April 18, 1995

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The ninth and final 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 18 in Room 118 of The Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty David Mann presiding. (This was a special called meeting, the purpose of which was to take up business which had not been ready for consideration at the time of the previous meeting, on April 4.) Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian; altogether, forty-one senators attended.

Proposed Change in the By-Laws

Herb Silverman was recognized for the By-Laws Committee and proposed to add a sentence to Article IV, Section 2 A., under "Composition and Election of Senators," as follows:

Faculty members on leave are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators.

The Committee's rationale was that "Faculty members on leave are expected to devote their time to enhancing their professional expertise, not to involving themselves with the daily activities of campus politics." The Speaker said the motion was duly entered, and would be considered by the senate in the Fall.

New Business

William Moore reported that the Welfare Committee had discussed the revised Sabbatical Leave Policy prepared by the office of Academic Affairs (technically, Draft #4 of Policy #2 of the General Policy Manual of the Office of Academic Affairs) and recommended that the Senate approve it. Beverly Diamond requested that the President or the Provost be asked to check over the draft once more for any possible "sexist" language; there were no objections. James Carew said that he was not sure what the word "normally" implied at the start of a sentence toward the end of Section 1.4 ("Normally, compensation for services including sabbatical leave salary during the period may not exceed the faculty member's salary for an equivalent period of time at the College"). Caroline Hunt questioned the wisdom of the first sentence in section 4.0, Completion of the Sabbatical: "Within one semester after the faculty member returns from sabbatical leave, she/he will be expected to share through a public lecture or demonstration the findings of the leave." She thought this was inappropriate, and moved to strike the sentence. This was accepted as a friendly amendment. The Senate then approved the draft of the policy, as amended. It is attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.
Wayne Jordan, for the Curriculum Committee, put forward several motions which, after some discussion, passed exactly as circulated, with two exceptions: there was a minor change in the original course proposal included with Biology 250 -- not a substantive change, and noted below; and one item, a change in requirements for the Marine Biology Major, was withdrawn without coming up for a vote. The original memorandum of April 11, 1995 is also attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes, and may be summarized as follows:

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

Bachelor of Science, with a New Concentration in Hospitality and Tourism Management

Requirements

New Courses:

- BADM 210: Introduction to the Hospitality and Tourism Industry (3 hrs.)
- BADM 340: Total Quality Management (3)
- BADM 345: Leadership and Management Development (3)

GEOLOGY

New Courses:

- GEOL 290: Special Topics in Geology (1-4 hrs.)
- GEOL 444: Geology of the Carolinas (3)

Course Deletions: GEOL 310, 400-404

ENGLISH AND COMMUNICATION

New Courses:

- COMM 240: Introduction to Broadcast News (3)
- COMM 340: Television News Reporting (3)
ECONOMICS AND FINANCE

New Course:

ECON 311: Environmental Economics (3)

MUSIC

New Minor in Music (Requirements)

BIOLOGY

New Course:

BIOL 250: Special Topics (1-4 hrs.)

[For information: the first offering of Biology 250 will be "The Ecology of Southern Africa," 3 hrs.; correction: change the prerequisites from "None" to "One year of Biology or permission of Instructor," making the language on the "For Information" sheet the same as on the New Course Proposal for BIOL 250.]

[Please note: the proposal to change the requirements for the Major in Marine Biology, included in the Committee's circulated Memorandum, was WITHDRAWN, and therefore not voted on.]

PHILOSOPHY [for information; no vote necessary]

Special Topics Course

PHIL 298: Theory and Practice in Clinical Bioethics (3)

During the discussion, Hugh Haynsworth moved an amendment to give only provisional approval to the proposed Concentration in Hospitality and Tourism, since the actual program had not yet been endorsed by the Commission on Higher Education, and the courses to be offered were not fully worked out; but this amendment was defeated. Rhonda Mack, from the School of Business and Economics, noted that a Special Topics course in Tourism is planned for the fall, and Wayne Patterson added that the CHE will approve programs without the actual courses being spelled out in complete detail; in any case, no courses would be offered until they had passed through the usual procedure of faculty approval. David Hall thought that the Physics Department should have been
consulted in greater detail about the new courses in Geology. When the Communication courses came up, the Speaker asked if there were any plans for obtaining our own radio station. Tom Heeney said that there were no plans that he knew of for a separate station as such, though individual programs might be planned for broadcast on existing local stations. Caroline Hunt asked what level of proficiency is required for Music Theory I in the Music Minor; Carla Lowrey said that piano playing was not needed, but that students would have to learn musical notation; Wayne Jordan added that the course was more "academic" and less "studio" now that it had been when it first came before the Curriculum Committee. Richard Nunan wanted to be sure that the senate was giving approval to Biology 250 as a Special Topics course only, and not making "The Ecology of Southern Africa" a permanent offering. This was confirmed; the content of the course was provided for information only, and not voted on.

The Speaker then reported that no one from the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs had been able to attend the meeting to speak about the proposed Program leading to the Master of Arts Degree in Bioethics, to be offered jointly with the Medical University of South Carolina. He had received, however, a copy of a letter dated April 3, 1995 from Larry Carlson, the chair of the Committee, to Wayne Patterson, Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, signalling the Committee's approval, and he asked that this letter be entered into the record:

The Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs recommends that the Graduate Council consider the proposed M.A. in Bioethics, which would be offered jointly by the University of Charleston, S.C., and the Medical University of South Carolina.

Working with the new CHE Guidelines, my committee approved the proposal after two meetings with the principal authors: Hugh Wilder, Marty Perlmutter, and (from MUSC) Mary Faith Marshall. During these discussions we reviewed the draft dated March 2, 1995, and raised a number of concerns and questions about the program. These issues include the nature of the partnership between the two institutions, administrative responsibilities, curriculum requirements, and projected enrollment; The committee was particularly concerned that the total estimated costs be broken down for each institution.

As a result of these meetings, the authors have incorporated what we believe are changes that strengthen the proposal and clarify several matters. Included in the new version is an appendix that details the costs for each institution. Hugh Wilder will be delivering today for you and the Graduate Council copies of the revised draft, dated March 29. This version, which includes revisions of both the proposal itself and the Memorandum of Understanding, replaces the draft of March 2, which your office earlier distributed to the Graduate Council.

Frank Kinard wanted to know about budgeting. The costs, Hugh Wilder replied, are modest,
and are mostly at the MUSC end. James Carew asked whether the program would be subject to review at the end of three years. Yes, Mr. Wilder said; all programs must meet this requirement, and Dean Patterson concurred. Amy McCandless said that the M.A. program in History, given jointly with the Citadel, had been reviewed in this way. Mr. Kinard said the problem was with funding at a time of general cuts; would funding be reviewed at the end of three years? Yes, Dean Patterson said; the three-year review takes everything into account. Caroline Hunt wondered whether we would eventually get to see syllabi for the courses involved; again, the answer was yes. (Dean Patterson added that he wanted to see a motion on the review process at the next meeting of the Graduate Council.)

David Hall asked exactly what is the Senate's jurisdiction over graduate programs? "Up or down," David Mann said. Susan Morrison reported that her chairman had said that the program had never been sent to the Biology Department, and since the program is very strongly medical -- biomedical -- there appeared to be lots of unanswered questions. Mr. Wilder said that he and Marty Perlmutter would be happy to meet with the Biology Department, and regretted not having done so. As to the name of the program, bioethics: this issue had been discussed at some length. The focus of the program is indeed on biomedical ethics. This meant that the conduct of research on genetic engineering, for example, might be an appropriate area of investigation within the program, but that something like environmental ethics would probably not be. The profession appeared to be moving away from the term, "biomedical ethics" toward the simpler "bioethics."

Caroline Hunt wanted to know if any other Departments in addition to Philosophy might be drawn on for this program, such as Languages or English. Yes, Mr. Wilder said; the teaching opportunities ought to be substantial. Mr. Carew wanted to know where the program director will be located; at MUSC for the first three years, then the College for the next three years, and so on. Dr. Marshall said that she thought the MUSC faculty would complement faculty from the College in staffing this program. Mr. Wilder added that the only reason the program had not yet been approved by MUSC was that they had recently appointed a new Provost, and a number of administrative matters had had to wait for the position to be filled. In the event, the joint Master's Program in Bioethics, as set out in the circulated draft document dated April 7, 1995, was approved by the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston. That document, and Mr. Carlson's letter from the Committee on Graduate Education, are attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

Von Bakanic, for the Academic Standards Committee, introduced a motion to send a revised Learning Disability Policy, as developed by her Committee, to the By-Laws Committee; it would replace the current section (c) on p. 139 of the Faculty/Administration Manual. This policy involves a change in the appeals procedure regarding accommodating students with learning disabilities. The policy itself, however, was not discussed and not voted on; the motion was simply to send it on to the By-Laws Committee, for their recommendation and action at a later meeting. The motion to forward passed, without opposition.

Elizabeth Martinez, for the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics, introduced a draft document containing Sexual Harassment Complaint Procedures, as developed over several years by
Sue Sommer-Kresse, with advice from the faculty, and now with the approval of the Committee. A very lengthy discussion followed, with a number of amendments being suggested, in most cases unsuccessfully, from the floor. The main burden of discussion was the need to preserve the principle of due process and the rights of the "accused" in harassment cases, while devising a workable procedure that would protect students, administrators, and faculty alike. Another topic was the desirability of resolving allegations or complaints of harassment, if feasible, without resorting to direct legal action; it would be a good idea to have procedures that would informally put a stop to bad behavior, while allowing the process not to be taken any further. Many were also concerned to prevent secret files or dossiers from being compiled on individual faculty members or administrators, particularly over long periods of time. In the event, the draft document was approved, with four changes suggested by the Committee itself, and one friendly amendment. These are the changes:

Part I, Section D (p. 1):

The liaison will not inform the accused of the complainant's allegations or the identity of the complainant without the complainant's consent. A complainant can request that the liaison communicate with the accused on behalf of the complainant. [The phrase, "revealing or not revealing the complainant's identity depending upon the wishes of the complainant," was stricken from the conclusion of this sentence at the urging of Fred Ettline, a suggestion which the Committee accepted as a friendly amendment.] The liaison will keep all communications with both the complainant and the accused strictly confidential throughout this process and will only pursue such contacts with the accused as the complainant requests. It is recommended that the complainant record in writing all dates and times contact was made to resolve the issue. [This sentence was added by the Committee.]

Part II C 3 a (p. 6):

If a student elects not to seek informal resolution of his/her complaint or informal resolution is sought, but no satisfactory accord can be reached, then in either instance, the immediate supervisor [of the accused, added] will forward the written complaint to the appropriate Senior Vice President for action [etc.].

Part III A 3 (p. 9):

Negotiated Settlement: In some cases, the filing of a formal complaint and investigation may result in an opportunity to negotiate a settlement of the case [etc.]. [Typographical errors corrected by the Committee.]

Part III B (also p. 9):

The burden of proving the allegations of the complaint is on the complainant. In
order to find the complaint to be "founded," the committee/panel/supervisor must find that the preponderance \[i.e., \text{greater than 50\%}, \text{cut out by the Committee}\] of the evidence \[\text{etc.}\].

The draft of the "Sexual Harassment Complaint Procedures" document, as corrected at the meeting, is attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes. Dean Sommer-Kresse said that in due course it would be forwarded to President Sanders.

Elizabeth Martinez spoke again for the Student Affairs and Athletics Committee, this time recommending an addition to the existing Attendance Policy. She reported that her Committee, as instructed by the Senate at the January 17, 1995 meeting, had worked with the Academic Standards Committee to come up with a more agreeable proposal addressing the needs of students who have to be absent while officially representing the College. A subcommittee, composed of two members each from the two Committees, and two additional faculty members, had come up with a revised version. John Newell moved an amendment, which was passed and incorporated in the text. Frank Cossa commented that the new proposal put the professor in a pretty tough position; David Hall thought it was too strongly worded, with too many "musts" and deadlines; James Carew insisted that students should never be penalized for absences as such, but only for work which they fail to make up. Susan Balinsky said that the intent of the proposal was to protect students from really unfair procedures, while still maintaining high academic standards; she thought a good compromise had been found by the subcommittee. Jorge Marban called for the question, successfully, and the main motion passed, as amended, changing the existing Attendance Policy (p. 114 of the College Catalogue) to the following:

If students who participate in athletic competitions or other college-sponsored events want to be assured that they are in compliance with the faculty member's attendance policy, they must provide written notification to all course instructors of dates and times when regularly scheduled classes will be missed. This notification must be provided by the first day of class; an instructor unwilling to excuse the student for such absences must notify the student before the end of Drop/Add.

******

Finally, at about ten minutes before eight, with no further business, and no Constituents left with enough steam to be Concerned, the meeting adjourned sine die. As he struck the gavel, the Speaker concluded the 1994-1995 Senatorial Year by saying, "That's a wrap."

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary