21 February 1994

To: Faculty Senate
Re: Senate Meeting of March 1st

Please find the following items:

1. Agenda for March 1st Senate Meeting
2. Curriculum Committee new business
3. Graduate Education Committee new business summary and revisions regarding the M.A. proposal in Court Interpretation (most of this material was sent to department chairs and should have been circulated to you previously)
4. English Department resolution regarding student evaluations
5. Academic Standards Committee proposal for changing the 7/37 rule
6. Advisory Committee to the President, for your information: Draft evaluation procedures and instruments to evaluate chairs and deans (note: this is a draft which will have been discussed by the Advisory Committee to the President and redrafted Monday, February 21st, but comments to that Committee are still welcome; Faculty Senate will discuss a revised document at the April Senate meeting)

Also find a summary version of State Senator Drummond's proposal for revamping CHE as a governing system for higher education in South Carolina
Faculty Senate Agenda

March 1, 1994

1. Minutes of previous meeting

2. Reports
   Speaker’s Report
   President Sanders

3. New Business
   --Curriculum Committee: New Courses
   --Graduate Education Committee: M.A. in Court Interpretation; New Courses
   --English Department: Resolution on Student Evaluations
   --Academic Standards Committee: 7/37 Rule Revision
   --Resolution of Remembrance: Professor Eugene C. Hunt

4. For Information: Draft Document on Evaluation Policy/Procedures for Deans and Chairs

5. Constituents’ General Concerns

6. Adjournment
February 18, 1994
College of Charleston
Faculty Curriculum Committee Report
Submitted to the Faculty Senate for Consideration on March 1, 1994

The Faculty Curriculum Committee recommends the following departmental changes in course offerings, major and minor requirements for consideration and approval by the Faculty Senate:

**Biology**  **B.S. in Biology with an emphasis in Molecular Biology.**
A Minimum of 30 semester hours in Biology, to include:
Biology 111/111L, 112/112L (8)
Biology 311 (Genetics) (3)
Biology 311L (Genetics Lab) (1)
Biology 312 (Molecular Biology) (3)
Biology 312L (Molecular Biology Lab) (1)
Biology 313 (Cell Biology) (3)
Biology 313L (Cell Biology Lab) (1)

Take any two of: (8)
Biology 304 (Plant Physiology) or
Biology 321 (General and Comparative Physiology) or
Biology 310 (General Microbiology) or
Biology 322 (Comparative Vertebrate Embryology)

Biology 455 (Seminar in Molecular Biology) (2)  **NEW COURSE**
Course description: A capstone course required of all students obtaining a degree in biology with an emphasis in molecular biology. Selected readings from the current literature in molecular biology will be discussed. Students will be expected to develop and present a seminar based on a topic approved by the instructor.

**Chemistry**
Chemistry 111/111L, 112/112L (8)
Chemistry 231/231L, 232/232L (Organic Chemistry) (8)
Chemistry 351,352 (Biochemistry) (6)
Chemistry 352L (Biochemistry Lab) (1)
[Chemistry 221 (Quantitative Analysis is recommended)]

**Physics**
Physics 101, 102 or 201, 202 (8)

**Mathematics**
Mathematics 120 (Calculus I) (4)
Mathematics 220 (Calculus II) (4)
Communication
The course changes below are to the Communications major in the following concentrations:

Communication Studies concentration

Change: Basic courses to "Choose at least 6 hours"
Change: Electives to "Choose at least 9 hours"
Add: COMM 220: Interpersonal Communication to Basic Courses
Add: POSC 322: Mass Media and Politics to Electives
Add: the following statement under Electives after "choose at least 12 hours from the following." Any 200 or 300 level course not taken to fulfill the requirement above.
Add: the following statement after "The major requirement totals 36 hours." At least 15 hours of this concentration must be 300/400 level Communication courses.

Media Studies concentration

Add: Comm 383: Media Criticism to Theory Courses

Media Theory Course Selection will now read:

STUDENTS ARE REQUIRED TO TAKE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:
A. COMM 386: Media Law
B. BADM 305: Corporate Communication Law
C. POSC 326: Mass Media and the First Amendment

STUDENTS ARE REQUIRED TO TAKE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:
D. COMM 383: Media Criticism
E. COMM 384: Ethics in Communication
F. POSC 320: Public Opinion and Voting Behavior
G. PSYC 323: Mass Media and Human Development

Add: POSC 322: Mass Media and American Politics to Media Electives
Add: the following statement to Media Electives: Any 200/300 level course not taken to fulfill a requirement above.
Add: the following statement after "The major requirement totals 36 hours." At least 15 hours in this concentration must be 300/400 level communication courses.
Drop: BADM 305: Corporate Communication Law from Media Electives
Drop: COMM 383: Media Criticism from Media Electives
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Laura Hines, Graduate Studies Coordinator
SUBJ: Update on Graduate Business for March 1, 1994 Faculty Senate Meeting
DATE: February 18, 1994

This is to let you know what action has been taken on the graduate course and program proposals which were distributed in a packet to your department offices for your perusal a couple weeks ago:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ACTION TO DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English courses</td>
<td>Recommended for approval to the Graduate Council by the Faculty Committee on Graduate and Continuing Education (FCGCE); approved by the Council on 2-11-94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German courses</td>
<td>Recommended for approval to the Graduate Council by the FCGCE; approved by the Council on 2-11-94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History courses</td>
<td>Recommended for approval to the Graduate Council by the FCGCE; approved by the Council on 2-11-94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal for M.A. in Legal Interpreting</td>
<td>Recommended for approval to the Graduate Council by the FCGCE; approved by the Council on 2-11-94; approved by the Board of Trustees (contingent upon approval by the Faculty Senate) on 2-15-94.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note #1: There have been some minor changes in the proposal at the request of the FCGCE such as removing a sentence on page 26 beginning "However, it is quite possible that some courses normally taught in the various departments could be adapted..." The FCGCE thought this was not a strong enough statement to warrant inclusion in the final version of the proposal. Also added were course acronyms.

Note #2: Attached is a first attempt at determining the revenue from the program which includes some added fees. This should be viewed as a very preliminary attempt - your comments are welcomed. Ultimately, of course, the Board of Trustees approves any special fees.

Note #3: Attached is a letter of support for the program from Harry Obst from the U.S. State Department which gives a good overview of the importance of having such a program on the master's level.
Prof. Virginia Benmaman  
University of Charleston  
66 George Street  
Charleston, South Carolina 29424-0001  

SUBJECT: Establishment of a Professional Interpreting Program  

Dear Professor Benmaman:  

Thank you for letting us review your proposal for establishing a program at Charleston University that would lead to an M.A. in Legal Interpretation.  

In our profession, we know from long experience that the university is the ideal place for training professional interpreters and translators. The leading interpreting programs in Europe are attached to universities, for instance, in Geneva, Paris, Vienna, Mainz, Florence, Heidelberg, and at Bradford University in the United Kingdom. The best Canadian programs are attached to universities. The graduates of these programs hold many of the key interpreting jobs in business and government in Europe and all over the world, which is the most convincing proof of their success.  

While American universities are graduating thousands of theoretical linguists and a sizeable crop of graduates from foreign language programs, professional programs for interpreters are virtually nonexistent at the very time when the need for them is the greatest. The Department of State employs more than a thousand interpreters, a few on staff and hundreds more as independent contractors. There are only two or three academic institutions in the United States where we can successfully recruit new talent. This forces us to hire many foreigners and to conduct extensive in-house training programs.  

Charleston University is to be congratulated for taking the initiative to establish a program in an area where our society has an urgent and dire need, a need to which most of academia has turned a blind eye, being preoccupied with what is fashionable and traditional, while ignoring some of the monumental changes taking place in our country and the world at this time.  

Many thousands of individuals who speak foreign languages (nobody knows the exact number but it is very large) function as interpreters and translators in the American legal and judicial system.
Only a tiny fraction of them can deliver the service in a professional and reliable manner. The reason is not only the lack of dependable certification of this profession at the state and federal level but the critical shortage of good training programs.

I have worked as an interpreter in courts only occasionally, but it was enough to make me realize the enormous potential for damage and miscarriage of justice when unreliable interpreters are used.

We are carrying out small but very successful training programs for interpreters in our own organization and have assisted a few other federal agencies with training efforts. We are also familiar with many academic training programs in the U.S. and in other countries. Many on my staff, as I, have attended those programs.

Based on our knowledge, your proposed training program contains the essential elements which are needed to achieve the M.A. level in the profession and which are lacking in some other academic programs. The State of South Carolina would be well advised to help you with those efforts, particularly because of its own excellent and farsighted efforts at improving international communication and attracting foreign investors into the state. Developing professional interpreters through such a program does not only benefit the courts and the legal profession, but, because professional interpreters can easily handle most other subjects, as you correctly point out in your letter to me, the presence of such interpreters greatly benefits the business community and the state as a whole.

I wish you success with your project and hope that other universities will follow your example. We need at least ten such programs to fill the void which currently exists.

Sincerely yours,

Harry Dobst
Director
Office of Language Services
INCOME GENERATED FROM THE MA IN LEGAL INTERPRETING PROGRAM

Using estimated fees as of 2-11-94

Per credit hour - 33 credits required to be paid to the University of Charleston

Non-resident fee: $240 per credit hour x 33 hours = $7,920
Resident fee: $120 per credit hour x 33 hours = 3,960
Computer fee: $2 per credit = 66
Matriculation fee: $15 per term x 6 summer terms = 90
Interpreting lab fee - $100 (one time fee) = 100
Special administration fee for Practicum and Internship:
Exit Exam: $250 = 250

Totals Resident Income = $4,966
Non-Resident Income = $8,926

Illustrations:

A non-resident student attending only summer sessions would pay to the University of Charleston a total of $8,926.

Starting the summer of 1997-98, it is anticipated that enrollment for the summer sessions will be 30 students. Each student will be taking 9 credit hours at $240 per credit hour. Revenue generated during the summer for credit hours alone would be 30 student x 9 credit hours x $240 per credit hour = $64,800 (assuming all students were non-resident enrollees).

A resident student attending fall, spring and summer sessions would pay the University of Charleston a total of $4,966. It is difficult to anticipate the number of resident students who would be enrolled in any given cycle.

It is anticipated that a special fee structure will be presented to the Board of Trustees for this graduate program. The unique nature of the program both in terms of the course structure and the utilization of a special interpreting laboratory supports this request. Note: The International Master of Business Administration Program (MBA) at the University of South Carolina assesses a $22,000 program fee.
To: Faculty Senate  
Fr: Department of English and Communications  
Re: Student Evaluation Forms

New Business

Resolved, that the College use the earlier student evaluation form instead of the new evaluation form developed by the Ad Hoc Committee on Use of Student Evaluations of Teaching.

Rationale:

The English Department has already raised six objections to the new form: these objections were read at the February 1 Senate meeting and can be found in the minutes of that meeting. Further objections are:

1. Trial runs have found students' comments are not legible on the duplicate sheets of the form.
2. Attempts to rectify this problem by photocopying each form would cost even more money than the form now requires.

The final point is that until we can find a practical and economical alternative to the old form the College should continue to use it.
February 15, 1994

TO: Dr. David Mann, Speaker
FR: Dr. Marsha E. Hass, Chair, FCAS
RE: Study Abroad and the 7/37 Rule

On recommendation of the Department of Languages, the Committee on Academic Standards makes the following motion:

The faculty rule requiring College of Charleston students to complete 30 of their last 37 hours in residence at the College of Charleston (sometimes stated that a student can take only 7 of their last 37 hours elsewhere) should ordinarily be waived by the Undergraduate Deans for any student majoring in foreign languages or any student with a minor in International Business.

In all cases, a minimum of 30 hours must be completed in residence at the College of Charleston. All other requests for exemption from the 7/37 rule will still be handled on a case by case basis by the committee.

**Rationale:**

Many students are unprepared to study abroad until their senior year and when they decide to do it, they run afoul of the 7/37 hour rule. This Committee has routinely been making exceptions to the rule, in good faith, for students having the necessary approval of their major departments. The number of requests is now excessive and taking up too much of the Committee's time. We would hope that this delegation to the Office of Undergraduate Studies is acceptable to the Faculty Senate. It does not involve a change in the rule, merely the way the Petitions for exception will be handled.
EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS BY FACULTY

This evaluation replaces the current form and procedure.

POLICY

1. Chairs will be evaluated by faculty in their respective departments once every two years. In addition, Chairs new in that position will be evaluated at the end of their first year if that year is not the one in which the evaluation normally takes place.

2. Only full-time faculty with rank of Instructor and above will evaluate Chairs.

3. Completed evaluation forms, with comments, will be returned to the Deans, who have the responsibility of evaluating Chairs. Deans will not share the evaluation forms with Chairs due to the confidentiality of the forms and for protection of the faculty. Because faculty will continue to be evaluated by Chairs on an on-going basis, it is imperative that Chairs not see the written comments.

4. Only summary statistical data will be distributed to Chairs. The Dean may provide a summary of the written comments to the Chair if requested.

5. Summary statistical data will be available to faculty in each respective Department through the Dean’s Office.

PROCEDURE

1. Evaluations will be distributed to faculty by Deans and will be completed by a specific date, determined by the Provost, early during the Spring semester.

2. Faculty will complete the evaluation, with comments, and the electronically scanned "answer" sheet and will return them to a designated person in the Dean’s Office.

3. A designated person from the Dean’s Office will take the forms to Administrative Computing to be scanned and summarized.

4. For each question, the following data will be calculated and distributed:
   a. the mean response
   b. the median response
   c. the proportion of responses for each category

5. The Dean’s Office will retain the written comments on the original evaluation form.

6. After the summary data are returned to the respective Dean’s Office, that data will be distributed to the respective Chairs.

7. Faculty may review the summary statistical data for their respective Chair in the Dean’s Office.
INSTRUCTIONS:

Please evaluate each of the statements which follow based on the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement. Use the following codes to mark your answers.

A - Strongly Agree
B - Agree
C - Neutral
D - Disagree
E - Strongly Disagree

Left Blank - not applicable

Please also provide specific written comments when appropriate. Use the Write In areas on the mark sense form or attach separate sheets.

The mean response, the median response, and the proportion of responses for each category will be reported for each Chair in summary form. The summary statistical data will be reported to the respective Chairs and will be available for Faculty review in the Office of the Dean.

The written comments will not be shown to the Chairs. The Dean may, however, provide summaries of the written comments to each respective Chair.

After completing this survey, please return the survey, with comments, and the completed mark sense form to the Office of the Dean on or before _______________________.

SECTION I - Administration

1. The Chair provides leadership in setting appropriate goals for the Department.
2. The Chair provides leadership in establishing appropriate policies for the Department.
3. The Chair provides leadership in recruiting new faculty and staff.
4. The Chair demonstrates a style of decision-making which is appropriate to different situations.
5. The Chair follows the stated policies of the Department, School, and College.
6. The Chair treats members of the faculty fairly.
7. The Chair ensures that faculty work loads are fair.
8. The Chair considers the views of the faculty when taking action.

COMMENTS: Comments may be written in Write In Area 1 on the mark-sense form or may be written on a separate sheet.

SECTION II - Leadership and Faculty Evaluation

9. The Chair encourages and supports the faculty in scholarly activity.
10. The Chair encourages and supports curricular development.
11. The Chair encourages and supports quality instruction.
12. The Chair is sensitive to the diversity of content and methodology in the various disciplines and fields represented in the Department.
13. The Chair evaluates teaching based on the stated criteria for teaching.
14. The Chair evaluates research and professional development activity based on the stated criteria for research and professional development.
15. The Chair evaluates service activity based on the criteria for service.

COMMENTS: Comments may be written in Write In Area 2 on the mark-sense form or may be written on a separate sheet.
SECTION III - Management of Resources

16. The Chair effectively manages the budget for the Department.

17. The Chair identifies salary inequities within Departments.

18. The Chair allocates resources fairly among the various faculty within a Department.

COMMENTS: Comments may be written in Write In Area 3 on the mark-sense form or may be written on a separate sheet.

SECTION IV - Communication

19. The Chair keeps faculty informed about Department, School, and College matters.

20. The Chair adequately communicates the purpose, achievements, and needs of the Department to others within the School and College.

21. The Chair demonstrates a genuine concern for the welfare of the Faculty.

22. The Chair is discreet in discussing confidential matters.

23. I feel free to communicate with the Chair.

COMMENTS: Comments may be written in Write In Area 4 on the mark-sense form or may be written on a separate sheet.

SECTION V - Overall

24. The Chair is respected by the faculty and staff in the Department.

25. The Chair is serving effectively in this position.
EVALUATION OF DEANS BY FACULTY

This evaluation is to be used in addition to the current evaluation provided by the Chairs in the respective Schools. Chairs will not complete this form.

POLICY

1. Deans will be evaluated by faculty in their respective Schools once every two years. In addition, Deans new in that position will be evaluated at the end of their first year if that year is not the one in which the evaluation normally takes place.

2. Only full-time faculty with rank of Instructor and above will evaluate Deans.

3. Completed evaluation forms, with comments, will be returned to the Provost, who has the responsibility of evaluating Deans. The Provost will not share the evaluation forms with Deans due to the confidentiality of the forms and for protection of the faculty.

4. Only summary statistical data will be distributed to Deans. The Provost may provide a summary of the written comments to the Dean if requested.

5. Summary statistical data will be available to faculty in each respective School through the Office of the Provost.

PROCEDURE

1. Evaluations will be distributed to faculty by the Provost and will be completed by a specific date, determined by the Provost, early during the Spring semester.

2. Faculty will complete the evaluation, with comments, and the electronically scanned "answer" sheet and will return them to a designated person in the Provost's Office.

3. The Provost will be responsible for having these forms taken to Administrative Computing to be scanned and summarized.

4. For each question, the following data will be calculated and distributed:
   a. the mean response
   b. the median response
   c. the proportion of responses for each category

5. The Provost will retain the written comments on the original evaluation forms.

6. The summary statistical data will be returned to the respective Deans.

7. Faculty may review the summary statistical data for their respective Dean in the Office of the Provost.
FACULTY EVALUATION OF DEANS

INSTRUCTIONS:

Please evaluate each of the statements which follow based on the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement. Use the following codes to mark your answers.

A - Strongly Agree
B - Agree
C - Neutral
D - Disagree
E - Strongly Disagree

Left Blank - not applicable

Please also provide specific written comments when appropriate. Use Write In areas or attach separate sheets.

The mean response, the median response, and the proportion of responses for each category will be reported for each Dean in summary form. The summary statistical data will be reported to the respective Deans and will be available for Faculty review in the Office of the Provost.

The written comments will not be shown to the Deans. The Provost may, however, provide summaries of the written comments to each respective Dean.

After completing this survey, please return the survey, with comments, and the marked "answer sheet" to the Office of the Provost on or before ______________.
SECTION I - Administration

1. The Dean provides leadership in setting appropriate goals for the School.
2. The Dean provides leadership in establishing appropriate policies for the School.
3. The Dean provides leadership in recruiting new faculty and staff.
4. The Dean succeeds in securing new faculty lines and staff positions for the School.
5. The Dean demonstrates a style of decision-making which is appropriate to different situations.
6. The Dean follows the stated policies of the School and College.
7. The Dean treats members of the faculty fairly.
8. The Dean considers the views of the faculty when taking action.

COMMENTS: Comments may be written on the Write In Area 1 of the mark-sense form or may be added on a separate sheet.

SECTION II - Leadership and Faculty Evaluation

9. The Dean encourages and supports the faculty in scholarly activity.
10. The Dean encourages and supports curricular development.
11. The Dean supports and encourages quality instruction.
12. The Dean is sensitive to the diversity of content and methodology in the various disciplines and fields represented in the School.
13. The Dean ensures that faculty evaluation is based on the stated criteria for each category.

COMMENTS: Comments may be written on the Write In Area 2 of the mark-sense form or may be added on a separate sheet.
SECTION III - Management of Resources

14. The Dean develops an appropriate budget for the School.

15. The Dean successfully identifies sources and procures external resources for the School.

16. The Dean remedies salary inequities within Departments.

17. The Dean allocates resources fairly among the various Departments within a School.

COMMENTS: Comments may be written in Write In Area 3 of the mark-sense form or may be added on a separate sheet.

SECTION IV - Communication

18. The Dean keeps faculty informed about School and College matters.

19. The Dean adequately projects the purpose, achievements, and needs of the School to others within the College.

20. The Dean adequately projects the purpose, achievements, and need of the School to outside groups.

21. The Dean demonstrates a genuine concern for the welfare of the faculty.

22. The Dean is discreet in discussing confidential matters.

23. I feel free to communicate with the Dean.

COMMENTS: Comments may be written in Write In Area 4 of the mark-sense form or may be added on a separate sheet.

SECTION V - Overall

24. The Dean is respected by the faculty and staff in the School.

25. The Dean is serving effectively in this position.
RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Higher education in South Carolina currently is overseen by a coordinating board, as opposed to a governing board.

As a coordinating board, the Commission on Higher Education currently has all the powers usually assigned to coordinating boards, including the following:

* Approval of new academic programs
* Termination of academic programs
* Approval of all new facilities and property acquisitions
* Allocation of state appropriations to institutions
* Statewide planning and institutional planning
* Statewide assessment and institutional assessment
* Licensing of post-secondary institutions
* Administration of Higher Education minority affairs programs
* State Postsecondary Review functions for federal aid programs under the Higher Education Act

A pure governing board like a Board of Regents normally would have all of the above responsibilities plus these additional duties:

* Establish missions of institutions
* Select and remove the institutional presidents
* Set tuition and fees
* Control and approve the internal institutional budgets
* Grant tenure to faculty
* Set admissions standards

The proposed alternative to establishing a board of regents, yet still strengthening statewide governance and accountability assigns to a newly created Council on Higher Education the responsibilities of the former CHE plus these additional duties:

* Establish missions of institutions
* Confirm institutional presidents, with power to remove for cause
* Set acceptable ranges for tuition and fees
* Approve internal budgets
* Establish personnel policies unique to higher education
* Set admission standards
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC Commission on Higher Education</strong>&lt;br&gt;Coordinating board for planning and assessment with recommendations to General Assembly&lt;br&gt;18 members apptd by Governor for 4 year terms (2 from each Congressional District recommended by a majority of legislative delegation and 4 at-large members confirmed by Senate). Chairman elected by CHE.</td>
<td><strong>SC Council on Higher Education</strong>&lt;br&gt;Quasi-governing board with enhanced authority for efficient management of higher education institutions&lt;br&gt;12 members: Chairman appointed by Governor and confirmed by Senate for term coterminus with Governor, 7 appointed by Governor for staggered 4 year terms, and 4 members chosen by the Boards of Trustees of the various institutions for staggered 4 year terms as follows: one each chosen by the Group I, Group II and Group III institutions and one ex-officio member chosen by the Council of Independent Colleges at the annual meeting of all Boards of Trustees called by the Council on Higher Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner appointed by CHE</td>
<td>Executive Director appointed by the Council on Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President of each institution appointed by Board of Trustees of each institution</td>
<td>President of each institution appointed by the institution’s Board of Trustees and confirmed by the Council with power to remove for cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public higher education institutions: 3 research universities, 7 senior colleges, 2 four year branches, 5 two year branches, plus State Board for Tec with 16 two year institutions. Collaborative relationship with private institutions.</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees of each institution&lt;br&gt;Varying numbers of members elected by General Assembly and/or appointed by Governor or other special case</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes beginning February 1, 1995