Minutes of the March 27, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, March 27, 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone requested to suspend Senate rules in order to put Old Business after New Business on the agenda (so that we could discuss the General Education Proposals at the end of the meeting.) Mr. Mignone’s request met with no objection.

The minutes from the February 27 meeting were approved.

Reports

Mike Haskins & Brian McGee—Integrated Marketing Communications Committee

Mike Haskins and Brian McGee reported on the work of the Integrated Marketing Communications Committee, which has been meeting for several months to update the visual design of the College's marketing tools (logo, website, publications, etc.) They pointed out that the College is behind other schools in terms of best practices in this area. Institutions such as Vanderbilt and Emory have better, more consistent websites and marketing tools than we have at the College. The committee has been conducting research and assessment; they plan to launch a new, integrated "brand" for the College in Fall of 2007. Following the report, Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) asked how many people in the field of higher education marketing used the word “branding,” suggesting that “imaging” might have fewer negative connotations. Mr. Haskins replied that the term is commonly used, that it serves as a short-hand that people in marketing and education are used to. The brand will be used to recruit students, to aid in fund-raising, and to enhance the college’s reputation in general.

Kay Smith—SACS Accreditation

Because Provost Elise Jorgens was out of town and unable to make a report, Mr. Mignone called on Kay Smith, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, to report in the Provost’s place. Ms. Smith reported that the recent SACS accreditation visit was quite successful. The accreditation team praised the QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) involving the First-Year Experience in particular, making no recommendations for change in relation to this plan. The SACS team lauded the QEP for faculty involvement in developing and staffing the First-Year Experience, for its setting within the academic culture, for the fact that it provides multiple pathways (both First-Year Seminars and Learning Communities), and for a Learning Communities proposal that would link CofC students with students at Trident Technical College.

Tenure and Promotion Committee—Proposed Changes to the FAM (to be voted on at April 17 Senate meeting)

Jane Clary, Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, presented a series of proposals for changes to the Faculty Administration Manual (FAM) involving Tenure and Promotion procedures. While many of these changes involve minor updating of the FAM, some are more substantial, such as a proposal that untenured faculty members will no longer be required to write colleague letters and a proposal that department-wide course grade statistics be included in evaluation packets. The series of proposals has gone to the By-Laws Committee for
consideration and will be debated and voted on at the April 17 Senate meeting. (For a full list of the T & P Committee’s proposed changes, please see Appendix 1).

Several faculty members asked questions as Ms. Clary was presenting her report. Norris Preyer (Physics/Astronomy) asked about Proposal II, which recommends that the minimum sample size of letters from recent graduates be increased from 25 to 40. Mr. Preyer said that his department would have trouble getting 40 letters, because they have so few majors. Ms. Clary responded that the department would have to try to obtain 40 letters, and if they didn’t have enough majors, they could solicit non-majors for letters. Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) pointed out that the new rules would require at least 40 requests for letters be sent out, not that 40 letters actually be returned by students.

Mary Beth Heston (Art History) asked whether Proposal III.2, which requires only tenured members of a department to submit colleague letters, applied to only those undergoing third-year review, or to everyone being evaluated. Ms. Clary replied that this change refers to all evaluations (third-year, tenure, and promotion).

Ms. Heston then asked a question about Proposal IV, which involves the granting of prior credit toward tenure. She wondered why the amount of prior credit granted would be a decision of the T&P Committee. Ms. Clary replied that it is not; this is a decision determined by contract letter. The language of this proposal is simply intended to reflect current administrative practice, which is to grant a maximum of two years prior credit toward tenure. Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) then argued that such a policy might drive well-qualified candidates away. Brian McGee (guest, Communication) pointed out that a well-qualified faculty member could still pursue early tenure and promotion, which is allowed.

Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) said that she was opposed to the portion of Proposal IX that gives less calendar time for departmental panels to meet and make decisions concerning tenure and promotion. Ms. Caveny felt a two-week period was too short, especially for large departments that have numerous candidates and may have more than one meeting devoted to each candidate. Ms. Clary replied that the T&P Committee wanted the whole process moved up, and they would be willing to re-examine the calendar, and perhaps move packet due dates earlier.

Terry Bowers (English), also in reference to the proposed calendar, asked whether a candidate waiting for a verdict on a publication could still add this to the packet later in the semester. Ms. Clary replied that candidates could add items to the packet, but that the date for doing this would be moved up a short time.

Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance), in relation to Proposal X, which requires an alternate member of the T&P Committee—from the candidate’s school—to serve when no regular member comes from that school, asked how it would be determined which regular member of the T&P Committee would step down. Ms. Clary replied that this might be determined by committee members’ schedules or by volunteer.

Next, Mary Beth Heston thanked Ms. Clary for all her hard work on the committee, noting that T&P is one of the most time-consuming committees that faculty members serve on. Mark Lazzaro (guest, Biology) asked if there were a plan for how people would be grandfathered in, if these proposed changes pass. Ms. Clary replied that her committee did not see anything in the
proposals that would require people to be grandfathered in; none of these changes involve contract-letter issues. Brian McGee added that, of the eleven proposals, only one (Proposal X) is a by-laws change controlled by the Senate and the Senate process—the other ten changes occur in the administrative portion of the FAM and have been brought to the Senate as a courtesy to establish a consultative process. Mr. Mignone pointed out that there is a strong tradition at the College that any policies concerning T&P be made through administrative consultation with faculty. Pete Calcagno (Economics/Finance) then asked about the timeline for when these changes would take effect. Ms. Clary replied that the changes would go into effect for Fall 2007.

The Speaker

Mr. Mignone’s report was very brief. He reminded Senators that special meetings of the Senate to discuss the General Education Proposals would take place on April 10 and April 12, and if necessary, on April 26 and May 3. In addition, regular Senate meetings are scheduled for April 17 and April 24. All of these meetings will be at 5:00 p.m. in the Wachovia Auditorium.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

The Senate approved all of the curriculum proposals from the Departments of Computer Science, Mathematics, Religious Studies, Theatre, and Economics and Finance. (For a full list of these proposals, please see Appendix 2).

There was brief discussion concerning of few of the proposals. Mark Long (Political Science) asked why there were no required texts listed for the proposed new course THTR 391, Stage Combat. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) replied that no textbooks currently exist for this course; it’s a movement-oriented course, similar in certain ways to a dance course. Mr. Long replied that he had found ten textbooks on the Amazon website called stage combat. Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) asked whether the course involved jousting and dueling. Ms. Kattwinkel replied that it does, but that it also involves history, films, articles, etc. Jennifer McStotts (guest, School of Humanities and Social Sciences) said that she could attest to the volume of handouts that are used in the class because her husband has taken it.

In addition, Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) asked about the requirement change for the major in Economics, which is intended to reduce requirements and give students more elective choices. He was particularly sorry to see the course ECON 308, Evolution of Economic Doctrines, dropped as a requirement. Mr. Nunan also said that he was surprised to see in the proposal that less sequencing of courses is a national trend in Economics departments. Pete Calcagno (Economics/Finance) replied that most Economics majors will still take ECON 308 anyway, because available electives are limited. The course is no longer required to be taken at a specific time in a student’s career, however. Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) added that Economics is moving in the direction of being more like a science. Biologists, he argued, do not require students to take a course in the history of biology. Such courses could be counter-productive in any case since they would focus on outmoded biological ideas. Mr. Nunan replied that he thought this was an unfortunate attitude. Mr. Blackwell said that he would prefer to see students spend their time on more relevant courses.
First-Year Seminar, FYSM 101

The Senate then turned to another proposal from the Curriculum Committee, for a new First-Year Seminar course, FYSM 101. Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) introduced the proposal by offering a brief history of its inception. The course, he said, represents unfinished Senate business. In the spring of 2004, the Academic Planning Committee presented a motion to the Senate to approve a First-Year Seminar course. While the full proposal was not approved, the first page of the proposal was accepted as a concept for a First-Year Seminar, with the understanding that the details of the course would be worked out later. Now, three years later, we have a fully worked out proposal with details. In addition, the proposal for FYSM 101 is also a reaction to the SACS visit and the Quality Enhancement Plan, which focused on two curricular initiatives, Learning Communities and a new First-Year Seminar. Mr. Wilder chaired the committee working on the First-Year Seminar for SACS accreditation. The third impetus for this course is the work of the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education and the proposals this committee has come up with. On April 13, the Senate approved a proposal to require a First Year Experience for all entering students. One possibility for fulfilling that experience is the First-Year Seminar. This is the proposal we are considering today.

Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) next introduced an amendment to the proposal that would hold departments harmless in relation to workload target numbers if faculty members sign on to teach these seminars, which will have low enrollments. Mr. Nunan’s amendment reads as follows:

Amend section 10(b) (Address potential shifts in staffing of the department) of the Curriculum Committee’s FYSM 101 New Course Proposal to read as follows (addition in blue):

All sections will be taught by regular faculty. Because of their low enrollment ceilings, the enrollments of FYSM 101 courses will be double-counted with respect to departmental teaching workload target figures, or departments will be otherwise “held harmless” with respect to the potential effect of these courses on workload target figures. Staffing will vary by department. As noted in 11 below, some departments will have additional faculty to help staff the course. Departments may offer sections of FYSM 101 in lieu of offering other general education courses.

Amend section VI.C (Faculty – Training, Compensation, Workload) of the First Year Seminar Committee’s FYSM 101 New Course Proposal to read as follows (cf. bottom of p. 15 of the Curriculum Committee support document entitled ‘New Course Support Report Feb 07’):

Participation in the First-Year Seminar program is part of the faculty member’s regular teaching load. Because of their low enrollment ceilings, the enrollments of FYSM 101 courses will be double-counted with respect to departmental teaching workload target figures, or departments will be otherwise “held harmless” with respect to the potential effect of these courses on workload target figures. Documentation of teaching performance in FYSM 101 will be included in the evidence of teaching effectiveness…
Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) asked what effect Mr. Nunan expected this amendment to have. Mr. Nunan replied that we currently have target numbers for departments to meet in terms of average student load. If someone is teaching two sections of a freshman seminar with 20 students each, rather than, say, 70 students in two sections of a departmental introductory course, departmental workload numbers could drop significantly, especially if several faculty members from a single department participate in the seminars. Such changes in target numbers could affect hiring decisions, etc. In addition, Mr. Nunan pointed out that the Senate had already added similar language to the portions of the General Education proposals that were passed at the April 13 special meeting of the Senate. Mr. Blackwell said that he didn’t see how Mr. Nunan’s amendment would accomplish his goal, because this document doesn’t really exist in any official capacity—it’s simply a curriculum form. It might be better, he added, to have a general Senate resolution on the matter. Hugh Wilder replied that, as the First-Year Experience program gets more fully developed and implemented, the committee and director will be reading documents concerning this course. So, he thinks that by revising this form and the accompanying report, the people implementing this course will have it in writing that the Senate endorsed these changes. Mr. Wilder asked that Senators approve Mr. Nunan’s amendment, pointing out that it would be odd to endorse similar language in the General Education proposals, but not here.

Darryl Phillips (At-Large, Classics) then asked a procedural question. He wondered if we were debating and voting simply on the curriculum proposal or also on the lengthy 40-page report that came with it. Mr. Wilder replied that the two documents are integrated. On the curriculum committee form, in responses to a few of the questions, references are made to the full report. He added that he thinks it’s unavoidable that the Senate will be voting on the detailed report as well as the curriculum proposal.

After a few more questions from Senators, concerning where this report appears (with other documents on the Senate website), what the enrollment ceilings for the course are (20), and whether we have the power to pass this amendment (everything the Senate passes is a recommendation), Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) called the question on the amendment. The Senate voted in favor of calling the question. Mr. Nunan’s amendment passed on a voice vote.

At this point, discussion returned to the original motion. David Kowal (Art History) moved to table (postpone) the discussion. A vote was taken and the motion to table failed.

Larry Krasnoff (guest, Philosophy) then asked what he referred to as a record-keeping question. He wondered whether FYSM would be the acronym for the course used on student transcripts, and whether this would make it difficult for the course to count toward specific majors as well. Mr. Wilder replied that there would be a specific identifier for each section so that the course could toward other requirements. The committee that developed the course wanted it to have its own identity as a First-Year Seminar even though this may make record keeping a bit more difficult.

Darryl Phillips (At-Large, Classics) said that he was in favor of the seminar, that he likes the fact that roster faculty will teach it, but he was disappointed with the curricular proposal. He would much prefer the course to have departmental acronyms identifying it because setting it up as FYSM entails setting up a new department in the SIS system, which he believes creates several problems. All faculty members would have student evaluations generated by the FYSM
department, which would go to the director of the First-Year Experience, not to department chairs. Percentile ratings for faculty evaluations would be compared against a group that is this new department. In addition, among other difficulties, an FYSM department would create problems tracking faculty workload. He would rather see the course created within existing departments than labeled with the FYSM moniker. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) replied that Mr. Phillip’s concerns had great merit and would have to be dealt with by an administrative body. Current courses (such as a Spoleto class she teaches) have acronyms that are not attached to a department. So, similar things are being done now, and they work. The General Education Committee was concerned that putting the course into existing departments might create a situation in which, over time, there would be creep toward these seminars becoming discipline-introductory classes, which is a model the General Education Committee does not want to follow.

Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) said that, while our new administrative computing system might be better, the SIS system we currently have would require that all double-counting of the FYSM 101 course would have to be done by hand, a painstaking process. Mr. Phillips, responding to Ms. Kattwinkel’s comments, argued that having a committee that approves or rejects First-Year Seminar courses on a regular basis would prevent the kind of disciplinary creep the General Education Committee feared. One of the things the QEP was praised for during SACS accreditation, he added, was its being situated in an academic setting, and he can think of no better academic setting than a disciplinary department rather than an FYSM department. Mr. Phillips also wondered whether departments would have to give up classroom space that would be allocated to an FYSM department. Mr. Wilder said that his committee did consider some aspects of the questions raised by Mr. Phillips. They used the Honors College as a model for the acronym and the way it would be implemented. In addition, we have other examples of four letter acronyms at the College that are smaller than departmental units. He argued that it is not quite accurate to say we would be creating a department by adopting the FYSM acronym. These four-letter acronyms do not necessarily stand for departments. Again, his committee wants this course to have its own identity, not to be subsumed by departments.

Mick Norton (Mathematics) said that he would like to see something added to the proposal about incoming students learning they’re expected to work hard and hold up their end. Larry Krasnoff, returning to the acronym debate, said that labeling of the course was not really a substantive issue; it is basically a record-keeping issue. He would like to see the course kept in departments just because it would be simpler. He is unable to amend the motion because he is not a Senator, but he would like to see a Senator propose an amendment to change the acronym so we can vote it up or down. Kay Smith then argued that we need to think about incoming students. She believes we would send a stronger programmatic message to these students by using the FYSM acronym. Such a designator would indicate that this is a special experience, and that we have special expectations of it. Information can easily be shared between the director of the First-Year Experience and department chairs. A director would need to know, she added, how these courses are working as a group of courses.

After a few more comments about the possibility of packaging the courses in both ways (as FYSM courses and as departmental courses), Mr. Wilder said that he thought we were getting away from discussion of the course itself and into implementation issues. The director of the FYE and the FYE committee can work to develop publicity that will advertise the courses in a clear and helpful way. Students can also be advised about how the courses can double count.
Calvin Blackwell then pointed out that we haven’t created a separate designation for Learning Communities. He argued it might be a good idea to pick one way or the other of designating courses. Since Learning Communities are designated within departments, he argued that we might as well use this practice for the FYSM courses as well. David Gentry (At-Large, Psychology) then asked how interdisciplinary FYSM courses would be accounted for if we use departmental acronyms. Deanna Caveny proposed that, as soon as our system allows it, the FYSM courses could be given multiple names.

Brian McGee said that he shares Mr. Phillip’s concerns, but that he’s taught similar courses at other institutions, and he can’t believe we won’t be able to solve problems they’ve solved in other places. Richard Nunan argued that specific departmental designators could be used in section numbers, and agreed with Mr. McGee that such problems can be worked out. He also said that he believes Learning Communities are quite different from freshman seminars and he would like to keep these courses separate. Doryjane Birrer (English) agreed that record-keeping can be worked out later, arguing that the Senate, as a body, has already endorsed shared General Education goals. She hopes we will take the opportunity to have a linguistic marker (FYSM) to indicate institutional cohesion, rather than reduce things back to departments.

Meg Cormack then offered an amendment that all courses would be labeled by department acronym. No one seconded the amendment. The question on the main motion was then called by Mick Norton. The Senate voted in favor of calling the question.

The Senate approved the proposal for a new FYSM 101 class.

The Senate adjourned at 7:00. New business that we didn’t get to at this meeting included curriculum proposals from the Department of Management and Entrepreneurship, proposals from the Graduate Education Committee, a proposed amendment to the FAM by the Nominations and Elections Committee, and a proposed campus-wide Committee on Environmental Sustainability. Except for the Nominations issue, which will be taken up at the special Senate meeting on April 10 (because of election timelines), the remaining issues will be taken up at the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate, on April 17.

Respectfully Submitted,
Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix 1.

T & P Committee: Recommendations for Changes to the Faculty Administration Manual

I. Student Evaluations, Comments on Student Evaluations (Manual Change)

1. The Faculty Administration Manual (FAM) requires that student ratings from all courses are included as evidence. The FAM also states that the candidate and/or the department may choose to include the comments as evidence (J.1.b.(5)). We recommend that no changes be made in this policy. However, the statement regarding student evaluation forms in section M.6.c. conflicts with that in J.1.b.(5).

We recommend that the statement in M.6.c. be changed from

“All completed student evaluation forms for courses taught during the evaluation period. (Normally these are included by the candidate in the packet; they may be provided by the department chair in the event the candidate is unable to do so.)”

To

“Student Rating Averages from all courses evaluated, Summary Ratings for all courses in the department, and Grade Distribution Reports for the department. (Normally, course evaluation ratings are included by the candidate in the packet; however, some or all of these documents may be provided by the department chair in the event the candidate is unable to do so.)”

2. We recommend that:

The following statement be added to J.1.b.(5), calling this statement (5.b.), and making the current statement (5) become (5.a)

“The Summary Rating for All Courses in the Department for each semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder with the summary student evaluations. The summary ratings for the department will be distributed to the faculty in the department each semester.”

3. We recommend that:

The following statement be added to J.1.b.(5), calling this statement (5.c.).

“The Grade Distribution Report for the Department for each semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder. The Grade Distribution Report for the Department will be distributed to all faculty in the department each semester. Names and other identifying information may or may not be removed from the report at the Department Chair’s discretion. The complete data in the report for an individual faculty member will be distributed to that faculty member each year for every semester.”
Rationale: Both the Summary Rating for the department for student evaluations and the Grade Distribution Report for the department represent additional evidence for evaluating teaching in the context of the department norms. Further, the Grade Distribution Report is useful for individual faculty in determining how one compares with others in the same department. It is clear that these reports are being used to evaluate candidates at the department level and references to grade distributions are common in the departmental panel and colleague letters. There are presently no guidelines about the use of these reports for evaluative purposes in the Manual. There is likewise no campus policy for the distribution of these reports. Identifying information about specific faculty may or may not be removed at the Chair’s discretion. We believe that requiring the distribution of the reports to all faculty members leads to greater consistency and transparency and provides useful information to the faculty member.

II. Letters from Recent Graduates (Manual Change)

We recommend that:

1. **The minimum sample size be increased from 25 to 40 in J.1.b.(4) in line 2 and in line 15.**

2. **Each Department’s graduate evaluation form will include a section that contains information and questions which will be used campus wide. This part of the form will be distributed by the Office of Academic Affairs each year.**

3. **Solicitation of Recent Graduate Evaluations for Third-Year Review cases be optional.**

   Add the following statement to J.1.b.(4) and to M.6.f.

   “**Recent Graduate Evaluations are optional for Third-Year Review.”**

Rationale: We recommend increasing the size of the sample in order to receive a larger number of responses. We recommend using a common part as part of the evaluation form so that at least some of the information received is consistent across departments. We recommend that departments supplement the common form if a department needs to have additional information specific to a department. We recommend not requiring letters for third-year review because most third-year review candidates will not have taught a significant number of recent graduates.

III. Department Colleague Letters/Extra-departmental Colleague Letters (Manual Change)

We recommend that:

1. **No extra-departmental colleague letters be required for third-year evaluation.**

   Add the following statement to M.6.d.

   “**Extra-departmental colleague letters are optional for third-year review.”**
2. the requirement specifying who in the department is required to write colleague evaluation letters be changed:

M.6.b. the current statement,

“Normally, only those faculty members who have more than two (2) full years of service within the department shall provide colleague evaluation letters; however, any member of the department may submit a colleague letter.”

Be changed to:

“Normally, all tenured faculty members in a department, including the department chair, must provide colleague evaluation letters; however, any member of the department may submit a colleague letter.”

Rationale:

1. We recommend that colleague letters written by College of Charleston faculty outside of the department not be required for third-year evaluation. In many cases, the faculty member being evaluated does not have significant service and other activities outside the department to merit requiring these extra-departmental evaluation letters. However, a person may request such extra-departmental letters if one so chooses.

2. We recommend that only tenured members of a department be required to write colleague evaluation letters. Some untenured faculty members may not feel comfortable writing evaluative letters for senior members in a department, and requiring untenured faculty members to evaluate senior faculty in the department could place the untenured faculty in a precarious position. For these reasons, the majority of the committee feel that un-tenured faculty members should therefore not be required to write colleague evaluation letters. We recognize, however, that in many cases, untenured faculty provide very thoughtful and useful information, especially in the area of research, and that these junior faculty might be better able to put the candidate’s contribution in perspective. An untenured faculty member in a department may write a colleague evaluation letter if he/she chooses to do so.

IV. Prior Credit

The current practice at the College, as we understand, is that normally, no more than two years of credit for prior experience is granted toward tenure. The FAM makes reference to cases in which up to three years of credit is granted.

We recommend that:

1. All references to ‘three (3) years of prior credit’ be changed to ‘two (2)’ for both instructional faculty and for library faculty in all sections of the FAM.

The final sentence in the first paragraph, M.1., should be deleted (In the case of faculty members hired with three years of credit toward tenure, the tenure review will replace the third year evaluation.)

2. The current practice and policy in the FAM is that faculty members with two years of credit will be evaluated during the spring semester of the
second year (after 3 semesters completed at the College) instead of during the fall semester of the third year (after 4 semesters) and that the Provost's Office will develop a special calendar for these candidates.

We recommend that this be changed:

From the Current statement, M.1. Introduction, paragraph 1,

“For a faculty member with two years of credit toward tenure, an evaluation will take place in the spring semester of the second year instead of the fall semester of the third year. (Each year as needed the Provost's Office will develop a special calendar for candidates with two years credit toward tenure who require third year review.)”

To:

“For a faculty member with two years of credit toward tenure, a third-year evaluation will take place in the fall semester of the third year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place in the fall of the fourth year. For a faculty member with one year of credit toward tenure, a third-year evaluation will take place in the fall semester of the third year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place in the fall of the fifth year.”

3. The final sentence in section 4, J. Introduction, paragraph 4,

“A person receiving the maximum of three years credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the third year at the College.”

should be changed to:

“A person receiving the maximum of two years credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fourth year at the College.”

AND the following sentence should be added:

“A person receiving one year of credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fifth year at the College.”

Rationale: Most of these changes are made to reflect current practice. The substantive change (2) is for consistency, so that all third-year evaluations take place in the fall. In all cases, the initial contract letter will stipulate when reviews are to take place. Also, current language in contract letters affords candidates the option of reverting to a tenure decision in the sixth year.

V. Mid-Year Hires (Manual Change – new information)

The FAM makes no mention of when candidates hired at mid-year are evaluated for tenure and promotion. The FAM gives no guidance concerning faculty hired at mid-year. We recommend:

1. For candidates hired at **mid-year with no prior credit**, the third-year evaluation will take place during the fall semester of the third year (after 3 semesters completed at the College) and the evaluation for tenure will take place during the fall semester of the sixth year (after 9 semesters completed).
2. For candidates hired at mid-year with one year of prior credit, the third-year evaluation will take place during the fall semester of the third year (after 3 semester completed at the College) and the evaluation for tenure will take place during the fall semester of the fifth year (after 7 semesters completed at the College).

3. For candidates hired at mid-year with two years of credit, the third-year evaluation will take place during the fall of the third year (after 3 semesters completed at the College) and the evaluation for tenure will take place during the fall semester of the fourth year (after 5 semesters completed at the College).

Given these recommendations, the following statement would be added to the introduction, M.1.

“Candidates hired at mid-year will undergo the third-year review during the fall semester of the third academic year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place during the fall semester of the sixth academic year. The evaluations for third-year review and for tenure will be adjusted accordingly for candidates hired at mid year and granted credit for prior experience.”

Rationale: No mention of mid-year hires is made in the FAM. Because faculty must be evaluated for tenure during the sixth year, we recommend that those faculty hired at mid-year (January) be evaluated on the same calendar as those faculty hired in August of the previous year. This policy gives those faculty hired at mid-year one semester less time in service before being evaluated for tenure. These changes, in large part, reflect current practice and will now be specified in the Manual.

VI. External Review of Research (Manual Change/Clarification)

1. We recommend that no changes be made concerning the requirement for External Reviews of Research – that they remain optional.

2. We recommend that the current statement in M.6.d.

“Letters of evaluation from extra-departmental colleagues assessing the faculty member’s contribution during the evaluation period.”

be changed to:

“Letters of evaluation from extra-departmental College of Charleston colleagues and, where appropriate, from colleagues at other institutions familiar with the candidate’s teaching, and/or research and professional development, and/or service; these letters are solicited by the department chair at the request of the candidate.

An independent external review of the candidate’s scholarly work by experts in the candidate’s field of work is optional, and the required protocol for this review is included in section J.2.b.(2).”

3. We recommend that the current statement in J.2.b.(2) be changed:
From

“Both internal and external colleague statements on research and professional activities.”

To

“(2) i. Departmental colleague letters evaluating research and professional development are required.

   ii. Optional evaluation of research and professional development includes:

   • letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions evaluating research and professional development

   and

   • independent external reviews of research. Departments which choose to conduct such external reviews must follow the process outlined here.”

4. We recommend that the instructions for External Reviews of Research which are included in the Memo be included in the FAM in J.2.b.2. immediately following the statement in (2) above.

5. We recommend that the current statement in J.1.b.(2) be changed:

From

“Internal and/or external colleague statements on teaching.”

To

“(2) i. Departmental colleague letters evaluating teaching are required.

   ii. Letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions evaluating teaching are optional.”

6. We recommend that the current statement in J.3.b.(2) be changed:

From

“Internal and/or external colleague statements on service activities.”

To

“(2) i. Departmental colleague letters evaluating service are required.”
ii.  *Letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions evaluating service are required."

Rationale: External review of research is being conducted more often in evaluations, and we recommend that the instructions for conducting these reviews be included in the FAM as required instructions instead of as recommended instructions. Presently, when the selection process for external reviewers is not specified or is inappropriate, the Advisory Committee is unable to use the information contained in the letters. The other recommendations for change are for clarification and consistency.

VII. Lists of Evidence for Teaching, Research and Professional Development, and Service (J.1.b.; J.2.b.; J.3.b.) should be edited to reflect any changes and current practice, and the lists might be re-ordered. Language should also be edited to reflect the use of the Executive Binder and the Supplemental Binder as necessary.

Rationale: The lists of evidence in each category is, in some cases, outdated and not in line with current practice. For example, under evidence for Research and Professional Development, section 4, evidence of scholarship, “research grants” might be changed to “funded research grants” and this item might be moved “up” in order of importance. Also, workbooks and study guides might be considered evidence of teaching, not as evidence of research and professional development, and might be moved to the section on teaching.

VIII. Insert statement passed by the Senate (2003-04) regarding “exemplary performance in at least one area” in the specific list of criteria for each rank:

   J.4.a.; J.4.b.; J.4.c. Include the statement below at the end of the introductory paragraph in each a, b, and c.

   “Evidence of exemplary performance is required in at least one of the specified professional competency areas.”

Rationale: These statements have been passed by the Senate and have not been added to the Manual.

IX. Calendar

Dates Stipulated in the Manual are marked with *.  We recommend the following date changes:

*August 15* Chairs confirm tenure list to Academic Dean, etc.....
(Changed from September 15*)

October 1 Candidates submit packets (Executive and Supplemental Binders) to the Chair
(Changed from October 15)

No later than Oct 15 Panel Chairs assure that all evaluation data have been collected and Panels convene
(Changed from October 27)
Nov 1*  Panel Chairs present results to the Dean
       (Changed from Dec 1*)

Dec 1*  Deans forward their recommendations to the Provost. Deans
       forward panel recommendations to the Provost. Deans forward all
       packet information to the Provost
       (Changed from Dec 15* (panel recommendation and packets) and from Jan 15
       (Dean’s recommendation))

Rationale: The calendar above allows for the evaluation at the department level and at the
School level to be completed before the end of the fall semester; it further allows for the work of
the Advisory Committee to begin earlier.

X. Membership on the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year
    Review (By-Laws Change)

We recommend that the Faculty Nominating Committee include as either regular
members or as alternate members at least one person from each of the Schools.

Rationale: At the request of the Provost, the Committee very carefully considered various
proposals to change the method of selecting the members of the Faculty Advisory Committee
for Third-Year Review, Tenure, and Promotion. Four options were considered:
1) selection based on nomination by each Dean, thereby increasing the number
   of members from five to seven
2) selection based on faculty vote by school, thereby increasing the number of
   members from five to seven
3) selection based on the deliberations of the Faculty Nominating Committee
   (current practice) but increasing the number of members to seven.
4) selection based on the deliberations of the Faculty nominating Committee
   (current practice) but no changes to the number of committee members.

We have concluded that increasing the number of members on the committee would make the
tasks of scheduling, of finding alternates, and of finding sufficient time to carefully review the
packets prohibitively difficult. It is our view that proposals 1 and 2 change the nature of the
committee from a “faculty voice” to a “school voice”. We feel that having the T&P Committee
chosen by the Faculty Nominating Committee balances the T&P Committee not only by
selecting members form the different schools, but also by selecting faculty members with
different ranks and by ensuring that a few of the members – but not all of the members – have
served previously on the T&P Committee. In particular, the membership of the T&P Committee
typically includes at least one member who has served on the committee the previous year.
This committee “memory” helps to consistently maintain the standards for tenure and promotion
from year to year. Selection of the committee members by direct vote or by direct appointment
eliminates the ability to balance the membership of the committee by anything other than
school. We recognize, however, that, if at all possible, candidates deserve to have a voice from
their school on the voting panel. We have therefore offered this compromise to proposals 1-4
above: the Nominations Committee will ensure that, among the 5 regular and the 5 alternate
members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review, all schools
are represented. In cases where a candidate’s school is not represented by the membership of
the regular members of the committee, the alternate from the candidate’s school will be called
in to replace one of the regular voting members, if possible.
XI. Process Clarification on Faculty Committee Action, M.10. *(Manual Change)*

We recommend that the following statements be added (insertions in italics)

The Provost will make packets of all candidates for tenure and promotion available to the members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review. *The Advisory Committee will review all of the evidence, including the evidence presented in the Executive Binder, the Supplemental Binder, and the recommendation of the Dean. The Advisory Committee will make an independent assessment of each case and may interview the candidate, the Department Chair, the Departmental Panel Chair, faculty members in the Department, the Dean, and others as necessary. The Faculty Advisory Committee will make a written recommendation to the President. The Faculty Advisory Committee will notify each candidate, Departmental Panel Chair, and the appropriate Dean in writing of its recommendation.*

The Committee will also review third-year candidates on all …..

XII. Process Clarification on Reporting Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel, Section M.7. *(Manual Change)*

We recommend that the current statement in M.7. be changed:

From

“The chair of the departmental panel will meet with the faculty member being evaluated to inform him/her of the panel’s written recommendation, which will include actual vote splits. Third year candidates will sign the panel’s evaluation.”

To

*“The chair of the departmental panel will meet with the faculty member being evaluated to inform him/her of the panel’s recommendation, including the actual vote splits. A copy of the panel’s written recommendation will be provided to the candidate. The candidate will sign the panel’s written recommendation.”*

Rationale: In some cases department chairs share the panel’s written recommendation with the candidate for promotion and tenure and in other cases the department chair only relates the vote of the panel to the candidate. The Committee recommends that a consistent policy for all departments be in place.

The current statement in the *FAM* is vague, and the Committee recommends that a more specific policy be included in the *Manual*.

The Committee believes that candidates have the right to know the issues raised in the panel recommendation. The committee also recognizes that the candor of the panel letter might be compromised if the candidate is allowed to have a copy of the letter, and this concern has been discussed at length. The committee has concluded that the right of the candidate to have the information included in the panel’s recommendation outweighs the potential danger(s), such as a lack of candor in the panel letter.
Appendix 2.

Faculty Curriculum Committee
Proposals for March 27 Senate Meeting

A. Computer Science
Proposal to change a Course – CSCI 199 Special Topics in Computing (Proposal online)
   Remove the prerequisite

B. Mathematics
Proposal to change a Course – MATH 207 Discrete Structures I (Proposal online)
Proposal to change a Course – MATH 307 Discrete Structures II (Proposal online)
   Both proposals to revise Catalog description, support letter from Computer Science

C. Religious Studies
Proposal to change a Course – RELS 301 Mysticism & Religious Experience (Proposal online)
Proposal to change a Course – RELS 350 Phenomenology of Religions (Proposal online)
   Drop RELS 105 prerequisite for both RELS 301 and RELS 350
New Course Proposal – RELS 335 Western Esotericism (Proposal & Syllabus online)

D. Theatre
New Course Proposal – THTR 315 Feminist Theatre (Proposal & Syllabus online)
New Course Proposal – THTR 318 History of Fashion & Manners (Proposal & Syllabus online)
New Course Proposal – THTR 391 Stage Combat (Proposal & Syllabus online)
   Note: Cover letter explaining the three proposals, and two support letters are also online

E. Economics and Finance
Proposal to change a Course – ECON 400 Senior Seminar in Economics (Proposal online)
   Remove the prerequisite ECON 305
Proposal to change a Course – ECON 201 Principles of Macroeconomics (Proposal online)
Proposal to change a Course – ECON 202 Principles of Microeconomics (Proposal online)
   Note: Cover letter and note online to explain Change in Sequence and renumbering of ECON 201 and 202.
Proposal to Change Requirements for Major – Economics (Proposal, reference, two support letters)

F. First Year Seminar FYSM 101
New Course Proposal - FYSM 101 First Year Seminar (Proposal & Syllabus online)
   Note: Also online is a supporting document based on the Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan
   Committee on the First Year Seminar.
G. Management & Entrepreneurship (M&E)

Proposal to change a Course – MGMT 445 Seminar in Entrepreneurship (Proposal online)
Change prerequisite and co-requisites

New Course Proposal – MGMT 351 Minority Entrepreneurship (Proposal & Syllabus and two supporting letters are online)

New Course Proposal – ENTR 406 Not-for-profit Entrepreneurship (Proposal & Syllabus online)
Note: Also online is a sheet explaining the three proposals above.

New Concentration Proposal – Entrepreneurship (Proposal with Reference, and support letter online)