Minutes of December 2003 Meeting of Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, December 2 in ECTR 116. Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order. He invited corrections to the November minutes and, hearing none, suggested that they be approved. A motion to this effect was passed. Next, requesting a suspension of the rules, Mr. Wilder moved ahead on the agenda and recognized David Gentry, chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections. Mr. Gentry reminded Senators that an At-Large Senate vacancy had occurred, and that By-Laws required that the Senate elect a replacement. The nominees for the replacement were Denis Keyes, Ralph Muldrow, and Joe Kelly. Mr. Gentry distributed paper ballots, then collected them in order to tally the results. At the end of the meeting, Mr. Gentry reported that Joe Kelly had been elected to serve as a replacement At-Large Senator.

Reports

Service Learning

After the election, the Speaker returned to the agenda, beginning with reports. He recognized Lauren Collier (Service Learning Coordinator, Office of Student Affairs), who had come to the November Senate meeting requesting Senate input on a Service Learning matter. Ms. Collier’s office would like to use the letters “SL” in section numbers to identify courses that have a service-learning component, so that when students register for them, they will know that this particular section has a service-learning component. At the November meeting, Senators asked for more information and for sample syllabi for courses that had such a component. Accordingly, Ms. Collier offered a fuller explanation to the Senate at this evening’s meeting. She explained that service learning is not the same as performing community service, but is “a methodology that infuses service” into a curriculum, Rather than being an add-on, it is an essential component of the course. Students actively participate in service that has been thoughtfully designed; the faculty member helps students to reflect on these experiences and to understand them as applications of theories they have learned in the classroom. Another advantage of service learning is that it provides experience that may help students when they seek permanent employment. Ms. Collier also noted that as a pedagogical tool, service learning gives students a problem to solve as a group, an activity that facilitates cognitive growth. Some service learning courses are about this pedagogy itself, but many are courses in which service learning is infused into an existing curriculum, and/or are courses in which students work together to develop a solution to a problem (for example, developing a strategic plan for a community in transition). A capstone course can also incorporate service learning. At the College, over 30 faculty members have attended workshops that Ms. Collier has offered on the topic, and she has also worked individually with faculty who are developing service learning components for their classes. Two Freshman Seminar courses and a Human Sexuality course have incorporated service learning since Ms. Collier came to the College. Syllabi from some College courses that included service learning had been placed on the Senate website.
Ms. Collier stressed to the Senate, “Service learning is not a fad,” citing numerous institutions that offer courses with service learning components. She offered a list of resources to faculty who were interested in learning more about the topic, and noted that this pedagogy provided numerous benefits. Because they require more time to be spent performing service outside of class, service learning courses are different from traditional courses and should be identifiable during registration. This way, students seeking out service learning can find these courses, and all students will understand when they register that the courses require students to spend time on their service outside of class. Hugh Wilder then explained to the Senate that Ms. Collier wanted the Senate’s opinion on who, if anyone, should be involved in identifying service learning courses. For example, it might be appropriate for department chairs to make this designation, he said. Senators Alex Kasman (Mathematics) and Glen Lesses (Philosophy and Religious Studies) wondered why service learning courses needed a special designation, since there are other courses that require students to spend time on events that take place outside of class (for example, theater courses require students to attend performances). Ms. Collier noted that in some cases, transportation and other logistics made service learning more challenging to carry out than other courses. Meg Cormack (Philosophy and Religious Studies) spoke in favor of designating service learning courses so students could avoid scheduling conflicts, but Frank Kinard (At-large) said he thought the Curriculum committee should review the designation. He believed there should be a standard for the amount of time a student should be required to spend in service, and that this should be spelled out in the College catalog. Ms. Collier said that any such standards should be developed by each discipline.

A motion was made to charge a committee to examine service learning and report back to the faculty. David Mann (Political Science) noted that since the Senate was still in the “Reports” section of the meeting, this would need to be a resolution instead of a motion. Further discussion led to the suggestion that Academic Planning look into this subject. Bev Diamond (At-large) noted that the Curriculum Committee evaluated courses according to standards that have already been developed, while it was the job of Academic Planning to tell faculty what sort of standards were needed. Ms. Collier noted that the Provost had been in favor of assigning this matter to a committee. The Provost, Elise Jorgens, told the Senate that she agreed that Academic Planning would be an appropriate committee. Todd Grantham (At-large) suggested that since there was such a small number of service learning courses in existence or under development, perhaps the faculty should go ahead and recommend that these few courses be designated. Academic Planning could proceed with its study as well regarding future courses. Frank Kinard said, “I’d like to instruct Academic Planning to look into liability issues that might arise.” Glen Lesses continued to object to giving service learning courses a special designation when there were other courses that also required off-campus activities. The Speaker then asked the Senate what they wanted to do about the resolution. Rohn England (Mathematics) asked if the resolution meant that the Senate could still advise Ms. Collier to implement the service learning designation? Yes, but we need to vote first, the Speaker said. The resolution passed on a voice vote.

The Senate discussed the registration flag further. Deanna Caveny (Mathematics)
noted that the designation “SL” would not work because the section numbers need two of the three available digits. Bob Perkins (At-large) asked whether the information delivered in an “SL” course would be the same as in a non-SL version of that course, and Ms. Collier said it would. In that case, Mr. Perkins said, Curriculum does not need to be involved. He wondered, though, whether this designation would be sufficient to alert students as to what they were getting into. Susan Kattwinkel (At-large) noted that service learning was essentially a pedagogical technique; pedagogy already varies from section to section of traditional courses, depending on the approach of the instructor. She opposed the designation of any pedagogical technique. Lisa Thomson Ross (Psychology) asked if the College were “moving toward” designating SL courses on students’ transcripts. Ms. Collier said this was only a concept at present. Darryl Phillips (Classics) wondered if this proposed “SL” would appear on a transcript, since, he said, that would be a serious consideration. Mr. Wilder said that section numbers do not now appear on transcripts. Finally, Bev Diamond proposed that Academic Planning look at the issue of flagging SL courses first, and report back to the Senate as soon as they have done so. Noting that this suggestion met with no objection, Mr. Wilder then recognized the chair of Academic Planning, who was next on the agenda.

Academic Planning Committee

Bill Olejniczak addressed the Senate on behalf of Academic Planning’s 18 months of work on a Freshman Seminar. (“And thank you for that new charge,” he said.) The Strategic Plan had tasked this committee to develop plans for an academic component of the first-year experience and to examine the existing Freshman Seminar, and to do so by the end of 2003. The committee’s written report to the Senate has been posted on the Senate website. Mr. Olejniczak told the Senate that this report was not a recommendation, but that the committee was ready to offer their ideas for public scrutiny. In its first year of work, the Committee considered a plan that would deliver this academic component of the first-year experience through an “add-on hour model,” using existing courses and adding an hour to sections designated for freshmen. This plan, however, met with much criticism from deans and chairs this past May, and the committee sought alternatives this fall. Mr. Olejniczak reminded Senators that his committee was not an Ad Hoc committee, but a Senate body, and that in its two years of working on this plan, its members had come from 10 departments and from 4 of the College’s 5 schools. They have also met with the Provost, and at this point, invite faculty to discuss the plan in hopes of developing a consensus.

Academic Planning believes that their Freshman Seminar plan meets the following tests: small class size, no increase in faculty workload, voluntary participation, and fiscal prudence. They also believe the course’s academic integrity will be very strong, and that these classes will be stimulating both for faculty and for students, Mr. Olejniczak noted that a review process has been built in, and that the plan is for course proposals to go before a new standing committee for approval, then through Curriculum and the Faculty Senate. Students in the course will be assured of one-on-one contact with roster faculty; these faculty will serve as students’ advisors during their first year. The Committee believes this course will also help the College to attract excellent, committed students.
Such courses are being offered at our peer institutions (and more prestigious ones); a list of course titles from such schools is included in the Committee’s written report. Mr. Olejniczak then asked for responses from Senators. George Pothering (At-large) suggested that the review process might be too extensive, and thought these courses should be reviewed by the proposed Freshman Seminar Committee only, in the same way that Special Topics courses are reviewed by the home department and not by the Curriculum Committee. Mr. Wilder noted that Honors Program courses are reviewed by the Honors Committee and do not go before Curriculum and the Senate. Norris Preyer (Physics) added that the only time such courses come before Curriculum is when they are being proposed as permanent courses. David Mann asked if faculty teaching these courses would advise students during their orientation, or only afterwards. The committee had not planned for them to do summer advising, Mr. Olejniczak said. Jane Clary (Economics) suggested that students should receive descriptions of these courses before their orientation. Charles Kaiser (Psychology) asked, first, whether there was an assessment plan built in (there was, to be done by the new committee), and whether there was money available to pay for the additional adjuncts that would be needed to staff the courses that would be vacated by faculty teaching in this program. Mr. Olejniczak said he did not foresee an increase in adjunct use, but said that he hoped the administration would be able to support this program financially, since they requested it in the first place. Mr. Kaiser also observed that he was glad to see that faculty developing new courses would receive course development grants; he wished such grants were available to other faculty as well.

Senators Lesses and Kinard both said they thought this would be an expensive program. The Provost spoke in favor of the seminar concept, but she noted that it would be costly and that she had asked the committee to prepare a budget for her. She added that she thought the course should be required of all freshmen, and that she affirmed the work of the committee, her concerns about cost notwithstanding. Frank Kinard said he thought such classes as those listed in the report (from UNC-Chapel Hill) could not possibly be taught to freshmen. Godwin Uwah (French) wanted to know how many faculty would be able to participate in the program, and whether this would in fact mean that more adjuncts would be teaching regular courses. If adjuncts could teach these courses, why shouldn’t they continue to teach the existing Freshman Seminar, he wondered. Vincent Spicer (Psychology) asked whether this course was voluntary or required at other schools. Mr. Olejniczak said this varied, and that such information was available on each school’s web page. George Pothering suggested that these courses need not be taught in smart classrooms, Susan Kattwinkel, a member of the committee, said that these freshman seminars were designed to introduce students to the liberal arts and sciences, and that this included introducing students to technological tools that could be demonstrated in smart classrooms. David Mann asked if the committee considered including the Convocation book/speaker as part of the first-year experience. Yes, Mr. Olejniczak said, but they ultimately decided not to limit the classes in that way; this would be an option, but not required. He concluded by inviting faculty to forward further comments to the Committee.
The Speaker recognized Michael Leitman of the Student Government Association. He reported to the Senate that the SGA had endorsed a resolution supporting faculty oversight over curriculum, a resolution which mirrored the one passed by the Senate in October in response to the proposed and then pre-emptively nixed LGBT minor. Mr. Leitman told the Senate that they had met with the Provost and asked her if the program was struck down because of political pressure. They then passed a resolution asking the administration to explain its reasons for stopping work on the minor. Mr. Leitman said he believed there was progress being made and that there would likely be a statement forthcoming soon. He told the Senate he wanted to let them know of the SGA’s activities “since we’ve worked on this together.”

The Speaker

The Speaker gave his own report. He reminded Senators of upcoming deadlines and dates (January 8th deadline for the next Senate agenda, which is before classes start; December 21st for the mid-year Commencement, with attendance always appreciated). The College is staging a day of service in honor of Martin Luther King, Jr. Day on January 19th, he noted. Teams of students, faculty, and staff will perform one-day service projects all over the Charleston area. Faculty are warmly encouraged to participate, whether through directing a student team, forming a faculty team, or joining all teams on the Cistern at 3 PM to celebrate Dr. King’s legacy of service.

Mr. Wilder also noted that the President is reviewing the statement of institutional “Core Values” that was developed as part of the Strategic Plan. Mr. Higdon wanted input from more faculty, and formed two focus groups which met in November. Faculty were chosen if they had served on the Strategic Planning Committee earlier, Mr. Wilder said. Probably there will be a chance for wider participation in the coming months, he added.

Finally, Mr. Wilder addressed procedural topics regarding Senate meetings. Noting that this month’s agenda packet was extremely large, he explained that the scanning of these documents could be very time-consuming and the turnaround time was sometimes barely sufficient to comply with By-Laws that require Senators to receive their packets one week in advance of the meeting. Should committees who generate lots of documents (Curriculum and Graduate Education) be required to submit all their forms electronically, he wondered. And how many Senators actually visit the website and read the scanned material? He invited comments on the process. Frank Kinard said that other schools had all of their forms online already, and that we should do the same.

New Business

Committee on Academic Standards

Deb Vaughn presented a proposal for the Academic Standards committee. This is a correction of an inconsistency they discovered in the College catalog, Ms. Vaughn said.
On page 58, the catalog says students can’t get placement credit for language proficiency if they are native speakers in that language. But on page 10, the catalog lists French, German, and Spanish as languages for which students receive credit and placement from CLEP (College Level Examination Program) exams. So students who are native speakers of these languages are now using CLEP to get placement credit for them. The Committee proposed the following change to the catalog:

Proposed addition to the CLEP section, 2003-2004 Undergraduate Catalog, p.10, under the line “Languages (French, German, and Spanish)”:

Note: No native speaker of a language other than English will be awarded foreign language placement credit for proficiency in his or her first language.

Godwin Uwah asked whether this proposed change was presented by the Division of Languages. Ms. Vaughn said it came from Professor Rickerson. Liz Martinez-Gibson (Hispanic Studies) said there had been no discussion of the proposal within the Division of Languages, and that it should be remanded to the committee so that they might consult with the Division. This motion was passed. Jane Clary then moved that Academic Standards reconsider whether we ought to give students credit hours for their language proficiency, and this motion was passed.

Committee on Graduate Education

Sarah Owens presented the following proposals for the Committee on Graduate Education. All were passed:

SPAN 630: Seminar in Hispanic Studies-- New Graduate Course Proposal
FREN 682 French Mass Media-- New Graduate Course Proposal
EDEE 699: Course Name Change to Clinical Practice in Elementary Education
EDEE 681: Course Name Change to Field Experience in Reading
EDEE 636: Course Name Change to Field Experience in Early Childhood Education
EDEE 698: Course Name Change to Clinical Practice in Early Childhood Education

Curriculum Committee

Norris Preyer presented the following proposals for this committee. All passed:

1. GEOL 213 Natural Hazards – New Course Proposal
2. GEOL 385 Internship – New Course Proposal
3. GEOL 338 Hydrogeology – Proposal to Change a Course
4. PSYC 389 Child Psychopathology – New Course Proposal
5. EDFS 350 Field Experience I in the Instruction of Students with Disabilities – New Course Proposal
6. EDFS 413 Field Experience II in the Instruction of Students with Disabilities – Proposal to Change a Course
7. EDFS 426 Language Development and Communication – New Course Proposal
8. B.S. in Special Education – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
9. PEHD 320 Special Topics: Sports and Exercise Nutrition – Information only
10. B.S. in Athletic Training – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
11. PEHD 245 Beginning Athletic Training – Proposal to Change a Course
12. PEHD 245-L Beginning Athletic Training Laboratory – Proposal to Change a Course
13. PEHD 345 Advanced Athletic Training – Proposal to Change a Course
14. PEHD 345L Advanced Athletic Training Laboratory – Proposal to Change a Course
15. PEHD 365 Identification and Treatment of Activity Related Injury and Illness – Proposal to Change a Course
16. PEHD 375 Clinical Education Experience in Athletic Training – Proposal to Change a Course
17. HEAL 333 Sports and Exercise Nutrition – New Course Proposal
18. PEHD 346 Athletic Injury Evaluation II – New Course Proposal
19. PEHD 346L Athletic Injury Evaluation II Laboratory – New Course Proposal
20. PEHD 433 Research Methods and Design in Health and Exercise Science – New Course Proposal
21. B. A. in Classics – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
22. Minor in Classics – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
23. SOCY 346 Environmental Sociology – New Course Proposal
24. ANTH 303 Paleolithic Archaeology – New Course Proposal
25. ANTH 304 Rise of Complex Civilization – New Course Proposal
26. ANTH 305 Prehistoric Ritual and Art – New Course Proposal
27. SOCY 348 Substance Abuse and Society – Proposal to Change a Course
28. SOCY 353 Sociology of Occupations and Professions – Proposal to Delete a Course

The final Curriculum proposal, for ISHP 101 (a zero-credit internship), generated considerable discussion. Glen Lesses objected to listing non-academic experiences on a transcript. Lydia Keadle (Career Services) addressed the Senate, explaining that some internships already show up on students’ transcripts under the designation TNIP, and that the current proposal would formalize this practice. Todd McNerny said that the current internships are not noted on transcripts by a course number. Susan Kattwinkel said she objected to using transcripts as resumes for students, and that this practice did not seem to allow the College accountability for these internships. Ms. Keadle said that several institutions are already noting such experiences on transcripts, and that this practice would also enable IRP to track data on rates of student participation in internships. Glen Lesses asked if there were any other way for such activity to be tallied besides giving the experience a course name and putting it on an academic transcript. Ms. Keadle replied that this made it much easier for IRP to report such data to CHE. Todd Mc Nerney (Theater) said that by putting something on a transcript, we give it academic value, and that he had questions about this. He also said he had concerns about the College’s liability for these internships, and Ms. Keadle explained that in the case of internships, it is the employer and not the College that assumes all liability. A division of the house was called for, and the vote taken was 15 in favor and 19 against; thus, the ISHP 101 proposal
was rejected.

Constituent Concerns

Bishop Hunt (At Large) spoke in protest of the recent “Smoke-Out” event in which motorcycles created deafening noise levels on Glebe and George Streets. Meg Cormack said that the Welfare Committee had dealt with this issue 6 years ago. Mr. Hunt said that during this semester there were a total of 9 amplified events which prevented work in offices and classrooms along George Street. The Speaker responded that he had forwarded complaints about noise to Jeri Cabot, who discussed them with Student Affairs. This office has apologized for the noise of the motorcycles, and promises to provide “advance notice” of future noisy events.

Marion Doig (At Large) said he did not recall the faculty ever agreeing to have non-academic activities noted on transcripts. Could the Committee on Academic Standards look into this, he asked? The Speaker said he would direct the Committee to do so.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary
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Feb. 10 (agenda deadline Jan. 29)
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Spring Faculty Meeting (5:00 PM, Physicians Auditorium)
April 19 (agenda deadline April 7)