October 3, 2000

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The second regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 3, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty-three senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (September 5) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett reported that Mr. Joel Smith, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, would be able to join the meeting in a few minutes, and would, she understood, have something to say about faculty participation in the search for the next president of the College. The Search Committee had not, in fact, been appointed yet. She also believed that Mr. Smith was concerned about the risk of specifying the qualifications of prospective candidates in such detail ahead of time that it might have the effect of "foreclosing our options."

On other matters: the Speaker said that the Office of Academic Affairs was working on a new policy for compensating Senior Instructors. She also urged faculty to try out the new software involving "PIN" numbers for gaining access to SIS (the Student Information System). Parents would be visiting the campus on the weekend of October 6-7, and a special celebration was planned for the opening of the College of Charleston Athletics Complex at Patriots' Point, on October 26. On the "copyright" issue raised at the start of the academic year: the administration had decided that it was not necessary, at this point, to formulate a specific policy-statement, but faculty should pay attention to the legal ramifications of possible copyright infringement in compiling course hand-outs, and so on.

Assessment Committee

Susan Kattwinkel reported that, in response to a request coming originally from the Office of Institutional Planning and Assessment, the general education subcommittee of last year's Faculty Committee on the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness had chosen the Educational Testing Service's "Academic Profile Test" as a way of finding out if the College's current General
Education Program is effective. Accordingly, a pilot program employing this instrument was initiated during the past summer, using participants in the Freshman Seminar program. The testing had not worked very well to begin with, but when completed, it would eventually involve about 600 students, and these students will be “followed up” with further testing in two years. One senator asked why the pilot program had not worked during the summer. The answer was that the students, for some reason, did not seem to be interested in participating.

New Business

Before turning to the business of the Curriculum Committee, the Speaker noted that from now on senators would receive a somewhat abbreviated packet, with parts of the lengthy supporting documentation for new courses and programs being left out. This would save paper and make the packets less unwieldy. A complete copy of these proposals would, of course, be available for inspection at the Secretariat in Maybank Hall. Caroline Hunt asked if it would still be possible for senators to receive the full packet if they wished. The answer was yes, and a roll-call sheet was circulated for those wishing to sign up for the complete version.

At this point, Mr. Joel Smith arrived, and the floor was turned over to him. (President Sanders came in with him, and sat in the front row—acting “as his lawyer,” he said.). Mr. Smith pointed out that his duty to help choose the next president of the College was important and almost frightening, because so much depended on it. Getting the wrong person for the job could have devastating consequences, not only “externally” but “internally” as well. (We had all seen what happened at a sister institution when the president turned out to be unable to get along with his faculty.) First and foremost, he was deeply concerned about having people trust the basic integrity of the selection process itself. There might at this point be questions that, as head of the Board of Trustees, he could not or ought not to answer, but this would not be because he was trying to be evasive. He felt it was both appropriate and important, at least for now, to keep his own personal views—about desirable qualifications for candidates, for example—to himself. The Presidential Search Committee had not been set up yet, and he did not want to appear to be dictating to other members of the Board.

One matter had been decided, however. This time, there would be at least three faculty representatives on the Committee—one more than at the time of the previous presidential search. Like most executive searches, the process would have three parts: the search for candidates (conducted by the Search Committee), the screening of the candidates (conducted by the Board), and the actual decision to select the next President. For now, suggestions are absolutely welcome. Anyone can get in touch with any member of the Board to suggest a name. In all, he expected somewhere around three hundred nominees. That would be whittled down to perhaps ten or fifteen “finalists,” and from there to a small handful who would actually be interviewed. He assured the faculty that there are no candidates whom he, as of now, would vote for. The faculty have, he said, both the right and the obligation to offer opinions and information to the Search Committee—and to any member of the Committee, not just to the faculty representatives serving on it. Above all, it was important for the whole community to trust the process. It would be a good process—he promised. He then asked if anyone had questions.
Hugh Wilder was recognized, and thanked Mr. Smith for coming. The mere act of attending the meeting, Mr. Wilder said, is a real help in gaining the trust of the faculty: “You have done a lot already.”

Mr. Smith returned the compliment. “The consumers of your services,” as he put it, are deeply impressed with the quality and achievements of the faculty of the College.

James Deavor then asked how soon faculty representatives would be chosen for the Search Committee. The answer was, probably by about the first of November. Mr. Smith said that he had invited the Speaker of the Faculty to serve on this committee, and also former President of the College Theodore Stern. Richard Nunan wanted to know how many individuals, all told, would be on the committee. Mr. Smith said that the Board intended to identify various “constituencies” for representation, and that the final number would probably be about twelve people, give or take two or so. He thanked the senate, and headed off to another commitment, but with a warm round of applause as he left.

The Speaker then discussed procedures for choosing faculty representatives. She said that the Committee on Nominations and Elections, in accordance with our By-Laws, would come up with a slate and conduct the election. Joel Smith, she said, wanted the senate to provide a list of names, from which the Board would then select two faculty members (in addition to the Speaker) to serve. There was some talk about holding a Special Called Meeting for the election, until it was realized that the next regularly-scheduled meeting, October 31, would be in time for the November 1 target date that Mr. Smith had mentioned.

Robert Mignone, speaking from the sidelines, asked permission to comment, and this was granted. The Senate, he said, should offer some positive guidance to the Nominations Committee as to how, and how many, candidates should be put forward. David Gentry said that nominations should be solicited from the entire faculty, not just from the senate. Reid Wiseman brought up, with a certain irony, the issue of “trust,” and suggested that we simply offer two names, not a whole list for the Board to pick over and choose from. We know which faculty members we trust probably better than the Board does. Would it be useful to distribute the e-mail addresses of Board members, so that we could tell them? Mr. Mignone insisted that the faculty should stick to its ground and follow standard nominating procedures for choosing our own “representation.” Mr. Gentry wondered whether the Board had a target date for choosing the next president. Not as far as she knew, the Speaker answered.

**New Business (cont.)**

Lynn Cherry then introduced several motions from the Curriculum Committee, which passed, without change and may be summarized as follows:

- S00055 - HIST 364 New Course: Sugar and Slaves in Colonial Brazil (3hrs.)
- S00056 - HIST 365 New Course: Modern Brazil (3)
- S00057 - HIST 285 New Course: The Indian Subcontinent since 1500 (3)
S00060 - HIST 265 New Course: [The] Caribbean Since 1800 (3)
S00061 - HIST 264 New Course: [The] Caribbean to 1800 (3)
S00066 - COMM 231 New Course: Journalism Practicum (1)
S00078 - PHIL 240 New Course: Jewish Philosophy (3) (cross-listed with JWST 240)
S00079 - JWST 240 New Course: Jewish Philosophy (3) (cross-listed with PHIL 240)
S00084 - RELS 360 New Course: Myth, Ritual & Symbol (3)
S00085 - Communication Courses for Humanities Credit:

F00002 - HEAL 317 Course Change
F00003 - PEHD 399 Course Change
F00004 - PEHD 430 Course Change
F00005 - PEHD 431 Course Change
F00006 - PEHD 437 Course Change
F00007 - PEHD 440 Course Change
F00008 - PEHD 458 Course Change
F00010 - ASST 101 New Course: Introduction to Asian Studies
F00011 - Asian Studies Minor

FOR INFORMATION ONLY:

COMM 334 / ENGL 334 - Technical Writing -- Change of Designation
HIST 330 (ST) - The Medieval and Renaissance City
HIST 360 (ST) - A Survey of Early and Modern West African History
PHYS 298 (ST) - Physics of Music

For the Committee on Graduate and Continuing Education, Rohn England moved the following:

SMFT 645 New Course: The Physics of Force and Motion for Teachers (4hrs.)

This passed. (A second motion from the Graduate Committee, concerning a Change of Grade for Student Teaching, was postponed, so that it could be discussed along with a similar motion from the undergraduate Curriculum Committee, at a later date.)
Kem Fronabarger then introduced recommendations from the By-Laws Committee concerning the wording of two Motions to Change the By-Laws that had been made at the April 4, 2000 meeting, the previous spring. These verbal recommendations were, in turn, amended and passed, as follows [Secretary's note: the numbering of the Technology Committee has been changed from 15 to 16, to take into account the recent addition of the Post-Tenure Review Committee to the list of Standing Committees]:

MOTION TO AMEND THE BY-LAWS, (No. 1)

(The By-Laws Committee has reviewed the motion presented by Professor Stephanie Low and recommends the following changes for consideration by the Senate.)

That the Faculty Senate establish a standing committee on Educational Technology, so that the By-Laws will read:

Article V. Committees
Section 3. Standing College Committees
B. The following standing College committees are established:
16. Committee on Educational Technology
a. Composition: Seven faculty members and one student. [amendment suggested from the floor by Susan Morrison, and passed: No more than two members may come from any one academic department.] Non-voting ex-officio members are the Provost and the Dean of Libraries.
b. Duties:
(1) To review annually the status of support for faculty and student use of educational technology, which includes the use of computers, audio-visual media, the Internet, and telecommunications;
(2) To consider and plan long-range academic use of educational technology for teaching and learning;
(3) To receive from the faculty, or from any school or department, recommendations or suggestions which may aid in the appropriate use of educational technology, promote efficient services, and encourage increased use of educational technology;
(4) To advise the Provost on basic policy for faculty use of educational technology;
(5) To advise the Dean of Libraries on the allotment of funds for implementation of educational technology.

[Original motion and rationale (from the Minutes of the April 4, 2000 Senate Meeting):

That the Faculty Senate establish a standing committee on Educational Technology.]
Composition:

Seven faculty members and one student. Non-voting ex-officio members: Provost, Dean of Libraries, Dean of Graduate Studies, and Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

Duties:

To consider and plan long-range academic use of technology for teaching and learning;

To review annually the status of support for faculty and student use of educational technology, including the use of computers, audio-visual media, the Internet, and telecommunications;

To receive from the faculty, or from any school or department, recommendations or suggestions which may aid in the [added as an amendment: appropriate] use of educational technology, promote efficient services, and encourage increased use of educational technology;

To advise the Provost on basic policy for faculty use of educational technology;

To advise the Dean of Libraries on the allotment of funds for the implementation of educational technology.

Rationale:

Currently the proposed duties are either not being performed or are being performed by staff and administration, with informal input from the faculty. This committee would provide the College with formal faculty input on the use of educational technology.

In Computer Science, we have experienced many occurrences when the computer science curriculum has been compromised by decisions made by technical support staff without consulting first with faculty. As more disciplines utilize educational technology, the possibility of other curricula being effected will increase.

The Faculty Senate should take a proactive approach to planning for the use of educational technology, including policy concerning faculty compensation, development, and workload. A long-range, strategic plan is critically needed. This faculty committee would guide not only the long-term planning, but also the short-term decisions that affect faculty and students. It can also serve as an advocate group to help the faculty understand what is going on in Educational Technology, and to help faculty make the transition to technology-assisted teaching and learning with representation.

The composition and duties of this proposed committee were adapted from the Faculty By-Laws, Article V, Section 3, B, 4. Committee on the Library (p. 45-46). The issues addressed by the proposed committee are also addressed by the Faculty Welfare, Academic Standards, and Curriculum committees. However, the proposed committee would focus on the use of technology as it relates to academic standards, curriculum, and faculty welfare, and advise the Faculty Senate from that perspective. []
MOTION TO AMEND THE BY-LAWS (No. 2)

(The By-Laws Committee has reviewed the motion presented by Professor Richard Nunan and finds no inconsistencies of the motion with other aspects of the By-Laws.)

A motion to extend the Academic Planning Committee’s charge, as set forth in the By-Laws, to include General Education:

Change the wording for the Academic Planning Committee

FROM:
Article V. Committees
Section 2. Standing Senate Committees
B. The following Senate committees are established:
1. Academic Planning Committee
   b. Duties: “To consider and recommend long-range academic programs and goals for the college...”

TO:
Article V. Committees
Section 2. Standing Senate Committees
B. The following Senate committees are established:
1. Academic Planning Committee
   b. Duties: “To consider and recommend long-range academic programs and goals for the college, including general education programs...”

[Original motion and rationale (from the Minutes of the April 4, 2000 Senate Meeting):]

2. From Richard Nunan and the Academic Planning Committee, a motion to extend the Academic Planning Committee’s charge, as set forth in the By-Laws, to include General Education:

   Article V, opening sentence of Section 2.B.1.b should read: "Duties: To consider and recommend long-range general education program goals and needs, together with other long-range academic programs and goals for the College..."

   Rationale
   In light of the ambiguous outcome of the recent GenEd Faculty Survey, the Academic Planning Committee thinks it prudent to create a mechanism whereby review of the GenEd requirements could be conducted on...
a relatively modest scale, with any proposed changes to be implemented, one at a time, over a number of years (which is how current committee members view the Academic Planning Committee's charge in other areas).

N.B. Opening sentence of Section V.2.B.1.b currently reads: Duties: To consider and recommend long-range academic programs and goals for the College.]]]

In the event, both recommendations from the By-Laws Committee about the wording of the two motions were accepted, as amended.

David Mann then argued that it was out of order to act on motions held over from a previous year, since all unfinished business expires when a legislative session ends, and that a "session" of the senate had come to mean the academic year. Some discussion followed about the meaning of term. The Chair, in consultation with the Parliamentarian, George Pothering, ruled that the motions were not out of order. Mr. Mann challenged the ruling of the chair, and his challenge was seconded by Reid Wiseman. The ruling of the Chair was sustained, on a voice vote.

It was then pointed out that the Senate had not voted on the motions themselves, but only on the changes recommended by the By-Laws Committee. Lynn Cherry wondered whether the duties of the Academic Planning Committee would not now conflict with those of the Curriculum Committee, and should not this issue be discussed and resolved before the actual motions were brought to a vote? The two motions to change the By-Laws were then put to a voice vote, and passed.

James Carew then introduced a motion about the grading system:

THE UNDERSIGNED SENATORS REQUEST THAT THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE CONSIDER [A PROPOSAL TO CHANGE; deleted, CHANGING added] THE GRADING SYSTEM USED AT THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON.

Currently, we use a system that permits awarding of the grades A, B+, B, C+, C, D, F. The rationale for this particular system is unclear, and it may be unique to this institution. For years, this system has been viewed by many faculty as both limiting, and difficult to justify. Why are two plus grades permitted, but not other options of a plus – minus scheme? Why should students whose work falls at the upper end of just the B and C letter-grade range be awarded greater points toward their GPA, when no other such special categories are permitted? The great range from D to C is especially troublesome. In particular, it is difficult to deal with a student whose record is one of improvement, but falls just shy of a minimum C. It seems unreasonable to award a C, grade, which is equivalent to that of a student who just misses a C+, but it seems equally unreasonable to award only a D, which is equivalent to the grade of a student who just barely passes.
A system that permits awarding of letter grades A through D with both pluses and minuses would provide the greatest degree of flexibility to faculty, and also award GPA points to students that more closely reflect their actual academic performance. Grading systems utilizing both plus and minus for grades A through D is in use on a large number of American campuses, and the GPA point values for each category are well established. Alternatively, a system with only A through F, with no special plus grades, would be fairer to all students and more justifiable for faculty.

Signatories:

James L. Carew  Richard Nunan  A. Kem Fronabarger
Michael P. Katuna

The motion to send this request to the Academic Standards Committee passed, as amended at the suggestion of Hugh Wilder, on a voice vote.

Constituents’ Concerns

David Mann formally requested that what he was about to say be entered into the record. He spoke out strongly against what he considered inconsistent parliamentary procedures. Is the senate, he asked, really cognizant of what it is doing in selectively ignoring Robert’s Rules of Order, and its own carefully worked-out By-Laws? In his view, the senate was now voting on things it liked, and suppressing matters it did not like, without much regard for legal precedent. This, he said, was a bad omen for the future of the senate as an institution.

After some miscellaneous announcements, and with no further business, the meeting adjourned at about 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary

2000-2001 Senate Meetings:
September 5, October 3, October 31, November 28;
January 16, February 13, March 13, April 3 (to be cont. on April 17, if nec.)
Faculty Meetings: September 11, 2000; April 23, 2001