March 2, 1999

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The seventh regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:06 p.m. on Tuesday, March 2 in ECTR 116, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Forty-one senators attended. Minutes of the February 2 meeting were approved.

Reports

Trisha Folds-Bennett reported that the Long-Range Planning Committee will soon name members of working groups. She also announced that the spring meeting of the full faculty will take place on May 3.

Bob Mignone reported that four members of the Council of South Carolina University Chairs met with the Senate Finance Committee to argue for more funds for higher education. CHE has requested $63 million in new appropriations and reallocation of $39 million of non-recurring funds to recurring funds.

New Business

• For the Academic Standards Committee, Brian Scholtens made a motion for change academic processes and policy for College of Charleston students in Study Abroad Programs:

  • That the process for application and approval of international programs used by College of Charleston students be handled by the Office of International Studies with oversight of approved programs by the Undergraduate Studies Office and the Academic Standards Committee
  • That all international programs be treated as transfer credit with only grades of C or better accepted.

The motion passed.
• For the By-Laws Committee Bishop Hunt moved two By-Laws changes presented below with narrative from the committee.

1. THE BUDGET COMMITTEE: change in duties

At the January 19 meeting of the Senate, the Budget Committee suggested changing the description of its duties by adding the following:

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.

The By-Laws Committee proposes a minor clarification in this language:

To review in particular the projected costs of proposals for new College programs and initiatives, and to inform the Senate, before these proposals are put to a vote, of the Committee's evaluation of their potential budgetary impact.

The paragraph in question (Article V, Section 2, Part B, Paragraph 2.b., on p. 42 of the newly-released Manual) would then read as follows, with the change underlined:

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 costs of proposals for new College programs and initiatives, and to inform the Senate, before these proposals are put to a vote, of the Committee's evaluation of their potential budgetary impact. 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.

The motion passed.
2. POST TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE: Composition, Duties

The first two paragraphs of the Revised Post-Tenure Review Proposal, as amended and passed by the Senate on February 2, 1999 state that:

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.

These instructions would seem to be "open and shut," leaving us no choice but to adopt strictly the existing language of the By-Laws that apply to The Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review, set out in Article V, Section 3 ("Standing College Committees"), Part 7, paragraph a. ("Composition") and b. ("Duties"), pp. 47-48.

The new committee would become no. 15 in the list of Standing College Committees:

15. Post-Tenure Review Committee

a. Composition:

(1) Five tenured faculty members. Five tenured alternates will also be elected. ("The Provost will serve as an ex officio non-voting member of the committee," deleted.)

(2) No faculty member holding either a full-time administrative or part-time administrative position which is connected with the tenure and review process, or serving as dean or department chair, may serve on this committee.

(3) No member of this committee may participate in any school or departmental evaluation panel for tenure and promotion; review except those conducted in her or his school or department.

(4) No member of this committee may participate in a review involving a faculty member of her or his department.
(5) Upon disqualification of a member or members from a [add: "post-tenure"] review, the Chair of the committee shall complete its composition by drawing lots from among the alternates.

b. Duties:

(1) To conduct all institutional-level post-tenure reviews (excluding promotions) which fall during its term of office.

When Mary Beth Heston asked why the membership of the Post-Tenure Review Committee was not made according to schools, Mr. Hunt the By-Laws Committee approves or recommends only the phrasing of By-Laws changes approved by the Senate. Bob Mignone suggested that in the future the Senate should consider changing the structure of both the Post-Tenure Review and the Promotion and Tenure Committees to insure representation from all schools.

The motion passed.

The By-Laws Committee also recommended placement in the Manual of the Post-Tenure Review passed by the Senate.

3. POST TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE: Procedures

In order to stay parallel with the long-standing arrangement of the Manual, Paragraphs 3-10 of the Revised Post-Tenure Review Proposal, as amended and passed by the Senate on February 2, should be renumbered 1-8, and placed in Section IV ("Institutional Policies, Regulations, and Procedures"), presumably right after the "Procedures for the Third Year Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty" (pp. 95-102), which is currently designated as Section M.

Technically, Section IV is not part of the By-Laws, so the Senate is in the position of merely recommending this arrangement to the Administration:

N. PROCEDURES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND LIBRARY FACULTY [subsequent sections, presently numbered N, O, etc., to be renumbered by one alphabetical letter, as O, P, etc.]

1. 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...

[The full text of the Post-Tenure Review is included with the minutes of February 2; the text with renumbered paragraphs is attached to the Secretary’s copy of these minutes.]
Constituents' Concerns

Rick Heldrich questioned why the faculty was never asked to approve the Senate structure of faculty governance after the initial three years as called for in the proposal to establish a Senate. Bob Mignone replied that the third-year review was part of an early draft of the proposal but intentionally not included in the final proposal that the faculty approved. According to Bishop Hunt, the “framers” of the Senate intended to have a sunset clause. When Mr. Mignone pointed out that the Senate could be abolished by a 2/3 vote of the faculty, Mr. Heldrich replied that he was asking for a vote of affirmation from the faculty. Some discussion followed about a procedure for the Senate to request faculty affirmation, but Phil Jos argued that a sunset clause calling for such affirmation was not in the proposal to establish a Senate passed by the faculty.

Franklin Ashley asked if there will be more discussion of Post-Tenure Review. The Speaker noted that any Senate action can be vetoed at a special meeting of the faculty. She added that the faculty will be asked to approve the Post-Tenure Review Committee and that a suggestion had been made earlier in the meeting to review the structure of the committee. Tom Baginski asked about the next step now that our proposal has been sent to Columbia. Mr. Mignone replied that Eileen Trainer at CHE is evaluating all post-tenure reviews with a checklist based on the Best Practices document, and each institution’s performance funding for one of the 37 indicators will be based on compliance. After praising the committees working on our post-tenure review for their care in crafting our proposal to meet the criteria set by CHE, he reminded the Senate that post-tenure review was established as a way to guard against calls to abolish tenure and that the Performance Indicators, now officially in place, can be abolished only by another law.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary