March 14, 1995

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The seventh regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1994-1995 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 14 in Room 118 of The Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty David Mann presiding. Fifty senators came. The Minutes of the previous meeting (February 7) were approved as circulated, after the Speaker noted that a sub-title ("Constituents' Concerns") had been omitted at the top of the last page. (James Carew pointed out another mistake after the meeting was over; this is described at the end of these Minutes.)

The chair then introduced Dr. Sam Stafford, head of the College of Charleston Alumni Association, who said that he had genuinely enjoyed the opportunity to attend the meetings of the Senate during the past year. He announced that the Association would sponsor a reception following a later meeting, and that Professor Marion Doig would be nominated as the next president of the Alumni Association, the first faculty member to be put forward for this office since Harry Freeman a few years since.

The Speaker asked to defer his report until the end of the meeting.

New Business

Brian Scholtens introduced two motions from the Academic Planning Committee. The first was a recommendation that the name of the Honors Program not be changed to "Honors College." Three reasons had been advanced to justify the change. First, it had been suggested that it would increase the visibility and attractiveness of the program, and therefore help the College compete for able students. No evidence, however -- in particular, no data -- had been offered to support this claim, and the Committee had not found it convincing. Secondly, such a change would set a precedent within the structure of the institution, possibly leading other units of the College to advance similar arguments for name (and subsequently status) changes: to erect another "college" within the College would, in the Committee's judgement, create a situation that would be awkward at best. Third, the Planning Committee also questioned the financial impact such a change would be likely to have on individual departments. If enrollments in the Honors Program continue to rise, there will necessarily be an increasing financial burden on departments, in terms of faculty time, supplies, and so on. And even if departments are compensated with adjuncts for faculty participating in the Honors Program, this generally does not "replace" that faculty member in the department. While commending the Honors Program for "the tremendous job it continues to do," the Committee did not find any of the reasons advanced for changing the name of the program to be persuasive.

During the discussion of this issue, Hugh Haynsworth wondered if there were precedents for having more than one "college" within a college. Boston College was cited as an example, because it has two such bodies, a College of Arts and Sciences and a College of Business. Frank Kinard
thought that that was a most unfortunate example. Hugh Wilder spoke in favor of the Committee's report, adding that, in view of recently announced cutbacks, the financial implications of changing the name now appear much more serious than they would have earlier. Bob Mignone also spoke in favor of the report, but felt compelled to point out that spending extra money to attract good students was not in itself necessarily a bad idea. Mr. Haynsworth wanted to know if the Planning Committee had consulted with the Director of the Honors Program. Mr. Scholtens replied that Rose Hamm had been invited to come to one of their meetings, and had very kindly done so, there had been full consultation, but the Committee remained unconvinced that the change was in the best interests of the College. In the event, the motion not to approve changing the name of the Honors Program to "Honors College" passed unanimously, on a voice vote.

The second motion was a recommendation to approve the draft of an "Academic Affairs Policy Formation" document, developed by the Office of Academic Affairs as "Policy #1" in an "Academic Affairs General Policy Manual." The Planning Committee offered two further (minor) suggestions, for consideration by the Senate and then by the Office of Academic Affairs:

In this policy statement (section 3.2.3) and in the faculty manual (section 4), reference is made to the Speaker of the Faculty referring matters of concern to the faculty senate or a committee. We recommend that the faculty senate review the language of these sections, to ensure that the wording of the statements is strong enough to be acceptable. Currently they read the Speaker may refer such matters to the faculty senate. Alternatively, it might read will [amended to shall] refer such matters, or some other option. This is not an objection to the policy statement, but rather an area of current policy that the senate may wish to reconsider, and thus should be changed in this policy statement.

A second minor point that we discussed is in section 3.3.6 of the policy statement. In this section a time limit of two months is given for consideration of any policy change. If applied strictly, this may cause problems for policies proposed just in advance of the summer, when faculty are often not on campus and the senate does not convene. A special consideration may be necessary for such circumstances.

To begin the discussion of the Committee's recommendation, the Speaker asked David Cohen first to clarify what the proposal itself actually means. Mr. Cohen said that, essentially, it does two things: it regulates the timing, and the physical location, of policy development. First, it would bring some order to the process of development, i.e., to the sequence of events that must occur in the course of forming new academic policies. Second, it would bring the people involved in policy development together systematically. Hugh Wilder, referring to section 2.0 ("Organization") asked for some examples of what was meant by academic "Policies" -- what sorts of affairs did Academic Affairs have in mind? The Senate itself, it appeared, was directly involved only in Section 3.3.3:

Draft policies reviewed by the Speaker of the Faculty and/or Faculty Senate which carry significant recommendations for modification shall be returned to the originator who may include these modifications in a revised draft. Whether or not these modifications are included, the originator will send the policy draft to the Deans and Directors [sic, no apostrophes] Group with the comments of the faculty within one month.
Mr. Cohen said that the policy on sabbatical leave, which had been under development for some time, would be a good example. Herb Silverman pointed out that the draft document is not really about approving policies, but only about recommending them, and he called attention to section 3.3.7:

The decision of the Provost in all matters of operating policy shall be final. Final approval by the Provost must be in writing and there is no deadline or time limit for this approval. Should the Provost not approve a policy draft, he/she will return the policy draft with a reason for rejection to the originator.

Hugh Haynsworth queried section 5.1:

Five years from the original approval date, each policy shall be reviewed by the Deans and Directors Group. The Provost will then reapprove the policy. Policies that are not specifically reapproved do not remain in force. Substantive revisions to policies will follow the policy review steps outlined [for outlined] in 3.0.

What would happen if something were not reviewed after five years; would it lapse? This, Mr. Haynsworth thought, did not make much sense. Mr. Cohen answered that "sunset" provisions are in the air just now. Richard Nunan, speaking to the same issue, said he could envision a kind of nightmare scenario in which Deans would be chronically reviewing and revising policies, leaving them no time to do all the other valuable things they do.

Joe Benich said that he had been reading section 1.0 ("Purpose"), but to small avail: just what is the purpose of this document? David Cohen again mentioned the Sabbatical issue as an example of a policy that seems to come up for revision with some regularity, as circumstances alter; the policy document would establish a timetable, and so on, for making any necessary changes. Mr. Benich thought that might just complicate matters, especially where State appropriations are involved. Carla Lowrey said that she would like to here more about what the Academic Planning Committee thought about the proposal; did they think the Senate should approve it? Brian Scholtens replied that the Committee did not see this as a matter of approval, exactly, but as a way of getting some faculty "input" into the formation of academic policies. "You mean you think the document is better than nothing?" "Yes."

Phil Dustan than asked David Mann if he thought the document was a good idea? The Speaker replied, that, on the whole, he did; it should have at least some beneficial effects. For example, a policy on sexual harassment has been worked on now by an appointed committee for a year and a half; it will probably now have to be channeled through the Senate before being implemented. (At this point, he urged that the Senate approve changing the instructions given to the Speaker in section 3.2.3, replacing "may" with the imperative, "shall" (a friendly amendment for "will"), so that the section reads:

The Provost shall refer appropriate draft policies that directly affect the faculty to the Speaker of the Faculty. The Speaker of the Faculty, in turn, may deleted] shall refer the policy draft to a faculty committee or ad hoc group for review and comment. This stage of review will take place once the draft policy has been reviewed with recommendations by the Academic Deans and/or the Vice President for Enrollment Management (level b) but prior to submitting the draft to the Deans and Directors
Group (level c). When the Provost refers a policy draft to the Speaker, the Speaker has two calendar months to carry out the review. The Speaker may petition the Provost in writing for an extension to this period.

In the event, the second recommendation from the Academic Planning Committee, endorsing the draft document on "Academic Policy Formation" (with two additional suggestions, as outlined in the Committee's report and amended at the meeting), was approved unanimously, on a voice vote. The Committee's report, and the full text of the draft document, are attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

William Moore, for the Faculty Welfare Committee, reported on recent difficulties with the College mail service. There seemed to be something like a power-struggle going on between UPS and the mail room, about what will, or will not, be delivered, by whom, and where. The mail room says that deliveries will be accepted from all carriers, but some faculty continue to experience problems, including delays in receiving parcels and packages containing crucial manuscripts or research materials. In fairness, Mr. Moore said, we should remember that the mail-room staff, and the space they work in, are the same size that they were sixteen years ago, even though the volume of mail has increased dramatically. Beverly Diamond asked why, if the mail room will accept deliveries from all carriers, the faculty are still getting parcels with labels or stickers saying otherwise? "Somebody is lying," Mr. Moore said; both sides insist that they know nothing about such refusals. One piece of advice: if you have parcels regularly delivered by the mail room, do not put a street address on it, which will only delay delivery. The mail room, by the way, does not sell stamps, because it is not allowed to; it is not a real U.S. Post Office (the Citadel's mail room, on the other hand, is). Caroline Hunt pointed out, however, that the East Bay Street Post Office does consider us to be a "real" post-office; how can the mail room "have it both ways"? Wayne Jordan asked what it would take to become officially a full-service post office; what prevents us from being one now? Perhaps, Mr. Moore suggested, we are too close to the main post-office; but he was not sure.

Lynne Ford asked what we are supposed to do right now? She had five boxes of mail in limbo, with no one apparently willing to deliver it. David Mann suggested that, if UPS or FEDEX is used, the academic department's street address should be used. Another problem, according to Mr. Moore, was that postal rates have recently been raised substantially on books and packages, as the U.S. Mail tries to generate revenue, with the result that publishers and others tend to use the private carriers, who remain less expensive, naturally, the government-controlled postal service does not like this. "So it's a fair summary of the current situation," David Hall queried, "to say that nothing has changed, except that mail is disappearing?" Caroline Hunt noted that Federal Express will, if told to, hold mail at its Broad Street office, without attempting delivery at all, until the customer himself picks it up. This can be arranged by checking off a small box on one of their forms, and it is a service that may be useful for particularly important parcels or envelopes. Peter Yaun said that somebody really ought to investigate what it would take to become a "full-service" post office; surely we are now big enough to qualify. Mr. Moore agreed, and said the Speaker of the Faculty should be involved in finding out about this. Is there some way, Lynne Ford asked, of making sure that faculty receive adequate notification of changes and directives affecting the College mail service? There is, Mr. Moore suggested: "get faculty input into Fred Daniel's office" (which supervises the mail room).
CHANGE IN THE BY-LAWS

Herb Silverman was then recognized for the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual. The Committee recommended approval of the change in the By-Laws proposed at the February meeting, to make the Registrar an ex officio member of the Curriculum Committee and of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs. Mr. Silverman emphasized that the Registrar would be a non-voting member of both committees. Without further discussion, the Senate endorsed this recommendation unanimously.

[Secretary's note: the affected sections are Article V, Sections 3 B 8a. and 3 B 2a., found on pp. 49 and 45, respectively, of the Faculty/Administration Manual.]

Frank Cossa, acting on his own behalf, then introduced a motion originally outlined in a letter to the Speaker dated January 27, 1995:

The Faculty Senate instructs the Faculty Welfare Committee [amended to "the Academic Planning Committee"] to devise an instrument whereby the Faculty may evaluate the Administration, the results of this evaluation to be made available to the Faculty.

Rationale:

Each member of the Faculty is required to undergo evaluation each year, likewise Chairs and Deans. It is only fair and just (and legal) that administrators be similarly evaluated.

The Senate previously "passed unanimously on a voice vote, with no discussion" (Minutes of the Faculty Senate, November 2, 1993) a resolution to have the results of the last evaluation of the Administration made available to the Faculty. This resolution was never complied with.

During a brief discussion, Amy McCandless said that she was not sure what we could do if the Provost would not follow through and make the results of administrative evaluations available to the Senate. Frank Kinard said there was no need to rely on the Office of Academic Affairs for this information; why not have the Faculty Senate devise an instrument for evaluating administrators, for our own benefit? A s a friendly amendment, Frank Petrusak moved to send Mr. Cossa’s instructions to the Academic Planning Committee, instead of the Welfare Committee; this was accepted. The main motion passed unanimously, as amended, on a voice vote.

Wayne Jordan then introduced a series of motions from the Curriculum Committee, including a further clarification of the science requirement in Computer Science, and new courses or descriptions or changes in French, Philosophy, Religious Studies, Communication, Library, Geology, Art History, and Biology. After some discussion, these changes were amended and passed; they are summarized below. Please note that one course proposal (Biology 2XX, "Ecology of Southern Africa") was NOT approved, but remanded to committee instead. Also, several changes in Philosophy and Religious Studies moved by the Curriculum Committee, including the course descriptions for Philosophy 260, and Religious Studies 245 and 401, were amended by the Senate in order to change them back to the way they had been worded in the original course proposals submitted by the Philosophy Department. The Curriculum Committee’s report, and a letter of
clarification kindly supplied after the meeting by the chairman of the Philosophy Department, are attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

COMPUTER SCIENCE

Clarification of requirements (BS in Computer Science)
Amendment of prerequisites (CSCI 350)

LANGUAGES: FRENCH

New Course: FREN 446 History of the French Language (3hrs.)

PHILOSOPHY & RELIGIOUS STUDIES [with three amendments, noted here]

New Course: PHIL 260 Philosophy of Biology (3)
[amended description, returning to language suggested by the Philosophy Department in their original course proposal sent to the Curriculum Committee, thus:]

An examination of philosophical issues within the biological sciences and questions about the epistemological status of biological knowledge. Possible topics include: the nature of life, the relationship between physical and biological sciences, the structure of evolutionary theory and the implications of sociobiology for ethical theories.

New Description and Prerequisite for RELS 401 Theories and Methods in the Study of Religion (3)
[amended, as above, restoring original wording, to:]

An examination of the problems and methods of the study of religion. Theories of the nature, origins and functions of religion will be considered. This course is designed as a senior seminar and is the capstone course for the program in Religious Studies.
Prerequisite: 9 Semester hours at or above the 200-level in Religious Studies.

Revised Prerequisite for Religious Studies (Bulletin, p.350)
[not amended at the meeting, but passed as specified in Curriculum Committee's circulated report; repeated here verbatim to forestall confusion:]

Prerequisite for all 300-level courses: 3 semester hours in Religious Studies or permission of instructor.

New Description for RELS 245 The Religions of India (3)
[amended, as above, restoring original wording, to:]

An examination of Hindu religious beliefs and practices in their Indian context with emphasis on primary texts, doctrines, rituals and the arts. Attention will be given to the change and development of Hindu religious ideas. The influences of Islam, Jainism, and Buddhism will also be explored.
ENGLISH & COMMUNICATION

New Courses: COMM 105 Forensic Lab (1, repeatable up to 4)
COMM 365 American Public Address (3)

LIBRARY

New Course: LIBR 105 Electronic Resources for Research (1)

GEOLOGY

Change in definition of the Minor in Geology

ART HISTORY

New Courses: ARTH 335 History of American Architecture (3)
ARTH 394 History of 18th and 19th Century Western Architecture (3)

HISTORY

New Courses: HIST 210 Special Topics in U.S. History (3)
HIST 233 Special Topics in European History Before 1715 (3)
HIST 240 Special Topics in European History After 1715 (3)
HIST 258 European Jewish History (3)
HIST 260 Special Topics in Asian, African, and Latin American History (3)
HIST 291 Special Topics in Medical History (3)

BIOLOGY

[BIOL 2XX. "Ecology of Southern Africa," was NOT PASSED, but remanded to committee.]

Course changes: BIOL 341 (General Ecology), and BIOL 3XX (Evolution, formerly 440)

Speaker's Report

The Speaker said that he had delayed his report until the end of the meeting because he thought other business should be completed before approaching a matter which he considered to be of considerable seriousness. He felt obliged to report to the Senate, and through the Senate to the Faculty at large, on his repeated but so far unsuccessful attempts to find out exactly what ad hoc "committees," "teams," "task-forces," "work-groups," and the like, dealing with academic matters, but NOT established by the Faculty, and operating largely or entirely without the Faculty's knowledge or approval, are currently in existence. Some examples -- and there are others -- include an "Advisory Committee on the Advising Center," a "Retention and Graduation Committee," and a group studying the implementation of a "Three Year Degree Program," for which, apparently, department chairs have already been told to submit plans. Mr. Mann expressed a strong belief that the Faculty Senate should not only, at the very least, be kept informed about such groups, but that, as a general rule, the existing structure of elected bodies should be used for "matters falling within
He then read an E-mail memorandum which he had sent to the Vice President for Enrollment Management on February 20.

To: Sue Sommer-Kresse
Subject: Committees

For the second time in two weeks I have become aware of committees which I did not know existed: the Advisory Committee on the Advising Center (last week) and the Retention and Graduation Committee (this week). Are there any more?

May I respectfully make a suggestion: committees formed by Academic Affairs which should involve the faculty should not in fact be formed at all. I would humbly beseech that Academic Affairs use the current structure of Faculty and Senate Committees to convey information and make policy. The Faculty and Senate Committees paint with broad enough brushes to fit whatever the nature is of a committee or task force which you desire to convene. For instance, Academic Standards or Student Affairs and Athletics (or both) could have been a forum for discussion of the Advising Center. Standards seems like a natural fit for Retention policies.

Creating ad hoc committees and task forces has been a sore spot to me for years because the establishment of same once led to bypassing faculty governance altogether. Certainly that is not your intention, but looks can be deceiving.

Please accept this comment with the spirit in which it is intended.

Dr. Sommer-Kresse, Mr. Mann continued, had sent back some details about the Advising Task Force (established by the Provost, apparently, in the Spring of last year), and about the "recruitment and retention" group (evidently an Enrollment Management subcommittee having no formal status) -- but no further information. On February 24, the Speaker thanked the Vice President, in a brief reply, and asked again whether there were any more such groups in existence.

On the 26 of February, Dr. Sommer-Kresse replied with some further details. The Speaker E-mailed her back as follows:

Thanks. May I print your letter in [the] Faculty Newsletter?

Of course my suggestion is [made in order to] inform the Speaker (this is not an ego trip!) so that the Speaker could advise you as to what relevant faculty committee(s) should be informed about these teams. The assumption is not that the teams make policy, but rather that it would be nice if faculty could know about these things openly. You never know. Most of us graduated from college three times, and some of us (whether we graduated three times or not) have some ideas. Linus Pauling once said that we all have ideas. The trick is to know which ones are the good ones.

My idea of full disclosure (too formal a phrase but it will have to do) is a good idea.

If you can think of any other groups, teams, councils or committees that the faculty might profit by knowing about, please let me know.
On February 27, Mr. Mann continued, Dr. Sommer-Kresse had replied with a brief message beginning, "Please do not print the response in the present form" -- apparently, he said, she had felt that her E-mail memorandum was just a quick answer to his questions, and not in a format suitable for distribution to the faculty. No additional information, however, on what ad hoc groups actually exist, was included.

Most recently, on the 28 of February (two weeks before the present meeting) he had received another electronic note, saying that the Vice President was not quite sure what the Speaker was asking for. He had answered directly, that he was simply asking for a list of task forces, committees, and ad hoc groups: what others are there, precisely what do they do, and why aren't the regular standing faculty committees and the faculty governance structures informed about them?

No reply had been received. "Be on guard," he said.

The Speaker concluded his report by noting that the Conference of South Carolina Faculty Chairs has a position paper in preparation vigorously opposing recent cuts in the funding of higher education in South Carolina.

Constituents' Concerns

Richard Godsen suggested that committee reports, especially for lengthy items like business from the Curriculum Committee, should be circulated on double-side pages, in order to save paper. Frank Cossa wanted to know if any progress had been made with regard to the Advising Task Force. David Mann said that he had attended one of their meetings (uninvited) and had told them they ought to disband, and let a regularly constituted Faculty Committee, such as the Curriculum Committee, deal with such matters next year. The faculty was perfectly capable, he thought, of coming up with a reasonable solution on its own to the problem of advising undeclared majors, and he suggested that a number of Senators would no doubt be more than happy to volunteer their time for such an important effort. He called for a show of hands to see who would be willing to take on, say, ten such additional advisees next year. No less than twenty hands went up, though the number appeared to dwindle slightly under scrutiny. The Speaker was cheered, he said, by this level of support; two-hundred advisees could thus be accommodated at a stroke. If the principle were extended to the faculty as a whole and received the same ratio of support, the whole problem of advising undeclared majors might be taken care of, without departmental quotas or administrative interference. Carla Lowrey wondered whether the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics might not be a better choice than Curriculum to look into advising next year. Hugh Haynsworth commented that he thought the President's Advisory Committee had also discussed the problem of advising (as well as the mail room), but had no solutions to bring to the Senate, thinking their job was simply to let the President know there were problems in these areas.

New Business (cont.): Proposed Change in the By-Laws

Beverly Diamond, for the Committee on Nominations and Elections, asked to return to New Business in order to introduce a proposal to change the By-Laws regulating the timing of nominations and elections for faculty committees. Without objection, it was so ordered, and she did. The changes proposed are as follows:
Article V, Section 2 A:
Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations and Elections by March 15 and elected by the Senate at the April Senate meeting.

Article V, Section 3A:
Members of standing College committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations and Elections by March 15 and elected by the faculty (as defined in Article I Section 1) at the April faculty meeting.

Article V, Section 3 B 3, 4:

(3) To present to Senators, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing Senate committees by March 15;

(4) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing College committees by March 15; [.

Rationale: The dates currently listed in the By-Laws were written under the assumption that a Senate meeting would occur at the end of April. This is no longer the case, and the proposed dates describe what is actually required.

The By-Laws Committee would make a recommendation on this proposal at the April 4 meeting of the Senate.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned just before 7:00 o’clock. [After the meeting ended, James Carew pointed out a hitherto undetected error in the Minutes of the February 7 meeting: the change from "excellent" to "meritorious," incorporated as an amendment to the first sentence of the third paragraph on p. 6, should be repeated elsewhere in the paragraph, since that is obviously what was intended. True.]

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary