December 7, 1999

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fourth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate (and the last of the century) convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, December 7 in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (November 2, 1999) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett reported briefly that a number of students have been unwisely persuaded to sign up for credit-cards which they cannot afford, by agents sent to generate business on campus. As a result, there will shortly be a policy in place to deal with such on-campus solicitations, and when it is ready it will be posted in various conspicuous places.

New Business

- Clyde Metz presented a series of motions from the Curriculum Committee. The first group had originally been intended for the November meeting, and was approved as circulated:

  1. F99006a GEOL 212 / 212-L New Course - Mineralogy (with Lab., 4hrs.)
  2. F99004 GEOL BS Degree Change
  3. F99028 GEOL BS Degree Change
  4. F99005 GEOL BA Degree Change
  5. F99029 GEOL BA Degree Change
  6. F99030 GEOL 208 Course Deletion
  7. F99008 GEOL 209 Course Deletion
  8. F99009 CHEMBS Degree Change
  9. F99010 BIOCHEM BS Degree Change
  10. F99011 CHEMBA Degree Change
  11. F99014 CHEM 491 Course Deletion
  12. F99021 CSCI 130 New Course - Visual Basic for Applications (3)
  13. F99024 SPAN BA Degree Change
  14. F99025 SPAN 444 Course Change
     SPAN 445 Course Change
     SPAN 446 Course Change
In addition, information was supplied concerning the following Special Topics courses:

15. F99026  BIOL 502  Special Topics–FY1
16. F99027  BIOL 503  Special Topics–FY1

A second set of motions was introduced, and approved in turn. In the brief discussion, Richard Nunan commented that the supporting materials from the Computer Science Department included in Senators' packets -- between seventy and eighty pages -- seemed unnecessarily lengthy, and Hugh Wilder was concerned about what might happen two years from now when grant funding for LACS 300, in the program for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, ran out.

1. F99017a  CSCI 110  New Course - Computing Concepts and Applications (3hrs.)
2. F99018a  CSCI 112  New Course - Communications Technology and The Internet (3)
3. F99019a  CSCI 114  New Course - Electronic Publishing and Design (3)
4. F99020a  CSCI 116  New Course - Data Organization and Management (3)
5. F99032  CSCI 440  New Course - Computer Networks (3)
6. F99041  CSCI 101  Course Deletion
7. F99042  CSCI 102  Course Deletion
8. F99043  CSCI 103  Course Deletion
9. F99044  CSCI 104  Course Deletion
10. F99031  ENGL  Minor Change
11. F99033  SPAN 220  Course Change
12. F99034  ARTH 319  Course Change
13. F99035  ARTH 415  Course Change
14. F99036  LACS 103  New Course - Intro. to Contemporary Cuba (3)
15. F99037  LACS 104  New Course - Intro. to Contemporary Chile (3)
16. F99038  LACS 200  New Course - Special Topics in LACS (3)
17. F99039  LACS 300  New Course - Special Topics in LACS (3)
18. F99040  LACS 400  New Course - Independent Study in LACS (1-3)

For the Committee on Graduate Education and Special Programs, Gary Harrison put forward a series of course proposals, including several items held over from the previous meeting. All were approved.

New Courses:

EDFS 703- Curriculum, Policy and Systems in Science and Math. Education (3)
ENGL 535 - African American Literature (3)
INTR 604 - Sign Translation (3)
PUBA 620 - Local Government Politics and Administration (3)
PUBA 632 / EVSS 632 - Environmental Politics (3)
PUBA 633 / EVSS 633 - Urban Planning (3)
PUBA 640 - Leadership and Decision-making (3)
SMFT 516 - Applications Across the Math. Curriculum with Technology (3)
SMFT 518 - Applications of Calculus for Teachers (3)

Changed Courses:
EVSS 641 - Aqueous Geochemistry
EVSS 602 / PUBA 602 - Public Policy Process
PUBA 601 - Government Data Sources and Analysis
PUBA 608 - Administrative Ethics and Accountability

Deleted Courses:
INTR 605 - Interpretation Theory and Practice
PUBA 510 - Computers in Government
PUBA 610 - Man and the City
PUBA 621 - Quantitative Methods

Richard Nunn then formally introduced his proposal to change the requirements for obtaining a “superior” rating at the time of Post-Tenure Review. His motion was to:

Ignore implication of language governing nature of evidence & review for superior rating. The only appropriate difference between a satisfactory packet & a superior packet should instead involve the inclusion of professional publications produced (or forthcoming), since the last review, plus documentation of a serious peer-reviewing process for at least two of these publications.

He briefly reviewed the rationale for this proposal, and then added two comments. First, in response to Caroline Hunt’s objections voiced at the last meeting, that his proposal seemed to favor “research” over “teaching,” and that this would be unwise at an institution whose primary mission is teaching, Mr. Nunn pointed out that his real purpose was to simplify an elaborate process which had been designed at a time when it was assumed that significant financial rewards would be available for faculty earning a “superior” rating. Since this was obviously no longer the case, it made sense to abbreviate the process as much as possible. Faculty wishing a merely satisfactory reading would not, under his proposal, need to do anything differently than they would have done before. Secondly, he thought that his proposal should come into effect immediately, before the first Post-Tenure Review packets had to be completed.
Robert Migneone said that, as he understood the proposal, its intent was to streamline the process and minimize the faculty effort involved. It did not change the fact that in general, only Full Professors would qualify for a superior rating. Julia Eichelberger agreed that it would be in the best interests of all concerned to minimize the process, and she supported the motion. Both Phil Jos and Hugh Wilder expressed some ambivalence, however, about the emphasis on research possibly turning the evaluation process into a mere check-list. Mr. Wilder felt strongly that any area of exemplary performance, including teaching and service, as well as research, should qualify a faculty member for a superior post-tenure review. Larry Carlson and Lynn Cherry both said they approved of Hugh Wilder’s statement. George Pothering thought that we should do away with the “superior” rating altogether, since it does seem to emphasize research at the expense of teaching. Robert Migneone pointed out, on the other hand, that “teaching” now forms an important criterion of evaluation for all post-tenure reviews, superior and not-so-superior alike; Mr. Nunan’s proposal would not change this. James Carew said that, since the Administration had plainly reneged on its commitment to provide real financial rewards for excellence, all candidates ought receive a “superior” rating; the process did not matter any more.

At this point, John Newell moved to amend Richard Nunan’s proposal by devising a substitute motion based on Hugh Wilder’s suggestion that exemplary teaching, and exemplary service, should also be acceptable criteria for a superior rating. Mr. Wilder phrased it this way:

Additional criteria for candidate seeking “superior”: Must also furnish
clear evidence of exemplary performance in at least one of the following
areas: teaching (professional competence in the case of librarians),
scholarship, and service.

Mr. Migneone noted that if we did this, we might have to submit the whole Post-Tenure Review document for re-approval. Brian Scholtens said this involved too big a change to be called a “substitute”; it was really an alternative. Nunan’s proposal was about “evidence,” while Wilder’s was about “standards.” After several suggestions that the whole matter be remanded to the Faculty Welfare Committee, Kem Fronabarger so moved. The motion to remand both proposals passed, on a voice vote.

Faye Steuer then introduced the following motion:

That the Senate direct the Faculty Welfare Committee to consider the
implications and to make recommendation(s) concerning the current Post-
Tenure Review policy that requires a panel of three tenured department
members to evaluate a department chair who is undergoing post-tenure
review.

The reason for the motion, she said, was that under current policy chairs are to be evaluated by a small, non-anonymous panel of department members who are themselves subject to regular evaluations by that chair. This could create subtle but real pressures on panel members to acquiesce to the chair’s preferences regarding his or her desire for a ‘satisfactory’ or ‘superior’ rating. In addition, current policy specifies that a chair undergoing post-tenure review will include in his or her packet the dean’s annual evaluations of that chair. In the
past, faculty members have not typically been privy to deans’ evaluations of chairs, and the
wisdom of effecting this tacit change in policy should be considered.

In the discussion, James Carew asked what good would it do? Besides, he liked the idea of
seeing the Deans’ evaluations of department chairs. Deanna Caveny, however, said this could
be very awkward because sometime these evaluations touch on delicate personnel matters
within departments, and on the chair’s ability to handle such issues; she supported the
motion. It passed, on a voice vote.

Trisha Folds-Bennett introduced David Mann to report the recommendations of the
Senate By-Laws Committee on the proposed CHANGES IN THE FACULTY-
ADMINISTRATION MANUAL introduced at the November meeting by the Tenure &
Promotion Committee (the “Lesses T&P proposals”), voted on at that time by the Senate, and
forwarded to the By-Laws Committee for any necessary textual adjustment. The Speaker
noted that two of the Committee’s recommendations, concerning Items IV and VII, which
Mr. Mann was proposing to change substantially, clearly involved making more than mere
verbal adjustments to the text – but that the duties of the Senate By-Laws Committee, as
spelled out in the By-Laws themselves, apparently do not preclude such a procedure,
especially in matters of importance. She said that she had also discussed with George
Pothering, the Parliamentarian, the concept of a motion to rescind, a procedure not yet used
by the Senate, but plainly described in Robert’s Rules of Order. A motion to rescind can be
made by any person or committee within a legislative session (i.e., an academic year, in our
case). Such a motion prohibits debate on changing the substance of the original motion; if
passed, it simply undoes (cancels) the original vote. In addition, the rescinded motion cannot
be brought up again, by anyone or for any reason, until the next legislative session (i.e., the
next academic year).

Mr. Mann then introduced the recommendations of the By-Laws Committee one by one; the
results may be summarized as follows. Actions taken at the November 2 meeting are
underlined, and in parentheses; actions taken at the December 7 meeting are listed in
square brackets and underlined twice:

I. Comments Portion of Student Evaluations (passed) [accepted, with change in wording]:

If it is a department’s policy to require the inclusion of the comments
portion of the student ratings, the department must develop .
 .
 .
 .
 rather than: If faculty in a department require the inclusion .
 .
 .
 .

II. Recent Graduate Letters (passed) [accepted, with change in wording]:

When a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than
twenty-five recent graduates, the department chair should so indicate.
rather than: In cases where a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than twenty-five recent graduates, the department chair should indicate that this has occurred. . . .

III. Content of Transmittal Letters (passed as AMENDED) [accepted, with change in wording]:

Add to page 99, M.7. (1st paragraph, before the last sentence):

While maintaining the confidentiality of any meetings, the statement will summarize the discussion that took place . . . .

rather than: ( . . . following the last sentence):

Each panel should write a letter, which while maintaining the confidentiality of any meetings, summarizes all of the discussion that takes place . . . .

IV. Department Chair Colleague Letters (passed) [rejected by the By-Laws Committee and RESCINDED by the Senate, on a voice vote]

V. Continuing Review of Senior Instructors (passed) [accepted, with a "typo" corrected]:

Thereafter, Senior Instructors will be reviewed every fifth year for continuation of employment according to the process outlined above.

rather than: Thereafter, Senior Instructors will be reviewed every fifth year for continuation of employment according the process outlined above.

VI. [Change in] Prof. Development Requirement for Senior Instructors (DEFEATED) [accepted, i.e., the previous defeat was agreeable to the By-Laws Committee and upheld by the Senate]

VII. External Peer Evaluation (passed as AMENDED) [rejected by the By-Laws Committee, but in effect UPHELD by the Senate after a motion to rescind failed]

Not surprisingly, most of the discussion focused on the last item, the motion to rescind the requirement for outside letters of evaluation. Richard Nunan felt such a motion was simply not in order, and not within the allowable duties of the By-Laws Committee, since it involved substantive change. Kem Fronabarger said he understood this feeling – but the motion had not been remanded to the By-Laws Committee before the November Senate vote (which he thought should have been done), so the Committee had to do it this way. Robert Mignone opposed the whole idea of a motion to rescind. This, he said, was the first time such a procedure had ever been used by the faculty, and it would appear to be inconsistent with
our parliamentary history. Invoking it is like being on a train and pulling the emergency stop bar, and it might, he said, lead to a serious undermining of our governmental structure. Both Phil Jos and Hugh Wilder also spoke against the motion to rescind. It would cut off debate drastically and absolutely, Mr. Wilder said -- and besides, this was not a real emergency. Julia Eichelberger asked how the basic issues involved could continue to be discussed, now that the Senate (in November) had endorsed the idea of requiring outside evaluation letters. The Speaker replied that a motion to reconsider would be in order (but would have to come from someone who had supported the winning side in November) -- or, a Special Meeting of the full faculty could debate the merits of the original motion, and conceivably veto it, as the faculty had done last spring with the General Education proposal.

Finally the question was called, and in the event, the motion to rescind Item VII (outside letters of evaluation) failed, on a voice vote.

Stephanie Low proposed:

That the Faculty Senate consider changing the last date students can withdraw without penalty to occur one week after midterm grades are posted.

She explained that the date we have now was set by the faculty themselves, and she provided a brief history. In the 1979-80 academic year, midterm was the last day to drop without penalty. By the mid-to-late 1980’s, 4 weeks into the semester had become the last day to drop. The thinking was that students do not "commit" to a course until there is no way out—and so, "the sooner the better." Later (after a student uprising), the date was moved to 6 weeks into the semester as a compromise date. A motion to forward this proposal to the Academic Standards Committee was seconded and passed.

Robert Mignone introduced the following motion, which was quickly seconded and passed:

The following questionnaire is to be administered to all roster faculty in order to survey their opinions about General Education. The results will be reported to the Senate at the February meeting:

1. Do you think the College of Charleston’s General Education Curriculum requirement should be changed? (Yes No)

2. If the College of Charleston were to consider changes in its General Education Curriculum, how do you think we might proceed? [check one]

   Begin with a critical reappraisal of the current requirements.

   Begin with a critical reappraisal of the April 1999 General Education Proposal.
(3) If you have any other comments or observations on this issue, please add them in the space provided.

Constituents' Concerns & Adjournment

The Speaker requested the next meeting occur on January 18, 2000, and the deadline for the agenda on January 11; without objection, it was so ordered. With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:45.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary

*****

Spring 2000 Senate Meetings
(Tuesdays at 5:00 o'clock in ECTR 116):
January 18, February 8, March 14, April 4 (second session April 18, if nec.)

Spring Faculty Meeting:
(Monday at 5:00 o'clock in Physicians' Memorial Auditorium)
April 24, 2000