The College of Charleston Faculty Senate met Tuesday, November 30, 2004, at 5:00 p.m. in Room 116 of the Education Center. After calling the meeting to order, Speaker Bob Mignone invited and received approval of the October minutes.

Reports

The Speaker
Noting the very full agenda, the Speaker said his report was brief. Since the last Senate meeting, he has been exploring the implementation of the Senate’s October resolution recommending observance of Labor Day as a holiday by the College. He has decided to recommend that the Faculty Welfare Committee seek input from staff and students and then draft a motion offering possible choices for implementing observance of this holiday. Mr. Mignone read from a letter he had received from one faculty member, Mick Norton, urging that the College not do away with the Memorial Day holiday in order to find room for a Labor Day holiday, since he believed this would solve one problem by creating another. “None of the choices are painless,” Mr. Mignone observed, and he thinks, therefore, that the Senate should compare the available options and then recommend the best ones to the administration. Would the Senate object, Mr. Mignone wondered, if he were to charge the Welfare Committee with coming up with a list of choices? The Senate offered no objections to this plan, so the Speaker said he would proceed with it.

Ad Hoc Committee on First-Year Experience
Mr. Mignone then recognized Jack Parson (Political Science). Mr. Parson reported that Trish Ward, chair of the committee charged with exploring implementation of a first-year seminar for all freshmen, had asked him, as a member of the committee, to report on her behalf. After the Committee was formed, the Provost announced that she was initiating a re-examination of the General Education requirements. The Ad Hoc committee has since met with the Provost, and now believes it will be impossible to consider implementation of the proposed freshman seminar until the new Vice President for the Academic Experience is in place and until possible new directions in General Education are a little clearer. Thus the committee has decided it must wait until January, in hopes that it may have more information by then. Mr. Parson said the committee would report to the Senate as soon as it had made substantial progress.

Diversity Committee
Virginia Friedman, Vice President for Strategic Communication, reported to the Senate in her capacity as chair of the President’s appointed Committee on Diversity. She recalled to the Senate that last year there had been faculty concern about a senior vice-president search and the need for a diverse pool of applicants. She reminded the Senate that this search had culminated in Victor Wilson, an “excellent choice.” Last fall the President formed this Diversity Committee and asked it to investigate how other colleges achieve this desirable goal, to hold forums on the topic, and to give the President a recommendation of best practices for the College in this regard. Ms. Friedman said that
the committee has made a number of recommendations to Mr. Higdon, and that he is still considering many of them, but has already acted on others. He has directed the College “to recruit an individual with expertise in institutional diversity issues” who would report directly to him, a position that Mr. Higdon wants to be at the senior level. Recognizing that a search of this kind requires extra resources, Mr. Higdon has engaged an agency that specializes in diversity hires, and has asked Joy Vandervort-Cobb (Theatre) to co-chair the search committee; other faculty also serve on it. Provost Elise Jorgens added that she and the President have discussed recruiting visiting faculty, and that the author Charles Johnson, who was the past Fall’s Convocation speaker, has been contacted and has expressed interest in coming here, year after next. At least three other people are being considered to visit for a year or a semester here. These are exciting candidates, Ms. Jorgens said, who would also add to the diversity of our faculty during their visit. In regard to regular faculty hires, she noted that the School of Business has already successfully recruited a new African American professor, and that another African American candidate was considering an offer for another position. Ms. Friedman, continuing with her report, noted that her committee and the President had sent faculty members to two national conferences on diversity, and these faculty will be reporting on what they learned to department chairs. Perhaps a campus forum will be offered on this as well, she said. Once the new Diversity Officer has been hired, the College will conduct a Campus Climate Survey, which measures campus attitudes on gender and race.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

On behalf of committee chair Deborah Boyle, Susan Morrison brought a number of motions to the Senate. The first item was quickly approved, and then the proposal for a Concentration in Creative Writing drew some discussion. Susan Kattwinkel (At-Large) said she supported the proposed track, but did question the need for a director who would receive a $5000 stipend. “We have five concentrations [in Theater] and no one gets a stipend,” she said. Larry Carlson, chair of English, responded that the director would oversee the visiting writers’ series and would have to work during the summer as well as during the academic year. “Should this be approved, Susan, you might use that as an argument in your department,” Mr. Carlson suggested. The new concentration was then approved by the Senate.

1. F04-12 ARTH 410: Internship – Proposal to Change a Course
2. F04-13 B.A. in English, Creative Writing – Proposal for a New Concentration
3. F04-14 B.A. in English, Creative Writing Concentration – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
4. F04-15 ENGL 221 Poetry Writing II – Proposal to Change a Course
5. F04-16 ENGL 224 Advanced Fiction Writing – Proposal to Change a Course
6. F04-17 ENLG 406 Crazyhorse Literary Publishing Practicum – New Course Proposal

A Geology course was then approved as proposed. Regarding the next two proposed courses, Darryl Phillips (Classics/German/Italian/Japanese/Russian) asked why they were
not part of his department. Any course designated “LING” belonged to his department for purposes of workload, the receipt of course evaluations, etc. “I will happily approve it,” he said, but he thought that his approval should have been part of the process. Susan Morrison said that the curriculum committee had not been aware of this, and said they would address the problem for future proposals. Regarding the proposal for Spanish 400, Service Learning, George Pothering (Computer Science) wondered if someone would get humanities credit for taking it. Jose Escobar (Hispanic Studies) said that the credit would either be social science or humanities, depending on the nature of the project. The Senate then approved these proposals as well as changes to English 101 and 102.

7. F04-11 GEOL 412 Crustal Geophysics – New Course Proposal
8. F04-18 LING 498 Independent Study – New Course Proposal
10. F04-20 HISP 498 Independent Study – New Course Proposal
11. F04-21 HISP 499 Bachelor's Essay – New Course Proposal
12. F04-22 SPAN 400 Service Learning – New Course Proposal
13. F04-23 ENGL 101 Composition and Literature and ENGL 102 Composition and Literature – Proposals to Change a Course

Next, a discussion ensued for the proposals from the Biology department. Norris Preyer (Physics) said he believed that some of program descriptions “may have unintended consequences.” He offered a friendly amendment that specified that the Physics requirement for both proposed Biology majors included the Physics lab, and that only courses in Physics, not in Astronomy, would satisfy this requirement. Both these amendments were accepted as friendly, and the Biology proposals were then approved.

14. F04-24 BS in Biology, BS with Concentration in Molecular Biology, BS in Marine Biology, BA in Biology, BS teaching option – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
15. F04-25 BIOL 211 Biodiversity, Ecology & Conservation Biology – New Course Proposal
16. F04-26 BIOL 212 Genetics and BIOL 212L Genetic Laboratory – New Course Proposal
18. F04-28 BIOL 310 General Microbiology – Proposal to Change a Course
19. F04-29 BIOL 312 Molecular Biology – Proposal to Change a Course
20. F04-30 BIOL 313 Cell Biology – Proposal to Change a Course
21. F04-31 BIOL 321 General and Comparative Physiology – Proposal to Change a Course

Finally, the Senate considered courses proposals for the newly approved major and minor in Discovery Informatics. Frank Kinard (Chemistry) had questions about the sequencing of some of the courses, and George Pothering (Computer Science) explained that students completing the minor had a different course (DISC 201) that was not intended for majors; the majors would take CSCI 334, a course that was “much more deeply database-oriented.” These proposals were then approved.
Committee on Tenure & Promotion

Jane Clary (Economics), chair of the committee, explained that they were bringing a proposal that had evolved because the Provost, having completed her first year of the T&P review process, saw some things she wanted to add. Ms. Clary said the Provost “thought that it might be good in some cases to have a fourth-year review” if in the course of the normal third-year review “there were some questions about whether the candidate would be successful in the tenure process.” This proposed 4th-year review would be done at the recommendation of the provost in consultation with the dean and the chair, “for some candidates,” she said. The motion 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.

Motion:

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

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.
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:

**IN THE CASE WHERE THE PROVOST REQUIRES A FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW, THE PROCEDURE IS THE SAME AS FOR THE THIRD-YEAR EVALUATION.**

(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 the proposal. Norris Preyer (Physics) commented that this process seemed to be too short, because the candidate would only learn in the spring that he or she would have to present a new packet the following fall. The Provost answered, “You may be right,” adding that she would have been agreeable to making this a fifth-year review rather than a fourth-year one, as long as there was this additional review in place. “But on other hand,” she said, “the candidate is very likely to know by December if there are problems.” There were candidates last year who did not seem strong enough to earn tenure, and she had not favored their retention but “was persuaded otherwise.” Such candidates need to be reviewed again, she said. Mr. Preyer noted that we already have annual evaluations, and Ms. Jorgens said that these evaluations do not “have the same force as a process like this.” She also noted that if a poor candidate is ultimately denied tenure, they will be searching for a job after having been here for 6 years, and it will be clear to future employers that they were denied tenure, which is not in their best interest. Tony Leclerc (Computer Science) asked if the Provost believed that the third-year review process was not working. At the third year, people are informed of any deficiencies, and Mr. Leclerc wondered how someone “could not know” that they needed to address them. The Provost said that she “was not very happy with” the process she participated in last year. In some cases, this extra review is needed.

Marion Doig (Chemistry) said he thought this was “actually a faculty friendly proposal.” He said that with this process, “if there is someone who the Provost is thinking of not retaining, they will have an additional year to improve in an area that they probably already know about.” Mike Moore, (Economics) agreed, saying this was a way of “giving a marginal candidate a second chance.” Frank Kinard (Chemistry) spoke against the
proposal. “To me, this is a department chair’s problem,” he said. “When someone has
been flagged [at the third-year review], the annual review should address the area that is
deficient.” The Provost said she did not think the department chair had the right to
terminate a marginal faculty member, and that this proposal “give us a stronger
mechanism to address a problem” more quickly.

Paul Marino (Biology) said, “The only part that I find questionable is the second part.
Why go through the process of preparing a whole packet again?” He said he thought the
fourth-year review should only address “the issue that is deficient,” since “If someone is
having problems the last thing you want to do is give them more work to do.” The
Provost said she would not mind if the process were amended to have the candidate only
address the problem areas. Glen Lesses (Philosophy) spoke in support of the proposal,
saying he thought such candidates needed more than an annual evaluation by one person.
George Pothering (Computer Science) said he agreed that the review should focus only
on the deficient area. Departments send out graduate surveys for the third year; would
they need to send them out again only a year later, and then once again in the 6th year? He
said he thought the response rate would decline significantly if this happened. Mark
Lazarro (Biology) said, “I don’t know if this procedure is the best way to go. If you
haven’t published or gotten enough grants, you obviously know that. If you have the
added stress and burden of turning in a packet, that takes a huge amount of time.” The
Provost suggested that the candidate might be asked to resubmit the packet, changing
only the problem areas. “It’s difficult to review just one area,” she said; “I want to see the
whole package.”

Joe Kelly (English) asked who would initiate this recommendation. Jane Clary said the
Provost would initiate it. Mr. Kelly asked if this meant the Provost is expecting she
would terminate more candidates in the future. He also noted that some departments
might consider a candidate somewhat marginal, but they could still have confidence that
this person would improve enough to earn tenure, and they might not want that person to
go through this process. Susan Farrell asked if the process was being proposed so that this
sort of candidate “won’t have to be fired.” The Provost said, “Yes, that could be what
would happen without this.” George Pothering said he believed departments should be
able to ask for a fourth year review. Jack Parsons (Political Science) commented that this
process would change “the whole dynamic of the tenure process. If we are going to do
this, departments will want to be able to ask for it.” He said he thought that the fourth-
year review would become “a fairly routine option that will be exercised more often.” He
was also “concerned about the consultations that will take place with the chair and the
dean” that might lead to the fourth-year review being required for someone. “The heart of
the review process now is the collegial review, the departmental panel. The chair is the
instrument of the department, and I would be concerned if the provost only consulted
with the chair and not the department panel.” The Provost said she assumed that chairs
did speak for their departments. (Snickering was heard from unidentified locations.) Jane
Clary told Mr. Parsons that she thought that “if the department were to ask for a fourth
year review, then I believe the packet would go to the T&P committee for review.” “So
we are introducing a routine 4th-year review,” Mr. Parsons said. Ms. Jorgens noted that the
Provost could still overturn the department’s suggestion that a fourth-year review was needed. Ms. Clary said, “Those cases would go to the T & P committee.”

Susan Kattwinkel asked how many semesters a candidate would have time to teach, if the problem was in teaching. Between the request for a review and the following October, there is not even a full semester. Glen Lesses (Philosophy) noted that between the fall of the 3rd-year review and the following 4th year, there are 2 semesters of teaching. He also noted that currently, “anyone involved in the 3rd year review of a candidate may request that T & P look at the case.” He added, “As a matter of practice there are very few negative recommendations” because Departments are usually unwilling to terminate a candidate. Maureen Hays (Sociology) said of the proposal, “This becomes less faculty friendly depending on when the candidate is notified of when they will get a fourth year review.” She asked that the proposal be sent back to the committee. Ms. Clary said that the calendar would be the same as the present 3rd-year review calendar, which meant that the candidates would have to be notified by March 15th. Ms. Hays said that if the review were called for as late as March 15th, then candidates would have very little time “to address really anything by October” when the new packet was due. Reid Wiseman (Biology) noted that in his department there had been more than one case where candidates had not done enough research, and they were “admonished and encouraged to publish. But they didn’t do it and they did not receive tenure. You should have confidence in the process,” he said to Ms. Jorgens. She said she was concerned that “we wait three years for that to happen.” “What would you have told the candidates that we didn’t tell them?” Mr. Wiseman asked. The Provost said that her advice would have been the same as the department’s, but that without this process, “I would not have had the opportunity to say this isn’t working, it’s time to send you on your way.” Tom Baginski (German) questioned whether a candidate were better served by being terminated at the fourth year rather than after being denied tenure. Tony Leclerc questioned the need to “protect” candidates in this way. “These aren’t children,” he said.

Paul Marino said that it was quite possible for someone to produce “two significant publications by the sixth year, and you wouldn’t know at the fourth year” whether or not that would happen. The Provost said that “you would know if they were in the offing.” Claire Curtis asked for clarification of the proposal: is there not automatic review of the 4th-year packets by T & P? Mr. Lesses said this would be “at the Provost’s discretion.” Liz Martinez (Hispanic Studies) asked, “Could someone who was told they’d be fired by department, legally say that they want a fourth year review, that they are legally entitled?” Ms. Jorgens answered that she was “not clear when a candidate would do that,” but that she would not object to it. Frank Kinard asked if this would be initiated only in cases where both the dean and the department had recommended retention. The Provost said that the language states “even if” the recommendation was for retention. So it could be done if the recommendation were for termination. Charles Kaiser said that this seemed to be interpreting the third-year as a summative evaluation, when in many cases in the past it has served as a formative evaluation that helps candidates to improve. Jack Parsons said he still was “not very comfortable with this, not because I oppose 4th year review,” but because there were not enough conditions accounted for in the proposal: should a candidate be able to request such a review? Should a department?
Ms. Clary said she did not think such a review would be asked for. Ms. Jorgens said that her “supposition” was that “the department or the dean can make a recommendation for 4th year review” if either party had concerns but wasn’t ready to vote to terminate a candidate. Glen Lesses observed that the Provost can stipulate what she likes in the Faculty-Administration Manual, since it is not the Senate’s purview; we only advise on changes. Tom Kunkle (Mathematics), noting that it was now 6:20 p.m., moved to remand the proposal to the committee. This motion was seconded and then passed.

**Committee on Academic Standards**

Debbie Vaughn, chair, proposed the following.

On October 12, 2004, the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards approved Sylvia Gamboa’s request to change the Summer School Course Overload Policy.

Currently, printed and electronic information from the Office of Summer Sessions refers to “Maximum Course Loads Allowed.” The committee agrees that all wording should refer to “Recommended Maximum Course Loads.” We also feel that two caveats should be given:

- Students with a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or less are advised against taking an overload
- Students with a cumulative or major GPA of 2.0 or less are strongly advised against taking an overload.

Deb Vaughn notes that Sylvia Gamboa has told the committee that the current policy is not actually enforceable. Furthermore, the Summer School has compared students who take an overload to students as a whole, and finds that the overloader’s grades are actually better, so it is hard to claim that the new policy would be harmful to students. Therefore, she has requested that the prohibition be removed and the “strongly advised against” caveats inserted. The Senate then approved the Committee’s proposal.

Ms. Vaughn then turned to a second proposal, below.

On November 16, 2004, the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards approved Jeri Cabot’s proposal to amend the withdrawal policy (page 19, 2004-2005 Undergraduate Catalog).

Currently, the catalog reads:

Students may voluntarily withdraw from a course before the official withdrawal date of the semester (see "academic calendar") providing they do so through a
formal process. Students may withdraw from individual classes or labs through Cougar Trail on the Web. A grade of W will be entered on their record.

Proposed language that begins in last line of the current statement:

Students may voluntarily withdraw from a course before the official withdrawal date of the semester (see "academic calendar") providing they do so through a formal process. Students may withdraw from individual classes or labs through Cougar Trail on the Web. A grade of W will be entered on their record unless the student has been found responsible for an Honor Code violation. In that case, the professor determines the grade entered on their record for that class.

Rationale:

Many professors' syllabi indicate that if a student is caught cheating, then s/he will automatically receive an “F” for the course. However, two plagiarism cases have come before the Honor Board this semester prior to the official withdrawal date. These students were found in violation of plagiarism and were able to withdraw from their classes without getting the penalty of an “F” in their GPAs. There needs to be a policy in place that closes this loophole.

Ms. Vaughn explained to the Senate that as it stands now, if a student is charged with cheating in a course before the withdrawal date, then the student can just withdraw and there is no recourse for the professor. Therefore the committee wishes to prevent this possibility by adding the sentence at the end of the paragraph. Sue Turner (Hispanic Studies) asked who have to find the student responsible for an Honor Code violation. Ms. Vaughn said this would be the Honor Board. Ms. Turner said that the proposed language suggested that the faculty member could decide on a grade based on the faculty member’s belief that the student was guilty. Jeri Cabot (Student Affairs) said that this was not the intention of the amendment, and she offered alternative wording as a friendly amendment: “A grade of W will be entered on their record unless the Honor Board has found the student responsible for an Honor Code violation.” Once this amendment was accepted, the proposal was passed by the Senate.

Committee on Graduate Education
Sarah Owens, chair, proposed the following new courses and course changes. The Biology courses that were cross-listed with undergraduate course were being proposed jointly by the undergraduate Curriculum committee and the Graduate committee, as Susan Morrison confirmed on behalf of Curriculum. All the following proposals were then approved:

COURSE CHANGE PROPOSALS
EDFS 725 - Classroom Management (change title to Classroom and Behavior Management)
EDFS 726 - Advanced Classroom Management (change title to Advanced Classroom and Behavior Management)
PROPOSALS FOR NEW GRADUATE COURSES
FREN 603 - Stylistics
FREN 681 - Oral Proficiency in French
SPAN 682 - Spanish Oral Proficiency

PROPOSAL TO CHANGE THE MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH PROGRAM
Requirement changes for British Literature

NEW COURSE
BIOL 627/EVSS 627   Marine Tetrapod Biology
BIOL 614/414   Environmental Immunology

Constituents’ Concerns
Incredibly, the Senate had now worked through its entire agenda. The Speaker asked if there were any Constituents’ Concerns, but all that could be mustered was Reid Wiseman’s anxiety that Senators might be missing that night’s broadcast of Jeopardy in which, as Internet rumor had it, the record winning streak would be broken. Given this concern and the triumphant completion of the night’s long agenda, the Senate moved to adjourn at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary