Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 10 March 2009

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 10 March 2009, at 5:00 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium. After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, the minutes of the Special Faculty Senate meeting on 27 January 2009 were approved, as were the minutes of the regular Faculty Senate meeting on 10 February 2009.

Reports

The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens said that her report would be short. Her main concern centers on budgetary matters. There is a lot of uncertainty about what the legislature will do with federal monies sent to the state as part of the stimulus package, but she said that the College will do all it can to get some of it.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked the Provost about a wish list for the C of C that was circulated some time ago, and wondered if that list was correct. The Provost answered that it was not, and that several efforts have been made to put together an accurate list. Speaker Kelly then added that the list referenced by Ms. Curtis had to include only “shovel-ready” projects and therefore was not fully representative of what the College needs and desires. The Provost said that her office is working on the task of putting together a proper list. Phil Dustan (Biology) suggested that weatherproofing and efforts to “go green” (including planting trees) should be on the list.

The Speaker

Since part of the Speaker’s report included an update on the new Provost search, Speaker Kelly gave the floor to Fran Welch, Chair of the Provost Search Committee. Ms. Welch informed the Senate that the advertisement for the position would go out to the Chronicle of Higher Education next week, and that information will be posted on a Web site as the search process moves forward. The timeline for the process, which will also be on the Web site, is to narrow the group of candidates by June, to bring the finalists for the position to campus in September, and to have a new Provost in place by January 2010. In the meantime, Bev Diamond will serve as interim Provost. Ms. Welch also asked that faculty help the Search Committee identify possible candidates. If faculty know of strong candidates, they should let the committee know. Assisting with the search is Alice Witt of the firm Witt/Kieffer, who is serving as the contact person.

Speaker Kelly, resuming his report, announced that the ad hoc Committee on Developing and Evaluating Teaching has created four sub-committees to work on various issues. One issue under discussion is the status of faculty development efforts; another is the course evaluation instrument in current use. The committee will work on a new draft of the evaluation form.

The Speaker next reported on the issue of budget reform. The ad hoc Committee on the Budget is developing a new budget process for the Academic Affairs part of the school budget, which will be brought to the Academic Forum for review.

Larry Krasnoff, chair of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance

Mr. Krasnoff said the committee has been examining the efficacy of the current college-committee system, looking at the size and composition of the Faculty Senate to consider whether a smaller Senate might be better, and reviewing the relation of the Senate to the
schools. He said that the committee would soon issue a draft report that will suggest some changes, especially with respect to committees. Committees are particularly ineffective, he said, on budget issues. There will be a new Budget Committee proposed that will replace the old Budget Committee, and that will be run out of the Academic Affairs Office, but include a lot of faculty representation.

Mr. Krasnoff then discussed the Senate. After giving an overview of how Senators are elected and how the apportioning system works (e.g., each department gets one Senator for every ten department members), he noted that the ratio of at-large Senators to department Senators has changed over time: there are fifteen at-large Senators, a number that has remained the same since the inception of the Faculty Senate, though the total number of Senators has increased as the College has grown and departments have gotten larger. Mr. Krasnoff also noted that compared to other colleges and universities, the C of C’s Senate is quite large. He said that his committee would propose that the Senate be reduced in size and that there be more at-large Senators who would represent schools. Reducing the size of the Senate by, say, twenty or thirty Senators would put the College more in line with other institutions and would likely attract people who really want to serve and are committed to the task of faculty governance. He added that a switch to at-large Senators who are elected by schools, rather than by the entire faculty, makes sense because it is no longer clear that, given the growth of the College, faculty know colleagues across schools.

Mr. Dustan pointed out that schools are not currently represented equally in the College, and asked if the committee talked about a system that addressed that issue. Mr. Krasnoff said that the committee had not because it had not seen a model based on equal representation of schools. Tim Carens (English) then asked for some elaboration on why a smaller Senate would be better. Mr. Krasnoff replied that a large Senate is unwieldy, making it harder to get things done; a smaller Senate also attracts more committed participants. He wondered whether all Senators come to Senate meetings and whether they even want to be here. He noted, too, that often people have to be dragooned into serving. Jason Coy (History) said that Senators sometimes can’t be at all meetings because of occasional conflicts (such as conferences they are scheduled to attend). He also said that there could be problems in having a Senate that is too small. Mr. Krasnoff replied that he thought a suitable size could be found that would allow for adequate representation of faculty and yet be effective.

Elizabeth Jurisich (Mathematics) asked what institutions the committee was comparing us to. Were they institutions with roughly the same number of students or with a comparable number of faculty with Ph.D.s? Mr. Krasnoff answered that regardless of how the comparison is done, the C of C’s Senate is larger than most schools. Steve Jaumé (Geology) asked if the committee considered the issue of the Senate’s size in light of the fact that a certain number of Senators are required to serve on certain committees. Mr. Krasnoff replied that the committee was aware of that issue, but focused on the more fundamental issue of what the optimal size of the Senate should be.

Bill Manaris (Computer Science) wished to know what problem the committee is trying to fix. What is wrong with the Senate as it is? Mr. Krasnoff referenced last year’s Gen-Ed reform failure effort as an example of how the Senate is ineffective in its current form. Speaker Kelly clarified that the issue of considering the Senate size was not motivated by the Gen-Ed reform failure, but rather by a sense that shared governance isn’t really happening as the by-laws says that it should. Mr. Manaris pointed out that the Gen-Ed effort is just one example. He asked for more evidence that proved the Senate was ineffective. Mr. Krasnoff responded that the Senate is not an effective body when it comes to planning. A smaller Senate would be much more effective in this area. Deanna Caveny (at-large) agreed that the Senate was not effective, nor was the current committee system, in her view, particularly effective.
Frank Cossa (Art History) expressed concern that a small Senate would not adequately represent the faculty, and that it would become a kind of Star Chamber filled with ambitious office seekers. He also observed that sometimes unwieldiness is a good thing. Jerry Boetje (Computer Science), addressing the issue of the Gen-Ed reform effort, said that he thought the process worked last year, and that the Senate needed to hear all the voices of its members. He was also not sure that a smaller Senate would have produced a better result, and added that the Senate does accomplish things and gets business done. Mr. Krasnoff disagreed, saying that he didn’t think the Senate got much done in the sense of playing an effective role in the College. As an example, he referenced the recent creation of the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs, which happened outside the Senate. He added that the Senate often gets bogged down in minutaie (such as routine curriculum proposals), and that it had accomplished little this year.

Jeffery Diamond (History) asked if the committee was going to propose a revised Senate that was still department based. Mr. Krasnoff said no. Mr. Diamond followed up, replying that we should not get rid of department based representation, which is how the College is organized. Mr. Krasnoff responded that at most institutions the Senate is not considered a department-based organization. The fact that ours is department-based proved to be a problem in the Gen-Ed reform last year.

Rohn England (Mathematics) said that maybe the Senate did do its job well last year. He added that in other institutions there is a more active school structure, where monthly meetings take place, and where the will of the faculty is expressed. In this regard, he suggested that the committee take a broader look at faculty governance. Mr. Krasnoff replied that the committee will recommend more involvement of faculty at the school level.

Mr. Dustan commented that he thought the biggest impediment to effective shared governance was on the administrative side. Perhaps the main problem is not the size of the Senate. Mr. Krasnoff said that we do see administrative good will in some areas of shared governance, but at any rate we, the faculty, must first “get our house in order.”

Speaker Kelly added that the Senate has not really participated in key decisions at the College. We are in our own silos, and while we may have our say on some things, it doesn’t change anything. He agreed that it was hard for a large Senate to function well as a decision-making entity. However, the senate may not wish to sacrifice wide representation for the possibility of creating a body that is more effective in getting things done. He concluded by encouraging Senators to send additional comments and ideas to the committee.

**Old Business**

**Motion to Change Article V Section 2.B.3 of the By-Laws: Duties of the By-Laws/FAM Committee**

This motion to amend the by-laws, which was introduced at the February Faculty Senate meeting, passed without further discussion. The specifics of the amendment are as follows:

- **Action:** Change to Article V, Section 2.B.3. Presentation to Faculty Senate on February 10, 2009. Faculty Senate consideration and possible action on March 10, 2009.

