MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The eighth 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, April 4 in Room 118 of The Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty David Mann presiding. Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian; altogether, forty-two senators attended the meeting. The Minutes of the previous meeting (March 14, 1995) were approved as circulated, after it was noted that in some copies the last line on p. 7 was not legible, or had dropped out. The sentence affected should read:

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 the purview of standing Senate or College committees," as specified in the By-Laws.

Speaker's Report

The Speaker announced that the real Faculty Newsletter would appear in a day or two, supplementing the Ur-version that had appeared on April Fool's Day. On a more serious note, he had an update on the question of advising undeclared majors. Sue Sommer-Kresse, Mr. Mann said, wanted to recommend setting up a faculty committee to study the matter; there would be a pilot project during the summer, for which he hoped faculty would sign up. He asked that an e-mail letter which he had sent to her, containing the gist of his idea about obtaining faculty participation, be attached retroactively to the correspondence contained in the Minutes of the previous meeting. The main paragraph of this communication reads as follows:

Look, my main point was much more simple. I assert that some faculty would work the way I suggest (10 a year, not to be confused with an IPTAY slogan), who do not do any advising outside department majors at present. Any who would be willing to do that should be allowed to do so and in fact should be compensated as if they did Stern Center summer advising. In a different context, James Madison described this process as "extending the sphere." If that means the bureaucracy needs to be shifted to accommodate, in the words of Jean-Luc Picard of the Starship Enterprise, "Make it so." That's it. Nothing dreadful.

Mr. Mann said that he would now like to see twenty Senators advising undeclared majors among incoming students, in this pilot project during the summer. Caroline Hunt asked if there would be a comparison made with a non-control group of students, to see if the special advising helped; the answer was yes. The Speaker concluded by announcing a special called meeting of the Senate to be held at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 18, in order to take up business which could not be readied in time for today. The agenda for this meeting, including items from the Curriculum Committee and Continuing Education, was set and would appear in the packets circulated to Senators beforehand.
New Business: Proposed Change in the By-Laws

Herb Silverman, speaking for the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, recommended approving the proposal introduced by the Committee on Nominations and Elections at the conclusion of the March meeting. This proposal would change the By-Laws regulating nominations and elections, as specified in Article V, Section 2A, to read: "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." Similarly, Article V, Section 3A: "Members of standing College committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations and Elections by March 15 by the Committee on Nominations and Elections and elected by the faculty (as defined in Article I Section 1) at the April Faculty Meeting." Similarly, in Article V, sections 3B 3 and 3B 4, "April 15" should be changed to "March 15" [changes emphasized; see p. 10 of the March Minutes]. Mr. Silverman's recommendation was put to the vote and endorsed by the Senate unanimously. [Secretary's note: as required in the By-Laws, this proposal was later submitted to the full Faculty and passed, by written ballot, as announced in a memorandum of May 9, 1995.]

Elections and Nominations

Beverly Diamond, for the Committee on Nominations and Elections, announced that no further nominations had been received for the various standing Senate Committees. The slate circulated to the Senate on March 27 was declared elected:

ACADEMIC PLANNING
7 faculty members, majority must be faculty senators

Courson, Frances (S) Educ. Foundations & Specializations
England, Michael Education Foundations & Specializations
Morrison, Susan (S) Mathematics
Olejniczak, William (S) Biology
Pincus, Michael History
Scholtens, Brian Spanish
Ward, Patricia (S) Biology

English & Communication

BUDGET
7 faculty members, majority must be faculty senators

Heeney, Tom (S) English & Communication
Leclerc, Anthony English & Communication
Sparks, Randy Computer Science
Stiglitz, Beatrice History
Tennyson, Mack French
Wilder, Hugh (S) Accounting
Young, Paul (S) Philosophy

Mathematics
BY-LAWS
3 faculty members, majority must be faculty senators

Newell, John (S) History
Parson, Jack (S) Political Science
Silverman, Herb (S) Mathematics

An additional nomination was then made from the floor, by Carla Lowrey, for the Faculty Library Committee (Thomas Baginski, Languages), and seven candidates were put forward for the Committee on Nominations and Elections:

Clary, Jane Economics
Diamond, Beverly Mathematics
Ford, Lynne Political Science
Hopkins, George History
Lesses, Glenn Philosophy
Kinard, Frank Chemistry
Morris, Frank Classics

Nominations for these two committees would also remain open until noon on April 13.

New Business (cont.)

Frank Cossa then introduced the following motion, as circulated to the Senate:

The Faculty Senate instructs the Academic Standards Committee to review the current system for advising undeclared majors, and to recommend revisions in, or alternatives to, this system.

The present advising system, Mr. Cossa said, was established without consultation with the faculty, and the faculty certainly should have been consulted, since advising is obviously an academic matter. Robert Mignone said he supported the motion; he agreed that advising is an academic matter, and clearly within the responsibilities of the faculty. Carla Lowrey also spoke in support, adding that she endorsed the broader principle of faculty involvement in academic affairs. The motion passed unanimously.

David Mann said that he had just found out about a memorandum to Deans and Department Chairs from the Vice-President for Enrollment Management, dated March 27, 1995, that refers to having a three-year accelerated degree program ready "in time for summer orientation" and asking for material to be submitted "no later than May 1." This scheme had been developed, the memorandum said, by a hitherto undisclosed "ad hoc implementation group" who had met "several times to develop a process and draft preliminary materials" for such a program. Since the faculty had not been consulted about this, either, the Speaker asked that a motion parallel to Mr. Cossa's be made, requesting the Academic Standards Committee to find out what was going on. Proceeding by May 1 was simply not practical. Richard Nunan said that he thought such a motion should go
to Academic Standards first, then to the Academic Planning Committee. James Carew said that it looked as though the idea had started as a paper exercise, and suddenly become real; he thought Academic Planning should take it up instead of Academic Standards. Robert Mignone agreed that long-term academic goals, such as an accelerated degree program appeared to be, were clearly within the responsibilities of the Academic Planning Committee. Dean William Lindstrom was asked about the program, and he said that to do a degree in three years was certainly "cramming it in," but that all the same requirements would have to be met. Joe Benich said that if all the same requirements would have to be met, then the program must be something that students can do now, already, if they want to; what would the differences, if any, be? David Mann added that he had actually seen a flyer, already printed up for the Office of Continuing Education, advertising something called "ACE," an acronym for "Accelerated Curriculum Emphasis." To put academic programs in place without consulting with the faculty at all, was, in his judgement, to set a terrible precedent.

Accordingly, Hugh Wilder made the following motion, to parallel Mr. Cossa's:

The Faculty Senate instructs the Academic Planning Committee to review the proposed "Three Year Accelerated Degree Program" and to issue a report to the Senate.

Caroline Hunt said that she thought the idea of an accelerated degree program was a good one, and offered real benefits, potentially, to a certain number of students; but the program, and the way it was being implemented, have potential ramifications for our "rights" as faculty members. For example, under this program, it seems likely that faculty can be told that they have to teach in the summer -- since a three year degree can only be completed by summer work in addition to the regular semesters, and academic programs have to be made available to students as advertised. Does this mean, in turn, that the faculty can now be put, in effect, on eleven-month contracts, whether they like it or not? Marty Perlmutter said that this is another reason why academic programs should come through academic committees. Joe Benich thought that, since the program seemed not to involve much of anything not already "on the books," it was really more of an advertising gimmick or "p-r" stunt for the College, rather than something at which the faculty ought to try to "draw the line." Rohn England took issue with this and said that it would be perfectly appropriate to ask the Academic Planning Committee to look into the program and report back to the Senate. Phil Dustan said that, contrary to appearances, such a program would have an impact on the College, because it would create another group competing for already scarce academic resources. Richard Godsen asked Dean Lindstrom how many people have actually accelerated their degrees in recent times; Mr. Lindstrom answered that perhaps half-a-dozen students had taken advantage of this opportunity in the last five years. (Mr. Benich noted, in passing, that many have enough trouble getting through in four years, let alone three.) Mr. Carew asked if there were any penalty involved for getting admission to the program and then not "making it" in three years; the answer was no. In the event, the motion carried, on a voice vote, unanimous but for a single, loud "no!"

Paul Young, standing in for Wayne Jordan, moved a series of proposals from the Curriculum Committee, which may be summarized as follows. With the exception of one correction to the German Studies Minor, made by Mr. Young at the meeting and noted below, these proposals were passed exactly as circulated; the original memorandum is attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes:
JEWSH STUDIES

New Courses:

Jewish Studies 200: Introduction to Jewish Studies (3 hrs.)
Jewish Studies 300: Special Topics in Jewish Studies (3)
Jewish Studies 400: Independent Studies (3)

LANGUAGES: CLASSICS AND GERMAN

New Interdisciplinary German Studies Minor:

Requirements [correction at the foot of p. 16 of the Committee's memorandum:]
Having completed GRMN 324, 325 and the two history courses, students have accumulated twelve to fourteen credits [changed from "either twelve or fourteen"]. The remaining four to six [changed from "four or six"] credits can be earned as follows: 


1. Augment credit hours from (1) to (1-3)

2. Change last sentence of description to: "A Collateral Study course may be repeated up to a maximum of six credit hours in conjunction with other primary courses."

BIOLOGY [for information; no vote necessary]

BIOL 453: Special Topics in Immunology (3)

During the brief discussion, Caroline Hunt noted that the Library should receive some additional funds for the new courses in Jewish Studies, since they involved assigning authors who are not part of the Library Approval Plan; John Newell said that Richard Bodek is working on this. Phil Dustan queried the strict attendance policy in one of the courses involved, History 340, but Marty Perlmutter said such matters were, as a matter of academic freedom, strictly at the discretion of the instructor. Carla Lowrey pointed out that courses in other areas, such as Psychology or Art History, could certainly be included as acceptable for "Collateral Study" credit in the German Studies Minor, if it seemed desirable at some later date. Hugh Wilder asked who would decide the number of credit-hours awarded for the Collateral Studies courses; the answer was, the director of the German Studies Program.
Constituents' Concerns

To conclude the meeting, there was a brief discussion of whether awards to faculty ought to be given out at the concluding general faculty meeting, rather than at the student award ceremony; some preferred the old way, of announcing them at Commencement, but others insisted that this was the students' great day, not the faculty's, and the ceremony was crowded enough anyway. Beverly Diamond noted the great secrecy surrounding these awards, and said it was both silly and unnecessary. Herb Silverman commented that one reason for changing to a faculty senate system of governance had been to encourage better communication between the administration and the faculty on important issues. Now, however, neither the President nor the Provost seemed to have the time to attend senate meetings, and he wondered whether the new system had made any difference at all. David Mann replied that he thought we have had more discussion in the senate than we used to have under the old system -- but, as to the faculty being taken seriously by the administration, he doubted whether the system of governance, as such, had had much effect one way or the other.

The meeting adjourned at about a quarter to seven, to be continued on April 18.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary