The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, April 25, 2006, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115 to continue business that we didn’t finish at the April 11 Senate meeting.

**New Business**

**Curriculum Committee**

Faculty Speaker Bob Mignone recognized Agnes Southgate, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, who moved several curriculum proposals (see Appendix I).

**A) Marketing & Supply Chain Management**

The first item the Senate discussed was a new major in Supply Chain Management. Chris Hope, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, reported that her committee was split in its vote on the proposal. They understood the desire to design special majors to stay in line with other business schools in the nation and to be on the cutting edge, but committee members had the following objections to the proposal:

1) That it was too specialized for an undergraduate major and would be more appropriate as a concentration.
2) That it required a very high number of hours to complete (although it is not out of line with other business majors).
3) That two required courses in the major are not yet fully developed.

The Speaker then recognized Erin Beutel, Chair of the Budget Committee, who said her committee had been concerned about the costs of the two new courses, but had been reassured there would be an amendment put forward in the Senate that would address costs.

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) reminded Senators that the College requires every department to offer a major with 36 hours. She argued that it is unclear where the 36 hour major, which would serve as an alternative to the Supply Chain Management major, is. Jose Gavidia (Management and Entrepreneurship) replied that, in the School of Business, there is no clear correspondence between majors and departments. Departments are groups of faculty, but majors don’t necessarily correspond to department groupings. Chris Hope added that there are exceptions to the 36-hour rule for the Schools of Business and Education. Mr. Gavidia also pointed out that the proposal for the major reduces hours from the concentration as it currently exists.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) spoke next. She wondered why there was no answer to question #8 on the new major proposal form. Thus, there was no academic discussion of why the particular courses for the major were chosen or how they fit into the beginning, middle, and end of the major. Ms. Curtis also worried that prerequisites for required courses would add to the high number of hours for the major. Finally she pointed out that
48 hours in the major are specific, required courses, and only 3 hours offer any type of elective. She would like to see a fuller explanation and justification for the major in pedagogical terms.

Terry Bowers (English) added that some members of the Academic Planning Committee simply felt the proposal was incomplete. For instance, no syllabi for the two new courses were offered. Mr. Bowers suggested the proposal was too incomplete to vote on. Ms. Southgate, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, spoke to this issue, pointing out that her committee had struggled with the issue of whether or not all new courses should have to be included with proposals for new majors. She believes they should, but argued that past precedents had been set for approving majors without all new courses fleshed out. Next year’s Curriculum Committee, she added, might have to deal more fully with this issue.

Glenn Lesses (Philosophy) voiced objections that he said were along the same lines as those originally presented by Chris Hope. He wanted to hear more about the review of the proposal by the Academic Planning Committee. He also wondered how the new major fit into the liberal arts and sciences curriculum. Some preliminary research he did shows that, around the country, places with majors like this were large, research universities with good programs in these areas. Wharton, MIT’s Sloan School, and some of the other best business schools in the country, as well as the COPLAC schools (Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges) did not have similar programs. In light of this, Mr. Lesses asked whether the major represented a legitimate undergraduate program.

Joe Kelly (At-Large, English) then raised two questions. First, he wondered if any of the schools mentioned by Mr. Lesses had specialized, niche programs based on their location. He suggested that the new major in Supply Chain Management might make sense here because of our location. Mr. Lesses replied that Sonoma State University has a wine management program, but most of the schools he researched did not have the kind of specialized, niche programs Mr. Kelly was asking about.

Second, Mr. Kelly asked why the proposal did not include a catalog description of the major. Ms. Southgate replied, saying that there had been many different versions of the proposal. Apparently, the proposal came to the Curriculum Committee and was sent back for revision several different times. Julia Eichelberger (At-Large, English) then asked for clarification about whether it is customary to vote on a major without a list of the major requirements. Ms. Southgate replied that it is not. She believes that there was a catalog description in an earlier version of the proposal, and that the description should have been included in the proposal, but wasn’t. Both Jose Gavidia and Gerry Gonsalves (Management and Entrepreneurship) confirmed that this was the case.

Daryl Phillips (Classics/German/Italian/Japanese/Russian) moved that we table the proposal and reconsider it next year. After a brief conference with Parliamentarian George Pothering, Mr. Phillips changed his motion. Instead of tabling the proposal, he moved that we refer it back to the Curriculum Committee.
The floor was then opened to discussion of Mr. Phillips’ motion. Jack Parson (Political Science) wondered if it were clear what the Senate is asking the Curriculum Committee to do with the proposal. It was generally acknowledged that the questions asked by Senators in the discussion of the proposal (and now contained in these minutes) would need to be answered. Julia Eichelberger said she’d like to see the proposal explain more clearly to the non-specialist what constituted the beginning, middle, and end of the major. Right now, the only rationale offered by the proposal is that students taking the major will be well paid upon graduation.

David Gleeson (History) argued that the Curriculum Committee had already passed the proposal and that he didn’t think it was fair to hold this proposal to a higher standard than other items which had been approved by the committee.

Daryl Phillips pointed out that only four pages of the proposal were available on the Senate website. Obviously, somewhere in the process, pages have dropped out of the proposal. The Senate needs a complete document.

The Senate voted to send the new major proposal in Supply Chain Management back to the Curriculum Committee for further consideration.

The Senate approved all of the other curriculum items, after brief discussion of the following items:

C) School of Sciences and Mathematics
Ms. Southgate pointed out that the new courses proposed by the School of Sciences and Mathematics, all research experiences carrying no credit, were created mostly so that students could receive stipends. State rules stipulate that students can’t receive stipends and credit hours for the same course. Paul Young (Mathematics) asked whether these courses would have any effect on students’ GPA’s. Ms. Southgate replied “no.” Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) asked if a grade of “unsatisfactory” in the research experience would appear on student transcripts. Ms. Southgate replied that it would.

G) Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education
Ms. Southgate pointed out that the new B.S. in Cognate Secondary Education would replace the current minor in Secondary Education. Students would still have to major in another academic discipline as well. Terry Bowers (English) announced that the English Department was split in their vote on this proposal. Those who were against it thought that the current hierarchy (major in a discipline, minor in secondary education) is good because it emphasizes a content area. He wondered if there is any evidence that this proposal will attract more teachers, suggesting it might have the opposite effect of scaring potential teachers away because it sounds like more work. Fran Welch, Dean of the School of Education, replied that this proposal is on the floor because students have asked for it. And further, students asking for it are good students—teaching fellows quite often. They believe they are already doing the work of a double major and they want credit for that. In addition, Ms. Welch argued that Secondary Education is currently
buried in the catalog and at the college; it’s difficult to find. Her School wants students to have strong content areas, but strong training in pedagogy as well.

Betsy Martin (Chemistry) spoke next, pointing out that her department was split on the proposal as well, for many of the same reasons cited by Mr. Bowers. She urged, though, that we make the path to teaching for students as smooth and accessible as possible. Bob Perkins (EDFS) argued that one reason for the new major is to reward students, but other reasons are to recruit new students and to help with advising. Students often come to teaching late and many advising problems arise because they are not getting to Secondary Education until it is too late. Andy Lewis, Chair of the Teacher Education Council, which has members from various academic departments, added that the council voted overwhelmingly in favor of this proposal. Students are currently putting in much, much more than the typical 18 hours required of a minor, but receiving credit for only a minor.

**Addendum to Curriculum Proposals**

Ms. Southgate moved to suspend Senate rules to allow us to consider an addendum to the curriculum items under consideration, since these new items had not appeared on the original April 11 agenda and the Senate had not seen them a week in advance. (See Appendix 2 for Addendum items).

The Senate approved suspending the rules by the required 2/3 vote.

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) asked for clarification about the following sentence describing the proposed change for ARTH 338: “This falls into same category as ARTH 335 and should read the same way.” Ms. Southgate explained that this sentence means the prerequisites for both courses will be the same.

The Senate approved all items proposed in the Addendum.

**Graduate Education Committee**

The Speaker then recognized Betsy Martin, Chair of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs, who first introduced a proposal for a Certificate Program in Medical and Health Care Interpreting, noting that the program received positive recommendations from both the Academic Planning and Budget Committees. The Certificate Program itself, Ms. Martin added, does not need a vote, but the new courses that accompany the program must be approved by the Senate.

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone asked for clarification about whether the Senate was being asked to vote. Hugh Haynsworth (Dean of Graduate Studies) replied that the Senate was welcome to vote on the proposal even though such a vote is not required. If the courses are voted down, he added, the proposal will be dead anyway.

Glenn Lesses (Philosophy) opened the discussion by referring to an article he’d seen in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* six weeks ago. This article stated that the college’s Program in Legal Interpreting, which has been in existence for ten years, has graduated
only 25 students. Mr. Lesses said that these figures made him question whether enough demand for the new program is really there. He wondered if instituting such a program would be a good use of the College’s resources. Liz Martinez (Hispanic Studies) spoke to Mr. Lesses’ question, noting that she is the one who put the certificate program together. She has volunteered at MUSC and sees a great need for such a program. The needs are so great, in fact, that Hispanic patients sometimes wait 4-5 hours for an interpreter to arrive to help them. The low number of students graduating from the Legal Interpreting Program, she added, is probably because all courses are offered during a six-week period in the summer. The program is currently being moved into the regular academic year so working people can take evening courses over a more spread-out time period.

George Hopkins (History) added that, in his view, Legal Interpreting is highly specialized, but that the Medical Interpreting Program would appeal to a wider range of people.

Hugh Haynsworth added that the Chronicle article Mr. Lesses referred to was extraordinarily positive about the Legal Interpreting Program. He added that new students have not been accepted into that program every year, and that it was funded out of summer school tuition. The current program being proposed is separate from Legal Interpreting with no intersecting courses. If the Medical Interpreting Program becomes successful, it might be possible, down the road, to incorporate the two into a single program in interpreting.

The Senate then voted to approve the new Certificate Program in Medical and Health Care Interpreting.

Ms. Martin next introduced the four new courses that will accompany the certificate program:

a. INTR 514 - Fundamental in Medical Interpreting
b. INTR 601 - Written and Sight Translation in Health Care
c. INTR 607 - Languages and Cultures in Health Care
d. INTR 613 - Consecutive Interpreting in Health Care

Susan Kattwinkel pointed out a typo in the title of the first course. It should actually read “Fundamentals in Medical Interpreting.”

There was no further discussion. The Senate voted to approve all four new courses.

Graduate Education Committee—Honor Code and the Grade of XF

Betsy Martin, Chair of the Graduate Education Committee, then moved to suspend the Senate rules to consider a motion from the committee concerning the Honor Code and the Grade of XF. The motion to suspend was necessary because this item did not appear on the original April 11 Senate agenda and because Senators did not see the motion a full
week in advance. The motion to suspend the rules was approved by the required 2/3 vote.

Ms. Martin introduced the motion, which reads as follows:

“We move that the Graduate School adopt the Honor Code as approved. When an XF is awarded to a student in a graduate program, the grade will carry a GPA of 0.0. However, dismissal is not automatic. Rather, the student’s status in the program (e.g., continuation with sanctions and probation, suspension or expulsion) will be determined pursuant to the College of Charleston Honor Code. The form used by the professor to report a suspected Class 1 or Class 2 violation to the Honor Board will have a place for the professor to check whether, based on the offense, he/she recommends Class 1 (sanction 1 or sanction 2) or Class 2 (sanction 1 or sanction 2).”

Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked what the committee’s rationale for this proposal was. She pointed out that academic expectations of graduate students are higher than for undergraduate students—they get kicked out of the program after receiving an “F” in a course. She asked why we shouldn’t have higher ethical expectations of graduate students as well. Ms. Martin replied that the Academic Standards Committee had not sent the original XF proposal passed by the Senate to either the Graduation Education Committee or the Graduate Council. Thus, those two bodies had no input into the institution of the XF grade. The Graduate Council, in particular, did not want to turn this issue over to another body since it has such serious consequences for graduate students. Yet, some people argue that we’re one institution and the Honor Code should apply to all, equally. This proposal represents a compromise view.

Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) then asked what we call adjuncts without doctorates who teach in graduate programs—professors or instructors? He pointed out that the wording in the motion might be a bit misleading and made a friendly amendment to change the word “professor” when used in the motion to “instructor.” The amendment was accepted.

Paul Young (Mathematics) asked who would determine the student’s status in the program, pointing out that this point is unclear in the motion. Ms. Martin replied that the Honor Board makes this determination. Mr. Young then moved a friendly amendment to add the phrase “by the Honor Board” after the words “will be determined” in the motion. The amendment was accepted.

David Gleeson (History) asked for clarification about the word “dismissal” used in the motion. He wondered whether “dismissal” meant suspension or expulsion. Ms. Martin said that it depended what class of violation the student was convicted of and what the sanction was determined to be. Hugh Haynsworth added that the works “expulsion” and “suspension” are used in the Honor Code, but the term “dismissal” has been used for years in the Graduate Catalogue. Dismissal is not equivalent to either suspension or expulsion. With a dismissal, a student is not eligible to re-apply for a program for one year. Then, the student may re-apply, and may or may not be re-admitted.
Mr. Wiseman then asked whether there were two separate Honor Boards, one for undergraduates and one for graduate students, or just one. Mr. Haynsworth replied that there is a single Honor Board, but that graduate students sit on cases involving other graduate students.

Discussion ended, and the Senate voted to approve the Graduate Committee’s motion concerning the Honor Code and the Grade of XF. The amended motion reads as follows (changes to the original motion are in red):

“We move that the Graduate School adopt the Honor Code as approved. When an XF is awarded to a student in a graduate program, the grade will carry a GPA of 0.0. However, dismissal is not automatic. Rather, the student’s status in the program (e.g., continuation with sanctions and probation, suspension or expulsion) will be determined by the Honor Board pursuant to the College of Charleston Honor Code. The form used by the instructor to report a suspected Class 1 or Class 2 violation to the Honor Board will have a place for the instructor to check whether, based on the offense, he/she recommends Class 1 (sanction 1 or sanction 2) or Class 2 (sanction 1 or sanction 2).”

**Constituents’ Concerns**

The Speaker recognized George Hopkins (History), who pointed out that, when we discussed the Coca-Cola Corporation at the previous Senate meeting, issues of human rights violations at other companies the College does business with were raised. Some faculty members argued it was unfair to single out Coca-Cola. Mr. Hopkins asked whether the College has a corporate responsibility clause in any of our vending contracts. Some other universities do have such clauses, and Mr. Hopkins feels the College should have a uniform policy about these issues as well. Mr. Mignone promised to check more fully into this matter and get back to the Senate about it. Scott Peeples (English) pointed out that a resolution about Coca-Cola passed by the SGA does include language about a corporate code of conduct. This was the one difference between the SGA resolution and the resolution passed by the Senate.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:25.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix 1: Curriculum Proposals

A) Marketing & Supply Chain Management
-Proposal for a new major: Supply Chain Management

B) English
-Proposals to change a course:
  1. ENGL 101: change course title and description
  2. ENGL 102: change in course description

C) School of Sciences and Math
-New course proposals
  1. BIOL 397: Research Experience in Biology
  2. CHEM 397: Research Experience in Chemistry
  3. CSCI 397: Research Experience in Computer Science
  4. DISC 397: Research Experience in Discovery Informatics
  5. GEOL 397: Research Experience in Geology
  6. MATH 397: Research Experience in Mathematics
  7. PHYS 397: Research Experience in Physics

D) Theater
-New course proposals
  1. THTR 365: Musical Theater performance workshop
  2. THTR 323: Creating scene and song

E) Latin American and Caribbean Studies
-New course proposal
  1. LACS 499: Bachelor’s Essay

F) Arts Management
-Proposals to change a course
  1. ARTM 340: Add ARTM 310: Advanced Arts Management as a pre-requisite
  2. ARTM 370: Building Participation in the Arts: Add ARTM 200: Introduction to Arts Management as a pre-requisite.
  3. ARTM 400: Internship. Remove ARTM 340: Arts Financial Management or ARTM 420: Policy in the Arts as pre-requisites

G) Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education
-Proposal for a new major: B.S. in Cognate Secondary Education (to replace existing minor)

H) Communication
-New course proposals
  1. COMM 378: Persuasion
  2. COMM 389: Public Opinion in American Politics
  3. COMM 395: American Politics and Mass Media
4. COMM 475: Electronic Magazine Production

- Course Change Proposals
  - Add prerequisites to COMM 380

- Delete a Course
  - Delete COMM 231: Journalism Practicum

- Proposal to Change electives for the Communication Studies Concentration
  - Add COMM 378 to Theory

- Proposal to Change electives for the Media Studies Concentration
  - Strike Theory/Research and insert Advanced Theory
  - Add COMM 378 to Media Electives
  - Add COMM 475 to Advanced writing
  - Strike POLS 389 and insert COMM 389
  - Add COMM 395 to Advanced Theory

- Proposal to Change electives for the Corporate and Organizational Communication Concentration
  - Add COMM 378 to Applications/Electives

- Proposal to Change electives for the Communication Studies Minor
  - Add COMM 378

- Proposal to Change electives for the Media Studies Minor
  - Add COMM 378, COMM 389, and COMM 395

I) Sociology:

- New course proposals:
  1. SOCY 272: Statistics for Sociology
  2. SOCY 372: Qualitative Research practicum
  3. SOCY 379; Special Topics in Social Research

- Proposal to delete a course:
  SOCY 363: African American Society and Culture

- Proposal to change a course:
  1. SOCY 343,350 and 354: change course number to respectively SOCY 366, 365, 364
  2. SOCY 347: change course number to SOCY 361 and catalog description
  3. SOCY 360: change course title, course prerequisites, and catalog description.
  4. SOCY 369: change course title and catalog description.
  5. SOCY 371: change course title, course prerequisites and catalog description.
  6. SOCY 362 change in course description
- Proposal to change degree requirements: B.S. Sociology
Appendix 2: Addendum to Curriculum Proposals

Art History program

ARTH 265: The city as a Work of Art. Remove all prerequisites

ARTH 299: Research and Methods in Art History (our "gateway" course)
Prereq currently reads: ARTH 101 or 102 or permission
Due to changes in the overall program, this should say:
6 hours of Art History or Permission of instructor

ARTH 335: History of American Architecture
Prereq currently reads: Permission ...or 6 hours of Art History or ARTH 299
Because of changes in HPCP program (for which these is an elective), this should say:
Permission of instructor OR six (6) hours of Art History OR ARTH 299 OR HPCP 199.

ARTH 338: American Vernacular Architecture and Material Culture
This falls into same category as ARTH 335 and should read the same way.

ARTH 340: Selected Topics in Art History
Prereq currently reads ARTH 101 or 102 or 103 or permission (This was the old listing).
It should read like all 300-level courses, that is:
Permission of instructor or 6 hours of Art History or ARTH 299.

Historic Preservation and Community Planning

HPCP 339 History of American Interiors add prerequisites HPCP 199 or permission of instructor

HPCP 420 Preservation Law and Economics. Remove ARTH230 as prerequisite, add HPCP 199

HPCP 490 Independent study. Add prerequisite Junior or Senior standing in HPCP with 3.0 GPA (overall and HPCP)