- **Intent:** To allow Committee on the By-laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual to correct inaccurate administrative titles in the FAM without action by the Faculty Senate and the faculty.
Motion:

3. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual

   a. Composition: Three faculty members. Ex-officio members are the Speaker of the Faculty, the Faculty Secretary, the Provost (or Provost’s designee), and the Vice President for Legal Affairs. (Rev. April 2007)

   b. Duties:

      (1) To review on a continuing basis the Faculty By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual;

      (2) To propose changes for the improvement of these documents and to forward the recommended changes to the administration and/or the Faculty Senate as appropriate;

      (3) To incorporate any revisions to or interpretations of either document in new editions of the documents; and

      (4) To make non-substantive changes to the Faculty By-Laws to correct unintended grammatical and spelling errors, and to address minor problems of stylistic consistency, and correct inaccurate administrative titles. Such a non-substantive change shall not constitute an amendment to or repeal of the Faculty By-Laws. Such changes shall be made only when unanimously approved by the Committee. Notice in writing shall be given to the Faculty Senate within 60 calendar days of such changes being approved by the Committee. Such changes shall be repealed if an appropriate motion to amend something previously adopted is approved by a simple majority of the Committee, the Faculty Senate, or the College Faculty. (Ins. April 2007)

New Business

Ms. Caveny, chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, introduced five motions to amend the by-laws. She explained that, in accordance with the by-laws, the proposed changes would not be voted on in this meeting, but would be discussed today, returned to the By-Laws/FAM Committee for further consideration, and then brought back to the Senate for a vote, perhaps as early as the next meeting in April.

The first proposed change, Ms. Caveny explained, was designed to address some problems that have arisen in the current definition of “regular faculty,” and specifically to clarify which administrators are to be categorized as “regular faculty.” The specifics of the amendment are as follows:

   Action: Change to By-laws Article I, Section 1: Membership in the College Faculty, Regular Faculty. Presentation to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009.

Intent:

   ▪ To more clearly define “regular faculty”
To include among regular faculty those full-time tenured and tenure-track employees who normally teach only three contact hours, including chairs of large departments and also assistant and associate deans

To replace “instructor” with “Instructor”

To clarify which administrators are members of the regular faculty

Motion:

Article I. Membership in the College Faculty

Section 1. Regular Faculty

The faculty members of the College of Charleston are those individuals whose obligation in the institution is both the dissemination and expansion of academic knowledge of an accepted academic nature. At the College of Charleston the following individuals are considered regular faculty members: (1) those full-time tenured and tenure-track employees of the institution who normally teach at least six contact hours of college credit courses or the equivalent in assigned academic research in their academic fields each semester; (2) full-time Instructor and Senior Instructor employees; (3) full-time professional librarians; and (4) ex officio, the President of the College, the Provost, the Vice President for Research and Professional Development and Dean of Graduate Studies, the Deans of Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Academic Deans, the Dean of the Honors College, and all administrative officers of the College with academic rank. These members of the faculty have voting rights at meetings of the College faculty.

Ms. Caveny added that the first footnote is intended to deal with the problem of a chair who is a regular faculty who “normally” teaches at least three contact hours each semester, but who may not do so every semester for certain reasons.

Norris Preyer (Physics and Astronomy) asked if faculty on sabbatical are still counted under category #1. Bev Diamond (guest and Associate Provost) answered that they were. Ms. Caveny added that though they are still counted, they are not allowed to be Senators.

Bill Olejniczak (guest) asked why the committee does not include visiting assistant professors in the definition of “regular faculty,” since they seem to qualify according to the first sentence of the definition. Ms. Diamond replied that the intent of the by-laws was never to include visiting faculty. The section on roster faculty deals with this issue, she said. A Senator then asked why Instructors and Sr. Instructors are put in a separate category. Ms. Caveny agreed that it didn’t make sense to have the teaching load requirement on tenured and tenure-track faculty members, but not on Instructors and Senior Instructors; so those two sections (1 and 2), she said, will be combined when the committee presents the latest version of the amendment at the next meeting.

---

1 When they are full-time tenured and tenure-track employees of the institution, full-time Instructor and Senior Instructor employees, or full-time professional librarians, Department Chairs, Assistant Deans, and Associate Deans are defined as employees normally teaching at least three contact hours of college credit courses in each semester.

2 An “administrative officer” shall be defined as any College of Charleston employee with a position title using the words “President” or “Provost.” In addition, the Provost may stipulate in writing that any College employee with academic rank is an administrative officer if that employee (a) has a position title using the word “Director” and (b) normally teaches fewer than three contact hours of college credit courses or the equivalent in assigned academic research in her or his academic field each semester.
The **second proposed change**, Ms. Caveny explained, is mainly intended to clarify who is eligible to serve in the Senate. The specifics of the amendment are as follows:

**Action**: Change to By-laws Article IV, Section 2: Faculty Senate, Composition and Election. Presentation to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009.

**Intent**:
- To more clearly define which regular faculty members are eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, vote in senatorial elections, and be counted in apportionment of Faculty Senate seats
- To replace “instructor” with “Instructor”
- To resolve an ambiguity in whether department chairs are allowed to serve as Faculty Senators. Our by-laws have specifically stated that chairs are eligible to serve as faculty senators. However, chairs were not clearly included in the regular faculty, which produced a contradiction.
- To specify that Assistant Deans and Associate Deans (who are otherwise members of the regular faculty) are also eligible to serve as Faculty Senators
- To clearly state which administrators are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators
- To clearly state which administrators are not eligible to vote in senatorial elections and should not count in Faculty Senate seat apportionment.

**Motion**:

**Article IV, Faculty Senate**

**Section 2. Composition and Election**

**A. Eligibility.**

A Faculty Senator must be a full-time tenured or tenure-track employee of the College who has completed at least three years of service at the College, and who normally teaches at least **six** contact hours per semester or the equivalent in assigned research or who is a full-time **Instructor**, Senior Instructor, or professional librarian. **Without regard to teaching load**, Department Chairs, Assistant Deans, and **Associate Deans who otherwise would be members of the regular faculty**—regardless of their teaching loads—are eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. (Approved April 2005) Administrators **Administrative officers**, including Deans of Schools and the **Dean of Libraries** **Academic Deans**, are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. Faculty members on leave are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators.

**C. Election**

1. **Without regard to teaching load, all** and only regular faculty members as defined under provisions (1), (2), and (3) of Article I Section 1 in Art. I, Sect. 1, excluding all those qualifying as *ex officio* regular faculty members under provision (4), are eligible to vote in Senate elections.

Mr. Coy asked for more elaboration on the rationale for including some administrators among faculty who are eligible to serve in the Senate. Ms. Caveny answered that there is a need to clarify who among administrators are mainly on the academic side of things and who are not. The consensus among the committee members was that Assistant and Associate Deans have a strong connection to their departments.
Next, Ms. Caveny introduced the third and fourth proposed changes, which go together. The third proposed amendment seeks to eliminate the fall and spring Faculty meetings; the fourth one requires the President to come before the Faculty Senate in the latter part of spring semester. Ms. Caveny explained that the rationale for these proposed changes stems from the sense that the faculty meetings are long and accomplish little. These amendments will eliminate meetings that are no longer particularly useful, while retaining their most important function—namely, requiring the President to report to and be questioned by the faculty. The fourth proposed amendment places the duty of the President reporting to the faculty within the venue of the Faculty Senate. The specifics of both amendments are presented below.

Third proposed amendment:

**Action**: Change to By-laws Article II. College Faculty Meetings. Associated Change to Article VI, Amending Procedures. Presentation to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009.

**Intent**:
- To eliminate requirement of fall and spring full faculty meetings
- To continue to allow meetings of the faculty to be called by the President of the College, Speaker of the Faculty, or petition to the Speaker of the Faculty by fifty faculty members
- To allow everything (except approval of degree candidates) that took place in the required fall and spring faculty meetings to take place at “ordinary” faculty meetings called at Speaker’s discretion
- To reclassify meetings of the faculty from “regular” and “special” to “ordinary” and “extraordinary”, since “regular” seemed to imply “with some regularity or regular schedule”
- To more clearly state that ordinary faculty meetings are not deliberative
- To specify who (the Speaker or Speaker’s designee) can waive the one-week advance notification requirement when calling extraordinary faculty meetings
- To clearly specify that Robert’s Rules of Order shall govern the conduct at extraordinary faculty meetings
- To fix section numbering in Article VI, Amending Procedures

**Motion**:

Article II. College Faculty Meetings

Section 1. Regular Ordinary Faculty Meetings

The College faculty shall meet twice annually, once early in the first semester and again late in the second semester, to hear reports from and to question the President of the College, the Provost, and the Speaker of the Faculty. At its spring meeting, the College faculty shall recommend recipients of degrees and certificates at spring commencement. Any written reports to the College faculty from the President, the Provost, or the Speaker of the Faculty shall be distributed by the Faculty Senate Secretariat to all faculty members. Ordinary meetings of the College faculty may be called by the Speaker of the Faculty. Ordinary faculty meetings may be called for such purposes as the distribution of information, discussion of a topic or topics relevant to the College faculty, hearing a presentation, and asking questions of the President of the College or other administrative officers of the College. An ordinary
meeting of the College faculty is not a deliberative assembly, and faculty at such meetings have no legislative or review authority.

Section 2. Special Extraordinary Faculty Meetings

A. Special Extraordinary meetings of the College faculty may be called by the President of the College, or the Speaker of the Faculty, or a petition to the Speaker of the Faculty by fifty faculty members. At such special extraordinary meetings the College faculty may review any Faculty Senate action.

B. Senate actions may be amended or vetoed by a simple majority vote of those members of the regular College faculty (as defined in Article I) present at such special extraordinary meetings of the College faculty, provided there is a quorum present.

C. The College faculty has legislative authority (i.e., may legislate and recommend to the President on matters normally under the purview of the Faculty Senate) only in case it acts in a special extraordinary meeting of the College faculty called by a petition to the Speaker of the Faculty by 50 regular College faculty members (as defined in Art. I) on a specific issue included in the agenda for that meeting and distributed at least one week prior to the date of the meeting.

D. A quorum at special extraordinary College faculty meetings shall be a simple majority of regular College faculty members.

E. Special Extraordinary meetings of the College faculty must be called in writing at least one week prior to the date of the meeting. A written agenda for each meeting will be distributed to all faculty at least one week prior to the meeting. The requirement of one week advance notice may be waived by the Speaker of the Faculty (or the Speaker’s designee) in case of emergency.

F. The current edition of Robert’s Rules of Order will govern the conduct of special extraordinary meetings of the College faculty.

G. The Faculty Secretary shall perform as secretary for all meetings of the College faculty.

Section 3. Presiding Officer

The Speaker of the Faculty shall preside at all regular and special ordinary and extraordinary meetings of the faculty. If the Speaker cannot be present, she or he shall designate an alternate Speaker for that meeting from among the members of the regular faculty of the College.

...
A. Motions for amendment or repeal of these by-laws may be made in writing at any meeting of the Faculty Senate. The motion shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the Senate its recommendations on the motion and any amendments at the next Senate meeting. Motions to amend or repeal these by-laws require a two-thirds vote in the Senate for approval. Approved motions must then be ratified by a simple majority of regular faculty members voting by electronic ballot on the motion. (Rev. Jan. 2007)

Section 2. Extraordinary Meeting Option for Amendment Introduction

B. Motions for amendment or repeal of these by-laws may be made in writing at any special extraordinary meeting of the College faculty. The motion shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the faculty its recommendation on the motion and any amendments at a second special extraordinary faculty meeting called by the Speaker of the Faculty to consider the motion. The faculty will then vote on the motion to amend or repeal the by-laws. It shall be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the membership voting, provided a quorum is present.

Fourth proposed amendment:

Action: Change to By-laws Article IV, Section 1: Faculty Senate, Functions. Presentation to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009.

Intent:
- To take the requirement that the President and Provost report to the faculty, which was part of the required faculty meetings, and place it under Faculty Senate instead

Motion:

Article IV. Faculty Senate

Section 1. Functions

A. The Faculty Senate is the primary legislative body of the College of Charleston faculty. The Senate may make recommendations on any matter under its purview to the President of the College. Except where otherwise specified in the By-Laws of the College Board of Trustees, the President shall have the power of veto over any action by the Senate. The veto shall be communicated in writing to the Senate, with reasons, within thirty days after receipt by the President. By a two-thirds vote, the Senate may appeal any action thus vetoed, through the Speaker of the Faculty, to the College Board of Trustees.

B. The Faculty Senate shall be concerned with all matters relating to academic programs, the curriculum, admissions and continuation standards, the grading system, degree and certificate requirements, and the utilization of the intellectual resources of the College. The Faculty Senate shall have the right and obligation to initiate needed institutional and academic studies, either directly or through appropriate committees.
C. The Faculty Senate may request meetings with the College Board of Trustees to discuss matters of mutual concern. Senators shall receive minutes of all meetings of the College Board of Trustees.

D. The Faculty Senate may establish and instruct such committees, standing and ad hoc, as may be necessary for the performance of its functions and elect or provide for the members of the committees in accordance with these by-laws.

E. At one Faculty Senate meeting early in the first semester and at one meeting late in the second semester, the Faculty Senate shall hear reports from and have the opportunity to question the President of the College and the Provost. Any written reports provided to the Faculty Senate by the President or the Provost shall be distributed by the Faculty Senate Secretariat to all faculty members.

F. The Faculty Senate is authorized by the College faculty to approve all degree candidates for graduation.

G. The specific duties of the Faculty Senate shall also include, but not be limited to, recommendations to the President concerning any of the following:

Sarah Owens (at-large) said that she was opposed to the third motion because it eliminated the only moments during the academic year when all of the faculty are together and present to hear the President. It also eliminates the introduction of new faculty (in the fall faculty meeting), which, she thought, was a nice and useful ceremony. Ms. Caveny replied that all faculty have voice privileges in the Faculty Senate and will still be able to hear the President speak there. She added that she, too, likes the introduction-of-new-faculty ceremony, but observed that because there have been so many new faculty coming to the College due to its growth over the years, the introductions are shorter and less productive. Moreover, the introduction of new faculty will still happen, but in a different venue.

Speaker Kelly, responding to Ms. Owens, said that his view is the opposite of hers. Attendance at the fall and spring Faculty meetings tends to be very low. The only people who show up at the fall meeting are the new faculty being introduced, the people introducing them, and a few core Senators. He did not think the welcoming ceremony was very celebratory. The same goes for the spring meeting: because the faculty awards ceremony and the honoring of retiring faculty are included with the business section of the meeting, the celebratory dimension of the event ends up being nullified. His intention is to enhance the ceremonial functions of these meetings by divorcing them from Faculty and Senate business and making them their own events.

David Gentry (at-large) asked about the election of College committee members, which has been done at the spring meeting. Ms. Caveny and Tom Kunkle (guest and chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee) replied that those elections are now done electronically and not in the meeting. Mr. Gentry observed that language about those elections taking place at the spring meeting might still be in the by-laws and need to be checked.

Ms. Caveny next presented the fifth proposed amendment, which specifies how to implement a previously approved change requiring tenure, promotion, and review candidates to sign the letter written by their evaluation panel. Ms. Caveny explained that the proposed
amendment seeks to clarify the intent of this section of the by-laws (VI. Sect. D, 7) and to indicate what signing the letter means in situations where the candidate disagrees with the evaluation. The specifics of the proposed amendment are as follows:

**Action:** Change to *Faculty/Administration Manual, V1.D.7, Reporting Procedures of Departmental Evaluation Panel*. Presentation to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009.

**Intent:**
- To implement previously endorsed change requiring: (a) tenure, promotion, and review candidates to sign their evaluation panel’s letter, and (b) panel chairs to provide candidates with a copy of that panel letter
- To specify that panel members should all sign their evaluation panel’s letter
- To specify what the panel members’ and candidates’ signatures mean

**Motion:**

VI, Sect. D, *Evaluation of Faculty, Procedures for Third-year Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty*

7. Reporting Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel

After due deliberation, the panel will shall take its vote by written ballot. The chair will shall draft a statement for the members of the panel to sign that reports the recommendation and vote of the panel. This statement should include justification for the panel’s recommendation. While maintaining the confidentiality of any meetings, the statement will summarize the discussion that took place among panel members, including positive and negative deliberations.

The chair of the departmental panel will shall meet with the faculty member being evaluated to inform him/her provide the faculty member with a copy of the panel’s written recommendation written statement, which will shall include actual vote splits and the signatures of all the panel members. The signatures of the panel members acknowledge only that the panel members participated in panel deliberation and had the opportunity to contribute to the development of the written statement. Third-year candidates will sign the panel’s evaluation. The faculty member shall sign a copy of the statement, with the signed copy to be retained by the chair of the panel for submission to the appropriate Academic Dean. The signature of the faculty member acknowledges only that a copy of the statement has been received by the faculty member.

The evaluation panel chair will shall forward the panel’s recommendation(s) statement to the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries. In the case of tenure and promotion recommendations, this must be done by November 1. In the case of third-year reappointment recommendations, this must be done by January 15.

**Faculty Curriculum Committee**

The following proposal was approved without discussion:

New Course—PHYS 296 - BIOL 396, Biophysical Modeling of Excitable Cells
Next, Bob Perkins (chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee) introduced the following proposal:

**New Course—JWST 280 Southern Jewish History**

Bill Olejniczak (guest and chair of the History Department) said that the History Department has not seen this proposal (or the other Jewish Studies proposals) and was particularly concerned that his department did not have the chance to review it. He asked that the Senate take this into consideration in its decision to approve the proposal or not. Mr. Krasnoff responded that though the word “history” is in the course title, it is a Jewish studies course. Jeffrey Diamond (History) said that it looks like a history course and thought that students would think it was one, and expect it to count as one. It would have been a proper courtesy, he added, to let the History Department know about the course.

The Senate voted and the course was not approved.

Mr. Perkins next introduced the following course, also in Jewish Studies:

**New Course—JWST 330 Representations of the Holocaust**

Mr. Cossa asked if “Representations” include plays, pictures, and other art forms. Mr. Krasnoff said that it could, and that it would be left up to the instructor as to whether a particular section would focus on memoir and films, or other forms of representation. If taught primarily as a film course, Mr. Cossa followed up, would it count as a Film Studies course? Mr. Krasnoff said the Jewish Studies Program isn’t asking for that because it can’t guarantee that the course will always primarily focus on films.

The Senate voted and approved the proposal.

Mr. Perkins then said that the next curriculum item was the proposal to change the minor in Jewish Studies, but he did not think that this could be passed as it contained two new courses, one of which was JWST 280 Southern Jewish History, the proposed new course that the Senate had just voted down.

Mr. Krasnoff suggested that he would bring back to the Senate in April the new course proposal for JWST 280 and the proposal to change the minor, but asked that the History Department would provide assurance that it would consider the proposals in time for the next Senate meeting. He added that in his experience the History Department has been slow in reviewing proposals. Mr. Olejniczak responded that that was not true, and said the department would review the proposals. Mr. Krasnoff wanted further guarantees that History review the proposals in time for the April Senate meeting; he then asked that the Senate approve the change of minor proposal with JWST 280 deleted from it.

One Senator asked whether the Curriculum Committee would have to review the whole proposal again, if Jewish Studies wished to add JWST 280 back into the change of minor proposal. Mr. Perkins said that since the committee had already approved the change of minor proposal with JWST 280 in it, there would be no need for the committee to review the exact same proposal again.

Mr. Krasnoff asked for unanimous consent to delete JWST 280 from the change of minor proposal, and unanimous consent was granted. Mr. Krasnoff announced that at the next meeting he would bring another change of minor proposal that included JWST 280.
The Senate voted and approved the proposal to change the minor in Jewish Studies (with JWST 280 deleted from the proposal).

The following proposals were all approved without discussion:

**Accounting**

Change Major—Accounting

**Biology**

Change Course—BIOL 322, Developmental Biology
Change Course—BIOL 212 and BIOL 212L, Genetics lecture and Genetics lab
Change Major—BA in BIOL
Change Major—BS Biochemistry: change the BIOL 212/212L choice to BIOL 305/305L
Change minor—Biology: change the required BIOL 212 to BIOL 305
Change Major—BS Biology with concentration in Molecular Biology
Change Major—BS Biology, BS Marine Biology, Teaching option
Change Courses with BIOL 212 prerequisite

**Constituents’ Concerns**

Scott Peeples (English) said that he was asked by a colleague to voice a concern—which he, too, shared—regarding the recent news that the President Benson had hired a speechwriter during a period of budgetary crisis. Mr. Peeples thought it was unwise to allocate precious resources to staff such a position, when it was becoming increasingly difficult to find the resources to maintain current levels of teaching personnel (i.e., faculty) in order to fulfill the institution’s core mission.

With all business on the agenda completed, a motion was made to adjourn. The motion was seconded and approved: the Senate adjourned at around 6:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary