MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 28, 2006 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, February 28, 2006, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

The minutes from the January 31 Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens began her report by informing faculty that she and several Deans had just returned from two admission events, one in Greenville and one in Columbia. These were both productive experiences, and she hopes the college participates in similar events in the future.

Next, Ms. Jorgens shared with faculty some statistics from the huge number of surveys conducted by the offices of assessment and planning and institutional research as well as by private consultants. The following are some interesting pieces of information collected in these surveys:

- Students asked about their decisions to enroll at CofC rated (among numerous other items) the following factors:
  - Opportunity to study overseas: 22% said “essential”
    28% said “very important”
    25% said “somewhat important”
    25% said “not important”
  - Opportunity for undergraduate research: 11% said “essential”
    25% said “very important”
    31% said “somewhat important”
    33% said “not important”
- 47% rated the college’s involvement in NCAA I Athletics as “not important” in their decision to enroll; 61% rated CofC’s reputation as a party school as “not important.”
- 71% of students reported having either a mother or father who has attained a Bachelor’s Degree from a 4-year institution of higher learning.
- Student religious affiliated broke down as follows:
  47%--Christian Protestant
  20%--Catholic
  20%--none
8%--other
3%--Jewish
1%--Buddhist
1%--Baptist

• Data from national student opinion surveys conducted in 2003 and 2004 show that students perceive CofC’s strengths to be:
  --quality of undergraduate instruction, both in introductory courses and in the major
  --academic support from faculty
  --accessibility of faculty outside the classroom
  --variety of courses offered

• Data from the same survey show that students perceive CofC’s weaknesses to be:
  --accessibility of advisors in the major
  --quality of advising
  --availability of offered courses

• Data from a national survey of college freshmen, conducted in 2004, show that CofC’s freshmen have the following characteristics:
  --91% are white
  --75% live over 100 miles away from the College
  --20% are Catholic
  --19% claim no religion
  --40% have fathers who are in the field of business
  --20% have mothers who are in the field of business
  --77% plan to attain a graduate degree of some kind
  --79% used the internet for research and/or homework
  --74% said CofC was their first choice for college

• Another national student survey, which attempts to get at actual student experience, not just their opinions, shows that:
  --CofC is successful in providing knowledge, but less successful in providing techniques or venues for students to showcase their knowledge.
  --Faculty are good at interacting with students in the area of grades and academics, but could engage students better in other ways.
  --CofC students excel at interacting with students from different backgrounds, but the college doesn’t encourage such interaction as much as it could.
  --CofC does well in the areas of study abroad and internships.

• Finally, a nation-wide survey conducted of faculty showed the following characteristics of CofC faculty:
  --31% are between the ages of 30-39
  --16% are 60+
  --68% are married
  --67% have a spouse working in the same city
--27% have a spouse working in academia
--30% joined CofC since 2002
--50% joined CofC since 1997
--12% will retire in the next 3 years
--67% developed a new course in the past two years

After the Provost had presented these statistics, she asked for questions from the Senate. Joe Kelly (At-Large, English) asked about the status of the faculty workload report. Ms. Jorgens replied that the administration had learned a great deal from the report. She has been working with Deans and Chairs to see if the College can accomplish the goals of the report without a full-scale change in the faculty manual. There are two areas she is particularly focusing on: 1) trying for increased flexibility for release time for research work, and 2) paying more attention to the way that independent studies are credited. In their workload efforts, the administration is using national benchmarks through the Delaware Study. Ms. Jorgens added that it is her goal to make any decisions about workload as open and transparent as possible. She expects that any decisions made by the administration will be supportive of faculty work.

When asked if new workload policies would be in effect next year, Ms. Jorgens responded that she hopes so, and that any new policy will be data-driven. Scott Peeples (English) then asked whether the workload report is available on-line. Ms. Jorgens replied that it is not. She apologized for not making the report more open, but the administration is worried about generating negative feedback from outside campus.

Speaker

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone began his report by announcing that there will be a student/faculty forum to discuss the new plus/minus grading system on March 16, from 5:00-6:00 in the Stern Center Ballroom. All faculty are welcome to attend.

In addition, he announced that the third stage of the college identity discussion will consist of faculty forums to be held in March. We will be hearing more about these forums soon.

Old Business

Academic Planning Committee—Transcript Notation of Non-Credit Experiences

The speaker then recognized Chris Hope, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, who made the following recommendation to the Senate on behalf of her committee:

The Academic Planning Committee recommends that the Senate require department or program driven course approval by the Curriculum Committee and the Senate prior to transcript notation for non-credit experiences. The current
practice of manually entering non-credit experiences in a field separate from courses on the academic transcript should be discontinued. Departments/programs that feel the need for a transcript notation for non-credit experiences should develop a department or program specific course proposal for such and submit it for consideration to the Curriculum Committee. In the absence of the passage of such a department/program course, students may place such non-credit experiences on their co-curricular record (as proposed by Student Affairs) or on a resumé.

**Rationale:**

- Historically, departments, the Curriculum Committee, and the Senate determine academic value of a course of study. That “flow chart” makes considerable sense.

- The academic transcript of an institution, if it is to retain its authority, credibility, and value, must be a document that reports academic work and not other types of life experiences.

- As currently configured, some non-credit internships have no departmental faculty supervision and award no grade, therefore it is inappropriate to place them on an official academic transcript.

In the discussion that followed, Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) asked if we could encourage students to include non-credit experiences on their resumés. Ms. Hope responded that the co-curricular records proposed by Student Affairs is intended to do just this—build resumés.

Brian McGee (visitor, Communication) asked if this proposal would be only a recommendation made by the Senate, not binding. Ms. Hope replied that it would, adding that all Senate proposals are merely recommendations. Mr. McGee then asked if there would be a period of time before this recommendation was implemented, since there are students in the pipeline right now who currently receive transcript notation for non-credit experiences. Ms. Hope replied that she thought there would be. There would be no removing of items already on the transcript.

Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) moved to amend the motion by adding that the new policy be put in place only after some kind of instrument is developed to recognize co-curricular activities. Peter Calcagno (Economics/Finance) seconded the motion to amend. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) agreed that there should be a co-curricular transcript, but spoke against Mr. Blackwell’s amendment, arguing that the people who create the new co-curricular transcript might delay because they are the same people who supported putting non-credit experiences on the academic transcript in the first place.

Discussion ended, and the amendment failed. A vote was then taken on the original recommendation as brought by the committee. The motion passed.
Academic Standards Committee—Proposal to Modify Admission Standards for the School of Business and Economics

The speaker next recognized Lynn Cherry of the Academic Standards Committee, who made the following motion to implement new admission standards for the School of Business and Economics:

The School of Business and Economics has admission standards to attract and retain students with the ability and commitment necessary for success in business and economics. The standards include the following requirements:

Completion of the following courses with no grade less than a “C-":
- MATH 104 or 250
- MATH 105 or 120
- ECON 201 or HONS 211
- ECON 202 or HONS 212
- ACCT 203*
- ACCT 204*
- DSCI 232

*Economics majors are not required to take ACCT 203 or ACCT 204.

Students should apply for admission to the School during the semester they expect to complete the requirements described above. Non-admitted students may take up to 9 hours of upper-division business courses (300 level or above). Exceptions to this 9 hour limit will be made to allow completion of degree requirements for other College of Charleston students with majors outside of the School of Business and Economics.

In the discussion that followed, Julie Davis (Communication) asked whether the last sentence of the proposal applied to minors. Rhonda Mack (Marketing and Supply Chain Management) replied that it did. The exceptions will apply mostly to minors and transfer students.

Next, Glen Lesses (Philosophy) asked whether the committee had considered the impact of these new admission standards on other parts of the College. He particularly wondered if there would be a flight of students to other programs. Ms. Cherry replied that the committee didn’t discuss this issue in detail. Her opinion is that, typically, many students who struggle in business classes currently do change their majors. Mr. Lesses responded that, when a new admissions policy for the School of Business and Economics failed in the Senate last semester, one of the concerns was how admissions standards for particular schools would impact other parts of the college. He still has the same concerns. Ms. Mack replied that the new standards require a GPA less than that needed to graduate from the College. She argued that the new standards don’t set as high a bar as the previous proposal did.
The Speaker then recognized Bob Perkins (At-Large, EDFS), who asked how grades would be calculated for students who retake a course after receiving a ‘D’ initially. Ms. Mack replied that all the proposal asks is that students eventually get at least a ‘C-’ in the listed courses. So, if a student initially took MATH 104, received a ‘D,’ then retook the class and received a ‘C-,’ they would not be denied admission to the school.

Darryl Phillips (Classics/German/Italian/Japanese/Russian) spoke next, pointing out that he believed the School of Business and Economics could accomplish their goals without calling for a special admissions process. He suggested making these grade requirements pre-requisites rather than admission standards. Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) pointed out that, currently, all the SIS computer system checks is whether a student is enrolled in necessary pre-requisite courses; it doesn’t check grades.

Joe Kelly (At-Large, English) then asked whether any student meeting these requirements would be guaranteed admission to the School of Business and Economics. Ms. Mack replied that the school can’t guarantee graduation because that depends on seats being available. But, she added that students meeting the admission requirements would be allowed to declare a major. Mr. Kelly asked if this could be made more explicit in the proposal. He suggested a friendly amendment which would make it clear that any student who meets the proposal’s requirements couldn’t be rejected from admission to the school. The amendment would read, “All students completing these courses with a grade of C- or better may declare a major in the School of Business and Economics.” The amendment was accepted as a friendly one.

Next, Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) said that she was concerned about the precedent of one school setting higher admission standards than others. She would love to have all her students be required to have passed English 101 with a ‘B.’ Claire Curtis (Political Science) responded that she was less concerned about precedent with this proposal than with the previous one because of the low bar required for admission. Julia Eichelberger (At-Large, English) agreed with Ms. Curtis, adding that she believes the proposal will help the School of Business and Economics mentor students and alert them early on of the need to do well in courses and take them seriously. Bob Perkins agreed, saying that he believes the intent of the proposal is not to get rid of students and send them to other schools, but to save students from failure.

Sue Balinsky (Physical Education and Health) then asked if there would be any opportunity for a student who received a ‘D’ in one of courses on the list, perhaps because of unusual circumstances, but who had a good overall GPA, to be admitted to the school.

Kay Smith, Associate Vice-President of the Academic Experience, asked how many hours a student would normally have when he or she declared a major under the new proposal, pointing out that the college requires students to declare majors by the time they have accumulated 60 hours. Ms. Mack replied that the latest students would declare a major in the school would be the second semester of their sophomore year. Students who come with AP credit would declare earlier.
Next, Joe Kelly wondered whether, if the Senate approves this proposal, future changes would have to come through the Senate again, or if, once passed, changes could be made by the administrators in the School of Business and Economics. Ms. Cherry replied that any future changes to the proposal would have to go through the appropriate faculty committees.

Returning to Ms. Balinsky’s previous question, Claire Curtis proposed a friendly amendment which would allow a student to petition to be admitted to the school despite one grade of ‘D’ in a course from the list. Ms. Mack replied that the proposal as is doesn’t preclude petitions. Elizabeth Jurisich (Mathematics) then spoke against the proposed amendment, arguing that it’s not a matter of sympathy—if students have missed a chunk of a math class, they’re simply not prepared to succeed in a later course. Jason Overby (Chemistry) agreed with Ms. Jurisich, pointing out that a ‘D’ grade stands for “deficiency.” Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) then argued that this issue is taken care of in the policy itself, since students can still take three upper-division classes before they declare a major. Ms. Mack added that the proposal is based on data, and that students making below a ‘C-’ on the listed courses aren’t going to succeed in the program. The friendly amendment was not accepted.

Discussion then came to an end, and after a voice vote, the proposal passed.

**Academic Standards Committee—Report on SGA Resolution and Proposal to Form an Ad-Hoc Committee**

Mr. Mignone then recognized Lynn Cherry again, who reported on the Academic Standards Committee’s examination of the SGA resolution concerning the plus/minus grading policy. Ms. Cherry said that the committee considered seven items from the resolution, which they considered to be in their purview. Of these items, the committee decided that several were worthy of further study.

Therefore, the committee proposed forming an Ad-Hoc committee to study the following issues:

--the course withdrawal deadline
--the maximum number of withdrawal credit-hours allowed
--a possible academic redemption policy
--the GPA required for various levels of graduation and semester honors.

In the discussion that followed, George Pothering (At-Large, Computer Science) asked what an academic redemption policy is. Ms. Cherry replied that such policies are in effect at many schools; they often allow students to retake courses in which they earned a ‘D’ or ‘F,’ but not have the old grade count in the GPA. Kay Smith then added that most schools with such policies strictly limit the number of courses a student can retake. Jason Overby then asked how an academic redemption policy fit with concerns about the new plus/minus grading system raised by the SGA resolution. He argued that this seemed like a “pork policy.” Ms. Cherry replied that the students also raised a number of additional
questions and concerns they would like to see addressed. These additional concerns are not necessarily related to the original resolution.

Susan Kattwinkel then asked why an Ad-Hoc committee was needed. She wondered why the Academic Standards Committee didn’t investigate these issues further. Ms. Cherry replied that the Standards Committee is extremely busy at this point and that the student concerns will be addressed in a more timely manner if an Ad-Hoc committee is formed. Jose Gavidia (Management and Entrepreneurship) then asked whether this was an emergency situation that we need to look at before the implementation of the plus/minus grading policy. Ms. Cherry replied that it was not an emergency, but that she doesn’t believe it should be dragged out unnecessarily.

Calvin Blackwell then asked whether the Ad-Hoc committee proposed could only consider relaxing standards or if it could also consider tightening standards as well. Ms. Cherry replied that such considerations would be up to the committee itself.

Discussion ended, and the proposal to form an Ad-Hoc committee passed.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

The Speaker then recognized Agnes Southgate, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, who moved the following proposals:

1) Astronomy packet:
   a. New course proposal: PHYS-377 Experimental Astronomy
   b. New Major: B. S. in Astrophysics. This will de facto replace the current B.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration. It will be more visible and attractive to potential students.
   c. New Major: B. A. in Astronomy.

2) Communication packet:

New course proposals:
   1. COMM 223: Interviewing (offered once/year)
   2. COMM 360: Communication and Technology (no overlap with Computer Sciences)
   3. COMM 436: Crisis communication (offered every other year)
   4. COMM 476: Capstone in Corporate and Organizational Communication (offered once/year)

Course changes:
   a. added prerequisite
   COMM 407: Seminar in Communication Management
   COMM 370: Gender and communication
b. New course description and prerequisites:
COMM 285: Basic Photojournalism *(change in emphasis to digital photography)*

c. New course title, description and prerequisites:
COMM 385: Advanced Photojournalism and Documentary Photography *(change in emphasis to digital photography)*

**Change in degree requirements for the major**

a. For all concentrations: Eliminate all references to ENGL 382 *(now replaced by COMM 382)*

b. Under Major requirements remove parenthetical text after “36 hours” and replace with “(except 39 hours for the Media Studies Concentration and 42 hours for the Corporate and Organizational Communication Concentration)” *This represents an increase of 3 credit hours in both cases*

c. For Communication Studies Concentration:
Add COMM 223 to “Fundamentals” section
Add COMM 360 to “Electives” section
Add COMM 394 to “Applications” section

d. For Media Studies Concentration:
Add COMM 375 (editing) to the “Required Courses” section
Add COMM 245, 285, 360, 394 and 436 to the “Media Electives” section
Add CSCI 112 and 114 to the “Media Electives” section
Delete the “Visual Communication” section and the “Trident Technical College” section
Create “Media Studies Capstone” section with choice from: COMM 499, 407, 435 or 495, with a minimum of 3 credits to fulfill capstone requirement.
Remove COMM 407, 435, 495 and 499 from “Media Electives” section

Under “Media Electives” drop from 3 additional courses to 2 additional courses.
Increase from 15 to 21 the number of credit hours needed at the 300-400 level with COMM-prefix.
Cap at 3 credit hours the number permitted in non-COMM courses to fulfill the Media Studies requirements.

e. For Corporate and Organizational Communication Concentration:
Add COMM 223 to “Fundamentals” section
Add COMM 360 and 436 to “Applications/Electives” section
Create “Corporate and Organizational Communication Capstone” section with choice from: COMM 435, 476, 495 or 499, with a minimum of 3 credits to fulfill capstone requirement.
Remove COMM 435, 495 and 499 from “Applications/Electives” section

**Change in degree requirements for the minor**

a. For Communication Studies
Add COMM 223 to the 200-level electives list
Add COMM 394 to the 300-400-level courses list

b. For Media Studies
Add COMM 335 and 394 to “choose 3 courses” section

3) Political Science packet

New course proposals:
1. POLS 221: Law and Society (from special topics)
2. POLS 308: Education Policy “
3. POLS 309: Health Policy “
4. POLS 310: Political Ecology “
5. POLS 334: Geographies and politics of the European Union (from special topics)
6. POLS 335: Cuban Revolution (study abroad in Cuba)
7. POLS 351: Utopia/Dystopia (from special topics)
8. POLS 352: Gender, Theory and Law; Sexual Harassment (from special topics)
9. POLS 353: Beginning Mock Trial once/year
10. POLS 354: Advanced Mock Trial once/year
11. POLS 368: Political Geography once/year
12. POLS 369: Politics of Globalization every 2 years
13. POLS 394/COMM 394: Political Campaign Communication from special topics in Comm
14. POLS 395: American Federalism (from special topics)

Change a course proposal:
POLS 301: Change in Title and description: Bureaucratic Politics and Policy

Delete a course proposals:
1. POLS 300: Budgetary Process
2. POLS 303: Advanced Policy Studies
3. POLS 320: Politics of Western Europe
4. POLS 325: Politics of Eastern/Central Europe
5. POLS 348: Methods in Political Science
6. POLS 349: Contemporary Constitutional Issues
7. POLS 385: The American Bureaucracy
8. POLS 393: Religion and Politics
9. POLS 403: Seminar in Public Policy
10. POLS 404: Seminar in Political Sciences

4) Art History packet

New course proposals:
1. ARTH 104 Themes in the History of Art
2. ARTH 225 Medieval Art
3. ARTH 277 Renaissance Art
4. ARTH 285 Modern Art
5. ARTH 301 Studies in Ancient and Medieval Art
6. ARTH 303  Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art  
7. ARTH 306  Studies in Modern, Contemporary and Film Arts  
8. ARTH 308  Studies in Asian Art  
9. ARTH 321  Hindu Myth and Image  
10. ARTH 322  Indian Painting  

Course changes:  
   a. New course title and description:  
ARTH 101  History of Art: Prehistoric through Medieval (changed from: History of Art: Prehistory through Renaissance)  
   better reflects content  
ARTH 255  Latin American Colonial Art (changed from: Latin American Art: Colonial to Modern)  
   content stops at the time of 19th century independence  
   b. New course number;  
ARTH 105 from ARTH 245  
   this course is a basic introductory course  
   c. Deletion of prerequisites:  
ARTH 250  American Art  
ARTH 255  Latin American Art: Colonial to Modern  
ARTH 265  The City as a Work of Art  
   These are broad survey courses  
   d. Deletion of prerequisites and new course number:  
Renumber ARTH 305  Pre-Colombian Art and Culture to ARTH 205  
Renumber ARTH 310  African Art to ARTH 210  
Renumber ARTH 345  Greek and Roman Art to ARTH 220  
Renumber ARTH 341  History of the Art of India to ARTH 241  
Renumber ARTH 342  History of the Art of China to ARTH 242  
Renumber ARTH 343  History of the Art of Japan to ARTH 243  
Renumber ARTH 380  History of Baroque Art to ARTH 280  
Renumber ARTH 393  Introduction to Film Art to ARTH 293  
   These are broad survey courses  
   e. New course title, description and prerequisites:  
ARTH 415  Advanced Seminar in Art and Architectural History (changed from Senior Paper in Art History); prerequisite: “Permission of instructor or 6 hours of Art History or ARTH 299”  
   f. Change prerequisites  
for all 300-level courses change prerequisites to: “Permission of instructor or 6 hours of Art History or ARTH 299”  

Change in Degree Requirements for the Major:  
1. Remove ARTH 101, ARTH 102, and ARTH 103 from list of required courses.  
2. Create 3 category of courses. Students need to choose at least one from each.
3. Additional requirements stay the same

5) Historic preservation and Community Planning packet

**Course changes:**

a. Create parallel courses with HPCP acronym for ARTH 290 (Special Topics); ARTH 340 (Special Topics); ARTH 410 Internship; ARTH 490 (Independent Study); ARTH 499 (Bachelor’s Essay) without removing the ARTH courses

b. Create parallel course HPCP 415 “Senior Seminar.” Leave ARTH 415 “Senior Paper in Art History” in place.

c. Change acronym:
ARTH 315 to HPCP 315 Urban Design Studio
ARTH 319 to HPCP 319 Architectural Design Studio
ARTH 420 to HPCP 420 Preservation Law and Economics

d. Change acronym & number:
ARTH 230 to HPCP 199 Introduction to Historic Preservation
ARTH 318 to HPCP 299 Preservation Planning Studio

e. Add HPCP acronym and Cross List with ARTH
ARTH 275 and HPCP 275 History of Land Design
ARTH 339 and HPCP 399 History of American Interiors

**Change in Degree Requirements for the major:**
ARTH 265 (The City as a Work of Art) becomes an alternative to HIST 211 (American Urban History) in the core requirements, and is removed from “column B.”

Added to the list of electives: ARTH/HPCP 339 (History of American Interiors)
HPCP 420 Preservation Law & Economics

**Change in Requirements for Minor**
Added to the list of electives: ARTH/HPCP 275 (History of Land Design); ARTH/HPCP 339 (History of American Interiors) and HPCP 420 Preservation Law & Economics are

6) Business Administration packet

**New course proposal:**
MGMT 350: Business, Leadership and Society

**New Concentration:**
Leadership and Organizational Studies

7) Art Management packet
New course proposals:
ARTM 210: Introduction to Music Management: proposal and syllabus
ARTM 325 Understanding Creativity: proposal and syllabus

8) Theater packet

New course proposals:
THTR 145: Elementary Tap
THTR 146: Intermediate Tap
THTR 322: Children’s Theater Repertory
THTR 339: Advanced Ballet
THTR 421: Creative Drama II

Course changes:
    a. Change in course description:
THTR 176: attendance at events and written critics
THTR 200
THTR 201: include student teaching in description
THTR 202: include stage management in description
THTR 331: lecture only, no practicum
THTR 387: reflect content
THTR 388: reflect content

    b. Change in course description and prerequisites:
THTR 316:
THTR 383: lecture only

    c. Change in course number and prerequisite:
THTR 270 (changed from THTR 370), change to lower courses prerequisites

    d. Change in prerequisite:
THTR 180, THTR 310, THTR 311 and THTR 377

    e. Change in course title and description:
THTR 221: to Creative Drama I (from Creative Dramatics)
THTR 380: change to Sound design and Production for the Stage (from Seminar in Sound for the Theater) reflect content

    f. Change in course title:
THTR 240: to Costume I: introductory studies (from Costume: introductory studies)

    g. Change in course title, description, and prerequisite:
THTR 340: to Costuming II (from Costume design)
THTR 207: to Drafting and Rendering (from Graphics for the Theater) reflect content, eliminate reference to computer graphics
h. Change in course title and prerequisites:
THTR 440: to Costume design (from Costume design research)

Change in Requirements for Concentration
Theater for Youth concentration:
Deletion of 2 courses (EDEE 311 and elective) being replaced by THTR 322 and THTR 421 (new courses above)

Deletion of ARTM 200 being replaced by 1 hour in either THTR 201/202 and 2 hours THTR 200

During discussion of the Astronomy packet, Glen Lesses (Philosophy) said that he found the new majors “extremely attractive.” But he pointed out that the College has a catalogue requirement that a department offering a major with more than 36 hours must also offer one with no more than 36 hours. He asked about an alternative offering to the B.S. in Astrophysics. Jon Hakkila, Chair of the Department of Physics and Astronomy, replied that the B.A. in Astronomy is the alternative offering. The name is different so as not to scare students away.

The next issue raised concerned the Communication packet. Julia Eichelberger (At-Large, English) asked about the amount of writing required for COMM 223: Interviewing, one of the new courses proposed. The syllabus seemed to imply that only 3 or 4 pages of writing would be required. Terry Bowers (English) also questioned the course, arguing that the course objective of students becoming better interviewees might be something better learned on the side rather than in an academic course. He asked whether the course required research. Brian McGee, Chair of the Communication Department, responded to both questions, pointing out that the field project required in this course is quite substantial, requiring both a good deal of writing and in-depth research.

Scott Peeples (English) then raised a question about the Business Administration packet. He pointed out that the syllabus for MGMT 250: Business, Leadership and Society, a new course being proposed, includes a line which states that all company analyses performed by students become the property of the professor. He asked whether this practice were legal and argued that he found it objectionable in any case. George Pothering (At-Large, Computer Science) pointed out that when students used to do software engineering projects in his department, the projects remained the property of the department.

Next, Susan Kattwinkel asked about the new concentration in Leadership and Organizational Studies. She argued that the proposal restricts admission, but has no clear guidelines or requirements for who would be admitted. Tom Kent, Chair of the Department of Management and Entrepreneurship, responded that the department would look for the best fifteen applicants, pointing out that this is not a major, but a concentration within an already existing major. Brian McGee then voiced his support for
the new concentration, but requested that the department notify departments that support these courses if the number of majors increases.

The last curriculum proposals discussed concerned the Theatre packet. Glen Lesses, pointing out that many dance classes are cross-listed with the Department of Physical Education and Health, wondered why the proposed new courses in tap dancing aren’t cross-listed. Todd McNerney, Chair of the Theatre Department, replied that these courses have been previously taught as special topics and have never been cross-listed. The intent of the department is to eventually institute a dance major, at which time they will have to de-cross-list the dance technique courses so that students won’t have too many PE courses (since the College only counts a certain number of PE courses toward graduation).

None of the other curriculum proposals elicited discussion. All of the motions brought by the Curriculum Committee passed.

**Constituent Concerns**

The Speaker recognized Scott Peeples (English) who announced that, at the next Faculty Senate meeting, he planned to introduce a motion on behalf of Amnesty International to encourage the College not to renew its Coca-Cola contract. Mr. Peeples wanted to give faculty members a heads-up about this matter.

Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) then asked about the possibility of having an ombudsman on campus. Provost Jorgens replied that the administration is investigating this possibility right now. An ombudsman is a neutral person who mediates campus disputes in the hopes of avoiding the grievance process.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary