Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 7 October 2008

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 7 October 2008, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, all the minutes of the spring 2008 Faculty Senate meetings devoted to the Gen-Ed Proposals (15 January, 29 January, 5 February, 19 February, 26 February, 18 March, 25 March, and 1 April) were approved. The minutes of the last regular Faculty Senate meeting (9 September 2008) were also approved.

Reports

The Provost

Associate Provost Bev Diamond substituted for Provost Elise Jorgens, who was out of town. Ms. Diamond reported that the Academic Forum had recently met and looked at draft language concerning annual faculty evaluations, which would go in the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM). Consensus, she said, is developing, though more detail is still needed. She added that faculty committees would look at the proposed language, that deans and chairs are working on their documents involving evaluations, and that faculty would be involved.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) asked if the College was looking at doing away with post-tenure review in light of the new system of annual and merit evaluations. Ms. Diamond replied that it makes perfect sense to get rid of post-tenure review and replace it with annual evaluations. But she said that doing so would also mean the elimination of the $2,500 salary increase that goes with a superior post-tenure-review rating. Some way of building that reward into the new system needs to be found.

The Speaker

Speaker Kelly spoke about the new merit system, noting that he was concerned that good teaching might not count as much as it has traditionally at the College. To address this concern, he reported that he and Bev Diamond have put together an ad hoc committee to look into what constitutes good teaching and how best to evaluate it. Sub-committees have been formed to look at various aspects of the issue. The committee’s goal is to provide a list of best practices to guide the development and evaluation of good teaching at the College.

Speaking on the Modification of Duties policy, the Speaker reminded this year’s Faculty Senate that last year’s Senate endorsed a resolution to adopt a new policy that was modeled on the one used at the University of South Carolina. The Speaker said that the Welfare Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee have been working on the details of adopting and implementing a new policy.

The Speaker next mentioned the status of the TERI plan and whether faculty on the plan are at-will employees or not (at-will employees lose their tenure). The Speaker said that the issue was complicated, and that various difficult legal points of law were involved, which have forced Academic Affairs and Human Resources to seek legal counsel in interpreting law, which is vague on this issue. He said that he would update the faculty as he finds more information.

Next, the Speaker reported an issue concerning the amount that the College contributes to the retirement of faculty in optional retirement programs (ORPs), such as TIAA-CREF. The College reports that it contributes 12.4%, but in fact it only contributes 5%, which is well below what the national average is and what our peer institutions contribute. The Speaker
said that he has met with Steve Osborne (Sr. VP of Business Affairs), Tom Trimboli (Sr. VP of Legal Affairs), and Shirley Hinson (Director of Government Relations), and that they are working on the issue, which is important because the College is not competitive in this area.

The Speaker next reported on the formation of a privacy committee organized by Tom Trimboli. The College has been lax with how it handles personal information, such as students’ social security numbers, and so the committee is tasked with writing a new policy to deal with such matters. The Speaker added that the Welfare Committee would look at drafts of the new policy and provide input. He urged faculty to send their ideas to the Welfare Committee.

Finally, the Speaker announced that he had been invited to serve on the Holiday Party Committee in order to represent the faculty. He invited Senators and other faculty members to take on this responsibility in his place.

Alex Modly, Student Government Association

Ms. Modly announced that the Major/Minor Fair had been changed from Thursday, 9 October to Thursday, 16 October to avoid a conflict with the Jewish holiday Yom Kippur. The event will take place in Physicians Promenade.

Deanna Caveny, chair of the Committee on By-Laws and Fac/Admin. Manual

Ms. Caveny announced that highlights as well as full minutes of the meetings of the Committee on the By-Laws and Fac/Admin. Manual (FAM) are posted on the Faculty Senate Web site. She said that the revised FAM will be posted on the Academic Affairs Web site. She added that the revised FAM would contain only content of “enduring significance,” which mainly includes policies, statements of purpose, and some key information about certain procedures (though not all procedures). Other information, which includes some procedural guidelines, will be posted on the Academic Affairs Web site.

Ms. Caveny announced that additions to the FAM include the following:
--a policy statement on Courtesy Appointments,
--the Modification of Duties policy,
--a slight change to the Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review (T, P & R) section involving details about when the President’s letter on any T, P, & R decision is due,
--some refinement to the language on annual and merit evaluations,
--the complete Post-Tenure Review policy,
--a clarification of the Sabbatical policy, which will state that all faculty on sabbatical must normally relinquish their administrative duties, and that they must sign a statement promising to return to the College after the sabbatical.

Ms. Caveny explained that the faculty owns and controls the by-laws, but not other information in the FAM, which is controlled by the administration. However, she said that the philosophy of the Committee is that any changes in the FAM should involve consultation between the faculty and the administration.

She also reported that when the Faculty Senate approved the formation of the new Gen-Ed Committee, it also proposed a change to the by-laws concerning the Academic Planning Committee. Her committee, she said, will report on this issue at the next meeting.

Finally, Ms. Caveny reported that her committee has reviewed the proposed by-laws amendment regarding the composition of the Gen-Ed Committee (the next item on today’s
agenda), and that the committee agrees that the proposal should be heard by the Senate. However, she reported that the committee is not making a recommendation on whether to approve or reject the proposal.

**Unfinished Business**

**Motion to amend language on the composition of the Gen-Ed Committee**

Since the Committee on the By-Laws and Fac./Admin. Manual had given its report on the motion, as required by the by-laws for any proposed change to the by-laws, the Senate resumed its deliberations on the motion, which reads as follows:

Insert a new Standing College Committee, the Committee on General Education.

1) Composition: Seven regular faculty shall be elected to serve on the Committee. Each academic school shall be represented on the Committee. The Committee shall have one voting student member selected by the Student Government Association. Committee members shall serve a term of one year and may, if re-elected, serve as many as three consecutive terms. The Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience (or other administrator designated by the Provost) and the Director of Assessment (or other administrator designated by the Provost), and one representative from the library faculty are *ex officio*, non-voting members.

Darryl Phillips said that while it was good to have wide representation on committees, he was opposed to this amendment for various reasons. First, he said that the use of the term *ex officio* was inappropriate. Normally, the term signifies one who holds another office and becomes a member of a committee. This definition, however, does not apply to the library faculty in this matter as it does with other *ex officio* members of the committee. Second, the motion doesn’t explain how the library member will be selected, which is generally not a good practice to start adopting. Third, the amendment implies a sense of ownership of the Gen-Ed Committee with respect to the library faculty. We wouldn’t, continued Mr. Phillips, say that of some other group, such as the English Department or the History Department. There are other ways to make the committee more representative.

James Williams (Library) said that he agreed with Mr. Phillips on the point about the use of the term *ex officio*, but not with his other points. The library faculty, he pointed out, supports the entire curriculum in a way that, say, the English Department and Math Department do not. The library therefore needs to be included in the Gen-Ed Committee’s deliberations and should have representation on the committee.

Pete Calzagno (Economics and Finance) wondered if library faculty are required to be on the Faculty Curriculum Committee. He thought that the Curriculum Committee is similar in kind to the Gen-Ed Committee, and that the rules governing membership in that committee would serve as a guide for whether or not the library must be represented on the Gen-Ed committee. Bob Perkins (Teacher Education and chair of the Curriculum Committee) said that a representative of the library was not required to be on the Curriculum Committee.

The Senate voted on the motion to amend the composition of the Gen-Ed Committee, and the motion failed.

**New Business**

**Faculty Curriculum Committee**
Speaker Kelly announced that one proposal from the Curriculum Committee had been withdrawn. This was the proposed minor in applied computing. The Speaker said that the reason for its withdrawal stemmed from the fact that two committees in addition to the Curriculum Committee are required to review the proposals, and that this process of moving documents through three committees slows things down. He said that he was looking into how the process might be made to work faster.

Bob Perkins (chair, Curriculum Committee) introduced the first two of four proposals coming from the Computer Science Department:

1. New Course—CSCI 392 Seminar on Computing and Society
   - Change Major; add CSCI 392 as a requirement *(Pending Budget Committee and Academic Planning Committee approval)*

2. Change Major: Change math requirements

Regarding proposal #2, Rohn England (Mathematics) pointed out that MATH 260, which was listed in the proposal, has been deleted from the catalog. He wondered whether the Computer Science Department was aware of this fact. Elizabeth Jurisich (Mathematics) said that the Math Department was involved in discussions of the proposal and that her department is communicating with the chair of the Computer Science Department about MATH 260.

The Senate voted and approved the two proposals.

The following proposals were passed without discussion:

- Delete course—CSCI 116 Data Organization and Management
- Change Minor: Computer Science

Mr. Perkins next introduced the following proposal from the Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies:

New Course—RUSS 390 Special Topics

One Senator asked what the special course was exactly. Mr. Perkins responded that the proposal seeks to create the category of a special topics course because hitherto no such course category had existed in the Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies.

The Senate voted and approved the proposal.

Next, Mr. Perkins introduced the proposal from the Department of Management and Entrepreneurship:

New Minor in Leadership, Change and Social Responsibility.

Norris Preyer (Physics) asked if all three committees (Curriculum, Budget, and Academic Planning) had reviewed and approved the proposal. Mr. Perkins responded that they had.

The Senate approved the proposal.

The Senate approved the following proposals from the Philosophy and Theatre Departments without discussion:

- Delete course—PHIL 204 Mind and Machines
Change Course—THTR 146  Intermediate Tap
Change Course—THTR 207  Drafting and Rendering for the Theatre
Change Course—THTR 332  Dance Choreography
Change Course—THTR 338  Dance Ensemble

Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Program

Heather Tierney, committee chair, introduced the following proposals:

Proposal for a New Graduate Program – M Ed in Teaching, Learning and Advocacy

Proposals for New Graduate Courses – M Ed in Teaching, Learning and Advocacy
MTLA XXX – Class, Race, and Gender in Education
MTLA XXX – Critical Issues in Contemporary Education
MTLA XXX – Family and Community Involvement
MTLA XXX – Identifying and Sustaining Effective Learning Communities
MTLA XXX – Literacy Development of Early Learners
MTLA XXX – Teacher As a Member of the Professional Community
MTLA XXX – Teachers As Advocates for Children & Youth

One Senator asked why none of the course proposals had course numbers attached to them. Diane Cudahy (Teacher Education) explained that numbers had recently been assigned to the proposed courses, beginning with 601 for the first course on the list and progressing to 607.

Jeffery Diamond (History) asked if there was a disciplinary field to which these courses are connected. Ms. Cudahy explained that the general discipline is education, that she and her have colleagues spent three years planning the program, and that they consulted with other colleagues, asking what they thought about the issues surrounding learning advocacy on a theoretical level. Based on that research and planning, they designed the proposed courses, which seek to develop teachers to fulfill roles that await them in their profession, but for which standard teacher-training courses don’t prepare them. She stressed that, according to their research and what other colleagues have told them, these courses are important. Mr. Diamond said that the courses are therefore for those who are already teachers. Ms. Cudahy replied “yes.” Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) asked what non-accredited teachers do about training. Ms. Cudahy explained that there are already programs in place for teacher training and development.

The Senate approved the proposals.

Next, the following proposals were approved by the Senate without discussion:

Proposals to Change a Graduate Course – M Ed in Teaching, Learning and Advocacy
EDEE 667 – Curriculum Theory and Application (Title and Course Description Change)
EDEE 678 – Methods and Materials in Reading Instruction (Title and Course Description Change)
EDFS 672 – Linguistic/Cultural Diversity in Education (Course Description Change)
EDFS 702 – Research and Development Project (Course Credit Hour Change)
EDFS 705 – Evaluation of Developmental Field Based Experience (Title and Description Change)
EDFS 711 – Educational Procedures for Exceptional Children in the Regular Classroom (Title and Description Change)

Proposal for a New Graduate Course – MAT in Performing Arts
EDFS 794 – Clinical Practice in Music, Theater or Dance Education

Proposal for a New Graduate Course – M Ed in Languages
LALE 700 – Thesis or Action Research

Proposals for a New Graduate Course – MS in Mathematics
MATH 550 – Linear Models
MATH 589 – Special Topics in Probability and Statistics

Proposals to Change a Graduate Program – Certificate in Statistics (Requirements Change)

Constituents’ Concerns

No concerns were voiced.

With its business completed, the Senate adjourned at 5:45.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary