

MINUTES OF COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON FACULTY SENATE

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, February 1st, at 5:00 p. m. in ECTR 116. 55 Senators attended. Speaker Bob Mignone called the meeting to order. He began by asking for corrections to the last meeting's minutes, which the Senate approved as previously circulated.

Reports

The Speaker then reported on several items to the Senate. He told the Senate that the Provost has instituted a new policy on consensual relations between faculty and currently enrolled students. The policy prohibits faculty members having romantic relationships with students. Mr. Mignone read the policy and could not resist adding, "I have referred this to the Student Affairs Committee." Next, he reported that there will be a new email distribution list from the Vice President's office, but this will be a "read-only" list, to which the recipients cannot reply. The facultyandstaff@cofc list will be configured so that individuals now on the list may unsubscribe from it if they wish. "I don't want that list to atrophy," Mr. Mignone said. He intended to continue communicating through this list, he said, and he hoped faculty would choose to remain on the list and to use it as its primary means of campus-wide communication. Mr. Mignone also informed the Senate that the recently adopted new major in Discovery Informatics has received praise from the provost at Clemson, and its next stop for review will be the SC CHE (Commission on Higher Education). Finally, Mr. Mignone thanked all faculty and staff who served as facilitators for the service projects performed for MLK Challenge on the recent holiday. He read the names of all these volunteers, who included faculty, administrators, alumni, and members of the community, and extended his thanks to them all.

Old Business

Committee on Tenure & Promotion

Jane Clary, committee chair, told Senators, "Well, we're back!" She noted that after bringing a proposal to the Senate at its last meeting, the Committee has tried to improve its motion for a possible fourth-year review, in response to Senators' comments. The amended proposal is as follows.

Motion to add possible Fourth-Year Review to T&P Process

At the request of the Provost, the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review is proposing the possibility of a fourth-year review in cases where the Department and/or the Dean recommend retention in the third-year review but where the Provost has serious reservations about the case. In cases such as these, the Provost might recommend for the fourth-year review instead of recommending for termination after the third year. In these circumstances, the candidate would undergo a formal fourth-year review.

- J. Third Year Review, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional Faculty** (page 74 in FAM), third paragraph. Insert at the end of the paragraph:

Original Motion: (Part to be changed is underlined)

In some cases, even where the recommendation is for retention, the Provost, in consultation with the Chair and the Dean, may require a fourth-year review to substantiate further whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made.

Amended Motion: (Changes are in bold italics)

In some cases, even where the recommendation is for retention, the Provost, ***at the request of the faculty member being reviewed, the Department Panel, the Department Chair, or the Dean, or at her discretion, in consultation with the above***, may require a fourth-year review to substantiate further whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made.

- M. Procedures for Third Year Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty**

1. **Introduction**, final paragraph. Insert at the end of the paragraph:

Original Motion:

In the case where the Provost requires a fourth-year review, the procedure is the same as for the third-year evaluation.

Amended Motion: (Changes are in bold italics)

For those faculty members required to undergo a fourth-year review, the Provost, in consultation with the Chair and the Dean, will determine the area(s) of professional competency for which additional material must be submitted for the fourth-year review. Otherwise, the faculty member's packet will remain the same as the packet submitted in the third-year review. The procedure for the fourth-year review in the areas of professional competency under review will be the same as for the third-year review.

(Note) Section I explains the policy governing termination. This section will not change:

After two or more years of service at the College in a tenure track position written notice that a probationary appointment is not to be renewed will be given to a faculty member at least twelve months before the expiration of any appointment.

A person whose contract is not renewed after the third-year evaluation would have a one-year contract for a fourth year. A person whose contract is not renewed after the (new) fourth-year evaluation would have a one-year contract for a fifth year.

The Speaker invited discussion of this proposal. The first suggestion offered was that the language in the amendment should be changed so that it did not refer to the Provost using “her discretion.” Ms. Clary offered to amend this phrase to “at the discretion of the Provost.” Next, Joe Kelly (English) asked if the T & P committee had discussed this proposal with any faculty who had been at the College less than 3 years. They had not, Ms. Clary replied. Norris Preyer (Physics) noted that in the previous discussion of the proposal, Senators had raised questions about short time between the third and fourth year review, and whether a faculty member might have time to demonstrate improvement. Why has that not been changed in the amended proposal, he wondered. Ms. Clary replied that the candidate would have a year--two semesters--between reviews. Mr. Preyer persisted, “But you learn of this decision in the spring, when half the spring semester is over.” The new packet is turned in during the fall semester, he said, and if a candidate is “told they had lousy teaching, they would have half a semester to improve.” Ms. Clary replied, “Hopefully, they would have had some indication beforehand.” She added, “I’m not sure the purpose of the review is to improve the teaching. It’s just to see how the evidence looks” a year later.

Tony Leclerc (Computer Science) disputed the assertion that a candidate would already know if he or she had problems. “It’s possible that the person would know nothing,” he said, because this is signed for cases in which “the provost is disagreeing with what the deans and chairs think. So the way it’s set up, it could be that the candidate has no time to make any of the changes. They could be unaware that there was a problem.” Ms. Clary noted that candidates would be terminated at the end of the third year if there were serious questions about their teaching. Michelle Van Parys (Studio Art) said that a candidate who did not know that he/she had problems in teaching by the third year would indeed have “a serious problem.” Mr. Leclerc said that this seemed to suggest that the fourth-year review was not necessary for deficiencies in teaching, but that there was not enough time for a candidate to address other problems, either, if the candidate does not get feedback on them “until March.”

Alex Kasman (Mathematics) asked, “Is there an informal way to do this, without a formal packet being submitted? Couldn’t the provost get the information at the fourth year without this process?” Tom Baginski (German) noted that, as the highest academic officer, “The provost can make this decision any

time. . . . The nice thing that I see here is that the provost relies on the department for input.” Susan Farrell (English), acknowledged that the proposal was being “presented as candidate-friendly, but my fear is that in practice it would be a way of terminating people who haven’t done enough at their fourth year.” In effect, the proposal would be a way of not allowing people the full six years they now have to meet their research requirement, Ms. Farrell said.

Betsy Martin (Chemistry) asked about the wording of the proposal. The first paragraph refers to the fourth-year review being used “in cases where the Department and/or Dean recommend retention.” Elsewhere, the motion says it may be used “even where the recommendation is for retention.” She wondered what the phrase “even where” meant. Ms. Clary responded that “if the recommendation is for termination, this [fourth-year review] would not come into effect.” Joe Kelly asked if a candidate had the right to ask for a fourth-year review if the department or dean did vote for termination. Ms. Clary said no, and confirmed Mr. Kelly’s understanding that the review would be an option “only if the candidate is not fired.” Tom Kunkle (Mathematics) suggested that the wording be changed, removing the word “even” so that it would read “in some cases, when the recommendation is for retention.” Ms. Clary asked for a response from Glen Lesses (Philosophy), who had devised the original wording. Mr. Lesses said the proposal meant to describe a scenario in which a department panel or dean has recommended retention, and the provost “is then inclined not to retain.” George Pothering (Computer Science) wondered if the proposal was actually intended to take care of cases in which a department had voted for retention, but only by a slim majority. Wouldn’t this be a case in which the Provost would want a fourth-year review, “even when” the vote had been for retention, he asked. Other senators said that if this had been the intention, the proposal should have spelled t out the scenario it was designed to address. Marion Doig (Chemistry) then spoke in favor of the proposal, saying that it would be an extra opportunity for a faculty member who would otherwise be fired. This proposal allows a person to add “two semesters’ worth of evidence” of improved teaching, or two more semesters to publish. Therefore, “I don’t think any faculty member is going to complain” about receiving this opportunity, he said.

The Speaker asked if faculty were ready to vote. After a voice vote, the Speaker requested a division of the house. By a show of hands, the motion failed.

New Business

Committee on Graduate Education

Sarah Owens, chair of the Committee on Graduate Education, brought several items to the Senate. The first item was for information only: newly developed guidelines for writing a Master’s thesis. These guidelines can be accessed at the following link (disabled at the moment, but it will be fixed soon, she said.)

<http://www.cofc.edu/gradschool/current/index.php>

This page gives a suggested timeline for completing the thesis as well as specific information on practical matters such as formatting the document. This will enable both students and faculty to have a clearer idea of how to submit a thesis, Ms. Owens said.

She then presented the following items proposals to the Senate. All were approved:

COURSE CHANGE PROPOSALS

ENGL 512 - Southern Literature (change course description)

ENGL 523 - 19th Century American Literature I (change course description)

ENGL 524 - 19th Century American Literature II (change course description)

ENGL 528 - American Fiction 1900 to Present (change course title)

ENGL 532 - American Poetry 1900 to Present (change course title)

ENGL 534 - American Drama 1900 to Present (change course title)

NEW COURSE PROPOSALS

EVSS 639 - Wetlands Hydrology and Biogeochemistry

LATN 622 - Vergil

LATN 623 - Roman Historiography

LATN 673 - Roman Biography

PUBA 660 - Contemporary Perspectives on Arts Education
PUBA 662 - The Avery, The Community and Applied Research
(N. B.: Ms. Owens said that this title had been incorrectly submitted, and should read as follows:
PUBA 662 Cultural Administration and Applied Research at the Avery)
PUBA 663 - Arts and Technology
PUBA 664 - Arts Education

Curriculum Committee

Deborah Boyle, chair, presented the following proposals, all of which received approval from the Senate.

1. F04-32 PHYS 312 Galactic and Extragalactic Astronomy – New Course Proposal
 2. F04-43 PHIL 160 Ethics and Sports – New Course Proposal
 3. F04-44 RELS 315 Cults and Charisma – Proposal to Change a Course
 4. F04-45 RELS 348 Asian Religions in America – New Course Proposal
 5. F04-46 RELS 340 Advanced Topics in Asian Religions – New Course Proposal
 6. F04-47 RELS 270 African-American Religions – New Course Proposal
 7. F04-48 HONS 175 Approaches to Religion – New Course Proposal
 8. F04-49 CHEM 441 Physical Chemistry I – Proposal to Change a Course
CHEM 441L Physical Chemistry I Lab – Proposal to Change a Course
CHEM 442 Physical Chemistry II – Proposal to Change a Course
CHEM 442 Physical Chemistry II Lab – Proposal to Change a Course
 9. F04-50 CHEM 490 Chemistry & Biochemistry Seminar – Proposal to Change a Course
 10. F04-51 B.A. in Latin American and Caribbean Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
 11. F04-52 Minor in Latin American and Caribbean Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Minor (add SPAN 447)
 12. F04-53 Minor in Latin American and Caribbean Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Minor (add ENGL 233, ENGL 234, ENGL 358)
 13. F04-54 Minor in Latin American and Caribbean Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Minor (add PORT 328)
 14. F04-55 Minor in Latin American and Caribbean Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Minor (add LTPO 250, LTPO 350, LTPO 450)
- F04-56 B.A. in Latin American and Caribbean Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major (add LTPO 250, LTPO 350, LTPO 450)

Faculty Welfare Committee

Bill Danaher, chair, brought a resolution that his committee hoped the Senate would endorse. This was a proposal “to support the formation of an adjunct welfare committee, and to direct President Higdon and Human Resources director Tom Casey to form this committee. The point is to give adjuncts representation here on campus,” Mr. Danaher said. The text of the proposal is as follows:

To: The College of Charleston Faculty Senate
From: The Faculty Welfare Committee
RE: A Resolution Concerning the Formation of an Adjunct Faculty Welfare Committee

It is hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports the formation of an Adjunct Faculty Welfare Committee. The Faculty Senate recognizes that the welfare of the adjunct instructors 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 adjunct instructional faculty of the College in much the same manner as the Faculty Welfare Committee serves the Faculty. While the Fourth Century Initiative of the College states as one of its primary goals the conversion of adjunct faculty to full-time faculty positions, this is a work in progress. Currently the College has a significant number of adjunct personnel whose welfare needs cannot be addressed by the Faculty Welfare Committee. Concerns of this committee shall be all College policies that affect the welfare of the adjunct faculty at large, such as:

15. employment and working conditions;
16. promotion policies;
17. work loads;
18. compensation;
19. leaves of absence;
20. 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 an Adjunct Faculty Welfare Committee.

Faculty Welfare Committee
 Karen Berg, Hispanic Studies
 Bill Danaher (Chair), Sociology and Anthropology
 James Deavor, Chemistry and Biochemistry
 Sara Frankel, Studio Art
 Sheridan Hough, Philosophy and Religious Studies
 Steve Jaume, Geology and Environmental Geosciences
 Celeste Lacroix, Communication
 Lisa Thomson Ross, Psychology

Discussion of the proposal ensued. Glen Lesses said that according to the current committee charges in the Manual, the duties of the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Faculty Compensation Committee overlap with this proposed committee. The Compensation Committee was recently formed to address salaries, while Welfare is still charged with all other aspects of faculty welfare, including the welfare of adjuncts. Mr. Danaher replied that an adjunct faculty member had met with Welfare and told the committee that adjuncts “need more representation on things that are of concern to them, like salary and seniority.” He said the adjuncts also desired a means of discussing these issues among themselves. The formation of this committee would fulfill that request and free up time for Welfare to do other things, Mr. Danaher said. Annette Godow (Physical Education and Health) spoke in favor of the proposal, saying that adjuncts “need representation and aren’t getting it.” Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) said that he believed that adjuncts should remain part of the purview of the Faculty Welfare Committee. “This committee is a good idea,” he noted, “but we as a Senate are responsible for the welfare of all faculty, including adjuncts.” Julia Eichelberger (English) said that Welfare has worked on behalf of adjuncts in the past, such as during the period from 2000 to 2002, when the committee made a sustained effort to get the administration to provide health insurance to adjuncts. The Speaker then called for a vote, and the resolution passed on a show of hands.

With no further concerns offered, the meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
 Julia Eichelberger
 Faculty Secretary

Spring 2005 Meeting Schedule

Senate Meetings (Tuesdays at 5 PM):

February 1; agenda deadline January 20, 4 PM

March 1; agenda deadline February 17, 4 PM

March 29; agenda deadline March 17, 4 PM

April 19 (continued **April 26** if necessary); agenda deadline April 7, 4 PM

Spring 2005 Full Faculty Meeting:

Monday, April 11; agenda deadline March 31, 4 PM