Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 8 April 2008

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 8 April 2008, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order.

Reports

The Provost

The Provost had no formal report to give. Associate Provost Bev Diamond took a moment to welcome to the College and to introduce to the Senate Ray Barclay, Associate Vice President and Director of Institutional Research.

The Speaker

Speaker Kelly thanked Debbie Vaughn (Faculty Senate Webmaster), Brian McGee (Parliamentarian), and Terence Bowers (Faculty Secretary) for their service to the Faculty Senate this year.

The Speaker announced that President Benson would attend the Spring Faculty Meeting, but would not deliver a speech. Instead, he will give his speech to the entire college community at the State of the College address.

The Speaker reported that he had recently met with President Benson and Steve Osborne, Sr. Vice President of Business Affairs, to discuss various issues, including the resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate concerning the Faculty Compensation Report and the minimum raise for faculty meeting the merit threshold. The President, Speaker Kelly reported, conveyed surprise to find himself in an adversarial relationship with a good part of the faculty over the new merit-raise system. The President assured him that raises would be given to all deserving faculty, and that in a few years the concerns motivating resolutions would be addressed. The President also said that he would quit if faculty salaries don’t come to the level of faculty salaries at our peer institutions.

On the issue of the resolution on the modification of duties policy, the Speaker reported that the President told him that he was glad to be informed of developments on the issue, that he will have a cost analysis done of it, and that he was not hostile to the resolution.

With regard to the Vendor Code of Conduct that the Senate endorsed, the Speaker reported that Steve Osborne thought there might be a “sticking point” in the College’s joining one of the labor rights organizations mentioned in the motion passed by the Senate on November 13, 2008. The Speaker said that he would follow up with Mr. Osborne on this issue.

The Speaker also reported on the issue of spousal benefits (including unmarried spouses). He said that the Budget Control Board decides policy in this areas, and that he saw the goal of getting certain spousal benefits as a long-term battle. He added that he would work with Mr.
Osborne and the Faculty Welfare Committee to find a long-term strategy to deal with this issue.

The Speaker also reported on the recently circulated ethics policy and the issue of accepting gifts, in particular honoraria. He brought up the issue at the Sr. Leadership meeting and was assured by Provost Jorgens that the policy did not cover modest honoraria earned by faculty.

Brian McGee, chair of the Committee on By-Laws and the Fac/Admin. Manual

In order to get through tonight’s crowded agenda, Mr. McGee said that he would circulate his report by email.

Larry Krasnoff, chair of the ad hoc Steering Committee to Assess Faculty Governance

In the interest of time due to the loaded agenda, Mr. Krasnoff kept his report to a minimum, but said that he would be happy to take questions and comments by email if Senators wished to discuss further the activities of the ad hoc Steering Committee to Assess Faculty Governance. He reminded the Senate of the survey sent out by his committee, stressed its importance, and hoped that many faculty would fill it out. He reported that his committee would also talk to other committees and get their views on faculty governance and each committee’s role in it.

New Business

Election of Faculty Senate Committees (Budget, Academic Planning, By-Laws)

Tom Kunkle, chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, told the Senate that the committee would accept additional nominations of faculty to serve on the Faculty Senate Committees (Budget, Academic Planning, By-Laws). No further nominations were made of any of the three committees. The Senate approved the slates presented by the Committee on Nominations and Elections for each of the Faculty Senate Committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Kasman</td>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>Acad Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess</td>
<td>Miner</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Acad Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>Acad Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Eichelberger</td>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>Acad Plan (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td>LIBR</td>
<td>Acad Plan (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Gonsalves</td>
<td>MGMT</td>
<td>Acad Plan (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>McNerney</td>
<td>THTR</td>
<td>Acad Plan (S)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Curriculum Committee

The Senate approved the following proposals without discussion:

**Archaeology**
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor/Concentration – Archaeology

**Psychology/Biology**
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor – Neuroscience; delete course PSYC 384 as elective
Proposal to Change a Course – BIOL/PSYC 448 – Change Title
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor – Neuroscience; change title of PSYC 448 to “Bachelor’s Essay in Neuroscience,” in the course listing

**Jewish Studies**
New Course Proposal – JWST 210 Jewish History I
New Course Proposal – JWST 215 Jewish History II
New Course Proposal – JWST 230 The Holocaust

**Education**
Proposal to Delete a Course – EDEE 401 Literacy Assessment
New Course Proposal – EDEE 363 Introduction to Early Childhood Education
New Course Proposal – EDEE 374 Elem Education – Balancing
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – BS Early Childhood
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – BS Elementary Education
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – BS Middle Grades Education

The following proposals were next submitted for approval:
International and Intercultural Studies
New Course Proposal – HNDI 101 Elementary Hindi I
New Course Proposal – HNDI 102 Elementary Hindi II

Brian McGee (Communication) asked what the Department of International and Intercultural Studies was. David Cohen (guest) responded that International and Intercultural Studies does not refer to a department; it is a designation by which to assign and label courses. Mr. McGee then asked if there were FTEs involved and if they accrued to a home department. Mr. Cohen answered yes to both questions.

The Senate approved the two new course proposals.

The following cluster of proposals were next submitted for approval:

Economics and Finance
New Course Proposals
- REAL 360 – Special Topics in Real Estate
- REAL 420 – Real Estate Independent Study
- REAL 444 – Real Estate Internship
- REAL 499 – Real Estate Bachelor’s Essay

Proposals to Change a Course
- FINC 375 – Principles of Real Estate
- FINC 376 – Real Estate Market Analysis - Course Number Change to REAL 376
- FINC 380 – Real Estate Investment Analysis - Course Number Change to REAL 380
- FINC 381 – Real Estate Finance - Course Number Change to REAL 410

Change of Degree Requirements for Minor/Concentration - Finance
Proposal for a New Concentration - Real Estate

Richard Nunan (at-large) first commented on the proposal to delete PYSC 384, which had been approved earlier. He said that he had no problem with deleting it, but was struck by the rationale that it was being removed because there was no longer anyone to teach it. He said that it was a good idea to avoid approving courses that are so narrow that only one faculty member is qualified to teach them.

Mr. Nunan then said that he was unhappy with the Economics and Finance proposals. He said that real estate was an inappropriate major for a liberal arts institution. He thought that it was best to table the proposals until the faculty was ready to have a serious discussion about establishing such a major. Otherwise, what will happen is that when the proposal to establish a major in real estate comes up, supporters will say that the Senate has already approved the idea of the major because it has approved the courses. He also had questions about what the proposed internship was and how it counted as academic experience. He then moved to table the Economics and Finance proposals. The motion received a second.
Mike Morgan (guest) said that the Economics and Finance Department isn’t trying to pursue a real estate major. He said that this was the first time he had heard of such an idea, and that it has not been discussed in department meetings. He said that his department does not have the faculty to teach a major in real estate. Regarding the internship, he said that his department has a thorough process that the students go through. ‘It’s not a question of students driving “For Sale” signs into lawns or selling houses. Students examine real estate markets, look at marketing models, study land use, and do other things of that sort. To table the proposals would be wrong, he said. His department, he argued, has followed Senate procedures, has funded the lines for the program, and is not asking for additional resources.

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) asked Mr. Nunan when he thought the issue of the real estate major might eventually come up given Mr. Morgan’s statement there are no plans for such a major. Mr. Nunan responded that it was more honest for the Senate to assume that there will be an effort to establish a major. Therefore, the Senate needs to discuss the appropriateness of a real estate major before we have real estate courses and everything else that a major has, except the name.

Mary Beth Heston (Art History) concurred and said that the curriculum proposals look like a “serious program-building effort.” Denis Keyes (at-large) asked if taking the courses in the program leads to a real estate license. Mr. Morgan said that it did not and insisted that a major was not in the works.

The Senate voted on the motion to table, which failed.

Mr. Krasnoff then asked about the acronym for the real estate courses. Do other concentrations have their own acronym, he asked. Cathy Boyd (Registrar and guest) answered “no.” Mr. Krasnoff pointed out that minors have their own acronyms, but not concentrations. The reason, he suggested, was that minors have a strong interdisciplinary component, but concentrations generally do not. In this sense, the real estate courses should really be Economics and Finance courses. The fact that they do not use the usual acronyms of the Economics and Finance Department raises suspicion about what the real estate concentration will become. Qualifying her previous response, Ms. Boyd added that there are some concentrations with their own course acronyms. Mr. Morgan also responded that he was told several years ago that CHE defined a minor and a concentration differently according to whether it was linked to Business Management or to Economics. The rationale for this distinction, he said, was not clear to him.

Jonathan Wiley (guest) said that he spent time putting together the concentration and that there was no intention to “pull something sneaky” or to create a major. He added that in order to create a real estate concentration in a liberal arts college, one had to be thoughtful and to select courses that were linked to liberal arts courses (e.g. in political science and environmental studies). The concentration in real estate at the College, he said, was different from the sort one might find in a typical business school.

George Hopkins (History) thought that this explanation from the faculty in the School of Business and the assurance that there would be no real estate major were adequate. Jennifer
McStotts (at-large) added that there is “nothing magical” about a prefix and the connection to a major.

The Senate voted and the curriculum proposals concerning the Economics and Finance Department were approved.

The Senate then approved the following curriculum proposals without discussion:

**Mathematics**
Proposal to Change a Course – MATH 103

**African American Studies**
New Course Proposal – AAST 300 Special Topics
New Course Proposal – AAST 381 African American Studies Internship
New Course Proposal – AAST 400 Independent Study

**Communication**
Proposal to Change a Course – COMM 335
Proposal to Delete a Course – COMM 325
New Course Proposal – COMM 314 Media History
New Course Proposal – COMM 337 Strategic Comm. Mgmt
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – Media Studies

**Geology**
Proposal to Change a Course – GEOL 441
New Course Proposal – GEOL 250 Introduction to Geochemistry
New Course Proposal – GEOL 250L Introduction to Geochemistry Lab
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – B.A. Geology
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – B.S. Geology

The following proposals were next submitted for approval:

**History**
New Course Proposal – HIST 250 Special Topics in Comparative/Transnational History
New Course Proposal – HIST 299 The Historian’s Craft
New Course Proposal – HIST 350 Special Topics in Comparative/Transnational History
New Course Proposal – HIST 450 Research Seminar in Comparative/Transnational History
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – B.A. History

Mr. Nunan asked if HIST 299 would increase the total number of hours for the major. Bill Olejniczak (History Department Chair and guest) said it would not. Mr. Nunan then asked why there were two courses with the same title and different numbers. Mr. Olejniczak said that this arrangement is not that unusual, that the two different special topics courses allow the
The department to try experimental courses pitched at different skill levels, and that they help the
department deal with transfer credits involving courses that don’t quite fit into our categories.
David Gleeson (guest) said that the 400-level course requires that students do more reading
and writing, and prepares them for the capstone course.

The Senate approved the History Department proposals.

The Senate next approved the following curriculum proposals without discussion:

**Philosophy**

*New Course Proposals*
- PHIL 207 – Ethics
- PHIL 208 – Knowledge and Reality
- PHIL 209 – Political Philosophy
- PHIL 234 – Eastern Philosophy
- PHIL 290 – Philosophy and the Cognitive Sciences

*Proposals to Change a Course*
- PHIL 101 – Change Title and Catalog Description
- PHIL 220 – Course Number Change to PHIL 201
- PHIL 230 – Course Number Change to PHIL 202
- PHIL 301 – Change Title and Catalog Description
- PHIL 315 – Change Title and Catalog Description

*Proposal to Delete a Course*
- PHIL 102 – Knowledge and Reality

Change of Degree Requirements for Major - Philosophy

**French and Francophone Studies**

*Proposals to Change a Course*
- FREN 220: Special Assignment Abroad
- FREN 370: Studies in French Film and Literature

*New Course Proposals*
- FREN 320: A survey of Francophone Literature
- FREN 321: A Survey of French Literature
- FREN 326: A survey of Francophone Civilization
- FREN 327: A Survey of French Civilization
- FREN 495: Capstone Seminar: Contemporary France and the Francophone World

*Proposals to Delete a Course*
- FREN 322: Delete course “Survey of French Literature I”
- FREN 323: Delete course “Survey of French Literature II”
FREN 324: Delete course “French Civilization and Literature”
FREN 325: Delete course “French Civilization and Literature II”
FREN 343: Delete course “La France Contemporaine (Contemporary France)”
FREN 480: Delete course “History of the French Language”
FREN 483: Delete course “French Fairy Tales: Word and Image”
LTFR 350: Delete course “French Literature in English Translation”
LTFR 450: Delete course “French Literature in English Translation”
FREN 313C: Delete course “Advanced French Conversation”
FREN 314C: Delete course “Advanced French Conversation”
FREN 113: Delete course “Language Practicum I”
FREN 213: Delete course “Language Practicum II”

Change of Degree Requirements for Minor – French

The following proposals were next submitted for approval:

Honors College
New Course Proposal – HONS 165 American Government
New Course Proposal – HONS 166 Honors World Politics
New Course Proposal – HONS 180 Honors Business and Consumer Ethics
New Course Proposal – HONS 210 Honors Business Law
New Course Proposal – HONS 214 Honors Business Statistics
New Course Proposal – HONS 394 Honors Research Methods

Rohn England (Mathematics) said the HONS 214 affects the Mathematics Department, yet no consultation about the course was made with his department. Gerry Gonsalves (Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee) said that HONS 214 just replaces an earlier course. John Newell (Director of the Honors Program and guest) said that this course is an upgraded or accelerated version of another statistics course. Mr. England explained that the acceleration concerns his department and is why it needed to be consulted. Mr. Newell apologized for not consulting with the Mathematics Department.

Another Senator asked about what sort of course HONS 394 Honors Research Methods was. Mr. Newell said that it was business research methods course and was designed to help business majors prepare for the Bachelor’s Essay. Mr. Nunan asked if the course title could be changed to “Business Research Methods.” Mr. Newell said that he would accept such a change. The Speaker then asked for unanimous consent to make the change in title to HONS 394. Unanimous consent was granted.

The Senate then approved the new course proposals for the Honors Program.

The Senate next approved the following curriculum proposals without discussion:

Physics and Astronomy
Proposal to Change a Course – PHYS 201, 201L, 202 and 202L
Proposal to Change a Course – PHYS 330
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Concentration - Meteorology
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor - Meteorology
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor - Astronomy
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor/Concentration - Physics
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – B.A. Astronomy
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – B.A. Physics
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – B.S. Astrophysics
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – B.S. Physics

Health and Human Performance

New Course Proposal – PEHD 352-L Physical Education Field Experience in Elementary Schools
New Course Proposal – PEHD 452-L Physical Education Field Experience in Middle/Secondary Schools
New Course Proposal – PEHD 457-L Field Experience in Adapted Physical Education
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Concentration - Physical Education Teacher Education

Computer Science, Mathematics

Proposal to Delete a Course – CSCI 130
Proposal to Delete a Course – DISC 201
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor/Concentration – Discovery Informatics

Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

The Senate approved the following curriculum proposals without discussion:

Proposals for a New Graduate Course – MS Accountancy
BLAW 509 – International Business Law
ACCT 542 – Taxation of Pass-Through Entities
ACCT 543 – Taxation of Corporations with Interstate and International Transactions
ACCT 555 – Information Technology Governance and Infrastructure Life-Cycle Management
ACCT 556 – Protection of Information Assets

Proposals to Change a Graduate Program
MS Accountancy
MA History

Proposals for a New Graduate Course – M Public Administration
PUBA 613 – Planning Law
PUBA 615 – Urban and Regional Development & Cross-listed as EVSS 695 – Special Topics
Faculty Welfare Committee
-- Resolution regarding the Modification of Duties Policy

Bethany Goodier (Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee) moved that the Senate adopt the following resolution:

Motion Regarding the Modification of Duties Policy
Approved by the
Faculty Welfare Committee March 27, 2008

WHEREAS, through the leadership of President Benson, President Higdon, and Provost Jorgens, the College of Charleston already has adopted a modification of duties procedure¹ for new faculty parents; and,

WHEREAS, the University of South Carolina, including the Columbia campus and the regional campuses at Aiken, Beaufort, Lancaster, Salkehatchie, Sumter, Union, and Upstate, also has a modified duties procedure with a similar purpose (hereafter, “USC procedure”); and,

WHEREAS, the USC procedure allows for modification of duties in exceptional cases that cannot be anticipated by any established procedure; and,

WHEREAS, the USC procedure provides for the uniform treatment of all birth and adoption cases, without regard to birth date or date of adoption; and,

WHEREAS, the USC procedure eliminates most sources of uncertainty for Deans, Department Chairs, current faculty, and prospective faculty in the application of the modification of duties procedure and creates a simple process for the administration of the procedure, especially with regard to teaching and other on-site duties; and,

WHEREAS, especially in faculty recruitment, the College of Charleston should not have a procedure that places the College at a competitive disadvantage when

¹ “Procedure: Modification of Duties for New Faculty Parents,” effective August 1, 2006; revised March 15, 2008. See the Academic Affairs Web site for the current version of this procedure.
compared with the University of South Carolina, including its Columbia campus and regional campuses, therefore,

RESOLVED, the College of Charleston should adopt a modification of duties procedure substantively identical to ACAF 1.60 (“Modified Duties Semester for New Faculty”), a procedure of the University of South Carolina, including its Columbia campus and regional campuses, and effective at the University of South Carolina since August 16, 2007.

Ms. Goodier said that she appreciated the fact the administration is responding to this issue. She stressed that the USC policy has a number of advantages: some of these are that it is clear, avoids ambiguity, and applies to emergencies (such as dealing with sick relatives) and goes beyond applying only to cases of childbirth. Also, the “USC Policy does not make time of birth the determining factor in setting precedent for how the policy is enacted, facilitating more uniform and fair application across campus.” It also doesn’t encourage faculty to teach extra courses or do extra service in order receive the benefit. The USC policy, she said, is more equitable than our policy and will help with the recruitment and retention of faculty.

Laura Turner (Theatre) asked if one’s leave time would be taken away or reduced in the event that one experienced a situation under the modified duties policy. Ms. Goodier said “no.” The two are separate issues.

Mr. Hopkins said that our current policy is well intentioned, but it is doesn’t really do the job in terms of what is desired and needed at the College. He urged that the Senate support the resolution. Meg Cormack (at-large) agreed. She said that anything we can do for members of our community we should try to do. The current policy, she added, was not clear or helpful.

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) said that it was hard to be against the resolution, but wondered if the budget analysis done by Steve Osborne (Sr. Vice President of Business Affairs) was available and had been looked at by the Welfare Committee. Ms. Goodier said that the Committee did not look at a budget analysis, but the key is to support a policy that is needed at the College.

Mr. Nunan said that in an ideal world we would have this kind of policy for all state employees, but we don’t live in such a world. Our current policy is elitist in that it applies only to faculty and not to staff. One could argue that you should settle for what you can get, but this policy reinforces different treatment for different types of employees. The USC policy, he added, is far more liberal than our own. For example, if two parents are faculty, the pregnant spouse can take a semester off and then the other spouse can take time off the next semester. He suggested that there are other ways to deal with the issue of parental leave for the birth of children, and warned that there might be “Hell to pay,” if this policy caught the attention of the newspapers and if certain legislators were to take note of it. They might accuse faculty of creating special privileges for themselves.

Conseula Francis (English) said that we don’t have to wait to live in an ideal world to adopt good policies. The current C of C policy, she said, is a lawsuit waiting to happen. Now
faculty have to rely on the goodwill of their colleagues to work around the difficulties that occur when a child is born. She said that she was not afraid of the “newspaper test.” Most workplaces provide leave-time for new parents. People in the world recognize this practice as the right and humane thing to do. We should, she concluded, “step up” as a liberal arts institution and endorse the policy.

Alison Piepmeier (guest) also spoke in support of the resolution. She said that the policy isn’t doing something trailblazing; rather, it is bringing the C of C in line with other organizations. She added that having a good modification of duties policy is a recruitment and retention issue. It will be harder to attract and keep good faculty here without a good policy. Currently, many faculty are afraid to speak out on this issue and young faculty in particular would see the failure of implementing a good policy as having a major influence on retention.

Another faculty member said that she had a baby under the old policy and the current one. The first time she did not think to ask for time off and felt disempowered to ask. The second time, with the policy in place, she did see her chair, but was told that she had screwed up the timing and that it would have been better to have the baby during a sabbatical. Of course, that is not what sabbaticals are for, she pointed out. In defense of her chair, she said that he had no clear policy to rely on. We need, she stressed, a good, good uniform policy and urged the Senate to endorse the resolution.

Laura Turner (Theatre) said that she timed her pregnancy to happen at the end of the semester, but because she piled up extra-courses to gain leave time, she ended up suffering from preeclampsia. We need a policy that helps faculty avoid such situations and deal with the tremendous stress they experience in trying to do their jobs while pregnant and taking care of infants or sick relatives.

Jeffery Diamond (History) voiced support for the resolution and said that if legislators complained, we should get in front of the issue and say that they don’t support families.

At this point, a Senator called the question. The motion to call the question passed.

The Senate voted to endorse the resolution on the modification of duties policy.

Faculty Educational Technology Committee
--Motion to implement online course evaluations on an optional basis

Mark Hurd, chair of the Faculty Educational Technology Committee (FEC), made the following motion:

1. The FETC recommends that the Senate support the implementation of an online course evaluation system as an optional method for evaluating courses that may be used at faculty discretion.

2. Faculty may choose to offer students paper or online evaluations.
3. For the purposes of tenure and promotion or merit evaluation, online course evaluations have been shown to be equivalent based on pilot data collected in the fall of 2007.

4. This optional online course evaluation system will be implemented and reevaluated after one year by the Faculty Senate.

5. There will be no positive or negative incentives offered to students to complete the online evaluations.

Mr. Wilder mentioned that at the last regular Senate meeting, when Mr. Hurd reported on the pilot program, Mr. Hurd said that the pilot system did not allow faculty to control the time-window for when the evaluations were done. Mr. Hurd replied that that was correct, but that in the future such control of the time-window might be doable. Mr. Wilder thought that the inability to control the timing of the evaluations presented a problem. He pointed out that though he was not familiar with any research on the question of whether evaluations change when major assignments are returned, in the current paper evaluation system faculty do have some control over the timing of evaluations. He was concerned about that loss of control, especially for untenured faculty, even though the proposed system is optional.

John Huddlestun (Religious Studies) responded that if the time-window were a week and faculty knew about it well in advance, they could work around it with respect to when they returned major assignments. He also asked Mr. Hurd why there were no incentives in place for students to complete the online evaluations. Mr. Hurd replied that some institutions offer students extra-credit if the evaluations are completed, but some people object to such a policy. He added that the Provost is not particularly in favor of this approach; she also dislikes the idea of punishing students (such as withholding grades), if they don’t fill them out.

Mr. Diamond was worried that the optional online system might become permanent. He was also concerned that students might do them late at night after coming home from a bar. The low response rate of online evaluations also concerned him, and he referenced the Citadel where online evaluation response rates have been low. He asked, too, what made the current system so inadequate that it needed to be changed. Denis Keyes (at-large) responded that the current system is expensive. Mr. Hurd also pointed out that the current system is unwieldy and not secure (anonymity of responses is compromised), and that the written responses in online evaluations tend to be richer. With respect to the issue of low response rates, he said that research shows that rates tend to rebound and come up after the school has adopted the system for a few years. He added that the Citadel’s system was problematic from the start. It was imposed upon the faculty, who didn’t sell it to their students. If people don’t buy into and promote the system, it won’t work. He mentioned also that, contrary to what some people think, with online evaluations you don’t just get the worst and the best students responding.

Jack Parson (Political Science) said that he saw the online system as the future, but was concerned about the time-window issue, and brought up Mr. Huddlestun’s idea of narrowing the window to one week so that faculty could work around it. A two-week window he thought might be too large, and faculty would be able to say that bad evaluation results were caused by the fact that they had to return a test or papers during the evaluation period.
Mr. Hurd replied that he didn’t want to predetermine in the motion what the time-window should, and wished to provide the flexibility to make changes on that aspect of the system.

Another Senator thought it would be wise to limit the window and make it uniform. Doing so would make it easier to compare courses and data. Mr. Krasnoff said that he generally supports the FEC proposal, and that the next logical step after doing the pilot study is to approve the motion to make the online evaluation system optional. On the time-window issue, he advised that it not be too narrow during the first year or so because people would need time to get used to a new system. He liked the fact that comments in the online system tend to be richer, but was concerned about the interpretation of data. He wondered if each department could determine the time-window so that the interpretation of data is consistent.

Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism) praised Mr. Hurd and his committee for their work on the pilot study, in which he participated, but said that he couldn’t support the motion until the issue of response bias was addressed. He said that his evaluations in the pilot study were excellent, but thought they might have reflected the views of a narrow range of students. “I am not that good,” he said, referring to his evaluation scores. He thought that there needed to be an incentive to insure a near 100% response rate so that the views of all the students in each course were registered.

Von Bakanic (Sociology and Anthropology) said that she received no written comments from the online evaluations done for her course, which was a 100-level course. She wondered if the research showed whether there are more written responses in higher course levels. Mr. Hurd replied that he was not aware of any such research.

Mr. Parson asked for unanimous consent to include the following language in the FEC motion: “The window of opportunity to complete evaluations will be no longer than one week. The week of the evaluations will be announced before the beginning of the semester.” Unanimous consent was not granted.

Mr. Parson then moved to insert that language into the FEC proposal. His motion received a second.

Mr. Diamond was concerned about who would choose the week of the evaluation period and still saw problems with the whole idea of online course evaluations. Jaap Hillenius raised the issue of Maymester courses. Perhaps a week would be impractical for such a compressed semester?

The Senate then voted on Mr. Parson’s proposed amendment, which passed.

Discussion of the FEC motion resumed. Brian McGee (Communication) asked how the Tenure and Promotion Committee (T & P) would view packets with a mix of paper and online course evaluations, and wondered whether this might cause problems for those going up for tenure or promotion. Mr. Hopkins, who said that he has served on the T & P Committee, thought that candidates for tenure and promotion could address possible disparities between
their online and paper evaluations in their narratives. He did not think that this issue would be problem.

Mr. Wilder highlighted another difference between paper and online course evaluations. With the paper evaluations done in class, there are instructions given and the evaluations are administered by students. Research shows, he said, that comments by instructors are significant and can make a difference in results. With the online system, instructors lose some control in this area. Ms. Cormack responded, saying that she thinks faculty will do the something similar in the online evaluation system as they do now. They will make a statement about the evaluations during the week of evaluations.

Todd McNerney (Theatre) wondered about the possibility of students getting together to write evaluations that are hostile. This possibility is less likely in the current system, he suggested. Mr. Huddlestun and Mr. Diamond agreed. Mr. Diamond added that he was concerned about the context and shaping influences on students during the evaluation. He was concerned about these and other issues and thought they needed to be sorted out and studied further.

Mr. Hurd responded that his committee have already done what Mr. Diamond is asking for. They have approached the issues surrounding online course evaluations like scientists: they have studied the scholarly literature (some of which they have put on the FEC website) examined the Citadel’s experience with online evaluations, and done a pilot study in which they collected and analyzed data. He said that he was not sure what more they could do. He also pointed out that the online system is optional. Those who still want to use the paper system may do so.

Mr. Krasnoff said that the Senate needed to make a decision. The concerns that have been raised are not about what will happen, but about what might happen. He said that we should either try the new system, study it, and see how it works, or we end it here. He called the question. The motion to call the question passed.

The Senate voted on the FEC motion to make online course evaluations optional, and the motion passed.

Academic Standards Committee

--Resolution on the proposed Second Baccalaureate Degree Policy

Mr. Krasnoff, chair of the Academic Standards Committee, presented the committee’s motion to establish a new policy for students earning a second baccalaureate degree. The current policy confuses a double major and a double degree and the new policy will distinguish them. The exact text of the motion is as follows:

Resolved: That the College adopt the Registrar’s proposed new policy on second bachelor’s degrees.
The text of the proposed Second Baccalaureate Degree policy is as follows:

A student who has previously earned a bachelor's degree from the College of Charleston and wishes to pursue further undergraduate work may either complete an additional major and have it noted on the permanent record (with date of completion)* or earn a second degree if it is different from the first (i.e., a B.A. if the first degree was a B.S. and vice versa**). This student must apply for re-admission for the second degree, and then:

- Must earn a minimum of 30 additional credit hours in residence at CofC.
- Meet all degree and College graduation requirements for the second degree program in the catalog under which he or she enters, or in a subsequent catalog.
- Meet all prerequisite and course requirements in the major field(s) for the second degree.

A CofC student may earn two different baccalaureate degrees (i.e., a B.A. and a B.S.**) concurrently at the College of Charleston, if he or she meets the following requirements:

- Earns a minimum of 152 credit hours, including a minimum of 62 hours in residence at CofC.
- Meets all degree and College graduation requirements for both degree programs.
- Meets all prerequisite and course requirements in two different major fields.

Students who hold a baccalaureate degree from another institution may earn a second baccalaureate degree at the College of Charleston by meeting the following requirements:

- Complete a minimum of 30 semester hours at the College of Charleston with at least 15 taken in the major field at the 200 level or above.
- Meet all prerequisite and course requirements in the major field and degree requirements for the second baccalaureate degree program.
- Earn a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 or higher in course work completed for the major and second baccalaureate degree programs.

*CofC students completing a major in the same degree program previously awarded will not receive a second diploma. However, the permanent record (transcript) will reflect the additional major. In the case of multiple majors in different degree programs, the student will choose the degree to be earned and posted on the diploma.

**Students earning an A.B. degree will earn that degree in place of the B.A. or B.S. normally earned with the major.

Proposed implementation is for undergraduate students entering under the 2008-2009 catalog.
Mr. Krasnoff then presented a brief summary of his written rationale, which is here provided in full:

“Rationale: The College’s current policy does not clearly distinguish dual degrees from dual majors. As things stand, a student completing two major programs, each leading to the B.A., will receive a single B.A. degree and a single diploma, reflecting both majors. Similarly, a student completing two major programs, each leading to the B.S., will receive a single B.S. degree and a single diploma, reflecting both majors. But a student completing two major programs, one leading to the B.A. and one leading to the B.S, will receive two degrees and two diplomas.

Many majors offer both a B.A. and a B.S. option, with the B.S. requiring additional courses. A student who completes all the requirements for the B.S. before graduating will receive a single B.S. degree. But a student can also graduate with only a B.A., and then return to complete the additional B.S. requirements. Such a student will receive two degrees, the original B.A and then the B.S., even though that student has completed the same program as the first student, who received only one degree.

Similarly, a student who completes one B.A. major before graduating, and then returns to complete a second B.A. major, will receive a second B.A. degree, even though a student who completes both majors before graduating will receive only one. (The same holds for students completing two B.S. majors in these different ways.) It makes little sense to treat these cases so differently. (All of our dual degrees are reported separately to the CHE, which means that we are also sending confusing or misleading information to the state.) The proposed new policy treats all double (and triple) majors as leading to a single bachelor’s degree. If a student wished to be awarded a second bachelor’s degree (as opposed to just a second major), they would have to complete an additional 30 hours. This change would bring our policy into line with the practices of most other institutions (see attachment). The new policy has been suggested by the Registrar and endorsed by the faculty committee on Academic Standards.”

Mr. Krasnoff next asked for unanimous consent to add as a parenthetical insertion the words “beyond the 122 hours required for a degree” in the text of the proposed policy—more specifically in the line marked by the first bullet point, after the phrase “30 additional credit hours.” Unanimous consent was granted.

The Senate vote on the motion and it passed.

Motion on faculty participation in the commencement ceremony

Marie D. Barnette made the following motion:

Mr. Speaker, for all commencement exercises, I move that regular faculty members of the College of Charleston be permitted on stage to present degrees or diplomas to graduating students when those students are family members of the faculty colleague or have long-standing prior relationships with the faculty colleague, such as those relationships predating the matriculation of the student at the College.
Darryl Phillips (at-large) said that he was willing to vote for the motion, but felt that it needed an extra provision, namely that the student approve the request to have a faculty member make the presentation of the diploma. He asked for unanimous consent to add this provision, but it was not granted.

Mr. Phillips then asked for unanimous consent that there be an added provision that the request come from the student (not the faculty member). Unanimous consent was granted.

Returning to the main motion, Lynn Cherry (guest) spoke against it, arguing that the current policy gives very clear guidelines regarding the privilege faculty have in presenting diplomas to relatives at the graduation ceremony. She said that as someone who receives many requests to present diplomas, she values the clear guidelines. This motion, she explained, opens up a whole new category of requests that will make the task of sorting through them and making decisions more difficult.

Mr. Nunan spoke in favor of the motion. He didn’t think that the difficulties would be so great. There is a bright line that clarifies what is a legitimate request and what is not: specifically, there must be a prior, longstanding relationship between the faculty member and the student. If it turns out that the passage of this motion creates a clogging effect, we an always rescind the privilege. Mr. Nunan added that if the Board of Trustees have this privilege, then the faculty should too, as they are more directly involved in education.

The question was then called, and the motion passed.

The motion on faculty participation in the commencement ceremony passed.

Constituents’ Concerns

Ms. Cherry urged the faculty to attend the commencement ceremony.

Mr. Krasnoff thanked the Speaker and Secretary for their efforts this year.

Having concluded its scheduled business, the Senate adjourned at around 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary