At-Large) said he thought these changes were too specific, and that the present FMLA policy already allows varying circumstances to be taken into account. Glen Lesses (Philosophy) suggested that the FAM should add a phrase to its description of the T & P schedule: “unless exceptions have been granted in accordance with the College’s FMLA policy.” He noted as well that the same language should be used throughout the manual, in descriptions of Senior Instructors and Librarians. Ms. Ross accepted both suggestions as friendly amendments.
Another senator asked if FMLA covered disabilities, to which some senators said yes and some no. Was a motion to remand in order now, Susan Kattwinkel asked. Yes, said Mr. Wilder. Various other possible scenarios were proposed by other senators, each of whom wondered if this amendment would cover them or exclude them unfairly. Paul Buhler (Computer Science) then asked if we couldn’t trust the Provost to deal with unusual scenarios (such as getting hit by a bus one week before your T& P packet was due) when they occur. “I’m coming to that position on this, too,” the Provost said. “Given funding for CARTA, that bus may not be a problem,” Frank Kinard said. Ms. Jorgens said, “I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this with the Welfare Committee.” A motion was made, then passed, to remand the proposal to Welfare. The amended, then remanded proposal follows, with amendments underlined:

The Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the Faculty Senate recommend the following changes to the Faculty/Administration Manual.

In the current edition of the Faculty/Administrative Manual, delete the following sentence in section IV. J. 5th paragraph:

A tenure decision is made only once, no later than the sixth year.

Insert in its place:

A tenure decision is made only once, in normal circumstances no later than the sixth year unless exceptions have been granted in accordance with the College’s FMLA and ADA policies. (see section IV. U. 7. for discussion of effect of leaves of absence on tenure schedule).

Delete the following sentence in section IV. K. 3rd paragraph:

A promotion decision is made only once normally in the sixth year.

Insert in its place:

A promotion decision is made only once, in normal circumstances no later than the sixth year unless exceptions have been granted in accordance with the College’s FMLA and ADA policies. (see section IV. U. 7. for discussion on effect of leaves of absence on promotion schedule).

Also insert the following as section IV. U. 7.:

7. Extension of Probationary Period.

An instructional faculty member who uses 120 days or more of paid or unpaid disability, family, infant, or newly-adopted child care leave during any consecutive two-year period shall be entitled, at his or her election, to extend the tenure/promotional probationary period by one year. An instructional faculty member who has used less than 120 days of paid or unpaid disability, family, infant or newly-adopted child care leave during any consecutive two-year period but who has, nonetheless, taken a significant amount of such leave prior to consideration for an award of tenure or promotion, or who has experienced circumstances which, at the faculty member’s election, could have resulted in a significant period of such leave may petition the Provost for an extension of the probationary period.

The decision to grant an extension of the probationary period under such circumstances shall be made at the sole discretion of the Provost, after consulting with the faculty member’s dean and department chair. The election to extend the probationary period by one year or the petition to the Provost to extend the probationary period by one year must be made no later than twelve months after the completion of the
leave and no later than March 15 of the contract year before which the tenure/promotional review normally would occur. If such election is made or if the petition is granted by the Provost, the faculty member thereby waives the provisions of the Faculty/Administration Manual requiring that a decision regarding the award of tenure be made within six years. No faculty member will be granted more than one such extension.

**Rationale:**

It is accepted practice amongst many institutions of higher learning to grant faculty in who have used a large amount of leave extensions of promotional/tenure decisions. The draft above is based heavily on the Faculty Handbook of The College of William and Mary. This also is in line with the College’s expressed FMLA policy, which states:

“Faculty members who take a substantial amount of leave for personal or family reasons may request to defer tenure and promotion decisions in consideration of the time they have been away.”

This statement seems to clearly support the extension of promotion and tenure decisions, however the current wording in the Faculty and Administration manual requires that the tenure decision be made no later than the 6th year. We recommend revising the manual to agree with the College’s FMLA policy.

Ms. Ross then presented the Welfare Committee’s second proposal, which she described as “a goodwill gesture,” to ask the College to create a Staff Welfare Committee that would monitor the same issues for staff that the Faculty Welfare covers for faculty. The proposal follows:

It is hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston enthusiastically supports the formation of a Staff Welfare Committee. The Faculty Senate recognizes that the welfare of the staff members of the College is not under its charge, and therefore this committee would not be a standing committee under the Faculty Senate. Its purpose would be to serve the staff members of the College in much the same manner as the Faculty Welfare Committee serves the Faculty. Concerns of this committee shall be all College policies that affect the welfare of the staff at large, such as:

20. employment and working conditions;
21. promotion policies;
22. work loads;
23. compensation;
24. leaves of absence;
25. fringe benefits, including: state retirement; health insurance, to include medical and dental benefits, life insurance; annuities, to include state and/or privately; sponsored programs; Social Security benefits; all other programs of a like nature.

The College of Charleston Faculty Senate strongly urges the President and the Director of Human Resources to take all necessary steps to form a Staff Welfare Committee.

Susan Kattwinkel asked who would be on this committee. Ms. Ross said they had not planned the composition, but that it would include the director of Human Resources and other staff. Peter McCandless (History) asked why Welfare had made this suggestion, and Ms. Ross said that staff members have contacted them and asked for it. Does the staff have a plan for how to create this committee, Jack Parson (Political Science) asked. Other senators asked about whether staff would be paid for time spent on this committee service, what the definition of “staff” was, and whether staff concerns should be handled by Human Resources. Annette Godow said this was simply a “friendly encouragement”
for HR to follow. The motion was then passed on a voice vote.

Constituents’ Concerns
Beatrice Frask (French) thanked faculty for their signatures to the tree-protecting petition at the February meeting, and asked the Senate for help on the matter of adjunct welfare. As an adjunct, Ms. Frask said she had heard many concerns and resentments expressed by other adjuncts who are highly educated but not well paid. Is there a voice for adjuncts, she wondered. Could they have representation on the Faculty Senate? Mr. Wilder noted, first, that all Senate meetings are open to all faculty, whether adjunct, visiting, or tenure-track. Adjuncts currently cannot serve as Senators, but could do so if we changed our By-laws. One way to proceed, he said, would be to suggest to Welfare to consider bringing such a motion. Bev Diamond suggested that Welfare could take up the special concerns of adjuncts in general, in addition to considering their representation in the Senate. Ms. Frask thanked the Senators for their suggestions, saying that it was “very difficult as an adjunct to be recognized.”

David Mann (Political Science) announced that the Bookstore Advisory Council had met. As a member of the council, “I really need your input,” he said, and asked faculty to relay their concerns to him. Darryl Phillips noted that the deadline for the reporting of mid-semester grades seemed to have been earlier this year. Since it’s all submitted electronically, couldn’t there be a later deadline so faculty could include midterm exams” Ms. Jorgens said the Registrar would open to a discussion of this. She also thought we should synchronize this midterm grade deadline with the withdrawal date. This semester there was indeed a very low submission of midterm grades, she said, but these grades should be a tool our students can use. Beatrice Frask asked about the problem of having only B+ and C+, with no other plus and minus notches, and Mr. Wilder said there was a new grading scale with more notches coming into effect in 2006. Another senator suggested that if we change to withdrawal and midterm deadlines, we should make sure students will still have the option to enroll in an Express class in the second half of the semester.

At last the meeting was adjourned, at 6:33.

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary
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