MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

April 7, 1998 (First Session)

The first session of the eighth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:07 p.m. on Tuesday, April 7, in ECTR 118, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Thirty-nine senators attended. Minutes of the March 10 meeting were approved. (The Secretary pointed out a course change that had been omitted from the March 10 minutes: BIOL 201 will be a 4-credit course with required lab. File copies of the minutes will be corrected.)

Reports

Mr. Mignone reported that he will include in the next Newsletter the Letter to the Editor that the Senate requested he write to the Post and Courier in response to Governor Beasley’s remarks about the value of a liberal arts education. He also reported that the number of architects being considered for the new library has been narrowed to six. The folders of these six are available for review in his office.

New Business

- Doug Friedman introduced twenty-eight motions from the Curriculum Committee. The following, listed by department, passed.

HONORS
- New Course: HONS 1xx Honors Psychology (3)

PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH
- Change to Teacher Education Concentration for NCATE compliance:
  - New (Required) Courses: PEHD 105 Basketball and Volleyball (2); PEHD 117 Badminton and Racquetball (2); PEHD 355 Sport Psychology (3)
  - Courses deleted from program: PEHD 350 Management of Intramural Recreation(3); EDFS 455 Literary and Assessment in the Content Area (3). [The proposed changes result in one additional hour being added to the Teacher Education Concentration.]

CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY
- New Course: CHEM 381 Internship (1-4)
MUSIC
• New Course: MUSC 361 Applied Music (1 or 2)

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES
• Change to Major: RELS 105 Introduction to World Religions is a requirement for the major
• Course Change (title): RELS 201 Old Testament changed to Hebrew Bible: History and Interpretation
• Course Change (prerequisite): RELS 301 Mysticism and Religious Experience will have RELS 105 as a prerequisite
• Course Change (prerequisite): RELS 353 Phenomenology of Religion will have RELS 105 as a prerequisite
• Course Change (number): RELS 450 Seminar in Religion renumbered to RELS 405
• Course Change (number): RELS 401 Theories and Methods in the Study of Religion renumbered to RELS 450
• Change in departmental requirement: All 400-level courses will have a requirement of 9 previous hours in Religious Studies

ART HISTORY
• New Course: ARTH 4xx Independent Study in Art History (3)
• New Course: ARTH 3xx Pre-Columbian Art and Culture (3)

BIOLOGY
• For Information—BIOL 503 Special Topics in Biology (4)

HISTORY
• Course Change: (title, prerequisites): HIST 258 European Jewish History: Medieval to the Twentieth Century changed to European Jewish History: Medieval to Modern; add “or HIST 103 and 104 prerequisites”
• Course Change (title, prerequisites): HIST 263 Latin America in the National Period changed to Latin America Since Independence; add “or HIST 103 and 104 to prerequisites
• Course Change (title, prerequisites): HIST 276 Medieval Islamic Civilization changed to Islamic Civilization; add “or HIST 103 and 104” to prerequisites
• Course Change (title, prerequisites): HIST 356 Georgian England changed to Georgian Britain; add “or HIST 103 and 104” to prerequisites
• New Course: HIST 241 Special Topics in Modern European History (3)
• New Course: HIST 261 Special Topics in Modern Asia, Africa, or Latin America (3)
• New Course: HIST 270 Special Topics in Pre-Modern History (3)
• New Course: HIST 347 Special Topics in Modern European History (3)
• New Course: HIST 361 Special Topics in Modern Asia, Africa, or Latin America (3)
• New Course: HIST 370 Special Topics in Pre-Modern History (3)
• New Course: HIST 441: Research Seminar in Modern European History
- New Course: HIST 461: Research Seminar in Modern Asia, Africa, or Latin America (3)
- New Course: HIST 470: Research Seminar in Pre-Modern History (3)

- For the Committee on Graduate Education, Chip Biembaum moved the adoption of eight courses, all of which passed:
  
  - New Course: SMFT 540 Fundamentals of Physical Science (4)
  - New Course: SMFT 538 Topics in Zoology for Teachers (4)
  - New Course: SMFT 523 Earth Sciences for Teachers (4)
  - New Course: SMFT 511 Introduction to Probability and Statistics (3)
  - New Course: SMFT 510 Introduction to Problem Solving (3)
  - New Course: EDFS 500 Nonviolent Crises Intervention (1)
  - New Course: SMFT 548 Atomic Theory of Matter from Lucretius to Quarks (4)
  - New Course: SMFT 637 Biotechnology (4)

- Ned Hettinger introduced three proposals from the Research and Development Committee and then moved Proposal #1:

  The Distinguished Research Award should be presented at the Graduation Ceremony (along with the Teaching and Advising Awards, as is the current practice).

Robert Russell spoke against the motion, claiming that the graduation ceremony is long enough already. Deanna McBroom added that the awards ceremony had become so long that it extended beyond the beginning of the University of Charleston graduation, and this is why the suggestion was made last year to move the awards. A number of senators expressed a preference that all awards be presented together, though not all agreed on when the presentation should take place. While Bishop Hunt and Deanna McBroom thought the faculty meeting the most appropriate time, Terry Bowers argued that all the awards should be presented at graduation because that is the most important ceremony for faculty and students and the ceremony during which our most important values are presented before the public.

When the motion failed, Mr. Hettinger moved the Proposal #2:

All awards (Teaching, Advising, Research, and Emeritus) should be presented at the Awards Ceremony (as was true before last year’s change).

Mr. Hettinger accepted as friendly Bishop Hunt’s amendment to replace “Awards Ceremony” with “spring faculty meeting,” and the amended motion passed. [All awards (Teaching, Advising, Research, and Emeritus) should be presented at the spring faculty meeting.] In passing this motion, the Senate assumes that the faculty awards will be listed in the awards ceremony program and announced at the graduation ceremony.
Richard Nunan presented the following proposal from the Ad-hoc Committee on Post-Tenure Review (Jim Carew, Marion Doig, David Kowal, Tom Langley, Amy McCandless, Gary Tidwell, Richard Nunan [chair])

POST-TENURE REVIEW PROPOSAL

1. A new standing faculty committee will be created, the 'Post-Tenure Review Committee'. Its membership will be constituted in accordance with the same criteria as the currently existing college-wide T&P Committee, but with no ex-officio members. Its members will be selected through the same process as well (i.e., via the Nominations Committee and the Senate, like other standing committees).

2. The charge of this committee will be to conduct all institutional-level post-tenure reviews (excluding promotions) which fall during its term of office.

3. A post-tenure review will be conducted for each tenured faculty member during the sixth year since her/his previous extra-departmental review, via the following set of procedures:
   (a) In the fall, the candidate will submit to her/his department chair a packet of materials:
      (i) For a candidate claiming a ‘satisfactory’ rating (see provision 5 below), the packet should consist of:
         Professional Vitae*
         Statement from candidate on teaching, research and service, addressing past five years and future plans and goals.*
         Computer-generated student teaching evaluations (summary pages with numbers) for all evaluated courses taught by candidate during five-year interval under review.*
         Department chair’s annual evaluations (both numerical summaries and narratives) during five-year interval under review. In the event that a department chair is being evaluated, the Dean’s annual evaluations of the Chair will be included instead.
         Two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers, concerning aspects of candidate’s teaching (or, for librarians, professional competency).**
      [* In the event of subsequent approval of teaching portfolios as part of the post-tenure review process, starred elements may be incorporated as components of those portfolios.]
      [** In the event of subsequent approval of peer teaching evaluations as part of the post-tenure review process, these letters will include peer teaching evaluation comments.]

      (ii) For a candidate claiming a ‘superior’ rating (see provision 5) the packet must also furnish clear evidence of exemplary teaching effectiveness (exemplary professional competency in the case of librarians), leadership in service, and continuing quality scholarship, including copies of at least two articles published in peer-refereed professional journals (or the
professional equivalent, e.g., professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts) since the previous post-tenure or promotion evaluation, accompanied by documentation concerning the nature of the reviewing process.

(b) This packet will be reviewed by the department chair during the fall semester of the sixth year, to determine whether the candidate's performance warrants an 'unsatisfactory' rating. In that event, the department chair will add a substantive evaluation letter to the packet, explaining his/her reasons for flagging the candidate's performance as unsatisfactory.

When the department chair herself/himself is up for post-tenure review, the most senior tenured member of the department (other than the chair) will convene, and chair, a departmental post-tenure review panel consisting of three tenured faculty (including the panel chair). Panel members will normally be drawn from the home department. No tenured faculty member concurrently subject to post-tenure review may serve on this panel. The panel will exercise the same responsibility with respect to the department chair's candidacy that the chair exercises in all other cases.

(c) The department chair (or the departmental panel) will forward the candidate's packet to the college-wide Post-Tenure Review Committee in early December, with either a brief acknowledgment of the chair's (or panel's) concurrence with the candidate's self-evaluation, or a detailed negative evaluation letter.

4. Evaluations of the Post-Tenure Review Committee can take one of three forms:

   'Superior'
   Candidate has continued to perform at the level expected for promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the standards of the Faculty-Administration Manual.

   'Unsatisfactory'
   Candidate has exhibited evidence of habitual neglect of duty, which means consistently and regularly failing to fulfill the terms and conditions of appointment, as laid out in the Faculty-Administration Manual's section on "Termination of Tenured Faculty Members 'for Cause' and Termination Procedure".

   'Satisfactory'
   All other candidates.

5. Whenever the Post-Tenure Review Committee assigns a rating of 'superior', such a rating must be accompanied by a permanent merit increase not less than that given for promotion to the rank of Professor, effective the academic year following the year of evaluation.

6. Whenever the Post-Tenure Review Committee assigns a rating of 'unsatisfactory', the case will be remanded to the existing departmental panel, or a new one convened for the purpose (in the latter case, including the department chair and two other tenured departmental faculty), to devise a remediation plan in consultation with the candidate. This plan must then be submitted to the college-wide Post-Tenure Review Committee for approval.
7. Ultimate ratification of satisfactory completion of a remediation plan rests with the college-wide Post-tenure Review Committee, as constituted at the time of the deadline originally assigned for completion of remediation.

In the event that the Committee concludes that the candidate has failed to complete the remediation plan to its satisfaction, the Committee will notify the candidate, the department chair or panel, the provost, and the dean of the candidate's school that the Committee has concluded that proceedings for revocation of the candidate’s tenure ought to be instituted, in accordance with the guidelines of the Faculty/Administration Manual.

8. The Post-Tenure Review Committee operates on a presumption of satisfactory performance. That is, the burden of proof (clear and convincing evidence) for a superior performance lies with the candidate, and the burden of proof for an unsatisfactory performance lies with the department chair or departmental panel.

The Post-Tenure Review Committee has the authority to demand explanations or additional data whenever the Committee perceives significant inconsistencies to exist between the candidate's submitted package of materials and either the candidate’s self-evaluation or the evaluation of the department chair or panel.

9. The normal minimal period for initial eligibility for promotion to Professor shall be reduced from seven years to six (in order to be consistent with the legislatively mandated post-tenure review period of six years).

10. In view of the fact that the 'Best Practices' documents call for post-tenure review of all tenured faculty, this proposal cannot be construed as full compliance with the legislative mandate encompassed by the 'Best Practices' documents unless all full-time administrators holding tenured faculty rank are individually subject to an appropriately analogous peer review by a college-wide committee of tenured faculty. (For this purpose, faculty evaluations of administrative offices are inadequate to the task.) Recognizing that such administrative personnel need to satisfy a different set of job criteria from those whose duties are primarily in the area of teaching, ratification of provisions 1-9 of this document is conditional on the creation of another ad hoc faculty committee, consisting of five teaching faculty and two administrators holding faculty rank, charged with devising a set of standards, a summary of types of evidence, and a suitable procedure for implementing post-tenure review of administrators holding faculty rank.

Ratification of provisions 1-9 is also conditional on approval by the Faculty Senate and the College’s Administration of such a system of evaluating administrators holding faculty rank, as a set of amendments augmenting the current proposal. Provisions 1-9 will take effect at that time.

The Speaker pointed out that the proposal contains at least five motions, two of which require by-laws changes. He suggested that the Senate view the document as a recommendation that will come back to the Senate for approval. A vote now would be an approval of the basic structure of the proposal so that it could go to the administration for input.
Some of the discussion of the proposal focused on the administration. Jim Carew said that the administration should not be able to mandate changes to the document, only to propose changes. Mr. Mignone expressed his desire that the faculty and administration would work together on the document. When Tom Baginski and Andrew Sobiesuo asked if full-time administrators with faculty rank would be covered by the proposal, Mr. Mignone referred to explanatory notes for Performance Indicator II, C indicating that the Post-Tenure Review may exclude administrators. Mr. Sobiesuo argued that administrators who have faculty rank and tenure should be subject to the post-tenure review. Richard Nunan pointed out that the proposal from the Ad-hoc Committee does include the administration [See item 10].

Herb Silverman voiced his concern about the autonomy that the proposal gives to the Post-Tenure Review Committee without department input, especially in regard to research that members of the Committee may be unfamiliar with. Mr. Nunan said that colleague letters could be added to the review process.

A lengthy discussion centered around the requirements for a superior rating. Mr. Nunan observed that the legislature has mandated that a superior rating carry a financial reward, though this might now be termed an “unfunded mandate.” Both Mr. Nunan and the Speaker acknowledged the presumption that the majority of reviews would receive a satisfactory rating. Mr. Silverman asked if an associate professor who received a superior rating would be eligible for promotion to full professor.

Expressing his dissatisfaction with the quantifying of research in the proposal, Bishop Hunt moved the following change in wording to 3, a, ii of the document: “continuing quality scholarship, including copies of at least two articles published in peer-refereed professional journals” with “continuing peer-reviewed published scholarship of high quality.” Members of the ad-hoc committee emphasized the need to maintain consistency with the Faculty/Administration Manual. Frank Morris spoke against such consistency and voiced his disappointment that the Ad-hoc Committee did not take a broad view of what might constitute a superior rating and instead let the current promotion criteria with emphasis on publication define terms of the post-tenure review. Mr. Nunan stressed the Ad-hoc Committee’s belief that the post-tenure review needed clearly defined standards for the Post-tenure Review Committee to follow and that the Manual would have to be changed before the post-tenure review criteria could be changed. Mr. Hunt’s motion failed.

When Lynne Ford suggested that the document should go back to the Ad-hoc Committee next year, Mr. Mignone responded that the Welfare Committee is the committee charged with matters such as these; the Ad-hoc Committee was formed because the Welfare Committee was overburdened with work this year. In addition, Mr. Mignone thinks it a good idea for the post-tenure review to be discussed by two committees.
To questions about final decisions on the document, the Speaker replied that the Faculty can only recommend. The document will go to the Provost, then to the President, and finally to the Board of Trustees.

The Post-Tenure Proposal passed unchanged but with the following conditions:

1. The document will go next to the administration for review;
2. In September, 1998, the document, along with any input from the administration, will go to the Welfare Committee;
3. The Welfare Committee will
   a) attempt to reconcile input from the administration with the document passed by the Senate,
   b) check to make sure the document is in compliance with the “Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review” and “Best Practices for Performance Review” as established by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, and then
   c) present the various parts of the document as motions to the Senate sometime during the fall semester (some as motions to change the by-laws and others as motions to change or add to the Faculty/Administration Manual).

The Speaker suggested that the Welfare Committee might have a faculty forum before the motions are voted on.

At 6:37 the Speaker asked for a motion of continuance. The second session of the April Senate meeting will convene at 5:00 p.m. on April 21.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary