March 12, 1996

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The seventh regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 12 in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Forty-one Senators attended; Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian. The Minutes of the previous meeting (February 6) were approved as circulated.

The Speaker recognized David Cohen, for the Office of Academic Affairs, who reported that the first part of the SACS accreditation process had now been completed, with the College apparently coming through with flying colors. The visitation team had apparently singled out only six areas for possible improvement, a far lower figure than was customary at most institutions. Their suggestions included more rigorous evaluation of graduate programs; having a single plan at the top for integrating all information technologies on campus; arranging for the Office of Institutional Research to evaluate itself more thoroughly; and having more faculty involvement in the periodic review and revision of our institutional “mission statement.” Mr. Cohen said that thanks were due to all concerned for their many splendid efforts in facilitating the accreditation process. Hugh Haynsworth said that he hoped many faculty would come to the scheduled discussions with our visitors, starting the next day, and that a number of letters about the accreditation itself were on file for those who might be interested.

Speaker’s Report

Mr. Mignone noted that the schedule of meetings with the accreditation team was in the Newsletter, as well as on campus-wide e-mail. He then mentioned four matters of general interest, as outlined in the handout of his Report circulated at the meeting. First, the Academic Standards Committee is indeed now working on a form for evaluating Administrators, as instructed by the Senate at the March meeting a year ago; in fact, they expect to complete their work soon. Secondly, with regard to the issue of honorary degrees: President Sanders has said that he is completely amenable to having the President’s Advisory Committee play a more active role in soliciting, reviewing, and recommending individuals for Honorary Degrees. The chair of the Advisory Committee, Roger Daniel, has said that his committee will come up with a schedule and plan for next year. For the Senate’s information, the President presents honorary degrees at commencement with these words:

By the authority of the State of South Carolina, granted to the Board of Trustees and committed to me; I declare that . . . is now admitted to the degree of Doctor of Humane Letters of the College of Charleston (etc.).
Third, the Speaker had prepared a status report on Motions passed by the Faculty Senate during the previous academic year. The complete text runs to several pages and is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes; Mr. Mignone’s summary (kindly supplied) is included here:

**Summary of Senate Votes 1994-95**
(Exclusive of most curriculum and program changes)

September 6, 1994
- **Credit for work at another institution by transient students** APPROVED

November 1, 1994
- **By-Laws change regulating nominations to the Committee on Nominations** APPROVED

November 29, 1994
1) **Guidelines for the use of Special Topics Courses** APPROVED
2) **Overlapping graduate and undergraduate course Review in Progress**
3) **Sabbatical Leave Policy Amendments Rejected**
4) **Smoking Policy Adopted**
5) **Parking Regulations Rejected**

February 7, 1995
1) **Termination of Probationary Faculty** APPROVED
2) **Five Year Optional Pay Review for Faculty** Rejected

March 14, 1995
1) **Not changing “Honors Program” to “Honors College”** APPROVED
2) **Academic Affairs Policy Formation Document** APPROVED
3) **Make Registrar an ex officio member of the Curriculum and Graduate Education Committees** APPROVED
4) **Charge to the Academic Planning Committee to develop a form for evaluating administrators** In Progress

April 4, 1995
1) **By-Laws changes regulating nominations and elections to senate and standing committees** APPROVED
2) **Charge to the Academic Standards Committee to review advising of undeclared majors** In Progress
3) **Charge to Academic Planning Committee to review “Three Year Degree Program”** Review Complete

April 18, 1995
1) **Revised Sabbatical Leave Policy Amendment Rejected**
2) **Sexual Harassment Draft** APPROVED
3) **Attendance Policy for students on College sponsored activities** APPROVED

Fourth, the Speaker included excerpts from the “Higher Education Joint Legislative Study Committee” report of February, 1996. Once again, the full text of the Speaker’s report is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes. The first part of this unusual document, however, and the ensuing description of the mission of higher education in the State of South Carolina, are of such exceptional interest as to warrant inclusion in extenso:
Report on the Higher Education Joint Legislative Study Committee

What follows are excerpts from the Higher Education Joint Legislative Study Committee report of February 1996. Senator Nikki Setzler chaired the committee. The other members were: Edward E. Saleeb, James E. Bryan, Warren K. Giese, John W. Matthews Jr, Addison G. ("Joe") Wilson, John E. Courson, John R. Russell and McKinley Washington Jr.

Issues and Concerns

The issues which the Committee felt spurred the establishment of the Committee and were an essential component of their deliberations and decisions were that:

- No criteria or standards exist for quality.
- No clear missions or goals exist for the state or the postsecondary institutions allowing institutions to overlap and compete for the same student.
- The existing funding formula, which is primarily based on the number of enrolled students, has no rewards for quality, therefore breeding mediocrity.
- An adversarial relationship exists between the Commission on Higher Education and the colleges and universities.
- Tuition costs at senior colleges and universities are no longer affordable or reasonable.
- Lack of coordination has created wasteful duplication.
- Institutions have not changed to meet the needs of the students and job market demands of the economy.
- Lack of trust and turf protection between and among institutions.
- Inadequate relationship with public education (K-12).

Essentially our work came down to answering three very basic questions:

- What do we expect our education buck to buy?
- How can we get more bang for the buck?
- Where does the buck stop?

The answer to that first question is obvious. We expect (our) higher education system to achieve:

- High Academic Quality
- Affordable and Accessible Education
- Instructional Excellence
- Coordination and Cooperation with Public Education (K-12)

Economic Growth...

...how to get more bang from our buck?

We want to emphasize that while we recognize the need for flexibility and periodic re-examination, we call for an end to "mission creep" where technical colleges try to become community colleges, two year colleges become four year institutions and four-year institutions seek to become full-fledged research universities. Similarly, wasteful duplication drains financial resources and inhibits the drive for excellence that can more easily be achieved by concentrating those resources.

We also seek more bang for our buck by development of a post-tenure review system that will insure instructional quality; by increasing the number of hours professors spend teaching and assisting students inside and outside the classroom; and by examining class size and student/teacher ratio.

Finally, we call for the implementation of performance-based funding that will reward those institutions that meet the goals we established, seek to strengthen those that are moving toward accomplishing these goals, and penalize those which consistently fail to carry out their defined mission and achieve the goals this plan establishes...

We call on the General Assembly to let the buck stop with the restructured Commission on Higher Education by giving the Commission authority to take real action to enforce compliance with these defined missions, quality criteria, and performance indicators. This includes the authority to re-engineer, consolidate, reduce and/or expand the number of existing institutions of higher learning as judged by the performance criteria recommended by this committee...

Recommendations...

Missions

The mission for higher education in South Carolina should be to be a global leader in providing a coordinated, comprehensive system of excellence in education by providing instruction, research and life-long learning opportunities which are focused on economic development and benefit the state of South Carolina.

*****

New Business

Herb Silverman, for the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, recommended approving a **PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE BY-LAWS** having to do with replacing At-Large Senators who do not complete their term of office. This had been introduced at the February meeting and amended by the Committee in the interim. Beverly Diamond suggested a further friendly amendment from the floor (changing “seven” to “ten” days), in order to allow the Committee on Nominations and Elections enough time to administer the election properly. This was accepted by Mr. Silverman for the Committee, making the proposal read as follows:
Append to Article IV, Section 2F:

If an at-large Senator needs to be replaced in the second year of a term, the Senate will elect the replacement by written ballot. The Committee on Nominations will provide a slate of at least two candidates circulated to the faculty at least two weeks before the Senate meeting. Additional nominations from the faculty may be sent to the Chair of the Committee on Nominations at least ten days before the Senate meeting.

The Senate unanimously approved the amended proposal, on a voice vote.

Trisha Folds-Bennett, speaking for the Curriculum Committee, then introduced six motions for action, and an additional item for information. These proposals were considered one by one and discussed very briefly. They passed as circulated (with one minor amendment to the second motion, noted below) and may be summarized as follows. The original documents are attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.

1. ENGLISH

   Course deletion: English 90

2. MUSIC

   2) New Course: Music 222, Special Topics for Non-Majors (3hrs.)

      [Note: this course was passed with an amendment from the floor: Caroline Hunt moved to strike section 5 of the proposal, “Prerequisites (or other restrictions): MUSC 131 or permission of the instructor,” in its entirety; this amendment passed on a voice vote.]

3. BUSINESS

   Change in requirements:

   Change math requirement for business majors from MATH 231, to MATH 104 or MATH 216

   4. BUSINESS (cont.)

   Change in prerequisite:

   Add BADM 370 as prerequisite to BADM 330
5. MATHEMATICS

Course deletion: MATH 231

6. GEOLOGY and also COMPUTER SCIENCE

Change in requirements:

Change math requirement in both departments from MATH 231 to MATH 216

[7. For information: Special Topics courses in GEOLOGY, and in PHILOSOPHY]

Susan Gurganus, speaking for the Faculty Welfare Committee, then put forward a Proposal Regarding Bicycle Traffic on Campus. After some discussion, and several attempted amendments, this proposal was remanded to committee on the suggestion of Frank Kinard, for clarification and further study.

Lynne Ford then presented a motion from the “General Education Discussion Group” calling on the Senate to form an ad hoc committee to review the current state of general education, in order “to facilitate a campus-wide discussion regarding general education at the College of Charleston.”

Rationale

There has been no comprehensive review of the general education curriculum and structure in 25 years. In the intervening years, goals and objectives were established for general education without broad campus-wide discussion. These goals and objectives have become the benchmarks for assessment and new course development although many faculty remain unaware that such goals and objectives exist. Three standing committees share jurisdiction with individual departments over general education: Academic Planning, Curriculum, and Assessment. None of the three committees have as their primary responsibility review of the general education curriculum and all three committees are burdened with specific duties which may make them reactive to specific proposals rather than capable of initiating a comprehensive review. While Academic Planning is most clearly charged with long-term planning, their specific duties relate to consideration of new programs and goals advocated by others in light of budgetary constraints and existing programs.

Several factors make this the appropriate time for the campus community to undertake a review of General Education. In the Spring of 1993, four faculty members attended an AAC&U-sponsored conference on General Education at the request of the Provost. Upon returning to campus, a General Education Discussion Group was formed to examine the current state of General Education at the College in light of information gathered at the conference. To expand the discussion, a campus-wide
Forum on General Education was held August 15-16, 1995, and over 120 faculty, staff, and students participated. The purpose of the Forum was to use the AAC&U publication Strong Foundations to assess our current efforts in light of twelve principles for effective general education programs. While the purpose of the Forum was not to consider specific changes to the curriculum, many important general and specific recommendations were generated through small group discussions that should become the basis for future campus-wide debate. Meanwhile, the SACS Self-Study has generated recommendations that bear directly on the General Education curriculum and their report suggests that the "General Education Committee" consider those recommendations. At the Forum and within the SACS discussions there has been considerable support for the formation of some type of committee. Following the Forum, the General Education Discussion Group solicited materials from other institutions that had undertaken comprehensive reviews of their own general studies requirements. The Group came to the conclusion that to institute a standing committee at this point in the process of review would be premature since it seemed to affirm the existing structure and content of general education rather than encourage a wide-ranging open examination that may include recommendations for change. This proposal calls for an open discussion of general education at the College of Charleston to take place. At the conclusion of the review process, a decision should be made as to the necessity of a standing General Education Committee for long-term review and maintenance.

During the discussion, David Kowal moved to change the composition of the proposed ad hoc committee by (essentially) equalizing the representation from each School. Hugh Wilder thought the idea of such a committee was excellent, but he was concerned that with so many members it might turn out to be unwieldy. Michael Friedman criticized the length of time being suggested (three years) for the committee to complete its work, but John Newell maintained that less than this had been found not to work elsewhere. Others thought the “Duties” of such a group should not be spelled out in elaborate detail but left in part to the committee itself to work out; accordingly, the “Duties” section was thinned by nearly a page. In the end, the proposal passed as amended:

**Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Current State of General Education**

**Composition**

Twenty-three (23) members in total: ten faculty appointed by the Senate (two from each of the five Schools: Humanities & Social Sciences, Mathematics & Science, Arts, Education, Business & Economics); three faculty serving ex officio as Chairs of the Academic Planning, Curriculum, and Assessment committees; five Deans (one from each of the five Schools); one representative from each of the following administrative offices, serving ex officio: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Enrollment Management; and two students. The committee shall be chaired by one or more tenure-track, roster faculty.
Duties

(1) Convene and facilitate a three-year campus-wide discussion on General Education to be completed by August of 1999.

(2) Make a report annually to the Faculty Senate and a full report to the Faculty Senate and full faculty by the end of three years (1999), at which time the faculty will be asked to affirm or modify the General Education curriculum.

(3) At the end of three years, make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate as to the need for a standing General Education Committee.

Constituents' Concerns

Mr. Mignone began by remembering Professor Michael Pincus, Chairman of the Languages Department, whose recent death had saddened so many in the College community. Susan Morrison called attention to the danger of legislators trading votes on key issues in return for obtaining college admission for their constituents. This, she said, had actually happened recently at another institution, even though the candidates for admission were completely unqualified. The faculty of the College must, she said, be prepared to resist granting admission to any individual in response to political pressure. Hugh Wilder thanked the Speaker for making available the report of the “Higher Education Joint Legislative Study Committee,” and he recommended that everyone should read the full document on file at the Secretariat and elsewhere, as well as the excerpts in the Faculty Newsletter. He thought that perhaps there should be some sort of official response on the part of the Senate. Mr. Mignone agreed, and mentioned possibly holding a forum to discuss the serious issues raised.

Jeff Frkonja wondered whether there was any connection between the enforced dropping of remedial courses at state institutions and forthcoming changes in admissions policy. The Provost, Conrad Festa, was asked to speak to this and said that he did not really think there was a connection; there are always some students who lack the necessary math or English skills to perform at the college level. He noted that SACS had recommended that faculty take a greater part in writing and revising the mission statement of the College. It looks, however, as though the Legislature wants to put more power, not less, in the hands of the educational Commissions. If this really happens, it may mean that we will have to give up some very important things as an institution.

James Carew asked what role, if any, the Faculty Senate ought to play in trying to hold on to the strengths that we now have. Dr. Festa said that he thought, to be honest, there was not much the Senate could do directly in this regard, and what role we can play is likely to be more effective if we avoid getting heavily involved in trying to bring direct political pressure on the Legislature, especially at the moment. The faculty certainly does have a positive role to play, however, in affirming standards, which is one of its natural and inescapable functions. As a matter of fact, there now seems to be more support in Columbia for higher education than there was a year ago -- the mood, the atmosphere seems better -- but they want proof that we are doing the good job we say we are doing.
This may lead to a lot of unnecessary paperwork -- but in exchange, perhaps, for better funding, based on "performance" rather than on the "head-count" or "FTE" system. Frank Kinard noted that this seems like the umpteenth time the Commission on Higher Education, in one or another of its guises, has tried to grab power, only to be turned down eventually by the Legislature. Mr. Mignone noted that we do seem clearly to be headed for a "performance-driven" rather than "enrollment-driven" system of funding for higher education. William Olejniczak asked whether the question of eliminating tenure was still alive. The Speaker said there had been a vote, last year, to table the issue for a year, but it may be about to come around again, since that time is almost up. There seems to be more interest now, however, in the idea of "post-tenure review" rather than in outright abolition. Finally, Mr. Carew reported that the President was genuinely concerned to know whether the Senate wanted him to attend our meetings, or not; we should send him some sort of signal.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about 6:45.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
Speaker’s Report

March 12, 1996

1) With regard to a concern raised at the February 6, Senate meeting concerning the charge given to the Academic Planning Committee on March 14, 1995 to develop a form for evaluating administrators, the Academic Planning Committee has assured me that they are working on it and that they expect to have their work completed shortly.

2) With regard to the issue of honorary degrees, the President was completely open to having the President’s Advisory Committee play a more active role in soliciting, reviewing and recommending individuals for Honorary Degrees. Roger Daniels, Chair of the Committee said his committee will come up with a schedule and plan for next year.

For your information, the commencement script for honorary degrees reads: “By the authority of the State of South Carolina, granted to the Board of Trustees and committed to me, I declare that ...is now admitted to the degree of doctor of humane letters of the College of Charleston....

3) This report includes a status report on motions passed by the Faculty Senate in 1994-95.

4) This report includes a report on the Report on the Higher Education Joint Legislative Study Committee.
Summary of Senate Votes 1994-95

September 6, 1994
  Credit for work at another institution by transient students APPROVED

November 1, 1994
  By-Laws change regulating nominations to the Committee on Nominations APPROVED

November 29, 1994
  1) Guidelines for the use of Special Topics Courses APPROVED
  2) Overlapping graduate and undergraduate course Review in Progress
  3) Sabbatical Leave Policy Amendments Rejected
  4) Smoking Policy Adopted
  5) Parking Regulations Rejected

February 7, 1995
  1) Termination of Probationary Faculty APPROVED
  2) Five Year Optional Pay Review for Faculty Rejected

March 14, 1995
  1) Not changing “Honors Program” to “Honors College” APPROVED
  2) Academic Affairs Policy Formation Document APPROVED
  3) Make Registrar an ex officio member of the Curriculum and Graduate Education Committees APPROVED
  4) Charge to the Academic Planning Committee to develop a form for evaluating administrators In Progress

April 4, 1995
  1) By-Laws changes regulating nominations and elections to senate and standing committees APPROVED
  2) Charge to the Academic Standards Committee to review advising of undeclared majors In Progress
  3) Charge to Academic Planning Committee to review “Three Year Degree Program” Review Complete

April 18, 1995
  1) Revised Sabbatical Leave Policy Amendment Rejected
  2) Sexual Harassment Draft APPROVED
  3) Attendance Policy for students on College sponsored activities APPROVED
Status Report On Motions Passed by the Faculty Senate 1994-95

(Most curriculum and program changes are not included.)

September 6, 1994

Credit for work at another institution by transient students Passed/ APPROVED

A recommendation was made by the Academic Standards Committee to clarify the policy regarding credit for work at another institution by transient students in the Undergraduate Bulletin. Append item 4 on page 120 of the 1994 Undergraduate Bulletin:

"4) Criteria for acceptable transfer credits also apply to transient students (see page 24)."
(Note: this rule is intended to apply only to our students who are transient students studying elsewhere.)

November 1, 1994

By-Laws change regulating nominations to the Committee on Nominations Passed/ APPROVED

A recommendation was made by the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual to approve a change in the By-Laws regulating when and how nominations to the Committee on Nominations can be made. Article V, Section 3B.b, be replaced with: Nominations may be made by faculty either at the April Senate meeting or by submission in writing to the Speaker at least 10 days prior to the April faculty meeting.

November 29, 1994

1) Guidelines for the use of Special Topics Courses Passed/ APPROVED

A recommendation was made by the Curriculum Committee that Major and Minor Departments should utilize Special Topics courses with discretion. Prior to the first offering of a particular topic, notification in due form will be sent to the Faculty Curriculum Committee and thence to the Faculty Senate, for information. Before the third offering of a particular topic within a period of five years, it must be submitted as a new course for the approval of the Faculty Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate and, when approved, be published in the Bulletin under its own title and number. When Special Topics courses are interdepartmental in character or subject, formal consultation with "interested" Departments is expected.

2) Overlapping graduate and undergraduate course Passed/REVIEW IN PROGRESS

The Academic Planning Committee was directed to look into and report on the question of overlapping graduate and undergraduate courses.

3) Sabbatical Leave Policy Passed with amendments/amendments rejected

A policy on Sabbatical Leave from Academic Affairs had been forwarded to the Welfare Committee for it to be forwarded to the Faculty Senate. The Welfare Committee revised the policy and put it on the agenda for the November 1 meeting of the Faculty Senate. Since no one from the Welfare Committee was at the November 1, 1994 Senate meeting, it was deferred to the November 29, meeting.

A revised version of the Sabbatical Leave Policy offered by Academic Affairs was proposed by the Welfare Committee. This proposal was amended and
endorsed by the Faculty Senate at the November 29, 1994 meeting. The most notable differences between the policy endorsed by the Faculty Senate and the policy offered Academic Affairs was that the Faculty Senate policy left out the requirements of disclosing additional income while on sabbatical and for giving a public lecture or demonstration of the findings resulting from the sabbatical.

On July 21, 1995 a memo from Conrad Festa to the Academic Deans, Department Chairs and Program Directors, presented the Sabbatical Leave Policy which Academic Affairs would adopt. The current policy includes the requirements of disclosing additional income while on sabbatical and for giving a public lecture or demonstration of the findings resulting from the sabbatical.

4) Smoking Policy  Passed/Adopted
A College of Charleston Smoking Policy was proposed by Andy Abrams, VP for Legal affairs, put forward by the Welfare Committee, passed by the Faculty Senate and adopted by President Sanders.

5) Parking Regulations  Passed/Rejected
The Welfare Committee recommended that the provision, which gives credit to state employees who transfer years of service into the College, be removed from the parking guidelines. It recommended that those who have previously transferred into the College and received credit not be penalized. Rather, this new policy be applicable to new employees beginning January 1, 1995.

February 7, 1995

1) Termination of Probationary Faculty  Passed/ APPROVED
A recommendation was made by the Welfare Committee that the following changes in the Faculty-Administration handbook be approved, where brackets indicate deletions and italics indicate additions.

From time to time it is important to the welfare of students or faculty in a department for a faculty member to be terminated from employment at the end of a first-year or second-year appointment. This is a legally correct action since state legislation (SC Code 8-17-380) provides that non-renewal of a one-year contract at the end of the contract period is not grievable and is not in violation of the terms of employment. [When the decision is reached not to extend a one-year appointment for an additional year, no reason for non-renewal need be given, but it is usually more professional and humane for the chair to discuss the reasons leading to the decision with the faculty member affected.] Nonetheless, termination based on discriminatory intent, violations of academic freedom, or inadequate consideration are all grievable under other provisions of the SC Code, federal law, and/or this Manual. In the case of the termination of probationary appointments (nontenured, tenure-track faculty), the faculty member must be informed of the decision in writing and, upon request of the faculty member, must be provided with the reasons for termination in writing. (Manual, p. 72)

2) Five Year Optional Pay Review for Faculty  Passed/Rejected
A recommendation was made by the Welfare Committee that an optional merit performance review process will be available for all faculty who have obtained their highest academic rank based on their degree status. This would include Full Professors who have achieved the College's
highest academic rank as well as Associate and Assistant Professors who, because of degree status, are ineligible for promotion to a higher rank. This optional merit performance review could occur after the completion of a minimum of each five year period in rank. This optional pay review can be initiated only by the professor...(See enclosure for the remainder of the proposal.)

March 14, 1995
1) Not changing "Honors Program" to "Honors College" Passed/ APPROVED
   A recommendation was made by the Academic Planning Committee that the name of the Honors Program not be changed to "Honors College".

2) Academic Affairs Policy Formation Document Passed with amendments/ APPROVED
   A recommendation was made by the Academic Planning Committee that the draft of an "Academic Affairs Policy Formation" document, developed by the Office of Academic Affairs be approved.
   The motion to endorse the "Academic Policy Formation" document with two changes was passed by the Senate.
   a) change 1 replaced the word "may" with "shall" in the following sentences:
      The Provost shall refer appropriate draft policies that directly affect the faculty to the Speaker of the faculty.
      and
      The Speaker of the Faculty, in turn, shall refer the policy draft to a faculty committee or ad hoc group for review and comment.
   b) change 2 recommends that consideration be given to the two month time limit on (faculty) consideration of policy changes if the two month period intersects the summer recess.

3) Make Registrar an ex officio member of the Curriculum and Graduate Education Committees Passed/ APPROVED
   A recommendation was made by the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual to make the Registrar an ex officio member of the Curriculum Committee and the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs.

4) Charge to the Academic Planning Committee to develop a form for evaluating administrators Passed with amendment/In progress
   A motion was presented by Frank Cossa, acting on his own behalf, asking the Faculty Welfare Committee to develop a form whereby the Faculty could evaluate administrators. The Senate amended the motion replacing the Faculty Welfare Committee by the Academic Planning Committee.

April 4, 1995
1) By-Laws changes regulating nominations and elections to senate and standing committees Passed/ APPROVED
Recommendation by the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual to approve a change in the By-Laws regulating nominations and elections.

   a) Article V, Section 2 A, 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.”

   b) Article V, Section 3 A, to read: “Members of standing College committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations and Elections by March 15 and elected by the Senate at the April Senate Meeting.”

   c) Article V, Sections 3 B 3 and 3 B 4 should similarly change “April 15” to “March 15”.

2) Charge to the Academic Standards Committee to review advising of undeclared majors Passed/In Progress

   A motion was made by Frank Cossa, acting in his own behalf, recommending that the Faculty Senate instruct the Academic Standards Committee to review the current system for advising undeclared majors, and to recommend revisions in, or alternatives to, this system.

3) Charge to Academic Planning Committee to review “Three Year Degree Program” Passed/Review complete

   A motion was made by Hugh Wilder, acting in his own behalf, recommending that the Faculty Senate instruct the Academic Planning Committee to review the proposal “Three Year Degree Program” and to issue a report to the Senate.

April 18, 1995

1) Revised Sabbatical Leave Policy Passed with amendment/amendment rejected by Conrad Festa.

   A recommendation was made by the Welfare Committee to approve the revised Sabbatical Leave Policy. The Senate amended the revised policy by striking the sentence “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.”

2) Sexual Harassment Draft Passed with changes/Adopted

   A recommendation was made by the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics to approve a draft document “Sexual Harassment Complaint Procedures” as developed over the years by Sue Sommer-Kresse, with advice from the faculty.

3) Attendance Policy for students on College sponsored activities Passed with amendment to text/ APPROVED

   A recommendation was made by the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics to approve an addition to the existing Attendance Policy. “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.”
Report on the Higher Education Joint Legislative Study Committee


“Issues and Concerns

The issues which the Committee felt spurred the establishment of the Committee and were an essential component of their deliberations and decisions were that:

No criteria or standards exist for quality.

No clear missions or goals exist for the state or the postsecondary institutions allowing institutions to overlap and compete for the same student.

The existing funding formula, which is primarily based on the number of enrolled students, has no rewards for quality, therefore breeding mediocrity.

An adversarial relationship exists between the Commission on Higher Education and the colleges and universities.

Tuition costs at senior colleges and universities are no longer affordable or reasonable.

Lack of coordination has created wasteful duplication.

Institutions have not changed to meet the needs of the students and job market demands of the economy.

Lack of trust and turf protection between and among institutions.

Inadequate relationship with public education (K-12)...

Essentially our work came down to answering three very basic questions:

What do we expect our education buck to buy?

How can we get more bang for the buck?

Where does the buck stop?

The answer to that first question is obvious. We expect (our) higher education system to achieve:

High Academic Quality

Affordable and Accessible Education
Instructional Excellence

Coordination and Cooperation with Public Education (K-12)


Economic Growth...

...how to get more bang from our buck?

We want to emphasize that while we recognize the need for flexibility and periodic re-examination, we call for an end to "mission creep" where technical colleges try to become community colleges, two year colleges become four year institutions and four-year institutions seek to become full-fledged research universities. Similarly, wasteful duplication drains financial resources and inhibits the drive for excellence that can more easily be achieved by concentrating those resources.

We also seek more bang for our buck by development of a post-tenure review system that will insure instructional quality; by increasing the number of hours professors spend teaching and assisting students inside and outside the classroom; and by examining class size and student/teacher ratio.

Finally, we call for the implementation of performance-based funding that will reward those institutions that meet the goals we established, seek to strengthen those that are moving toward accomplishing these goals, and penalize those which consistently fail to carry out their defined mission and achieve the goals this plan establishes...

We call on the General Assembly to let the buck stop with the restructured Commission on Higher Education by giving the Commission authority to take real action to enforce compliance with these defined missions, quality criteria, and performance indicators. This includes the authority to re-engineer, consolidate, reduce and/or expand the number of existing institutions of higher learning as judged by the performance criteria recommended by this committee...

Recommendations...

Missions

The mission for higher education in South Carolina should be to be a global leader in providing a coordinated, comprehensive system of excellence in education by providing instruction, research and life-long learning opportunities which are focused on economic development and benefit the state of South Carolina...

The primary mission or focus for each type of institution should be

1. Research Institutions (USC, Clemson and MUSC)

   College level baccalaureate education, master's degrees, professional degrees and doctoral degrees which lead to continued education or employment.
Research through the use of government, corporate, non-profit organization grants and/or state resources.

Public service to the State and their local community.

2. Four Year Colleges and Universities

College level baccalaureate education and selected master’s degrees which lead to employment and/or continued education.

Limited and specialized research.

Public service to the State and their local community.

3. Two Year Institutions-Branches of the University of South Carolina

College level pre-baccalaureate education necessary to confer Associates Degrees which lead to continued education at a four year or research institution....

4. State Technical and Comprehensive Education Systems

All postsecondary vocational, technical and occupational training and diploma and associate degree programs leading directly to employment or maintenance of employment and associate degree programs for nontraditional students to gain access to other postsecondary education.

Up-to-date and appropriate occupational and technical training for adults.

Special school programs that provide training for prospective employees for prospective and existing industry in order to enhance the economic development of South Carolina....

SUCCESS FACTORS AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

1. Focused on Mission

-Expenditure of funds
-Curricula offered
-Approval of mission statement
-Adoption of strategic plan to support mission statement
-Attainment of strategic plan goals

2. Quality of Faculty

-Credentials of professors and instructors
-Performance review system for professors and instructors (to include student and peer evaluations)
-Post-Tenure review for professors
-Compensation of faculty
-Student contact hours out-side the classroom
-Public service (within normal compensation)

3. Classroom Quality
-Class size and student teacher ratio
-Credit hours taught by instructional staff
-Program and degree accreditation
-Emphasis on quality teacher education and reform

4. Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration

-Sharing and use of technology, equipment, supplies, and source matter experts
-With business community

5. Administrative Efficiency

-Percentage of administrative cost
-Use of best practices
-Elimination of unjustified duplication and waste
-Overhead Costs

6. Entrance Requirements

-SAT and ACT scores
-Class standing/GPA/activities
-Post secondary achievement
-SC residents a priority

7. Graduate’s Achievements

-Graduation rate
-Employment rate of graduates
-Employer feedback
-Prof/Certif. exam scores
-Continued education
-Credit hours earned to graduate

8. User-friendliness of the Institution

-Transferability of credits
-Continuous, lifelong educational offerings
-Accessibility to all citizens

9. Research Funding

-Support for improved teacher education
-Public and private sector grants...

The Commission on Higher Education (CHE) should...

1. Develop acceptable standards for the performance indicators of the success factors...by January 1, 1999...

2. Develop and implement a funding formula based on performance standards...by July 1, 1999...
3. Design a reporting system that accurately and efficiently reflects performance in relationship to designated performance standards.

4. Review and approve institutional mission statement development by the institutions boards of trustees to ensure they are within the overall mission for their particular type of institution and within the overall higher education mission of the State...

While legislation is not needed the Committee further recommends that:
...

2. The goal for all existing research institutions should be to become Carnegie Research I Institutions...

4. Each Board of Trustees should have an audit committee made up of members of the Board...

6. Approval of new doctoral programs should be “frozen” until further study by CHE, in cooperation with the Boards of Trustees, to determine the need for increase or closure of existing programs.

7. CHE should strengthen the requirements for being considered an in-state student in order to ensure that the tax paying citizens of South Carolina have first priority in attending South Carolina’s public colleges and universities.

8. A need-based and/or scholarship assistance program should be developed and funded for public college and university students.
Speaker's Note

This has been a tragic season. In the three weeks since the Special Issue of this Newsletter reported the drowning death of Jozef Modzelewski and the serious automobile accident of Ewa Wojcicka, Ewa died and another member of our college community, Laura Griffin, was killed by a hit-and-run driver as she was jogging on the sidewalk by the Battery.

Stunned and grief-stricken, our College Community is in a continuous state of mourning. Three truly extraordinary individuals are gone forever and the voids which they have left are shrouded in the senselessness of their deaths.

This issue is dedicated to their memory.

The Joint Legislative Committee on Higher Education is due to make its report to the South Carolina Legislature on February 6. A report on their report will appear in the next Newsletter.
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Ewa Wojcicka, 1955-1996

With sorrow and regret the Department of Mathematics reports that Dr. Ewa Wojcicka, Associate Professor of Mathematics at the College of Charleston, died on January 14, 1996. We mourn the loss of a valued colleague and dear friend.

On December 10, while travelling north on Highway 17 near Beaufort, Ewa's car swerved into the southbound lane and into the path of a pickup truck. It took an emergency crew some time to cut her out of the wreckage. Due to the apparent severity of her injuries, the crew was reportedly astounded to find Ewa alive and actually conscious. She fell unconscious during the helicopter ride to Savannah Memorial Hospital. The trauma unit rushed her to emergency surgery that evening and returned
the next morning to visit her, astonished that she was still alive. By now her family had arrived at the hospital. Ewa's fiancee, David Sumner, had arrived at 2:00 a.m. the night of the accident, just after they admitted her into the ICU from the emergency room. The first reports were discouraging, there was little hope for survival. A few days later her condition was critical, with a mere twenty percent chance of survival. Survival could well mean severe brain damage, perhaps paralysis. But when the doctor told David that only two of ten in Ewa's condition could be expected to survive, David brightened. He knew Ewa better than anyone and with those odds Ewa would make it. And make it she did. Her struggle was heroic. In the thirty-three days between December 10, 1995 and January 13, 1996 Ewa found her way out of the abyss. With each step the light grew brighter and Ewa drew closer to wholeness. After serious talk that she might remain in a coma for months or as long as a year, there was the first time she smiled at David, first a faint flicker, then a full, sparkling Ewa smile. At one point the doctors needed to determine if she could move her fingers. Knowing that Ewa was a mathematician, a young resident asked her: "Ewa, what is the square root of four?" Ewa raised two fingers and the room went into cheers and high-fives. There was the first time Ewa sat up in a chair and breathed without the respirator, but still with a trachea tube. Gradual movement was returning to all of her. She was pronounced "recovered" and ready for transfer. On Tuesday January 9, Ewa was transferred to a rehabilitation center in Columbia, where David and Ewa's family live. Ewa's progress in Columbia was nothing short of amazing. Ewa communicated by mouthing words (the trachea tube was still being used), by writing and by computer. David said that he had some of the best conversations of his life during those days with Ewa. On Friday, January 12 Ewa wrote to David on a pad "I love you more than I can say." David left the hospital that night filled with excitement for the things he and Ewa would do together. Ewa was back.

During the night of Friday, January 12 or early morning of January 13, Ewa was found with her legs in the bedrails, face down, not breathing and without a pulse. Her heart was restored by CPR at the rehabilitation center before the EMS crew arrived. She was brought to a nearby hospital. Life support was terminated the next day at the request of her family.

Ewa Wojcicka was born in Gdansk Poland on April 24, 1955. She received a Bachelor of Science in Mathematics in 1978 from the University of Gdansk. In 1978 her family immigrated to the United States and settled in the Columbia area. Soon after arriving in Columbia, Ewa entered graduate school at the University of South Carolina and received a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Mathematics in 1985. Ewa came to the College of Charleston as an Assistant Professor in 1985 and was an Associate Professor of Mathematics at the time of her death. During her career she published several highly regarded research papers in mathematics, first in the area of Analysis and later in the area of Combinatorics. Ewa was an excellent teacher, she lectured with clarity and energy. Her enthusiasm for mathematics was contagious and mirrored her enthusiasm for life. She was generous with her time and patient with her students, always demanding the highest standards of performance from herself and others. Ewa's considerable talents as a researcher and teacher made her respected by her students and her peers. Ewa was a member of the American Mathematical Society and the Mathematical Association of America. Ewa's remarkable gifts were not limited to her professional life. Fitness and athletic competition were a lifelong passion. She had a 5.0 Volvo ranking in tennis and had been the captain of the championship volleyball team at the University of Gdansk. When Ewa walked she sprinted, even if it was going down the hall to her next class, she moved with strength, speed and grace. And Ewa's heart was as warm and generous as her wonderful smile. Although she was a critic of organised religion, she lived by the commandment Love thy neighbour. She gave a great deal of herself to community service: whether it was tutoring and caring for the girls and young women at the Florence Crittenden Home for Unwed Mothers or working with a mathematically gifted child at Buist Academy, Ewa gave from the heart. We will miss Ewa, we'll miss her sparkling smile and radiant energy. •
Why Not Run a Business Like a Good University? by Robert Woodbury

"If you only ran your college like a business..." is a phrase we in university administration hear from our friends in the business world.

Frankly, we in higher education have learned much about operating in a more business-like manner. The stringency of the last few years in particular have helped us weed out unnecessary functions, use technology more effectively, plan more strategically, and use limited resources more efficiently. Most of us are better managers than we would have been if we had been less attentive to recent developments in the private sector. Those in the private sector, however, might reflect on some comparisons and strengths in the university world that might be helpful, in turn, to them.

First, higher education is one of the few United States "industries" universally recognized as the best in the world. This is no longer true of cars or electronics or most other areas of manufacturing. But our colleges and universities, as a whole, dominate the globe as do few sectors other than the entertainment industry, munitions, and soft drinks.

Second, our favorable balance of payments is estimated to exceed $5 billion and is expanding. Almost 420,000 foreign students the vast majority funded from abroad, study full time on our campuses. Perhaps 80,000 US students study abroad and then only for brief periods and mostly for "cultural" reasons.

Third, higher education has been a growth industry for four decades, despite a dramatic decrease in the college-age population over the past 20 years. We have expanded from 2 million students to over 14 million since World War II. Growth in related areas, such as continuing education or sponsored research, has grown as dramatically.

Fourth, cases of college bankruptcy, defaults on loans, or higher level malfeasance are all but unknown. Certainly many colleges are run better than others, but the overall record of fiscal stewardship would be the envy of many boards of directors.

Fifth, no other industry that I know has assembled, retained, and energized so much educated talent at such a low cost. At a single institution, thousands of people have studied an average of six full years past their bachelor's degree (more than many Mds) and earn only $45,000 (the average salary of a university professor in the US).

Sixth, undergraduates get a bargain, despite the perceptions of parents or taxpayers. A college supplies housing, food, association with the best minds in many fields, art centers, athletic events, entertainment, libraries, and all the amenities and intellectual resources of a small city. Who else can do this for an average cost of $12,000?

Seventh, the return on investments is enviable. Aside from any benefits of a human or cultural dimension, a graduate of a four-year institution earns approximately 50 percent more than a high-school graduate, or $500,000 more over a lifetime. The contributions of university research and ancillary activities to society are incalculable.

It is worth exploring the managerial reasons for this success. Decision-making is highly decentralized. Issues of curriculum, teaching, scholarly support, admissions, selection of staff, rest with an academic department—a group of faculty with common aspirations for the department, their discipline, and their students to succeed.

The fundamental work of teaching and learning is controlled by the faculty member, the "frontline worker."

The most critical issues depend on creativity, energy, and commitment in a particular classroom or laboratory. There is minimal bureaucratic control over "the work." The basic assumption is that management's job is to provide the tools, encouragement, and security for faculty to use their creativity and imagination. In this sense, a faculty member is treated as a professional.

The enterprise is daily in touch with the consumer. However passive some students may be, colleges are influenced incessantly by consumers on campus as well as indirectly by those who choose not to come. When the "traditional" consumer market shrank, colleges aggressively pursued nontraditional markets.
Our apparatus for quality control and improvement are highly developed and regular. We have complex procedures for program evaluation, institutional or professional accreditation, self-study, government program approval, peer-review journals, and even teacher evaluation mechanisms. No less important are mechanisms for colleague review in a department or profession. Whatever the critique of the tenure system, no profession requires as intensive a year-long review of an individual after six years of probation than does a good university.

Opportunities for professional renewal, growth, and continuing education are well developed. Faculty and other professionals are expected not only to keep up in their field, but are provided opportunities, including study leaves, for major scholarly and professional development. Faculty are hired for the long-term.

Universities are structured in a mode of “shared governance,” a relatively flat bureaucracy and open information across the entire enterprise. In an age when the notion of proprietary information is disappearing, academic disciplines have been internationally open for decades. In addition, universities have a reward system where the president is paid about three times the average faculty member, four times the average employee, and five times an entry level employee - a sharp contrast with the 70 plus multiplier in large businesses.

Finally, universities and colleges seek long-term results. The real measures involve institutional reputation, successes of graduates, and accomplishments of faculty, which require more sophisticated qualitative assessments over long periods. Investment is something to assure stewardship over the long haul.

Does some of this sound familiar? Many of the current guides to improved business structures and enterprises, from “total quality management” to quality circles to other modes, are similar to processes and approaches that colleges and universities have developed over decades. Plenty is wrong with many colleges. More than most realize, however, businesses can learn a great deal from higher education about management and leadership.

Robert L. Woodbury is the director of the McCormack Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Massachusetts-Boston. He is a past chairman of the New England Board of Higher Education and former chancellor of the University of Maine System.

(Note: This article first appeared in the March 23, 1993 issue of the Christian Science Monitor and appears here with the author's consent.)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Foundation Faculty/Staff Pledge Drive (Contributed by Stephanie Mignone)

A representative from your department will be contacting you soon regarding faculty pledges to the College of Charleston Foundation. Please bear in mind, as you consider giving, that the Foundation supports faculty activity such as travel, research, speakers, and candidate interviews, as well as scholarships and awards for students. Although large donations are by all means encouraged (contributors of $100.00 are entered in a drawing for dinner at Celia’s), most important to the College’s overall fundraising efforts is the percentage of faculty participation. A high participation figure helps convince outside donors (and also State legislators) of the faculty’s dedication. Individual pledges can be directed to specific programs, departments or funds with a simple notation on the pledge card. NOTE: Memorial Funds are in place for each of our recently deceased colleagues, Jozef Modzelewski, Ewa Wojcicka, and Laura Griffin.

To those who have already pledged, many thanks.

The Self-Study Report (Contributed by Hugh Haynsworth)

The focused self-study is nearing completion. The self-study report is rolling off the printer now and will be mailed to members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) consulting team and distributed widely among the offices of the college community. Many thanks go to our tireless editor, Prof.
Caroline Hunt, all the members of the six self-study committees and the steering committee, and to Paula Edwards, our administrative assistant.

The self-study report includes the report of each of the six self-study committees and a strategic plan which addresses the goal of becoming an international, multicultural liberal arts institution. The strategic plan, developed by the steering committee, reflects the recommendations of the six self-study committees and the discussions which took place at the President's Retreat last September. The plan describes the actions the steering committee feels will best address the goal of the self-study. However, it is a still a draft plan that will be modified, based on your comments and the advice of the team of SACS consultants, who will visit the college the week of March 10 - 15.

On behalf of the self-study steering committee, I solicit your help. Please read the strategic plan and ask questions or make suggestions. We need your feedback. Every full-time faculty member and many administrators will receive a copy of the strategic plan, and copies of the entire self-study document will be placed in every departmental office. In addition, the entire self-study document will be accessible online; we will be distributing particulars about access in a few days. Give us your written comments on the plan, before the visit of the SACS consultants, by mailing your comments directly to Hugh Haynsworth, Mathematics Department or by accessing the self-study documents online and typing your comments into the space provided as an e-mail message. In addition, we will hold a series of public forums on March 13 or March 14 with the consultants. We hope you will attend and express your thoughts.

Thank you for participating in this important process.

**THE LUNCH EXPRESS** *(Contributed by Dining Services)*

Working through lunch? Don't skip lunch or order fattening pizza. Dining Services LUNCH EXPRESS will be delivering Healthy Choice deli sandwiches, tossed salads, fruit, cookies, and bottled beverages beginning February 5th right to your desk. Only a $5 minimum order is required and regular menu prices are in effect. The convenience is incomparable. Look for the specialty designed menu in your department mailbox or the Stern Center Food Court. You may also call Dining Services at 953-5669 for more information.

---

**THE PROGRAM IN THE CAROLINA LOWCOUNTRY AND THE ATLANTIC WORLD** *(Contributed by Rosemary Brana-Shute)*

1) Changes in Seminar Scheduling and Speakers

On February 23, Thomas Cohen of Catholic University will give a public lecture at the Blacklock house at 1 p.m. His topic is "The Fire of Tongues: Antonio Vieira and the Missionary Church in Colonial Brazil." Students as well as faculty are encouraged to attend.

The previously scheduled speaker for the Faculty Seminar series for February 23, 1996 has been changed. Dr. John Russell-Wood of the History Department at the Johns Hopkins University will offer a paper for discussion entitled "Through an African Diaspora in Colonial Brazil" at the Blacklock House from 3-5 p.m.

To receive Dr. Russell-Wood's paper in advance, please contact Randy Sparks or Rosemary Brana-Shute, Program Co-Directors, at the History Department (953-5711) or FAX 953-6349 or email Sparksr@CofC.edu or Branashuter@CofC.edu.

The two presentations amount to a Brazil Day and will deal with the encounters among Europeans, Africans, and Native Americans.

2) "Center and Periphery in the Atlantic World" Symposium

The College of Charleston's Program in the Carolina Lowcountry and the Atlantic...
World will host an interdisciplinary symposium entitled “Center and Periphery in the Atlantic World” on April 12-13, 1996 on the College campus. The symposium is intended to explore the most prominent theoretical constructs underlying the study of the Atlantic World. Invited speakers, representing the disciplines of geography, political science and sociology, will prepare brief discussion papers which will be circulated before the symposium. In order to receive the papers in advance and to reserve a place at the symposium, pre-registration is requested.

**Program**

**Friday, April 12:** The Blacklock House
2:00 p.m.: Jack P. Greene (Program Director, The College of Charleston and Department of History, The John Hopkins University)
   Welcome and Introductory Comments

2:10 p.m.: Christopher Chase Dunn
   (Department of Sociology, The John Hopkins University)

4:00 p.m.: John Agnew (Department of Geography, Syracuse University)

7:00 p.m.: Buffet Dinner
   (No fee, but pre-registration required)

**Saturday, April 13:** Lightsey Conference Center
8:30 a.m.: Continental Breakfast

9:00 a.m.: Ronald Chilcote (Department of Political Science, University of California, Riverside)

11:00 a.m.: Roundtable Discussion
   Chair: Samuel M. Hines, Jr. (Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences, College of Charleston)

To pre-register or further information, contact Randy Sparks or Rosemary Brana-Shute, Program Co-Directors, at the History Department (953-5711) or FAX 953-6349 or email Sparksr@CofC.edu or Branashuter@CofC.edu.