January 19, 1999

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fifth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:08 on Tuesday, January 19 in Maybank 100, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Forty-three senators attended. Minutes of the December 1 meeting were approved.

Reports

The Speaker reported that the most recent revision of the Proposal for General Education will be circulated within the next two days. She then outlined the charges she has given to five committees to review specific components of the proposal. The Speaker asked committees to be mindful of the whole proposal while focusing on specific components and, in their reviews, to summarize both strengths and weaknesses of the proposal.

Committee charges are as follows:

Curriculum Committee (deadline: Friday, February 12 to John Newell)
- review the Introduction to the Liberal Arts and Sciences course. The committee is asked to comment on the course using the same criteria of judgment used for any specific course review
- overall review of the impact the changes in general education requirements might have on other curricular issues and degree requirements
- review of the General Education Committee's responsibilities. The committee is charged with consideration of the responsibilities of the General Education Committee, particularly responsibilities that may overlap with or conflict with the responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee. Furthermore, the committee is asked to make suggestions regarding the coordination of duties between the General Education Committee and the Curriculum Committee.

Budget Committee (deadline: Friday, February 12 to John Newell)
- review of the budgetary impact of the entire proposal. This review should be accomplished in coordination with the Business Affairs and Academic Affairs offices. Particularly, the committee should examine resource allocations and reallocations made necessary by the Introduction to Liberal Arts course, the thematic cluster courses, and the General Education Committee.
Faculty Welfare Committee (deadline: Friday, February 12 to John Newell)

- review of impact on faculty work environment (workload, flexibility, responsibility to departmental curriculum vs. general education curriculum, commitment to majors vs. nonmajors, research time) brought about by changes in the general education requirements. Particularly, the committee should examine the Introduction to Liberal Arts and Sciences course, the global perspectives requirement, the writing intensive requirement, and the thematic cluster requirement.

Assessment Committee (deadline: Friday, February 12 to John Newell)

- Review of the proposal from the perspective of efficacy assessment. Particularly, the committee is asked to report to faculty how an assessment plan might be used to make decisions about the adoption of new general education requirements and how assessment data might be used in the future to make decisions about the continuation of the program. The committee is asked to address specifically the Introduction to Liberal Arts and Sciences course, the thematic cluster requirement, the global perspectives requirement, the writing intensive requirement, and the proposed changes in distribution requirements.

Academic Planning Committee (deadline: Monday, March 1 to Trisha Folds-Bennett)

- receiving the recommendations from the Curriculum, Budget, Faculty Welfare, and Assessment Committees and integrating them into the General Education Program Proposal
- ensuring that the final proposal is coherent, efficient, and well-justified
- sending the proposal to the Senate for review and vote

According to the proposed time line, the Academic Planning Committee (John Newell, Chair) will present the proposal to the Senate on April 6. The Senate will consider the proposal on April 6 and continue discussion, if necessary, on April 27.

(Note: If the Senate votes on the proposal on April 6, the full faculty will be asked to endorse, amend, or veto Senate action at the faculty meeting scheduled for April 19. If the Senate does not vote until April 27, the faculty meeting will be rescheduled for May 3.)

New Business

- For the Committee on Graduate Education, June Mirecki moved the following courses and change in admission requirements. All five motions passed.

- New Courses: ECON 520 Managerial Economics (3); SMFT 555 Applications of Physics for Teachers: How Things Work (4); SMFT 647 Determination of the Structure of Matter: Analytical Tools Employed Across the Science Curriculum (4); SMFT 697 Special Topics in Science or Mathematics for Teachers (1-4)
• Change in Admission Requirements for the Master of Science in Environmental Studies (MES):
  1. One junior/senior graduate level course in applied statistics
  2. In order to be able to fully understand environmental issues, students must have exposure to basic sciences—including laboratory work. Ideally students should have undergraduate coursework in biology or chemistry. However, the admissions committee recognizes that some students with exceptional backgrounds and training in other areas—either another science or social science—may wish to enter the program. These students are encouraged to apply and will be considered on a case-by-case basis but should understand that they may be required to take one or more additional science courses.

• For the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics. Scooter Barnette moved the following:

The Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics would like to recommend that the degree certificate (diploma) contain the name of the students’ majors. If the students were to have two majors, then we would recommend that he/she receive two diplomas.

Some senators and Undergraduate Dean Bill Lindstrom spoke against a proliferation of diplomas. Presently students receive two diplomas only if they are awarded two degrees (BA and BS)

Kem Fronabarger amended the motion as follows: “If students have two majors and one degree, both majors will be printed on the diploma.” The amendment passed.

Some discussion of the main motion focused on the reason for majors being included on diplomas. Ms. Barnette reported that the Student Government Association, which brought the resolution to the Student Affairs Committee, argued that including the major on the diploma would help foreign companies and universities participating in exchange programs because transcripts are very difficult to translate. Alpha Bah agreed about the difficulty with transcripts but added that letters of recommendation carry far more weight. Both he and Rich Bodek pointed out that a major in many other countries means a much more concentrated program of studies than the thirty-six hours typical of our majors. For that reason, including the major on a College of Charleston diploma would not accurately reflect the nature of a liberal arts degree.

To questions from Marion Doig and Bill Moore about common practice, Ms. Barnette answered that the Registrar had surveyed eight institutions in the Southeast about their practice and found that most four-year institutions do not include students’ majors on their diplomas. The main motion failed.
• For the Academic Standards Committee, Brian Scholtens moved that the following be added to the math/logic alternatives policy to keep it in line with the foreign languages alternatives policy:

   Exceptions/Substitutions:
   A. No course taken as an alternative to the math/logic requirement may also be used to satisfy a major or minor requirement without approval of the major or minor department.
   B. No course taken as a part of any other general degree requirements may also satisfy a part of the math/logic alternative program.

The motion passed.

• For the Budget Committee, Bill Olejniczak requested and received Senate approval to send the following change in By-Laws to the By-Laws Committee, a change that refines the Budget Committee’s duties:

Proposed changes to Article V., Section 2, Part B2b Budget Committee Duties (Sentence which would be added is in bold)

To review College policies relating to long-range financial planning, budget preparation, and the allocation of funds within budget categories, and to recommend policy changes.
To review in particular the projected cost estimates for proposals of new College programs and initiatives, and forward to the Faculty Senate, when the proposals come to the floor for a vote, its recommendations concerning the potential budgetary impact of the proposals. To review each annual College budget. The Chair of the Budget Committee or her or his representative shall attend meetings of the budget Committee of the Board of Trustees

Constituents' Concerns

Bishop Hunt read the following resolution, drafted by Susan Morrison, commending Bill King for his contributions to the College.

WHEREAS Bill King has, for twenty-three years, regularly coached College of Charleston swimming teams to outstanding performances;

AND WHEREAS Bill King has selflessly and unceasingly promoted swimming by the entire College community through his directorship of the Stern Center Pool and his credit and non-credit offerings of swimming courses;
AND WHEREAS Bill King, throughout his career at the College of Charleston, and without being required to do so, has routinely monitored the academic progress of the students on the swim team and insisted that they place a priority on their academics;

AND WHEREAS the swim team has consistently had a commendable team grade point average;

AND WHEREAS Bill King has vigorously supported students in their pursuit of post-Baccalaureate educational programs and career goals;

AND WHEREAS Bill King is a coach who truly understands the meaning of the term, "student athlete;"

We, the College of Charleston Senate, on behalf of the entire Faculty, wish to thank Bill King for his long-standing and outstanding service to the College, and especially for his dedication to the academic mission of the institution.

At the request of the Speaker, Parliamentarian George Pothering reviewed some of Robert’s Rules as the Senate prepares to discuss the proposals for General Education and Post-Tenure Review.

Bob Mignone reminded the Senate that the Proposal for Post-Tenure Review must be sent to CHE by February 15, or the College could lose as much as 3% of its budget for failing to comply with the scheduled implementation of a Performance Indicator. When Idee Winfield said that she has a list of questions from her department about the review, the Speaker assured her and others that the agenda for the February 2 meeting would be cleared to allow time for discussion of the proposal.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary