April 24, 1995

THE FACULTY MINUTES

The second and final regular meeting of the Faculty of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1994-1995 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, April 24 in the recital hall of the Albert Simons Center for the Arts, Speaker of the Faculty David Mann presiding. Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian. The Minutes of the previous meeting (September 12, 1994) were approved as circulated.

New Business

Conrad Festa, Provost and Dean of the Faculty, was recognized and moved the tentative approval of undergraduate degree candidates, pending completion of all requirements, as named on a list from the Registrar's office, dated April 12, and supplied by the Office of Academic Affairs. Additional names were added by Andrew Lewis, Charles Beam, Robert Dukes, and Nan Morrison, and the motion was approved, on a voice vote. The list is attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

The Speaker then addressed special thanks to Dr. Sam Stafford, President of the College of Charleston Alumni Association, for attending the meetings of the faculty and senate throughout the year; the entire faculty, Mr. Mann said, was grateful for his patience, and for his efforts to help the faculty and the Alumni to keep in touch with each other's concerns, for the mutual benefit of the College.

Wayne Patterson, Dean of Graduate Studies, presented a list, dated April 21, of fifty-six candidates for graduate degrees, and these, too, were tentatively approved, subject to completing requirements.

Election of Faculty Committees

Beverly Diamond, for the Committee on Nominations and Elections, then asked for the approval of standing committees of the faculty for next year, as previously nominated; they were declared elected by acclamation. Two committees, for which additional nominations had been received, were then voted on by written ballot. When the results were reported at the end of the meeting, the following were elected: Welfare Committee: Abdul Aziz, Jim Deavor, Susan Gurganus, Dorothy Marban, Kim May, William Moore, Harold Nations, Carolyn Russell. Library Committee: Thomas Baginski, Bonnie Devet, Brad Huber, Roger Logan, Paul Marino, June Mirecki, Robert Russell. There was also a correction: Martha Runey was removed (at her request) from the President's Advisory Committee, and Richard Godsen added. The corrected list is attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes, and a corrected version would be circulated the next day (April 25) attached to the "Highlights" of the meeting, and again, with any changes occurring over the summer months, at the beginning of the Fall Term.
President's Report

President Alexander M. Sanders was then recognized and addressed the faculty on three issues: budget and revenue projections; pending legislation, especially the attempt to abolish tenure; and the College's prospects for the future. The bottom line on the budget was that, even if costs remained approximately the same next year -- and they would inevitably go up in some areas over which we had no control, like postage or electricity -- revenues would go down, because of declining financial support from the State. This meant that, even with fairly optimistic projections, we would be facing next year a budget imbalance of almost a million dollars, if nothing were done -- which explains why recent cuts had had to be planned or put in place. The good news was that we are an efficient operation, much more so than some other educational institutions in the region. This has allowed us to increase our instructional budget in recent years by a substantial 69%, while administrative costs have gone up only 31% -- a figure that includes routine maintenance, right down to the cost of cutting the grass. In stark contrast to this, Mr. Sanders pointed to the figures for another institution, which showed a meagre 9% rise in instructional expenses, but 45% more for administration. Another heartening development was the special appropriation by the Legislature of $7,000,000 to enable the College to buy the Bishop England High School campus. This was very good news indeed, especially at a time when all government expenditures, and especially educational costs, were being scrutinized more closely than ever.

The" bad news," of course, was the bill to abolish tenure. Mr. Sanders said the faculty could do three things to help: not abuse tenure (but this is very rare); educate people about its real benefits; and avoid deluges of letters to legislators they don't vote for. In other words, elected government officials should be contacted on this issue only if there is some previous connection between that official and the faculty member. When making a case for tenure, by the way, there were a number of arguments that don't work. These include: telling people that academic salaries are too low (they certainly are, but times are tough all over, and South Carolina is not a rich State); claiming that tenure protects First Amendment rights (it would be very difficult to conceive of a situation today, the President said, in which State employees could actually be punished for saying what they think); and pointing out that to abolish tenure would seriously damage our competitive hiring position, as we bid against other educational institutions for able teachers, scholars, and administrators, particularly those from outside the region (proponents of this legislation say that other states are going to follow suit, so this will be of no consequence).

On the other hand, there are some arguments against abolishing tenure that are not only valid, but useful, because they work: first, no other enterprise subjects its employees to the kind of disciplined, nay, tortured scrutiny that higher education does before awarding tenure -- in fact, independent tests confirm that in the large majority of cases, tenured professors just keep on going, and going, and going, without slacking off. Second, there is no substantial danger whatsoever of getting "tenured in" -- because the College today has about the same ratio of tenured to untenured faculty as it had ten years ago, and in the academic world in general, moreover, these numbers seem to be fairly constant: at any given time, about a third of faculty are tenured, a third are trying to get
that way, and a third are on their way out, that is, non tenure-track, not returning, and so forth. Above all, we should avoid gratuitously insulting our legislators -- some of whom are actually our friends! -- even if, for example, financial arrangements for the Bishop England campus do not work out exactly as we hope. In addition, it might be very helpful to make some symbolic political gestures, one of which would be to call attention to the fact that it is possible, right now -- however unwise as a general rule -- for students who are especially hard pressed financially to graduate from the College in three years. Mr. Sanders said that he would also like to see some way for a family to "lock in" tuition costs at the College, perhaps even from the time a child is born. Measures like this would provide a real propaganda windfall for the College in today's climate, and might help the public to perceive us as the dedicated and public-spirited institution that we surely are.

The President concluded his report by saying that he thought the future of the College is actually brighter than it ever has been in the past. Because we operate on a fundamentally sound financial basis, and have done so for many years, we are not being forced to cut into the bedrock of our educational programs. This fiscal soundness should stand us in good stead not only now, but into the next century. Above all, he did not see the Administration and Faculty as adversaries, but as allies, on the same side when it came to all the really important issues, like the question of tenure. This was one reason why he had never felt better about the future of the institution.

A few questions followed. Jack Parson asked if an appropriations bill had been through the House of Representatives? Yes, but it was unclear whether the Senate would do any better with it than the House. James Carew wondered if there was any truth to rumors of a bonus being turned into a real pay raise? No, it was just talk. Frank Kinard asked whether, as a way of making up the projected fiscal shortfall, any thought had been given to setting up a "female leadership program" at the College? No.

**New Business (cont.)**

Two retiring senior members of the faculty were then honored by the College and their colleagues. Dean Gordon Jones spoke of Professor James P. Anderson (Mathematics). Mr. Anderson, a graduate of the Class of 1955, was appointed to the faculty in 1957, and had served with distinction and dedication, in many capacities, for over thirty-eight years. Dean Samuel Hines spoke of Professor Malcolm C. Clark (History), who was appointed in 1966, and had served variously as chairman of his department, Speaker of the Faculty, and director of the graduate program in History; Mr. Clark was given an additional valedictory encomium by George Hopkins, present chair of his department. Mr. Anderson and Mr. Clark received standing ovations in honor of their long and distinguished service. *Sapientia ipsa libertas.*

Conrad Festa then gave out service awards from the State of South Carolina to faculty members who had reached the traditional milestones:
For ten years of service:

Katherine Bielsky
Charles Biernbaum
Mary Boyd
Rosemary Brana-Shute
Betsy J. Clary
Barbara Duval
Allen K. Fronabarger
Richard Nunan
Robert Nusbaum
Michael Phillips
Phillip Powell
Howard Rudd
Gregory Schmitt

For twenty years of service:

Marion Doig
Robert Dukes
Richard Godsen
Mary K. Haney
Michael Katuna
William Kubinec
Charles Matthews
Peter McCandless
Robert Norton
Sandra Powers
Martha Runey

Finally, an engraved plaque, from the Office of Academic Affairs, was presented to David Mann for his unprecedented five years' service as Speaker of the Faculty. This concluded the awards.

Mr. Mann read out the results of balloting for faculty committees, which had just been reported to him, and asked if there were any concluding announcements. In response, Hugh Haynsworth spoke briefly about a substantial faculty "retreat," to be held early in the Fall Term of the next academic year, and Peter Rowe reported that he was gratified by the ample faculty response to a questionnaire which he had sent out earlier in regard to "job satisfaction."
The Secretary then asked to be allowed to read following resolution of appreciation into the record:

Resolution

The Faculty of the College of Charleston wish to thank David Mann, once again, for his outstanding contributions to the life of this institution. As Speaker of the Faculty, under two Administrations, and under two different systems of faculty governance, he has given unstintingly of his energy, enthusiasm, and humor. In the Faculty Newsletter, he has refreshed our spirits; in countless committees, he has worked for the general welfare, in ways large and small; in the conduct of faculty meetings, and now at meetings of the Senate, he has stood resolutely for the independence of the faculty and the integrity of the teaching profession. Mr. Speaker, we are in your debt. Thank you!

With no further business, the meeting adjourned sine die, at about 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
April 18, 1995

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The ninth and final meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1994-1995 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 18 in Room 118 of The Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty David Mann presiding. (This was a special called meeting, the purpose of which was to take up business which had not been ready for consideration at the time of the previous meeting, on April 4.) Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian; altogether, forty-one senators attended.

Proposed Change in the By-Laws

Herb Silverman was recognized for the By-Laws Committee and proposed to add a sentence to Article IV, Section 2 A., under "Composition and Election of Senators," as follows:

Faculty members on leave are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators.

The Committee's rationale was that "Faculty members on leave are expected to devote their time to enhancing their professional expertise, not to involving themselves with the daily activities of campus politics." The Speaker said the motion was duly entered, and would be considered by the senate in the Fall.

New Business

William Moore reported that the Welfare Committee had discussed the revised Sabbatical Leave Policy prepared by the office of Academic Affairs (technically, Draft #4 of Policy #2 of the General Policy Manual of the Office of Academic Affairs) and recommended that the Senate approve it. Beverly Diamond requested that the President or the Provost be asked to check over the draft once more for any possible "sexist" language; there were no objections. James Carew said that he was not sure what the word "normally" implied at the start of a sentence toward the end of Section 1.4 ("Normally, compensation for services including sabbatical leave salary during the period may not exceed the faculty member's salary for an equivalent period of time at the College"). Caroline Hunt questioned the wisdom of the first sentence in section 4.0, Completion of the Sabbatical: "Within one semester after the faculty member returns from sabbatical leave, she/he will be expected to share through a public lecture or demonstration the findings of the leave." She thought this was inappropriate, and moved to strike the sentence. This was accepted as a friendly amendment. The Senate then approved the draft of the policy, as amended. It is attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.
Wayne Jordan, for the Curriculum Committee, put forward several motions which, after some discussion, passed exactly as circulated, with two exceptions: there was a minor change in the original course proposal included with Biology 250 -- not a substantive change, and noted below; and one item, a change in requirements for the Marine Biology Major, was withdrawn without coming up for a vote. The original memorandum of April 11, 1995 is also attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes, and may be summarized as follows:

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

Bachelor of Science, with a New Concentration in Hospitality and Tourism Management

Requirements

New Courses:

- BADM 210: Introduction to the Hospitality and Tourism Industry (3 hrs.)
- BADM 340: Total Quality Management (3)
- BADM 345: Leadership and Management Development (3)

GEOLOGY

New Courses:

- GEOL 290: Special Topics in Geology (1-4 hrs.)
- GEOL 444: Geology of the Carolinas (3)

Course Deletions: GEOL 310, 400-404

ENGLISH AND COMMUNICATION

New Courses:

- COMM 240: Introduction to Broadcast News (3)
- COMM 340: Television News Reporting (3)
ECONOMICS AND FINANCE

New Course:

ECON 311: Environmental Economics (3)

MUSIC

New Minor in Music (Requirements)

BIOLOGY

New Course:

BIOL 250: Special Topics (1-4 hrs.)

[For information: the first offering of Biology 250 will be "The Ecology of Southern Africa," 3 hrs.; correction: change the prerequisites from "None" to "One year of Biology or permission of Instructor," making the language on the "For Information" sheet the same as on the New Course Proposal for BIOL 250.]

[Please note: the proposal to change the requirements for the Major in Marine Biology, included in the Committee's circulated Memorandum, was WITHDRAWN, and therefore not voted on.]

PHILOSOPHY [for information; no vote necessary]

Special Topics Course

PHIL 298: Theory and Practice in Clinical Bioethics (3)

During the discussion, Hugh Haynsworth moved an amendment to give only provisional approval to the proposed Concentration in Hospitality and Tourism, since the actual program had not yet been endorsed by the Commission on Higher Education, and the courses to be offered were not fully worked out; but this amendment was defeated. Rhonda Mack, from the School of Business and Economics, noted that a Special Topics course in Tourism is planned for the fall, and Wayne Patterson added that the CHE will approve programs without the actual courses being spelled out in complete detail; in any case, no courses would be offered until they had passed through the usual procedure of faculty approval. David Hall thought that the Physics Department should have been
consulted in greater detail about the new courses in Geology. When the Communication courses came up, the Speaker asked if there were any plans for obtaining our own radio station. Tom Heeney said that there were no plans that he knew of for a separate station as such, though individual programs might be planned for broadcast on existing local stations. Caroline Hunt asked what level of proficiency is required for Music Theory I in the Music Minor; Carla Lowrey said that piano playing was not needed, but that students would have to learn musical notation; Wayne Jordan added that the course was more "academic" and less "studio" now that it had been when it first came before the Curriculum Committee. Richard Nunan wanted to be sure that the senate was giving approval to Biology 250 as a Special Topics course only, and not making "The Ecology of Southern Africa" a permanent offering. This was confirmed; the content of the course was provided for information only, and not voted on.

The Speaker then reported that no one from the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs had been able to attend the meeting to speak about the proposed Program leading to the Master of Arts Degree in Bioethics, to be offered jointly with the Medical University of South Carolina. He had received, however, a copy of a letter dated April 3, 1995 from Larry Carlson, the chair of the Committee, to Wayne Patterson, Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, signalling the Committee’s approval, and he asked that this letter be entered into the record:

The Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs recommends that the Graduate Council consider the proposed M.A. in Bioethics, which would be offered jointly by the University of Charleston, S.C., and the Medical University of South Carolina.

Working with the new CHE Guidelines, my committee approved the proposal after two meetings with the principal authors: Hugh Wilder, Marty Perlmutter, and (from MUSC) Mary Faith Marshall. During these discussions we reviewed the draft dated March 2, 1995, and raised a number of concerns and questions about the program. These issues include the nature of the partnership between the two institutions, administrative responsibilities, curriculum requirements, and projected enrollment; The committee was particularly concerned that the total estimated costs be broken down for each institution.

As a result of these meetings, the authors have incorporated what we believe are changes that strengthen the proposal and clarify several matters. Included in the new version is an appendix that details the costs for each institution. Hugh Wilder will be delivering today for you and the Graduate Council copies of the revised draft, dated March 29. This version, which includes revisions of both the proposal itself and the Memorandum of Understanding, replaces the draft of March 2, which your office earlier distributed to the Graduate Council.

Frank Kinard wanted to know about budgeting. The costs, Hugh Wilder replied, are modest,
and are mostly at the MUSC end. James Carew asked whether the program would be subject to review at the end of three years. Yes, Mr. Wilder said; all programs must meet this requirement, and Dean Patterson concurred. Amy McCandless said that the M.A. program in History, given jointly with the Citadel, had been reviewed in this way. Mr. Kinard said the problem was with funding at a time of general cuts; would funding be reviewed at the end of three years? Yes, Dean Patterson said; the three-year review takes everything into account. Caroline Hunt wondered whether we would eventually get to see syllabi for the courses involved; again, the answer was yes. (Dean Patterson added that he wanted to see a motion on the review process at the next meeting of the Graduate Council.)

David Hall asked exactly what is the Senate's jurisdiction over graduate programs? "Up or down," David Mann said. Susan Morrison reported that her chairman had said that the program had never been sent to the Biology Department, and since the program is very strongly medical -- biomedical -- there appeared to be lots of unanswered questions. Mr. Wilder said that he and Marty Perlmutter would be happy to meet with the Biology Department, and regretted not having done so. As to the name of the program, bioethics: this issue had been discussed at some length. The focus of the program is indeed on biomedical ethics. This meant that the conduct of research on genetic engineering, for example, might be an appropriate area of investigation within the program, but that something like environmental ethics would probably not be. The profession appeared to be moving away from the term, "biomedical ethics" toward the simpler "bioethics."

Caroline Hunt wanted to know if any other Departments in addition to Philosophy might be drawn on for this program, such as Languages or English. Yes, Mr. Wilder said; the teaching opportunities ought to be substantial. Mr. Carew wanted to know where the program director will be located; at MUSC for the first three years, then the College for the next three years, and so on. Dr. Marshall said that she thought the MUSC faculty would complement faculty from the College in staffing this program. Mr. Wilder added that the only reason the program had not yet been approved by MUSC was that they had recently appointed a new Provost, and a number of administrative matters had had to wait for the position to be filled. In the event, the joint Master's Program in Bioethics, as set out in the circulated draft document dated April 7, 1995, was approved by the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston. That document, and Mr. Carlson's letter from the Committee on Graduate Education, are attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

Von Bakanic, for the Academic Standards Committee, introduced a motion to send a revised Learning Disability Policy, as developed by her Committee, to the By-Laws Committee; it would replace the current section (c) on p. 139 of the Faculty/Administration Manual. This policy involves a change in the appeals procedure regarding accommodating students with learning disabilities. The policy itself, however, was not discussed and not voted on; the motion was simply to send it on to the By-Laws Committee, for their recommendation and action at a later meeting. The motion to forward passed, without opposition.

Elizabeth Martinez, for the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics, introduced a draft document containing Sexual Harassment Complaint Procedures, as developed over several years by
Sue Sommer-Kresse, with advice from the faculty, and now with the approval of the Committee. A very lengthy discussion followed, with a number of amendments being suggested, in most cases unsuccessfully, from the floor. The main burden of discussion was the need to preserve the principle of due process and the rights of the "accused" in harassment cases, while devising a workable procedure that would protect students, administrators, and faculty alike. Another topic was the desirability of resolving allegations or complaints of harassment, if feasible, without resorting to direct legal action; it would be a good idea to have procedures that would informally put a stop to bad behavior, while allowing the process not to be taken any further. Many were also concerned to prevent secret files or dossiers from being compiled on individual faculty members or administrators, particularly over long periods of time. In the event, the draft document was approved, with four changes suggested by the Committee itself, and one friendly amendment. These are the changes:

Part I, Section D (p. 1):

The liaison will not inform the accused of the complainant's allegations or the identity of the complainant without the complainant's consent. A complainant can request that the liaison communicate with the accused on behalf of the complainant. [The phrase, "revealing or not revealing the complainant's identity depending upon the wishes of the complainant," was stricken from the conclusion of this sentence at the urging of Fred Etline, a suggestion which the Committee accepted as a friendly amendment.] The liaison will keep all communications with both the complainant and the accused strictly confidential throughout this process and will only pursue such contacts with the accused as the complainant requests. It is recommended that the complainant record in writing all dates and times contact was made to resolve the issue. [This sentence was added by the Committee.]

Part II C 3 a (p. 6):

If a student elects not to seek informal resolution of his/her complaint or informal resolution is sought, but no satisfactory accord can be reached, then in either instance, the immediate supervisor [of the accused, added] will forward the written complaint to the appropriate Senior Vice President for action [etc.].

Part III A 3 (p. 9):

Negotiated Settlement: In some cases, the filing of a formal complaint and investigation may result in an opportunity to negotiate a settlement of the case [etc.]. [Typographical errors corrected by the Committee.]

Part III B (also p. 9):

The burden of proving the allegations of the complaint is on the complainant. In
order to find the complaint to be "founded," the committee/panel/supervisor must find that the preponderance [i.e. greater than 50%, cut out by the Committee] of the evidence [etc.].

The draft of the "Sexual Harassment Complaint Procedures" document, as corrected at the meeting, is attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes. Dean Sommer-Kresse said that in due course it would be forwarded to President Sanders.

Elizabeth Martinez spoke again for the Student Affairs and Athletics Committee, this time recommending an addition to the existing Attendance Policy. She reported that her Committee, as instructed by the Senate at the January 17, 1995 meeting, had worked with the Academic Standards Committee to come up with a more agreeable proposal addressing the needs of students who have to be absent while officially representing the College. A subcommittee, composed of two members each from the two Committees, and two additional faculty members, had come up with a revised version. John Newell moved an amendment, which was passed and incorporated in the text. Frank Cossa commented that the new proposal put the professor in a pretty tough position; David Hall thought it was too strongly worded, with too many "musts" and deadlines; James Carew insisted that students should never be penalized for absences as such, but only for work which they fail to make up. Susan Balinsky said that the intent of the proposal was to protect students from really unfair procedures, while still maintaining high academic standards; she thought a good compromise had been found by the subcommittee. Jorge Marbán called for the question, successfully, and the main motion passed, as amended, changing the existing Attendance Policy (p. 114 of the College Catalogue) to the following:

If students who participate in athletic competitions or other college-sponsored events want to be assured that they are in compliance with the faculty member's attendance policy, they must provide written notification to all course instructors of dates and times when regularly scheduled classes will be missed. This notification must be provided by the first day of class; an instructor unwilling to excuse the student for such absences must notify the student before the end of Drop/Add.

*****

Finally, at about ten minutes before eight, with no further business, and no Constituents left with enough steam to be Concerned, the meeting adjourned sine die. As he struck the gavel, the Speaker concluded the 1994-1995 Senatorial Year by saying, "That's a wrap."

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The eighth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1994-1995 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 4 in Room 118 of The Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty David Mann presiding. Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian; altogether, forty-two senators attended the meeting. The Minutes of the previous meeting (March 14, 1995) were approved as circulated, after it was noted that in some copies the last line on p. 7 was not legible, or had dropped out. The sentence affected should read:

Mr. Mann expressed a strong belief that the Faculty Senate should not only, at the very least, be kept informed about such groups, but that, as a general rule, the existing structure of elected bodies should be used for "matters falling within the purview of standing Senate or College committees," as specified in the By-Laws.

Speaker's Report

The Speaker announced that the real Faculty Newsletter would appear in a day or two, supplementing the Ur-version that had appeared on April Fool's Day. On a more serious note, he had an update on the question of advising undeclared majors. Sue Sommer-Kresse, Mr. Mann said, wanted to recommend setting up a faculty committee to study the matter; there would be a pilot project during the summer, for which he hoped faculty would sign up. He asked that an e-mail letter which he had sent to her, containing the gist of his idea about obtaining faculty participation, be attached retroactively to the correspondence contained in the Minutes of the previous meeting. The main paragraph of this communication reads as follows:

Look, my main point was much more simple. I assert that some faculty would work the way I suggest (10 a year, not to be confused with an IPTAY slogan), who do not do any advising outside department majors at present. Any who would be willing to do that should be allowed to do so and in fact should be compensated as if they did Stern Center summer advising. In a different context, James Madison described this process as "extending the sphere." If that means the bureaucracy needs to be shifted to accommodate, in the words of Jean-Luc Picard of the Starship Enterprise, "Make it so." That's it. Nothing dreadful.

Mr. Mann said that he would now like to see twenty Senators advising undeclared majors among incoming students, in this pilot project during the summer. Caroline Hunt asked if there would be a comparison made with a non-control group of students, to see if the special advising helped; the answer was yes. The Speaker concluded by announcing a special called meeting of the Senate to be held at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 18, in order to take up business which could not be readied in time for today. The agenda for this meeting, including items from the Curriculum Committee and Continuing Education, was set and would appear in the packets circulated to Senators beforehand.
New Business: Proposed Change in the By-Laws

Herb Silverman, speaking for the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, recommended approving the proposal introduced by the Committee on Nominations and Elections at the conclusion of the March meeting. This proposal would change the By-Laws regulating nominations and elections, as specified in Article V, Section 2 A, to read: "Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations and Elections by March 15 and elected by the Senate at the April Senate Meeting.” Similarly, Article V, Section 3A: "Members of standing College committees are nominated by March 15 by the Committee on Nominations and Elections and elected by the faculty (as defined in Article I Section 1) at the April Faculty Meeting." Similarly, in Article V, sections 3B 3 and 3B 4, "April 15" should be changed to "March 15" [changes emphasized; see p. 10 of the March Minutes]. Mr. Silverman's recommendation was put to the vote and endorsed by the Senate unanimously. [Secretary's note: as required in the By-Laws, this proposal was later submitted to the full Faculty and passed, by written ballot, as announced in a memorandum of May 9, 1995.]

Elections and Nominations

Beverly Diamond, for the Committee on Nominations and Elections, announced that no further nominations had been received for the various standing Senate Committees. The slate circulated to the Senate on March 27 was declared elected:

**ACADEMIC PLANNING**
7 faculty members, majority must be faculty senators

- Courson, Frances (S)
- England, Michael
- Morrison, Susan (S)
- Olejniczak, William (S)
- Pincus, Michael
- Scholtens, Brian
- Ward, Patricia (S)

Educat. Foundations & Specializations  
Mathematics  
Biology  
History  
Spanish  
Biology  
English & Communication

**BUDGET**
7 faculty members, majority must be faculty senators

- Heeney, Tom (S)
- Leclerc, Anthony
- Sparks, Randy
- Stiglitz, Beatrice (S)
- Tennyson, Mack
- Wilder, Hugh (S)
- Young, Paul (S)

English & Communication  
Computer Science  
History  
French  
Accounting  
Philosophy  
Mathematics
BY-LAWS
3 faculty members, majority must be faculty senators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newell, John</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parson, Jack</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverman, Herb</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional nomination was then made from the floor, by Carla Lowrey, for the Faculty Library Committee (Thomas Baginski, Languages), and seven candidates were put forward for the Committee on Nominations and Elections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clary, Jane</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond, Beverly</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford, Lynne</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins, George</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesses, Glenn</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinard, Frank</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, Frank</td>
<td>Classics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominations for these two committees would also remain open until noon on April 13.

**New Business (cont.)**

Frank Cossa then introduced the following motion, as circulated to the Senate:

The Faculty Senate instructs the Academic Standards Committee to review the current system for advising undeclared majors, and to recommend revisions in, or alternatives to, this system.

The present advising system, Mr. Cossa said, was established without consultation with the faculty, and the faculty certainly should have been consulted, since advising is obviously an academic matter. Robert Mignone said he supported the motion; he agreed that advising is an academic matter, and clearly within the responsibilities of the faculty. Carla Lowrey also spoke in support, adding that she endorsed the broader principle of faculty involvement in academic affairs. The motion passed unanimously.

David Mann said that he had just found out about a memorandum to Deans and Department Chairs from the Vice-President for Enrollment Management, dated March 27, 1995, that refers to having a three-year accelerated degree program ready "in time for summer orientation" and asking for material to be submitted "no later than May 1." This scheme had been developed, the memorandum said, by a hitherto undisclosed "ad hoc implementation group" who had met "several times to develop a process and draft preliminary materials" for such a program. Since the faculty had not been consulted about this, either, the Speaker asked that a motion parallel to Mr. Cossa's be made, requesting the Academic Standards Committee to find out what was going on. Proceeding by May 1 was simply not practical. Richard Nunan said that he thought such a motion should go
to Academic Standards first, then to the Academic Planning Committee. James Carew said that it looked as though the idea had started as a paper exercise, and suddenly become real; he thought Academic Planning should take it up instead of Academic Standards. Robert Mignone agreed that long-term academic goals, such as an accelerated degree program appeared to be, were clearly within the responsibilities of the Academic Planning Committee. Dean William Lindstrom was asked about the program, and he said that to do a degree in three years was certainly "cramming it in," but that all the same requirements would have to be met. Joe Benich said that if all the same requirements would have to be met, then the program must be something that students can do now, already, if they want to; what would the differences, if any, be? David Mann added that he had actually seen a flyer, already printed up for the Office of Continuing Education, advertising something called "ACE," an acronym for "Accelerated Curriculum Emphasis." To put academic programs in place without consulting with the faculty at all, was, in his judgement, to set a terrible precedent.

Accordingly, Hugh Wilder made the following motion, to parallel Mr. Cossa's:

The Faculty Senate instructs the Academic Planning Committee to review the proposed "Three Year Accelerated Degree Program" and to issue a report to the Senate.

Caroline Hunt said that she thought the idea of an accelerated degree program was a good one, and offered real benefits, potentially, to a certain number of students; but the program, and the way it was being implemented, have potential ramifications for our "rights" as faculty members. For example, under this program, it seems likely that faculty can be told that they have to teach in the summer -- since a three year degree can only be completed by summer work in addition to the regular semesters, and academic programs have to be made available to students as advertised. Does this mean, in turn, that the faculty can now be put, in effect, on eleven-month contracts, whether they like it or not? Marty Perlmutter said that this is another reason why academic programs should come through academic committees. Joe Benich thought that, since the program seemed not to involve much of anything not already "on the books," it was really more of an advertising gimmick or "p-r" stunt for the College, rather than something at which the faculty ought to try to "draw the line." Rohn England took issue with this and said that it would be perfectly appropriate to ask the Academic Planning Committee to look into the program and report back to the Senate. Phil Dustan said that, contrary to appearances, such a program would have an impact on the College, because it would create another group competing for already scarce academic resources. Richard Godsen asked Dean Lindstrom how many people have actually accelerated their degrees in recent times; Mr. Lindstrom answered that perhaps half-a-dozen students had taken advantage of this opportunity in the last five years. (Mr. Benich noted, in passing, that many have enough trouble getting through in four years, let alone three.) Mr. Carew asked if there were any penalty involved for getting admission to the program and then not "making it" in three years; the answer was no. In the event, the motion carried, on a voice vote, unanimous but for a single, loud "no!"

Paul Young, standing in for Wayne Jordan, moved a series of proposals from the Curriculum Committee, which may be summarized as follows. With the exception of one correction to the German Studies Minor, made by Mr. Young at the meeting and noted below, these proposals were passed exactly as circulated; the original memorandum is attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes:
JEWSH STUDIES

New Courses:

Jewish Studies 200: Introduction to Jewish Studies (3 hrs.)
Jewish Studies 300: Special Topics in Jewish Studies (3)
Jewish Studies 400: Independent Studies (3)

LANGUAGES: CLASSICS AND GERMAN

New Interdisciplinary German Studies Minor:

Requirements [correction at the foot of p. 16 of the Committee's memorandum:]
Having completed GRMN 324, 325 and the two history courses, students have accumulated twelve to fourteen credits [changed from "either twelve or fourteen"]. The remaining four to six [changed from "four or six"] credits can be earned as follows: [.]


1. Augment credit hours from (1) to (1-3)
2. Change last sentence of description to: "A Collateral Study course may be repeated up to a maximum of six credit hours in conjunction with other primary courses."

BIOLOGY [for information; no vote necessary]

BIOL 453: Special Topics in Immunology (3)

During the brief discussion, Caroline Hunt noted that the Library should receive some additional funds for the new courses in Jewish Studies, since they involved assigning authors who are not part of the Library Approval Plan; John Newell said that Richard Bodek is working on this. Phil Dustan queried the strict attendance policy in one of the courses involved, History 340, but Marty Perlmutter said such matters were, as a matter of academic freedom, strictly at the discretion of the instructor. Carla Lowrey pointed out that courses other areas, such as Psychology or Art History, could certainly be included as acceptable for "Collateral Study" credit in the German Studies Minor, if it seemed desirable at some later date. Hugh Wilder asked who would decide the number of credit-hours awarded for the Collateral Studies courses; the answer was, the director of the German Studies Program.
Constituents' Concerns

To conclude the meeting, there was a brief discussion of whether awards to faculty ought to be given out at the concluding general faculty meeting, rather than at the student award ceremony; some preferred the old way, of announcing them at Commencement, but others insisted that this was the students' great day, not the faculty's, and the ceremony was crowded enough anyway. Beverly Diamond noted the great secrecy surrounding these awards, and said it was both silly and unnecessary. Herb Silverman commented that one reason for changing to a faculty senate system of governance had been to encourage better communication between the administration and the faculty on important issues. Now, however, neither the President nor the Provost seemed to have the time to attend senate meetings, and he wondered whether the new system had made any difference at all. David Mann replied that he thought we have had more discussion in the senate than we used to have under the old system -- but, as to the faculty being taken seriously by the administration, he doubted whether the system of governance, as such, had had much effect one way or the other.

The meeting adjourned at about a quarter to seven, to be continued on April 18.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
March 14, 1995

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The seventh regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1994-1995 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 14 in Room 118 of The Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty David Mann presiding. Fifty senators came. The Minutes of the previous meeting (February 7) were approved as circulated, after the Speaker noted that a sub-title ("Constituents' Concerns") had been omitted at the top of the last page. (James Carew pointed out another mistake after the meeting was over; this is described at the end of these Minutes.)

The chair then introduced Dr. Sam Stafford, head of the College of Charleston Alumni Association, who said that he had genuinely enjoyed the opportunity to attend the meetings of the Senate during the past year. He announced that the Association would sponsor a reception following a later meeting, and that Professor Marion Doig would be nominated as the next president of the Alumni Association, the first faculty member to be put forward for this office since Harry Freeman a few years since.

The Speaker asked to defer his report until the end of the meeting.

New Business

Brian Scholtens introduced two motions from the Academic Planning Committee. The first was a recommendation that the name of the Honors Program not be changed to "Honors College." Three reasons had been advanced to justify the change. First, it had been suggested that it would increase the visibility and attractiveness of the program, and therefore help the College compete for able students. No evidence, however--in particular, no data--had been offered to support this claim, and the Committee had not found it convincing. Secondly, such a change would set a precedent within the structure of the institution, possibly leading other units of the College to advance similar arguments for name (and subsequently status) changes: to erect another "college" within the College would, in the Committee's judgement, create a situation that would be awkward at best. Third, the Planning Committee also questioned the financial impact such a change would be likely to have on individual departments. If enrollments in the Honors Program continue to rise, there will necessarily be an increasing financial burden on departments, in terms of faculty time, supplies, and so on. And even if departments are compensated with adjuncts for faculty participating in the Honors Program, this generally does not "replace" that faculty member in the department. While commending the Honors Program for "the tremendous job it continues to do," the Committee did not find any of the reasons advanced for changing the name of the program to be persuasive.

During the discussion of this issue, Hugh Haynsworth wondered if there were precedents for having more than one "college" within a college. Boston College was cited as an example, because it has two such bodies, a College of Arts and Sciences and a College of Business. Frank Kinard
thought that that was a *most* unfortunate example. Hugh Wilder spoke in favor of the Committee's report, adding that, in view of recently announced cutbacks, the financial implications of changing the name now appear *much* more serious than they would have earlier. Bob Mignone also spoke in favor of the report, but felt compelled to point out that spending extra money to attract good students was not in itself necessarily a bad idea. Mr. Haynsworth wanted to know if the Planning Committee had consulted with the Director of the Honors Program. Mr. Scholtens replied that Rose Hamm had been invited to come to one of their meetings, and had very kindly done so, there had been full consultation, but the Committee remained unconvinced that the change was in the best interests of the College. In the event, the motion not to approve changing the name of the Honors Program to "Honors College" passed unanimously, on a voice vote.

The second motion was a recommendation to approve the draft of an "Academic Affairs Policy Formation" document, developed by the Office of Academic Affairs as "Policy #1" in an "Academic Affairs General Policy Manual." The Planning Committee offered two further (minor) suggestions, for consideration by the Senate and then by the Office of Academic Affairs:

In this policy statement (section 3.2.3) and in the faculty manual (section 4), reference is made to the Speaker of the Faculty referring matters of concern to the faculty senate or a committee. We recommend that the faculty senate review the language of these sections, to ensure that the wording of the statements is strong enough to be acceptable. Currently they read the Speaker may refer such matters to the faculty senate. Alternatively, it might read will *amended to shall* refer such matters, or some other option. This is not an objection to the policy statement, but rather an area of current policy that the senate may wish to reconsider, and thus should be changed in this policy statement.

A second minor point that we discussed is in section 3.3.6 of the policy statement. In this section a time limit of two months is given for consideration of any policy change. If applied strictly, this may cause problems for policies proposed just in advance of the summer, when faculty are often not on campus and the senate does not convene. A special consideration may be necessary for such circumstances.

To begin the discussion of the Committee's recommendation, the Speaker asked David Cohen first to clarify what the proposal itself actually means. Mr. Cohen said that, essentially, it does two things: it regulates the *timing*, and the *physical location*, of policy development. First, it would bring some order to the process of development, i.e., to the sequence of events that must occur in the course of forming new academic policies. Second, it would bring the people involved in policy development together systematically. Hugh Wilder, referring to section 2.0 ("Organization") asked for some examples of what was meant by academic "Policies" -- what sorts of affairs did Academic Affairs have in mind? The Senate itself, it appeared, was directly involved only in Section 3.3.3:

Draft policies reviewed by the Speaker of the Faculty and/or Faculty Senate which carry significant recommendations for modification shall be returned to the originator who may include these modifications in a revised draft. Whether or not these modifications are included, the originator will send the policy draft to the Deans and Directors [sic, no apostrophes] Group with the comments of the faculty within one month.
Mr. Cohen said that the policy on sabbatical leave, which had been under development for some time, would be a good example. Herb Silverman pointed out that the draft document is not really about approving policies, but only about recommending them, and he called attention to section 3.3.7:

The decision of the Provost in all matters of operating policy shall be final. Final approval by the Provost must be in writing and there is no deadline or time limit for this approval. Should the Provost not approve a policy draft, he/she will return the policy draft with a reason for rejection to the originator.

Hugh Haynsworth queried section 5.1:

Five years from the original approval date, each policy shall be reviewed by the Deans and Directors Group. The Provost will then reapprove the policy. Policies that are not specifically reapproved do not remain in force. Substantive revisions to policies will follow the policy review steps outlined [for outlined] in 3.0.

What would happen if something were not reviewed after five years; would it lapse? This, Mr. Haynsworth thought, did not make much sense. Mr. Cohen answered that "sunset" provisions are in the air just now. Richard Nunan, speaking to the same issue, said he could envision a kind of nightmare scenario in which Deans would be chronically reviewing and revising policies, leaving them no time to do all the other valuable things they do.

Joe Benich said that he had been reading section 1.0 ("Purpose"), but to small avail: just what is the purpose of this document? David Cohen again mentioned the Sabbatical issue as an example of a policy that seems to come up for revision with some regularity, as circumstances alter; the policy document would establish a timetable, and so on, for making any necessary changes. Mr. Benich thought that might just complicate matters, especially where State appropriations are involved. Carla Lowrey said that she would like to here more about what the Academic Planning Committee thought about the proposal; did they think the Senate should approve it? Brian Scholtens replied that the Committee did not see this as a matter of approval, exactly, but as a way of getting some faculty "input" into the formation of academic policies. "You mean you think the document is better than nothing?" "Yes."

Phil Dustan than asked David Mann if he thought the document was a good idea? The Speaker replied, that, on the whole, he did; it should have at least some beneficial effects. For example, a policy on sexual harassment has been worked on now by an appointed committee for a year and a half, and it will probably now have to be channeled through the Senate before being implemented. (At this point, he urged that the Senate approve changing the instructions given to the Speaker in section 3.2.3, replacing "may" with the imperative, "shall" (a friendly amendment for "will"), so that the section reads:

The Provost shall refer appropriate draft policies that directly affect the faculty to the Speaker of the Faculty. The Speaker of the Faculty, in turn, [may deleted] shall refer the policy draft to a faculty committee or ad hoc group for review and comment. This stage of review will take place once the draft policy has been reviewed with recommendations by the Academic Deans and/or the Vice President for Enrollment Management (level b) but prior to submitting the draft to the Deans and Directors
Group (level c). When the Provost refers a policy draft to the Speaker, the Speaker has two calendar months to carry out the review. The Speaker may petition the Provost in writing for an extension to this period.

In the event, the second recommendation from the Academic Planning Committee, endorsing the draft document on "Academic Policy Formation" (with two additional suggestions, as outlined in the Committee's report and amended at the meeting), was approved unanimously, on a voice vote. The Committee's report, and the full text of the draft document, are attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

William Moore, for the Faculty Welfare Committee, reported on recent difficulties with the College mail service. There seemed to be something like a power-struggle going on between UPS and the mail room, about what will, or will not, be delivered, by whom, and where. The mail room says that deliveries will be accepted from all carriers, but some faculty continue to experience problems, including delays in receiving parcels and packages containing crucial manuscripts or research materials. In fairness, Mr. Moore said, we should remember that the mail-room staff, and the space they work in, are the same size that they were sixteen years ago, even though the volume of mail has increased dramatically. Beverly Diamond asked why, if the mail room will accept deliveries from all carriers, the faculty are still getting parcels with labels or stickers saying otherwise? "Somebody is lying," Mr. Moore said; both sides insist that they know nothing about such refusals. One piece of advice: if you have parcels regularly delivered by the mail room, do not put a street address on it, which will only delay delivery. The mail room, by the way, does not sell stamps, because it is not allowed to; it is not a real U.S. Post Office (the Citadel's mail room, on the other hand, is). Caroline Hunt pointed out, however, that the East Bay Street Post Office does consider us to be a "real" post-office; how can the mail room "have it both ways"? Wayne Jordan asked what it would take to become officially a full-service post office; what prevents us from being one now? Perhaps, Mr. Moore suggested, we are too close to the main post-office; but he was not sure.

Lynne Ford asked what we are supposed to do right now? She had five boxes of mail in limbo, with no one apparently willing to deliver it. David Mann suggested that, if UPS or FEDEX is used, the academic department's street address should be used. Another problem, according to Mr. Moore, was that postal rates have recently been raised substantially on books and packages, as the U.S. Mail tries to generate revenue, with the result that publishers and others tend to use the private carriers, who remain less expensive, naturally, the government-controlled postal service does not like this. "So it's a fair summary of the current situation," David Hall queried, "to say that nothing has changed, except that mail is disappearing?" Caroline Hunt noted that Federal Express will, if told to, hold mail at its Broad Street office, without attempting delivery at all, until the customer himself picks it up. This can be arranged by checking off a small box on one of their forms, and it is a service that may be useful for particularly important parcels or envelopes. Peter Yaun said that somebody really ought to investigate what it would take to become a "full-service" post office; surely we are now big enough to qualify. Mr. Moore agreed, and said the Speaker of the Faculty should be involved in finding out about this. Is there some way, Lynne Ford asked, of making sure that faculty receive adequate notification of changes and directives affecting the College mail service? There is, Mr. Moore suggested: "get faculty input into Fred Daniel's office" (which supervises the mail room).
CHANGE IN THE BY-LAWS

Herb Silverman was then recognized for the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual. The Committee recommended approval of the change in the By-Laws proposed at the February meeting, to make the Registrar an ex officio member of the Curriculum Committee and of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs. Mr. Silverman emphasized that the Registrar would be a non-voting member of both committees. Without further discussion, the Senate endorsed this recommendation unanimously.

[Secretary's note: the affected sections are Article V, Sections 3 B 8a. and 3 B 2a., found on pp. 49 and 45, respectively, of the Faculty/Administration Manual.]

Frank Cossa, acting on his own behalf, then introduced a motion originally outlined in a letter to the Speaker dated January 27, 1995:

The Faculty Senate instructs the Faculty Welfare Committee [amended to "the Academic Planning Committee"] to devise an instrument whereby the Faculty may evaluate the Administration, the results of this evaluation to be made available to the Faculty.

Rationale:

Each member of the Faculty is required to undergo evaluation each year, likewise Chairs and Deans. It is only fair and just (and legal) that administrators be similarly evaluated.

The Senate previously "passed unanimously on a voice vote, with no discussion" (Minutes of the Faculty Senate, November 2, 1993) a resolution to have the results of the last evaluation of the Administration made available to the Faculty. This resolution was never complied with.

During a brief discussion, Amy McCandless said that she was not sure what we could do if the Provost would not follow through and make the results of administrative evaluations available to the Senate. Frank Kinard said there was no need to rely on the Office of Academic Affairs for this information; why not have the Faculty Senate devise an instrument for evaluating administrators, for our own benefit? As a friendly amendment, Frank Petrusak moved to send Mr. Cossa's instructions to the Academic Planning Committee, instead of the Welfare Committee; this was accepted. The main motion passed unanimously, as amended, on a voice vote.

Wayne Jordan then introduced a series of motions from the Curriculum Committee, including a further clarification of the science requirement in Computer Science, and new courses or descriptions or changes in French, Philosophy, Religious Studies, Communication, Library, Geology, Art History, and Biology. After some discussion, these changes were amended and passed; they are summarized below. Please note that one course proposal (Biology 2XX, "Ecology of Southern Africa") was NOT approved, but remanded to committee instead. Also, several changes in Philosophy and Religious Studies moved by the Curriculum Committee, including the course descriptions for Philosophy 260, and Religious Studies 245 and 401, were amended by the Senate in order to change them back to the way they had been worded in the original course proposals submitted by the Philosophy Department. The Curriculum Committee's report, and a letter of
clarification kindly supplied after the meeting by the chairman of the Philosophy Department, are attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

**COMPUTER SCIENCE**

Clarification of requirements (BS in Computer Science)
Amendment of prerequisites (CSCI 350)

**LANGUAGES: FRENCH**

New Course: FREN 446 History of the French Language (3hrs.)

**PHILOSOPHY & RELIGIOUS STUDIES [with three amendments, noted here]**

New Course: PHIL 260 Philosophy of Biology (3)
*amended description, returning to language suggested by the Philosophy Department in their original course proposal sent to the Curriculum Committee, thus:*

An examination of philosophical issues within the biological sciences and questions about the epistemological status of biological knowledge. Possible topics include: the nature of life, the relationship between physical and biological sciences, the structure of evolutionary theory and the implications of sociobiology for ethical theories.

New Description and Prerequisite for RELS 401 Theories and Methods in the Study of Religion (3)
*amended, as above, restoring original wording, to:*

An examination of the problems and methods of the study of religion. Theories of the nature, origins and functions of religion will be considered. This course is designed as a senior seminar and is the capstone course for the program in Religious Studies. Prerequisite: 9 Semester hours at or above the 200-level in Religious Studies.

Revised Prerequisite for Religious Studies (Bulletin, p.350)
*not amended at the meeting, but passed as specified in Curriculum Committee’s circulated report; repeated here verbatim to forestall confusion:*

Prerequisite for all 300-level courses: 3 semester hours in Religious Studies or permission of instructor.

New Description for RELS 245 The Religions of India (3)
*amended, as above, restoring original wording, to:*

An examination of Hindu religious beliefs and practices in their Indian context with emphasis on primary texts, doctrines, rituals and the arts. Attention will be given to the change and development of Hindu religious ideas. The influences of Islam, Jainism, and Buddhism will also be explored.
ENGLISH & COMMUNICATION

New Courses: COMM 105 Forensic Lab (1, repeatable up to 4)
COMM 365 American Public Address (3)

LIBRARY

New Course: LIBR 105 Electronic Resources for Research (1)

GEOLOGY

Change in definition of the Minor in Geology

ART HISTORY

New Courses: ARTH 335 History of American Architecture (3)
ARTH 394 History of 18th and 19th Century Western Architecture (3)

HISTORY

New Courses: HIST 210 Special Topics in U.S. History (3)
HIST 233 Special Topics in European History Before 1715 (3)
HIST 240 Special Topics in European History After 1715 (3)
HIST 258 European Jewish History (3)
HIST 260 Special Topics in Asian, African, and Latin American History (3)
HIST 291 Special Topics in Medical History (3)

BIOLOGY

[BIOL 2XX, "Ecology of Southern Africa," was NOT PASSED, but remanded to committee.]

Course changes: BIOL 341 (General Ecology), and BIOL 3XX (Evolution, formerly 440)

Speaker's Report

The Speaker said that he had delayed his report until the end of the meeting because he thought other business should be completed before approaching a matter which he considered to be of considerable seriousness. He felt obliged to report to the Senate, and through the Senate to the Faculty at large, on his repeated but so far unsuccessful attempts to find out exactly what ad hoc "committees," "teams," "task-forces," "work-groups," and the like, dealing with academic matters, but NOT established by the Faculty, and operating largely or entirely without the Faculty's knowledge or approval, are currently in existence. Some examples -- and there are others -- include an "Advisory Committee on the Advising Center," a "Retention and Graduation Committee," and a group studying the implementation of a "Three Year Degree Program," for which, apparently, department chairs have already been told to submit plans. Mr. Mann expressed a strong belief that the Faculty Senate should not only, at the very least, be kept informed about such groups, but that, as a general rule, the existing structure of elected bodies should be used for "matters falling within
He then read an E-mail memorandum which he had sent to the Vice President for Enrollment Management on February 20.

To: Sue Sommer-Kresse
Subject: Committees

For the second time in two weeks I have become aware of committees which I did not know existed: the Advisory Committee on the Advising Center (last week) and the Retention and Graduation Committee (this week). Are there any more?

May I respectfully make a suggestion: committees formed by Academic Affairs which should involve the faculty should not in fact be formed at all. I would humbly beseech that Academic Affairs use the current structure of Faculty and Senate Committees to convey information and make policy. The Faculty and Senate Committees paint with broad enough brushes to fit whatever the nature is of a committee or task force which you desire to convene. For instance, Academic Standards or Student Affairs and Athletics (or both) could have been a forum for discussion of the Advising Center. Standards seems like a natural fit for Retention policies.

Creating ad hoc committees and task forces has been a sore spot to me for years because the establishment of same once led to bypassing faculty governance altogether. Certainly that is not your intention, but looks can be deceiving.

Please accept this comment with the spirit in which it is intended.

Dr. Sommer-Kresse, Mr. Mann continued, had sent back some details about the Advising Task Force (established by the Provost, apparently, in the Spring of last year), and about the "recruitment and retention" group (evidently an Enrollment Management subcommittee having no formal status) -- but no further information. On February 24, the Speaker thanked the Vice President, in a brief reply, and asked again whether there were any more such groups in existence.

On the 26 of February, Dr. Sommer-Kresse replied with some further details. The Speaker E-mailed her back as follows:

Thanks. May I print your letter in [the] Faculty Newsletter?

Of course my suggestion is [made in order to] inform the Speaker (this is not an ego trip!) so that the Speaker could advise you as to what relevant faculty committee(s) should be informed about these teams. The assumption is not that the teams make policy, but rather that it would be nice if faculty could know about these things openly. You never know. Most of us graduated from college three times, and some of us (whether we graduated three times or not) have some ideas. Linus Pauling once said that we all have ideas. The trick is to know which ones are the good ones.

My idea of full disclosure (too formal a phrase but it will have to do) is a good idea.

If you can think of any other groups, teams, councils or committees that the faculty might profit by knowing about, please let me know.
On February 27, Mr. Mann continued, Dr. Sommer-Kresse had replied with a brief message beginning, "Please do not print the response in the present form" -- apparently, he said, she had felt that her E-mail memorandum was just a quick answer to his questions, and not in a format suitable for distribution to the faculty. No additional information, however, on what ad hoc groups actually exist, was included.

Most recently, on the 28 of February (two weeks before the present meeting) he had received another electronic note, saying that the Vice President was not quite sure what the Speaker was asking for. He had answered directly, that he was simply asking for a list of task forces, committees, and ad hoc groups: what others are there, precisely what do they do, and why aren't the regular standing faculty committees and the faculty governance structures informed about them?

No reply had been received. "Be on guard," he said.

The Speaker concluded his report by noting that the Conference of South Carolina Faculty Chairs has a position paper in preparation vigorously opposing recent cuts in the funding of higher education in South Carolina.

**Constituents' Concerns**

Richard Godsen suggested that committee reports, especially for lengthy items like business from the Curriculum Committee, should be circulated on double-side pages, in order to save paper. Frank Cossa wanted to know if any progress had been made with regard to the Advising Task Force. David Mann said that he had attended one of their meetings (uninvited) and had told them they ought to disband, and let a regularly constituted Faculty Committee, such as the Curriculum Committee, deal with such matters next year. The faculty was perfectly capable, he thought, of coming up with a reasonable solution on its own to the problem of advising undeclared majors, and he suggested that a number of Senators would no doubt be more than happy to volunteer their time for such an important effort. He called for a show of hands to see who would be willing to take on, say, ten such additional advisees next year. No less than twenty hands went up, though the number appeared to dwindle slightly under scrutiny. The Speaker was cheered, he said, by this level of support; two-hundred advisees could thus be accommodated at a stroke. If the principle were extended to the faculty as a whole and received the same ratio of support, the whole problem of advising undeclared majors might be taken care of, without departmental quotas or administrative interference. Carla Lowrey wondered whether the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics might not be a better choice than Curriculum to look into advising next year. Hugh Haynsworth commented that he thought the President's Advisory Committee had also discussed the problem of advising (as well as the mail room), but had no solutions to bring to the Senate, thinking their job was simply to let the President know there were problems in these areas.

**New Business (cont.): Proposed Change in the By-Laws**

Beverly Diamond, for the Committee on Nominations and Elections, asked to return to New Business in order to introduce a proposal to change the By-Laws regulating the timing of nominations and elections for faculty committees. Without objection, it was so ordered, and she did. The changes proposed are as follows:
Article V, Section 2 A:
Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations and Elections by March 15 and elected by the Senate at the April Senate meeting.

Article V, Section 3A:
Members of standing College committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations and Elections by March 15 and elected by the faculty (as defined in Article I Section 1) at the April faculty meeting.

Article V, Section 3 B 3, 4:

(3) To present to Senators, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing Senate committees by March 15;

(4) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing College committees by March 15; []

Rationale: The dates currently listed in the By-Laws were written under the assumption that a Senate meeting would occur at the end of April. This is no longer the case, and the proposed dates describe what is actually required.

The By-Laws Committee would make a recommendation on this proposal at the April 4 meeting of the Senate.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned just before 7:00 o'clock. [After the meeting ended, James Carew pointed out a hitherto undetected error in the Minutes of the February 7 meeting: the change from "excellent" to "meritorious," incorporated as an amendment to the first sentence of the third paragraph on p. 6, should be repeated elsewhere in the paragraph, since that is obviously what was intended. True.]

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The sixth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1994-1995 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 7 in Room 118 of The Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty David Mann presiding. Thirty-nine senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (January 17) were approved as circulated. (But please see below, under "Constituents' Concerns," for mistakes brought to the Secretary's attention at the end of the meeting by James Carew.)

New Business

David Mann proposed "that the Registrar be added as an ex officio member of the Faculty Curriculum Committee and the Continuing Education/Graduate Education/Special Programs Committee." This proposed change in the By-Laws, he said, would go to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, for a recommendation at the next meeting.

Wayne Jordan then moved a series of recommendations from the Curriculum Committee. The first was an amendment to the Committee's original report, handed out by Mr. Jordan at the start of the meeting and reproduced here in extenso for the sake of clarity:

BIOLOGY

February 7, 1995

[Biology 399: Tutorial]

Change the number of semester hours credit from 3 to 1-3, and the maximum hours credit from 12 to 3.

Add prerequisites: Biology 111, 111L, 112, 112L

Bulletin description as follows:

Biology 399, Tutorial (1-3, repeatable up to 3).
Individual instruction given by a tutor in regularly scheduled meetings (usually once a week).
Prerequisites: Biology 111, 111L, 112, 112L, junior standing, and permission of tutor and department chair. [p. 392]

This proposal passed, as amended. The remaining recommendations of the Committee, from the report of January 27, may be summarized as follows:
ENGLISH AND COMMUNICATION

New Courses:  
- English 354 Jewish American Literature (3hrs.)
- English 495 Field Internship (1-3)
- Communication 399 Tutorial (3) [amend prerequisites to read, "at least junior standing," etc.]
- Communication 499 Bachelor's Essay (6)

[Bulletin descriptions, pp. 245, 247, 256, 257]

LANGUAGES: CLASSICS AND GERMAN

Changes in Requirements for German Major:

Increase hours from 24 to 27 beyond intermediate level  
Add GRMN 313 to course listings in Bulletin (previously approved but omitted because of error)  
Add GRMN 463 to choices satisfying requirement of at least one other 400-level course  

[Bulletin description, p. 323]

During a brief discussion, Carla Lowrey noted that the increase in hours required for the German major had also been approved by the faculty at a previous meeting, as German 313 had been, but this change had not made its way into the Bulletin either. These recommendations also passed, as amended, and the original documents are attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

Andy Abrams was then recognized, and reported briefly, as requested, on the College's efforts, still very preliminary, to gain a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa. In April of last year the President and the Provost had decided to look into the question, and an application had been sent off in October. The first part is purely quantitative. At about the end of April of this year, their Committee on Qualifications will select places to visit; if we were to be selected, they would come to investigate sometime in late 1995 or early 1996. They have told us that around fifty institutions make inquiries in each application "cycle." Of these, usually six to eight are chosen for visitation, and an even smaller number, sometimes as few as two or three, are finally approved. There is no longer, as there once was, any difficulty about an institution's reapplying if it gets turned down to start with. Joe Benich asked what the Phi Beta Kappa membership ratio was between public and private institutions, and between doctoral-degree-granting and largely undergraduate institutions. Mr. Abrams said that he had no information on this, but most types of institutions were eligible. Caroline Hunt mentioned that last year the chairs had been asked to supply the names of ΦBK members in their departments. Mr. Abrams said that one of the requirements for applying was that 10% of an institution's faculty, or at least ten individual faculty, must be ΦBK members; the College of Charleston has twenty-five. How would membership effect the already existing honors societies? This had not yet been addressed. William Moore pointed out that election to Phi Beta Kappa had been a traditional reward for able students in Arts and Sciences, and he wondered whether eligibility at the College would be limited to certain fields or "Schools." Mr. Abrams replied that membership is institutional, rather than by subject studied. Caroline Hunt said that she thought most institutions had their own, internal criteria for membership, and she wondered why the faculty had not been consulted before the application process had been undertaken. Essentially, Mr. Abrams replied, the President had simply been interested in finding out if we were eligible as an institution, and that is "where it is" at the moment.
William Moore, as chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, then introduced two recommendations. The first, on the termination (from employment) of probationary faculty, had been initiated by the campus chapter of the AAUP and further developed by the Welfare Committee, who had given it their unanimous approval. Accordingly, Mr. Moore moved the following changes to the College of Charleston Faculty-Administration Manual (deletions are in [brackets], additions in bold):

1. Recommendation Concerning Termination of Probationary Faculty

From time to time it is important to the welfare of students or faculty in a department for a faculty member to be terminated from employment at the end of a first-year or second-year appointment. This is a legally correct action since state legislation (SC Code 8-17-380) provides that non-renewal of a one-year contract at the end of the contract period is not grievable and is not in violation of the terms of employment. When the decision is reached not to extend a one-year appointment for an additional year, no reason for non-renewal need be given, but it is usually more professional and humane for the chair to discuss the reasons leading to the decision with the faculty member affected. Nonetheless, terminations based on discriminatory intent, violations of academic freedom, or inadequate consideration are all grievable under other provisions of the SC Code, federal law, and/or this Manual. In the case of the termination of probationary appointments (nontenured, tenure-track faculty), the faculty member must be informed of the decision in writing and, upon request of the faculty member, must be provided with the reasons for termination in writing.

(Manual, p.72)

The College is under no obligation to reappoint any untenured faculty member at the expiration of the contractual year [, and the South Carolina State Personnel Department does not require that any cause for non-renewal be given by the Chair of the department or any member of the administration]. But termination decisions for probationary faculty must be made in writing and, upon request of the faculty member, the reasons for termination must be provided in writing.

(Manual, p.73)

Before beginning the discussion, Mr. Moore outlined the rationale which the Committee had circulated with their proposal:

Faculty hired into probationary positions, both tenure-track and instructor lines, ought to be furnished with a reasonable expectation that their contracts will not be terminated during the probationary period except for cause, where cause includes the considered judgment of the tenured departmental faculty, the Provost, the President, and possibly the Tenure and Promotion Committee, that a candidate's performance is substandard with respect to the criteria established for tenure or promotion.

If grounds for dismissal happen to be somewhat tenuous, the current language in the Manual may encourage a departmental chair, or even an entire department, to undertake an early dismissal of a probationary faculty member in order to avoid the potentially more difficult process of going through a third year evaluation.
Other sections of the Manual seem to contradict the current statements on pages 72 and 73. For example, p. 69:

If a faculty member on probationary or other nontenured appointment alleges that a decision against reappointment was based significantly on considerations violative of academic freedom or governing policies concerning illegal or institutional discrimination by the institution on the basis of race, sex, religion, national origin, age, physical handicap, marital status, or sexual or affectional preference, he or she may file a grievance with the Faculty Hearing Committee.

The probationary or nontenured appointee may always demand adequate assurance that his or her termination was not motivated by prohibited considerations. Such consideration cannot be had unless the terminated faculty member is provided with a full explanation of the reasons for non-renewal.

Regardless of what we say or omit in the Manual, or what the legislature says in the South Carolina Code, the First and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution take priority on issues of academic freedom and discrimination, respectively.

Phil Dustan wanted to know who makes the decision to "terminate from employment" in such cases. The answer was, that the procedures for this are in place elsewhere in the Manual. Joe Benich asked whether those with "terminated" contracts are automatically offered a second year to finish out their employment; if so, the recommendation would, he thought, be changing something found elsewhere in the procedures of the Manual. Pursuing a previous question, Caroline Hunt asked whether the Welfare Committee had actually looked at the issue of who "terminates." Mr. Moore said they had not, and that this was perhaps a significant omission; Paul Young agreed. Frank Kinard said the effect of these changes would be to require providing a written explanation of termination to everyone so affected, and that this would be putting the institution to a great deal of trouble. The College, he said, was in a bind right now; he was fearful of more lawsuits if this measure were endorsed. "Why shouldn't this institution," Robin Bowers asked, "be put to some trouble" over something this important? Richard Nunan, speaking to Mr. Kinard's question, said that not giving reasons for termination would likely lead to lawsuits; better for everyone concerned to have to give reasons. Mr. Kinard replied that the courts will make institutions follow "due process" no matter what "procedures" are in place.

Carla Lowrey cautioned that we may be opening a "can of worms" here. We all know, she said, that in an academic situation there are sometimes reasons to get rid of people -- good reasons -- that would not stand up in court. Richard Nunan replied that "the horse is already out of the barn," since language about grievance suits already appears in the Manual. Not to give reasons for dismissal would be to open up the probability of more legal action against the College, not less. Mr. Kinard objected again: the language being proposed, making "inadequate consideration" a legitimate grounds for grievance, was very broad. James Carew wanted to know if striking out this particular phrase would be a substantial loss. Mr. Nunan answered that these terms are defined elsewhere in the Manual as referring only to procedures, not to substance. Someone asked if the document had been examined by a lawyer; Mr. Moore replied that Andy Abrams had seen an earlier version of it.
Rebecca Herring asked how specific the "reasons" given for termination would have to be. Mr. Moore said that this was not a question specifically addressed by the Welfare Committee, but that probably a fairly general statement would do, or at least he believed that would be the case. In the event, the recommendation passed, on a voice vote.

Mr. Moore then introduced the second proposal from the Welfare Committee, the draft of an optional salary-review plan. This plan was not, he said, by any means "written in stone," and suggestions would be welcome. One reason for developing it is that public schools in South Carolina have a system in place for automatic pay-raises over a period of years, but we do not. A result is the "salary compression" we have learned about recently, which particularly afflicts long-term faculty members at the College. But this proposal -- which could be extended to librarians as well, with a few changes in terminology -- ought to help almost everyone, and not just senior faculty. The plan, he emphasized, would be strictly optional; participation would be entirely at the faculty member's discretion. His understanding, furthermore, was that the Administration definitely favored developing some sort of proposal along these lines.

During prolonged discussion, a clause was cut out of the second paragraph, and a correction and friendly amendment added to the third, changing the word "excellent" to "meritorious." After some unsuccessful attempts to raise the raises of the worthy, the question was called on the main motion by Mr. Benich, and the draft recommendation approved, as amended, on a voice vote:

DRAFT

Five Year Optional Pay Review for Faculty

An optional merit performance review process will be available for all faculty who have obtained their highest academic rank based on their degree status. This would include Full Professors who have achieved the College's highest academic rank as well as Associate and Assistant Professors who, because of degree status, are ineligible for promotion to a higher rank. This optional merit performance review could occur after the completion of a minimum of each five year period in rank. This optional pay review can be initiated only by the professor.

Individuals who wish to be evaluated will submit a letter to the Provost with a copy to their Chair by May 1st of their fifth year (or later) of service in rank asking for an optional merit pay review. The professor will prepare a packet consisting of evidence of continued Teaching Effectiveness, Research and Professional Development and Professional Service to the Community for the period of service to be evaluated as outlined in the College of Charleston Faculty Organization and By-Laws (see pages 78-81 of May 13, 1994 document). Confidential letters of evaluation will be solicited from departmental members [of the same rank or higher, deleted]. In addition, the Chair will solicit letters from at least three extra departmental colleagues whose names will be provided by the candidate. The entire packet will be submitted to the College of Charleston's collegewide Tenure and Promotion committee for evaluation by October 1st. The Tenure and Promotion Committee will review the packet and may conduct an oral interview with the candidate. The Committee will apply the following standards in its evaluation:
(1) Exemplary teaching effectiveness.
(2) Continuing quality scholarship. Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality, therefore the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professional evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). In addition to scholarship, sustained professional activity is expected. All evidence should be rigorously evaluated.
(3) Active and sustained participation in a leadership capacity in service to the College and, where appropriate, to the community.

Specific standards for each rank are in the Faculty Manual.

The Tenure and Promotion Committee will recommend by December 1st either of the following performance ratings for each professor being evaluated - Meritorious [replacing Excellent] or Satisfactory. A rating of excellent would result in a $2,500 merit raise for Full Professors, a $2,000 merit raise for Associate Professors and a $1,500 merit raise for Assistant Professors. These raises will be independent of any other pay increase and would be implemented the next academic year. A rating of satisfactory would result in no merit increase. Professors who receive a rating of excellent may request a merit pay review at the end of each five year period. Professors who receive a satisfactory [evaluation, added] may reapply for a merit pay review after two additional years.

This proposal will be implemented beginning May 1995 with the first evaluations to be conducted October 1995. In order to reduce the administrative and financial impact on the Committee and Institution, it is proposed that those professors with 10 years or more in rank be eligible for evaluation in the first year. Those with five years or more in rank will be eligible for evaluation in the second year. From that time forward, individuals will be eligible for evaluations at the designated intervals.

Rationale:

The proposal is designed to encourage and reward senior faculty members who continue to perform at a level of excellence once they achieve the highest rank for which they are eligible. It would also contribute significantly to faculty morale and may dissuade some from seeking other faculty positions or pursuing administrative careers when they would really prefer to teach, engage in research, and provide service. It could also help to alleviate salary compression. While this proposal impacts most immediately on senior faculty members, it should be emphasized that faculty members in all ranks may benefit from this proposal over time.

*****

The original documents of both recommendations from the Welfare Committee are attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.
Jack Parson brought up recent changes in the campus mail service, noting that the mail room was declining to deliver mail received from private shippers, such as UPS or Federal Express, to department offices, requiring instead (without consulting the faculty) that such private carriers deliver directly. This, he said, was a matter of serious concern. Occasionally, perhaps, there had been abuses, such as faculty or administrators trying to get truck tires, or video equipment, delivered through the College mail. On the other hand, some faculty had experienced very serious delays in receiving dated material vital to their research, in some cases losing out on grant applications or publication deadlines because letters or parcels sent by private carrier had been held up or returned by the mail room, instead of being delivered, as would normally be expected in a university setting, through the campus mail.

Mr. Parson also called attention to what he said the Advising Center had recently done, which was to reinstitute a formula for determining how many instructional faculty from each department must present themselves for advising duty at advising time. Apparently, this quota system is made necessary by students not taking per-registration, or whatever, seriously enough, which is caused, in turn, by "current student behavior." But we as a faculty should be changing student behavior, not giving in to it. This was surely a backward step. The Task Force on Advising, by the way, had seen nothing about this formula, and was probably expected to "rubber stamp" it. Mr. Parson concluded by asking that the President's Advisory Committee look into the whole question of advising. Too much, he said, is now being done at the administrative level by fiat rather than discussion.

David Mann said that he had just spent almost a whole day on these two particular problems. For the moment, the mail room will deliver UPS packages. Also, Maggie Pennington will bring this issue, and the question of advising, to the President's attention at the next meeting of the Advisory Committee. Beverly Diamond commented that the problem with the packages had been going on for some months now, with no notice at all having been sent to the faculty. The Speaker said that he thought there had been some kind of notification sent out on "WANDO" during the fall term -- but not everyone on the faculty uses that system. Frank Kinard said it would be much better for the faculty to be able to continue to use their professional address -- it would be a real handicap, in some case, not to be allowed to do so.

James Carew, who had not been able to be present earlier, when the Minutes of the previous meeting (January 17, 1995) had been approved, called attention to an error and two omissions. On the next-to-last line of page 1, "Academic Affairs Committee" -- there being no such animal -- should be corrected to "Academic Standards Committee." Farther back in the same paragraph, probably right after the third sentence, a comment of Mr. Carew's should be inserted in the discussion of a proposed attendance policy (later remanded to committee) for students officially representing the College:

Dean William Lindstrom said the statement should perhaps include something about no "direct" penalties for such activities. James Carew commented that there should not be any "direct" grade penalties assessed in any college-level courses. Enrique Graf thought that taking part in artistic "performances," [and so on].
The other omission came at the end of the first paragraph on page 3. These words, Mr. Carew said, ought to have been included:

> Provost Festa was asked whether the data supplied to Deans and Chairs was to be shared with the Faculty, and Festa indicated that, yes, they were to be shared with Faculty [end of paragraph; text kindly supplied by Mr. Carew].

It was important to have this on the record, Mr. Carew said, because apparently some departments were not cooperating in making the data available.

Finally, Caroline Hunt asked what had happened to the questions about the status of the Honors Program that had been raised at an earlier meeting. David Mann said that this would be reported on next time. With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
January 17, 1995

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fifth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1994-1995 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 17 in Room 118 of The Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty David Mann presiding. Forty-six senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (November 29) were approved as circulated.

The Speaker reported that there would be an open meeting of the Trustees on January 18 and urged members of the Senate and all interested faculty to attend. He also mentioned that there would be a conference on publishing, to be held at the Lightsey Center in late February.

New Business

Liz Martinez, for the Student Affairs and Athletics Committee, proposed a class attendance policy for students who officially represent the College, to be inserted on p. 114 of the Bulletin:

Absences due to officially approved representation of the College of Charleston, such as athletic teams and student congresses, will not result in a grade penalty for the student.

Frank Kinard objected, saying that absences may well lead to lower grades, and legitimately so, if a student does not make up work missed by "representing the College." Dean William Lindstrom said the statement should perhaps include something about no "direct" penalties for such activities. Enrique Graf thought that taking part in artistic "performances," such as concerts or plays, should also be exempted, and suggested adding this word. Dean William Lindstrom said the statement should perhaps include something about no "direct" penalties for such activities. Enrique Graf thought that taking part in artistic "performances," such as concerts or plays, should also be exempted, and suggested adding this word. Joe Bennich wanted the proposal to make clear that students are responsible for making up any work missed through such participation. Lynne Ford wanted to know what "official" meant; who decides what events are "official" or otherwise? Caroline Hunt said that in its present form the proposal seems to imply that athletics, student meetings, concerts, plays, and so on, come before academics at the College, and that this is precisely the wrong message to send. Now, as in the past, if extra-curricular activities cause problems, students should learn to work around those problems; the faculty should not be expected to work around the student. The notion that the faculty should routinely be expected to give priority to matters other than academic seemed, she said, to be gradually gaining acceptance, and represented a creeping mentality that the Senate could do something to put a stop to, while still protecting students from being arbitrarily penalized. She moved to remand the proposal to committee, saying that an open forum on the subject might be a good idea. Hugh Haynsworth supported the motion to remand, but added, as a friendly amendment, that the Student Affairs and Athletics Committee should be directed to meet with the Academic Affairs Committee in order to work out a joint proposal. The motion to remand, as amended, passed unanimously.
For the Curriculum Committee, Wayne Jordan moved four proposals, as circulated to the Senate in a memorandum of January 4, 1995. These may be abbreviated as follows:

1. A NEW INTERDISCIPLINARY MINOR IN PRE-ACTUARIAL STUDIES (Department of Mathematics/Department of Economics and Finance)

2. RE-FORM IN THE SOCIOLOGY MAJOR PROGRAM [see summary below]

3. CLARIFICATION OF SCIENCE REQUIREMENT IN THE COMPUTER SCIENCE (BS) MAJOR AND CHANGE OF PREREQUISITES FOR CSCI 350 [not passed]

4. NEW COURSES IN ELEMENTARY AND EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

   EDEE 465: Independent Study in Education (1-3hrs.)

   EDEE 580: Special Topics in Education (1-3)

During the brief discussion, Frank Kinard wanted to know, in reference to the first item, how many students would be likely to pursue "Pre-Actuarial Studies"? Richard Norton said that at the moment there were two or three; if it became a recognized Minor, there might be four or five. Proposals 1, 2, and 4 passed, on a voice vote. The third proposal, in Computer science, received more attention, since there seemed to be some question about which courses could be counted among the "two (2) additional courses chosen from other science courses which satisfy BACHELOR OF SCIENCE requirements in Physics, Biology, Marine Biology, Chemistry, Biochemistry, or Geology." Phil Dustan wanted to remove "Marine Biology" from the list, and this was accepted as a friendly amendment. Caroline Hunt said that the Computer Science Department ought to supply a specific list of courses that it accepts or rejects, rather than trying to cover the matter in a single, general sentence. In the event, the third proposal was turned down, on a unanimous voice vote. At the meeting Mr. Jordan circulated a useful Addendum to the Committee's report, which may be reproduced here. All of the original documents are attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

Summary of Changes in Sociology Program

Total hours of required courses increases from 33 to 34.
Math 104 or equivalent required of all majors.
SOCY 202 and two new courses, SOCY 271 (Intro to Social Research) and SOCY 491 (Soc Colloquium), are required of all majors. Special Topics required discontinued.
More definite requirements for the Minor: SOCY 101, 202, 260, 271 and two courses at 300 level.
Changes in title or number or definition of SOCY 205, 206, 231, 352, 358, 371.
The following inserted as Prerequisites for SOCY 360 and 371: SOCY 101, 202, 260, and 271.
The following inserted as Prerequisites for all courses numbered in the 330s, 340s, and 350s: SOCY 101 and 200-level SOCY course.
The following inserted as Prerequisite for all 300 level courses:
For non-majors, written permission from the instructor is required if other prerequisites are not met.
SOCY 252 is dropped, its content to be taught in SOCY 352. Population and Society.
Report

Most of the remainder of the meeting was taken up by a report on faculty salaries, presented by Arthur Felts, with the assistance of Janet Key, prepared by the Institute for Public Affairs and Policy Studies. The Provost, Conrad Festa, said that the study had taken a year to complete, and was based on questionnaires sent to a group of "peer institutions," some of which, despite assurances of confidentiality, had declined to participate. He himself had reviewed the data very carefully. The study revealed a "significant problem" with salary compression -- that is, with salaries falling gradually farther and farther behind over a period of years -- especially at the Full Professor level. There were, Mr. Festa added, some small problems elsewhere, but nothing of outstanding concern; the College is reasonably competitive with other comparable institutions, both regionally and locally.

Mr. Felts proceeded to introduce a series of nineteen overhead projections, containing graphic displays of statistics derived from running a "regression analysis" on the data received. The purpose of this, he said, was to attempt to measure actual College of Charleston faculty salaries against what they might reasonably be expected to be, when compared with salaries at other institutions, taking into account considerations of faculty rank, gender, years of service, academic department, and so on. Owing, doubtless, to the extremely sensitive nature of the subject, no supporting documents of any kind were circulated to the Senate, and no copies of the documents briefly displayed on the overhead projector were forthcoming, either for inclusion in, or attachment to, the Minutes. The presentation, therefore, must remain effectively "off the record." Mr. Felts concluded, however, that on the whole "we are doing pretty well."

Constituents' Concerns

Beverly Diamond asked senators please to remind their colleagues to return their requests for committee assignments. Mr. Mann noted that there will be a report on Phi Beta Kappa at the next meeting. Hugh Haynsworth pointed out that this year's "drop-add" period had been extended to five days, with a good deal of resulting confusion. It ought to be cut to three days next time.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
November 29, 1994

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fourth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1994-1995 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 29 in Room 118 of The Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty David Mann presiding. Forty-four senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (November 1) were approved as circulated.

The Senate gave tentative approval, pending completion of all requirements, to undergraduate and graduate degree candidates intending to graduate in December; the names are attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

Beverly Diamond, for the Committee on Nominations, recommended two changes on the Tenure and Promotion Committee: Virginia Benmaman (Languages), previously a regular member, becomes an alternate, and David Kowal (Art History), previously an alternate, becomes a regular member. These recommendations were accepted, and the Tenure Committee is now as follows:

Members:
James Carew
Marion Doig
Caroline Hunt
David Kowal
Gary Tidwell

Alternates:
Virginia Benmaman
Katherine Bielsky
Robert Johnson
James Smiley
Paige Wisotzka

Wayne Jordan then moved a series of proposals from the Curriculum Committee, including new courses in History, African American Studies, a change in listing in Art History/Arts Management and Administration, and a set of guidelines on Special Topics courses; these may be summarized as follows:

Memorandum of Nov. 21, 1994:

1. Course Changes

History

New Course: HIST 221: Women in the United States (3hrs.)

African American Studies

New Course: AAST 200: Introduction to African American Studies (3)
Art History/Arts Management and Administration

Change in Department Listing: ARTH 240 becomes ARTM 240: Gallery Fundamentals

2. Guidelines for the use of Special Topics Courses:

Major and Minor Departments should utilize Special Topics courses with discretion. Prior to the first offering of a particular topic, notification in due form* will be sent to the Faculty Curriculum Committee and thence to the Faculty Senate, for information. Before the third offering of a particular topic within a period of five years, it must be submitted as a new course for the approval of the Faculty Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate and, when approved, be published in the Bulletin under its own title and number. When Special Topics courses are interdepartmental in character or subject, formal consultation with "interested" Departments is expected.

*The Faculty Curriculum Committee will generate a form for this purpose, a brief version of the New Course Form presently in use.

[Secretary's note: the concluding sentence of the main paragraph was originally placed right after the first sentence, and was moved to its present position by a friendly amendment.]

During the brief discussion, Frank Kinard wondered why AAST 200 had no prerequisites; Mr. Jordan said that this was not unusual. Hugh Wilder wished to know if the new form would be used for every Special Topics course, and not just interdisciplinary ones; the answer was, yes. Robert Johnson wanted to know what would happen when a course was offered for the third time in year six; the answer was, that this would not affect the basic sequence of one, three, five. Richard Nunan asked whether the guidelines did not represent a change to two allowable years before special topics courses must go through the Curriculum Committee, rather than the three years specified under the present rule? Mr. Jordan replied that no record of such a rule ever having actually been passed by the faculty appears to exist. Marty Perlmutter wondered if the requirement that all Senate members get copies would not generate too much unnecessary paperwork; no, because the Senate is not the full faculty, merely a microcosm. Paul Young added that the Curriculum Committee publishes no Minutes, and so giving notification of Special Topics courses to Senators was a way of having them on record. In the event, these proposals passed, as amended, on a voice vote; the original documents are attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

Larry Carlson then introduced a series of proposals from the Faculty Committee on Graduate and Continuing Education, as approved by the Graduate Council. These proposals include new or changed graduate courses in Biology, Education, Geology, Languages, Mathematics, Physics, and Public Administration, and may be summarized as follows; minor corrections, and an amendment, are incorporated (N = New Course; C = Course Change):

Biology

BIOL 6XX & EVSS 610: Environmental Biology (N)
Education

EDEE 706: Special Topics in Education (N)
EDFS 687: Technology Education for Teachers (C)
EDFS 689: Application of Telecommunications in the Classroom (C)
EDFS 690: Use of Technology in Reading, Language Arts, and Social Studies (C)
EDFS 691: Use of Technology in Math and Science (C)
EDFS 692: Advanced Technology Applications in Education (N)
EDFS 712: Transition Programming for Exceptional Children and Youth (C)
EDFS 716: Working with Families of Exceptional Children and Youth (C)
EDFS 717: Technology Applications in Special and Remedial Education (C)

Geology

EVSS 640: Earth Systems Science (N)
EVSS 641: Aqueous Geochemistry (N)
EVSS 643: Environmental Geochemistry (N)
EVSS 645: Coastal Processes and Issues (N)
[The proposal was amended to eliminate co-listing EVSS 645 as GEOL 445]

Languages

LANG 590: Special Topics (N)

Mathematics

MATH 523: Partial Differential Equations I (N) [numbering corrected, adding "I"]
MATH 551: Linear Programming and Optimization (N)
MATH 552: Operations Research (N)
MATH 611: Real Analysis I (C)
MATH 623: Partial Differential Equations II (N) [delete first sentence from the description on p. 134 of the Bulletin]
MATH 699: Independent Study in Mathematics (N)

Physics

EVSS 650: Energy Production and Resource Management (N)
EVSS 656: Atmospheric Science (N)
EVSS 658: Climate Change (N)

Public Administration

PUBA 701: Capstone Seminar (N) [correction: to be first offered in the Spring of 1995, not 1994]

During the discussion, Frank Kinard asked, as a point of information, whether he was correct in thinking that undergraduates were not allowed in graduate courses? Mr. Carlson said that this depends on the department and the program. Laura Hines noted that particularly able undergraduates are occasionally allowed into some graduate courses if they have exhausted the regular
undergraduate offerings. Questions were raised about the proposed cross-listing of EVSS 645, Coastal Processes and Issues, as Geology 445; was it already in the catalogue as an undergraduate course? The answer was, presumably yes. Laura Hines said, however, that more work would be required of any graduate students enrolled. Mr. Kinard thought there were possibly serious problems in having both undergraduates and graduates enrolled in the same course, and urged that there was no reason to duplicate 400-, 500-, and 600-level courses concerned with the same material. David Mann commented that the problem appeared to be the possible overlap between upper-level undergraduate, and lower-level graduate courses, and wondered whether the matter should be sent to the Academic Planning Committee. (Beverly Diamond suggested voting on the 600-level courses first, before taking up this question; the Speaker said the motion was unnecessary, because the matter was already on the floor.) Caroline Hunt asked whether voting on a 600-level course would authorize it on the 400-level; the answer was, no. Mr. Carlson noted that his committee considered that it was recommending the substance of the courses involved, rather than the numbers, which the CHE had already approved. Frank Kinard said that we ought to have a written policy covering the overlap between graduate and undergraduate course enrollment, though we could act on the motion before us now. Susan Morrison, the Parliamentarian, said that an amendment to the motion, accepting EVSS 645, but striking out the cross-listing as GEOL 445, would be in order; this amendment was moved and passed. The main motion passed, as amended (and with the minor corrections noted above), on a voice vote. The original proposals and supporting documents, amounting to some 72 pages, are attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

John Newell then moved to direct the Academic Policy Committee to look into and report on the question of overlapping graduate and undergraduate courses. This was seconded and passed unanimously, on a voice vote.

Von Bakanic, for the Academic Standards Committee, introduced a resolution from the Office of Admissions and Continuing Education for changes to pp. 24-25 of the College of Charleston Undergraduate Bulletin. The purpose of these changes is "to extend the present Continuing Education policy" by incorporating "a justified need for clearer academic standards" and providing "greater opportunities for adult students." The resolution contains eight paragraphs, to be inserted between the fourth paragraph on p. 24 and the fourth paragraph on p. 25, replacing the present language from "Continuing Education Students" up to the start of a description of the "North Area Facility." An important part of this resolution is the addition of a paragraph d), describing an "Adult Degree Track." After very brief discussion, the resolution on Continuing Education passed without objection, on a voice vote. The original document from the Office of Admissions and Continuing Education is attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

William Moore, for the Faculty Welfare Committee, then introduced three proposals, on sabbaticals, smoking, and parking. The first, which had been introduced at the previous meeting but postponed in order to allow a representative of the Welfare Committee to speak to the issue, received some discussion. James Carew moved to strike the last sentence of the first paragraph on p. 2 of the Sabbatical Leave Policy ("The faculty member must disclose any additional income she/he receives while on sabbatical"); the motion to strike passed on a voice vote, and the Sabbatical Leave Policy was then endorsed, as amended. Second, Mr. Moore put forward a memorandum to the Welfare Committee from Andy Abrams, Vice-President for Legal Affairs, dated October 5, 1994, suggesting "that the following language be used to address the concerns expressed by the Senate about the current smoking policy":
The College of Charleston hereby adopts the preamble of the South Carolina Clean Indoor Air Act of 1990, which provides in part that it is "desirable to accommodate the needs of nonsmokers to be free from exposure to tobacco smoke while in public indoor places." Consistent with both this principle and the specific provisions of the Act, smoking is prohibited in all College of Charleston buildings, except in "enclosed private offices" and designated employee break areas.

For purposes of the College of Charleston's smoking policy, "Enclosed private offices" are defined as "those private offices with sufficient physical separation to insure that tobacco smoke does not impinge upon non-smoking areas." Accordingly, where smoke from an otherwise private office does impinge upon smoke-free areas, the office is not "enclosed" and, therefore, is not an allowable area for smoking.

Upon the registration of a complaint or acting on her/his own behalf, the immediate supervisor shall be responsible for determining whether an office of any employee under the supervisor's control is an "enclosed private office." The supervisor shall make this determination and advise, in writing, the office resident and the complainant of the decision. If the supervisor concludes that this office is not an "enclosed private office," then the office in question shall immediately be designated a non-smoking area. Thereafter, the supervisor may attempt, where appropriate, to accommodate the office resident by seeking some other available "enclosed private office" on campus where smoking would be permitted.

After some discussion (during which Mr. Abrams made clear that the proposal was intended to deal only with faculty offices, and not reopen other aspects of the question), and an unsuccessful attempt to amend, the motion on smoking passed, on a voice vote.

Mr. Moore then introduced the third proposal from the Welfare Committee, a modification in parking regulations, designed to rectify an unauthorized change made by a former administrator to the parking policy drawn up by the Parking Committee some years ago:

The Welfare Committee unanimously recommends that the provision, which gives credit to state employees who transfer years of service into the College, be removed from the parking guidelines. It recommends, however, that those who have previously transferred into the College and received credit not be penalized. Rather, it will be applicable to new employees beginning January 1, 1995.

Peter Yaun asked whether parking lots belong to the State. Andy Abrams said they belong to the College, though there are some hybrid areas; in any case, parking seniority is not something the State addresses. The motion on parking passed, once again on a voice vote, concluding the report from the Welfare Committee. The original documents for all three proposals passed are attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

Trish Ward, for the Honors Program Committee, recommended "that the name of the Honors Program be changed to Honors College and that the Director of the Program be made Dean of the Honors College." Hugh Wilder then called attention to paragraph four of the attached report on these proposed changes, sent on September 20, 1994 to the Honors Program Committee by Elizabeth Martin, chair of the "Honors Program Study Committee".
It is the opinion of this committee that the action in question is more involved than a name change. What is presently in place is quite effective, successful, and supports the mission of the academic departments of the College. Any changes in the program for Honors students should be instituted as a joint effort of the faculty and the administration and be considered in light of the over-all, long range plan for the college/university structure.

Mr. Wilder thought that, in light of these findings, the motion from the Honors Program Committee raised serious procedural questions, and that it should be remanded to the Academic Planning Committee. The duties of the Honors Program Director might very well change, he said, in relation to other Deans, Department Chairs, and the Provost, if the Director became a Dean, and he formally moved to remand. This motion was seconded. Richard Godsen asked if the proposal should be remanded to the Academic Planning Committee with specific recommendations, and Mr. Wilder phrased his motion as follows:

That the proposal from the Honors Program Committee, to change the Honors Program to the Honors College and to make the Director a Dean, be remanded to the Academic Planning Committee, in order, first, to inquire into and to specify what the relationship would be between the new Dean and the already existing Deans, the chairs of departments, and the Provost, and second, to look into the recent growth of the Honors Program, with the Director being asked to draw up a report for the Academic Planning Committee, to include a consideration of the implications of this growth for the College as a whole, and an outline of projected future staffing needs.

After some parliamentary maneuvering, the motion to remand passed, on a voice vote.

Constituents' General Concerns

Herb Silverman asked when the smoking policy just passed would go into effect. Mr. Abrams said, presumably at the start of the next semester (January, 1995). Melanie Gribbin, Student Government Association representative to the Senate, asked how the Registrar's office indicates whether F grades on a transcript derive from Honor Code violations; the provisions for repeating courses "do not apply to any course for which the student has received the grade of F in consequence of honor violation." Beverly Diamond suggested working on this with the Academic Standards Committee. Attention was called to the forthcoming Martin Luther King Day at the College, which is scheduled for Monday, January 6, and includes a celebration at the Sottile Theater starting at 8:00 p.m. Caroline Hunt requested a report on efforts to introduce a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa at the College; Andy Abrams will be asked to look into this next semester. The Speaker concluded the meeting by announcing that the Trustees would be invited to attend the January meeting of the Senate. With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
November 1, 1994

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The third regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1994-1995 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 1 in Room 118 of The Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty David Mann presiding. Forty-two senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (October 4) were approved as circulated.

Reports

Mr. Mann thanked Robert Mignone for serving as Speaker pro tempore at the previous meeting, and he commended Hugh Haynsworth for his punctuality in providing notices of the times and places of Self-Study meetings. For such faithful service, Mr. Haynsworth was inducted on the spot into the Order of the Purple Bandana. Wearing his new award, Mr. Haynsworth mentioned that about thirty faculty members would shortly be asked to participate in surveys of one kind or another in connection with the Self-Study, and he requested, in all seriousness, that these surveys be completed and returned in a timely fashion. Mr. Mann then thanked Residence Life and Housing for the fine Halloween Carnival which they had sponsored on October 27, which he said he had personally enjoyed very much. He also noted that on October 28 he had written to Mr. Larry Ellis, Executive Director of the South Carolina State Employees' Union in Columbia, as follows:

Dear Mr. Ellis:

The Faculty Welfare Committee of the College of Charleston has voted to recommend that I write to you. As you know, the State provides limited coverage for employees who should become disabled to the extent that they cannot perform the functions for which they were hired. You also know, I am sure, that this disability coverage has not been adjusted recently to accommodate for inflation. In fact, you might know (I do not) when the General Assembly last voted to increase disability coverage to state employees. As it was explained to me, the disability coverage extends up to 50% of an employee’s monthly salary, but with a maximum of $800 a month in benefits. For long-time state employees, that is not enough.

We have had occasions where employees have been retired because of disability. The coverage is sorely short for these unfortunate souls. The Faculty Welfare Committee urges the Association to lobby the General Assembly for an increase in the maximum monthly disability payment.

Unfortunately, there are many state employees who might benefit from such an increase. Your thankless (for the most part) task of serving all state employees, whether they be members of the Association or not, should be appreciated. I applaud you for your efforts.
On behalf of College of Charleston employees, thank you for reading this request. If there is anything I personally can do to assist, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely, [etc].

A xerox of the original letter is attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

**Proposed Change in the By-Laws**

Herb Silverman, for the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty-Administration Manual, recommended approval, with a slight rewording, of a By-Laws change proposed at the previous meeting by the Committee on Nominations and Elections regarding procedures for making nominations to the Committee on Nominations and Elections:

The [By-Laws] Committee recommends that the first sentence in Article V, Section 3B1. b., be replaced with: *Nominations may be made by faculty either at the April Senate meeting or by submission in writing to the Speaker at least 10 days prior to the April faculty meeting.*

(The original proposal had read, "Nominations may be made by faculty attending the April Faculty Senate meeting or submitted in writing to the Speaker of the Faculty at least 10 days prior to the April Faculty Meeting.") The change in wording was adopted, and John Newell suggested waiting until the spring before submitting the proposal to the Faculty for approval, so that any other such changes could be voted on at the same time; this was accepted. The proposed change was then approved by the Senate unanimously, on a voice vote.

A report from the Faculty Welfare Committee on Sabbatical Leave Policy was then introduced, as circulated, but since no one from the Welfare Committee had been able to attend the meeting to speak to the issues involved, James Carew moved to table the report until the Senate could discuss the subject with a member of the Committee. This motion passed.

Wayne Jordan, for the Curriculum Committee, then proposed a series of course changes in Modern Languages, in Accounting and Legal Studies/Business and Economics, in the African Studies Minor, and (for information) in History, as follows.

**Modern Languages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Courses:</th>
<th>Hebrew 101 Elementary Modern Hebrew (3hrs., throughout)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hebrew 102 Elementary Modern Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hebrew 201 Intermediate Modern Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hebrew 202 Intermediate Modern Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic 101</td>
<td>Elementary Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic 102</td>
<td>Elementary Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic 201</td>
<td>Intermediate Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic 202</td>
<td>Intermediate Arabic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chinese 101  Elementary Chinese
Chinese 102  Elementary Chinese
Chinese 201  Intermediate Chinese
Chinese 202  Intermediate Chinese

Accounting and Legal Studies/Business and Economics

New Course:  BADM 3XX  White Collar Crime and Ethics (3)
(The number was temporarily corrected from 360 to 3XX)

African Studies Minor

New Course:  AFST 202  Special Topics in African Studies (3)
(To be listed in Bulletin as AFST minor "elective" course)

[History: for information]

Course Change:  HIST 351, Women in the Western World, becomes:
                HIST 252  Women in Europe (3)

There was some discussion of the African Studies course. Frank Cossa wanted to know how topics for this course would be selected, and who decides who teaches it? Wayne Jordan said that Mr. Cossa had indeed touched on a glitch in the system. Jack Parson pointed out that the African Studies minor is run jointly by History and Political Science. Joe Benich objected, saying that he thought "special topics" courses were supposed to be given a regular name and entered into the catalogue after being given three times: this would be the first course to be made permanent without a fixed subject-matter. John Newell said that the "three-semester" rule had been discussed in the past but never actually passed by faculty vote. Caroline Hunt pointed out that special topics courses normally receive a higher number than 201 or 202 -- usually something in the 215 to 220 range -- and urged that the African Studies committee consider renumbering it. Beverly Diamond was not clear why Joe Benich objected. Mr. Benich repeated his reason, saying that he thought the "three semester" rule was College policy. Mr. Jordan replied that this policy was adhered to by most academic departments but was not actually a university rule. James Carew said that he was bothered by what he saw as the increasing number of "floating" courses, that is to say, courses not being given by any department. Mr. Jordan thought there were now perhaps half a dozen of these, and they were part of the trend toward "interdisciplinary" offerings in general. Hugh Haynsworth asked if the African Studies course would count toward fulfilling the general degree requirements? Mr. Jordan replied that this matter had not, he thought, been discussed by the Curriculum Committee. Jack Parson said that African Studies courses do count as electives. In the event, these changes were approved essentially as circulated, on a voice vote. The original memoranda, dated October 18, 1994, are attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.
Finally, David Mann brought up the Secretary's suggestion to re-schedule the February and April meetings of the Senate for the second, rather than the first, Tuesday of the month; this would have the advantage of providing a balanced interval of about four weeks between each meeting (i.e., January 17, February 14, March 14, and April 11). John Newell thought this was a bad idea, because it would require the Senate to meet on Valentine's Day; the proposal was voted down. Accordingly, the spring meetings will take place on January 17, February 7, March 14, and April 4, as provided in the By-Laws.

Constituents' General Concerns

Hugh Wilder mentioned his request at the previous meeting that the Speaker find out from the President what progress, if any, had been made by the students in formulating their own policy on smoking. Charles Kaiser asked to what extent the Curriculum Committee actually checks with other departments potentially "affected" by new course proposals; the answer was, regularly. Richard Nunan asked whether the proposed change in the By-Laws endorsed by the Senate earlier in the meeting was intended to apply to the nominating procedures of all committees, or just to the Committee on Nominations and Elections itself; the answer was, the latter. At the end of the discussion, Hugh Haynsworth suggested that the course change in history, which had been presented "for information" only, seemed substantial enough so that it should be voted on. Amy McCandless, however, assured the Senate that the name change simply represented "truth in advertising," and that it was definitely not a new course; Wayne Jordan added that there was a "Women in America" course in the offing that would be complementary. Mr. Haynsworth said that it was not the particular course, but the principle, that he was objecting to.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned just before 6:00 o'clock.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
October 4, 1994

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The second regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston for 1993-94 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 4 in Room 118 of The Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Senate pro tempore Robert Mignone presiding. Forty-six Senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (September 6) were approved as circulated.

Mr. Mignone announced that the Speaker, David Mann, had been unable to attend the meeting and that, in keeping with the By-Laws, he would serve in his absence. He then introduced Mr. Sam Stafford, head of the College of Charleston Alumni Association and a member of the Class of 1968, who spoke very briefly about the activities of the Association, saying that he was looking forward to attending as many faculty and senate meetings as he could. He hoped to report, in a general way, on some of our doings to the alumni, and, in turn, to pass on to the senate any news or information which might be thought helpful.

New Business: Reports

Beverly Diamond was recognized for the Committee on Nominations and Elections and recommended two changes in the membership of the Tenure and Promotion Committee: Gary Tidwell (Accounting), to replace Mike Morgan (ineligible, as a department chair), and Robert Johnson (Biology), to replace Mr. Tidwell on the list of Alternates. This motion was approved.

In addition, the Committee recommended the following change in the Faculty By-Laws:

To amend Article V, Section B1 b, to read as follows: 

Nominations may be made by faculty attending the April Faculty Senate meeting or submitted in writing to the Speaker of the Faculty at least 10 days prior to the April Faculty meeting. Elected by all members of the faculty as defined in Article I Section 1 no later than May 1. As is the case with all committees, the new committee begins its work August 15 (Article V, Section 1D).

Rationale: Under the current By-laws, the Faculty Senate has the primary responsibility for nominating a slate of candidates for the Committee on Nominations (at the April Senate meeting). Additional nominations from the general faculty must be accompanied by a petition signed by at least 10 faculty members. After the April 1994 Senate meeting, only six candidates remained on the slate for the seven person committee, and no further nominations were forthcoming from the faculty. The task of nominating this committee comes at the end of the spring semester when faculty members are busy with teaching duties. The proposed amendment will make it more likely that needed nominations will be made.
Mr. Mignone said that this recommendation would be passed on to the By-Laws Committee, who would report at the next meeting.

Wayne Jordan, speaking for the Faculty Curriculum Committee, moved the acceptance of three sets of curricular changes, as circulated in documents dated September 7, 13, and 14. The first to be discussed was a proposal from the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies for a new Major in Religious Studies at the College. The supporting documentation for this proposal runs to twenty-two pages, with several letters endorsing the program attached at the end; its contents may be summarized as follows.

Proposal for
Religious Studies Major
Bachelor of Arts (BA) Degree

I. Classification
II. Justification
   A. Historical Background
   B. Religious Studies at the College of Charleston
   C. South Carolina Commission on Higher Education Evaluation
   D. Objectives of the Major
   E. Religious Studies and the Mission of the Institution
   F. Religious Studies at other State-Supported Colleges and Universities in S.C.
   G. Career Opportunities for Graduates in Religious Studies
III. Enrollment
IV. Curriculum
   A. Requirements for the Major
   B. Rationale
   C. The Minor in Religious Studies [for information: no changes proposed]
   D. New Courses [none envisaged before "1996 or 1997"]
V. Faculty
   A. Current Faculty
   B. Faculty Qualifications without Vitae (i.e., no names attached)
   C. New Faculty (one more tenure track position for a specialist in the history of Christianity, with additional competence in Islam, starting August, 1995)
   D. Faculty Utilization
   E. Faculty Development
VI. Physical Plant and Equipment
VII. Library
VIII. Accreditation, Approval, Licensure or Certification [none needed]
IX. Estimated Additional Costs [Mr. Jordan made a minor correction]
X. Institutional Approval [approval by Board of Trustees still required]
Mr. Jordan moved the formal acceptance of Parts A and B of Section IV, "Curriculum." Some discussion ensued. Hugh Wilder said that the proposal, if endorsed by the Senate, would then be submitted to the Board of Trustees, and, if approved, could become available to students starting in the Fall Term of 1995. Lynne Ford asked whether there really were enough potential majors to justify the program. Mr. Wilder said his department did not anticipate a great many majors, but that upper-level courses in Religious Studies, as well as lower-level "service" courses in the subject, were well-attended now, this suggested that there would be a perhaps limited but quite real demand for a full-scale Major. Caroline Hunt wanted to know if the Philosophy Department had any sense of what the response to such a program might be in the local community; had there been any "flak" at the idea of teaching more courses involving religions other than Christianity? Mr. Wilder replied that he thought the program would become better accepted on the "outside" as it develops. James Carew said that, on the contrary, he would like to broaden the major by including more "non-Western" elements. Mr. Jordan invited June McDaniel to comment. She thought that the program was broadly based and evenly balanced right now.

Herb Silverman objected to the language of Part D, section 7 ("Objectives of the Major"), which states that "students will be encouraged to understand and respect [emphasis added] the diverse backgrounds of a wide variety of religious practitioners. This respect will be developed through thematic, comparative studies and courses," etc. Mr. Silverman said that he thought teaching respect for religion as such (as opposed to critical thinking about religion) should not be one of the purposes of an academic program, since whether religion ought to be respected is a matter of opinion. Mr. Wilder replied that the main focus of the program is to encourage critical thinking in general. Lee Irwin said that diversity and open-mindedness were indeed encouraged in Religious Studies courses at the College, but that we cannot and ought not to close the door on students who happen to be primarily interested in the Western tradition, from their backgrounds, this is perfectly natural and to be expected. In any case, an element of comparative study will be required in order to get through the program. Tom Heeney asked whether four full-time tenure-track faculty would be enough to staff the Major, "basically, yes," Mr. Wilder answered. In the event, the proposed Major in Religious Studies was passed unanimously, on a voice vote. A copy of the document, as corrected at the meeting, is attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

Mr. Jordan then proceeded to the list of curricular changes circulated on September 7, which may be summarized as follows.

**Arts Management**

New Course:

ARTM 360  Special Topics in Arts Management (3hrs.)

**Biology**

Change in Requirement for Majors:

(MATH 120, or its equivalent, required for all Biology majors)
Mathematics

New Course:

MATH 101L  Mathematics Laboratory (1)

Physical Education and Health

New Course:

PEHD 240  Worksite Wellness (3)

Course Changes:

PEHD 202  Laboratory Activities in Physical Education (1)
(new number and course title)

PEHD 457  Adapted Physical Education (3)
(new course title)

Psychology

New Courses:

PSYC 340  Nonverbal Communication (3)
PSYC 342  Approaches to Human Communication (3)
PSYC 384  The Psychology of Eating and Drinking (3)
PSYC 386  Drugs, Brain, and Behavior (3)
PSYC 392  Introduction to Clinical Psychology (3)
PSYC 366  Laboratory in Sensation and Perception (1)

Delete Courses:

PSYC 325  Experimental Analysis of Behavior (3)
PSYC 366  Laboratory in the Experimental Analysis of Behavior (1)
(NOTE: not the same in content as the PSYC 366 listed above, which is a new course, to which the old number has simply been reassigned.)

Renumber and Change Courses:

PSYC 108: becomes 324 (also change note under course description)
PSYC 309: change in title, note
PSYC 316: change in prerequisite
PSYC 322: change in title, add prerequisite
PSYC 323: add prerequisite
PSYC 328: add prerequisite
PSYC 335: add prerequisite
PSYC 414: change in prerequisite
Change in Requirements for the Major:

1. Additional requirement: majors must complete at least two of these three:
   PSYC 213, 319, 326

2. Additional requirement: majors must complete at least two of these three:
   PSYC 307, 309, 310

3. Renumber fourteen courses:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Course</th>
<th>New Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>214 (old number: 319)</td>
<td>378 (old number: 335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215 (326)</td>
<td>380 (328)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324 (108)</td>
<td>382 (327)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370 (315)</td>
<td>390 (314)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372 (330)</td>
<td>394 (316)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374 (322)</td>
<td>396 (414)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376 (323)</td>
<td>399 (339)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Change the section of the Undergraduate Bulletin referring to Major Requirements.

Before the vote, there was some discussion. Caroline Hunt wanted to know what the word "equivalent" meant in the Biology requirement, "MATH 120 (or its equivalent)"; was the thirty-six hour limit in total requirements for an undergraduate major being exceeded? Beverly Diamond replied that the phrase referred to three possibilities: credit earned through Advanced Placement, transfer courses, or the "bridge" course, MATH 105; and no, more than thirty-six hours was not being required. Several Senators objected to the new courses proposed by the Psychology Department, on the grounds that they appeared mechanical and dehumanizing: "How do you teach "non-verbal communication," Frank Cossa asked; to John Michel, "all those clinical courses" looked like "mere exercises in button-pushing." Charles Kaiser responded that interesting questions had been raised and that, in fact, some Psychology courses attempted to address these very issues, especially the notion of "dehumanization." Robin Bowers added that many Psychology courses regularly attempt to bridge the apparent gap between the sciences and the humanities. In the event, these proposed changes were put to the vote, one after the other, and passed without amendment.

Mr. Jordan concluded the report of the Curriculum Committee by recommending a change in History, as specified in a memorandum sent out on September 14:

**History**

Change in Course:

HIST 251 The Cosmos in History to 1800 (3)
(New Title and Catalog Description)

This also passed, after a very brief discussion. The original documents embodying these course changes are also attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.
New Business (cont.)

Robin Bowers and Charles Kaiser, noting that the dangers of "second-hand" tobacco smoke were by now well established, introduced a motion "To prohibit smoking in private offices on campus." During the discussion, Andy Abrams, who was asked to comment on the legality of the measure, said that, although he was personally in favor of such a motion, it would not work as phrased this way, because of existing state law, which specifically provides that smoking shall be permitted in enclosed private offices. The state Attorney General has ruled that the existing regulations governing smoking cannot be made more restrictive than specified by the Legislature. After some discussion, the sponsors of the motion agreed to withdraw it in favor of a substitute motion proposed by Herb Silverman, calling for "the Faculty Welfare Committee to work with Andy Abrams on finding was of legally banning smoking indoors at the College." After a successful call for the question, the substitute motion was approved on a voice vote.

Constituents' Concerns

Richard Nunan called attention to a forthcoming meeting of the AAUP, reminding the Senate that academic freedom is not free. Charles Kaiser pointed out that the dangers of being hit by a bicycle while going to class had, if anything, increased since signs had been put up saying "please," no bicycle-riding on campus. Students interpreted these signs to mean that if they were not pleased to stop, they did not have to, and there appeared to be no enforcement from the security staff. Several senators pointed out that Security might have more important things to do than arrest people for riding bicycles. What will it take, someone asked, to get the Administration to realize how serious this problem is? Does someone have to be maimed or even killed first, in order to get their attention?

Peter Yaun, reverting to the smoking issue, said that although we all have offices, they do not really belong to us. Is there anything to prevent department chairs from moving faculty whose smoking annoys their colleagues into other offices, where it would not? Wouldn't this be a common sense solution? Hugh Wilder remembered that President Sanders had spoken last year about students formulating their own no-smoking policy and said that he would like the Speaker to ask whether any progress had been made. Frank Cossa recalled the problem of last year's inequities in Maymester and Summer School salaries, adding that he would like to go back to the practice of "departmental averaging." Finally, Mr. Mignone read an announcement about the forthcoming Phi Kappa Phi book sale and asked for contributions.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
September 12, 1994

THE FACULTY MINUTES

The first regular meeting of the Faculty of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1994-1995 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, September 12 in the recital hall of the Albert Simons Center for the Arts, Speaker of the Faculty David Mann presiding. Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian. The Minutes of the previous meeting (April 18, 1994) were approved as circulated.

President's Report

President Alexander M. Sanders was recognized and welcomed the faculty back for the start of another academic year. He reported that he had been misquoted in the press recently; for instance, a letter of his printed in the Cougar Pause only appeared hopelessly illiterate because a sentence had been left out. The underlying situation, however, was not at all amusing. Evidently schools and colleges were being viewed in some quarters with mounting hostility and suspicion. As an example, he quoted from a stinging indictment of higher education by Newsday columnist Robert V. Reno. "Wages," Mr. Reno had written,

have about tripled in the last twenty years. The average full professor's salary at private institutions has quadrupled. Average tuition at four-year private institutions is roughly seven times higher than it was twenty years ago. The cost of attending state-supported colleges has exploded only slightly less dramatically. Absent an explosion in the quality of higher education and in the competence of graduates during the same period -- which nobody suggests has happened -- it is obvious that the finances of the nation's colleges and universities, were they viewed with the scrutiny we apply to most public expenditures or to ordinary household budgets, are out of control.

"These facts," the columnist had concluded, suggest that "the consumer is getting it in the neck."

Winthrop University President Anthony J. DiGiorgio, Mr. Sanders added, had also voiced a related concern, in remarks delivered to that university community on August 17. He had cited "a phenomenon that has surprised me this year and gives me great pause. There is very real anger being directed at higher education. -- I do not mean concern, annoyance, disappointment, chagrin, or any other variant of anger. I mean real anger." This anger, DiGiorgio observed, seems to come principally from "the makers and shapers of public policy -- governors, legislators, heads of public agencies, and regulators." The reason, according to him: "Too many of them believe that colleges and universities have become isolated from the economic pressures that are forcing most other American enterprises to rethink purpose and mission and to scale back the size of operations."
"More pointed," DiGiorgio went on, "is the anger at institutions as havens for a privileged class that has forgotten its responsibilities to others. Increasingly, those responsible for public policy describe higher education as 'a bastion of arrogant irrelevance, openly disdainful both of the opinion of others and of the state's policy priorities.' The consequences of that anger, President DiGiorgio had said, include cuts in funding and efforts to prescribe faculty workloads and eliminate sabbaticals. (He is right about this, Mr. Sanders noted; in just the last sixty days he had himself received, as President of the College of Charleston, five separate inquiries from legislators on the subject of faculty workloads and sabbaticals.) The anger is not dispelled, DiGiorgio had said, when higher education becomes "the only institution that defines downsizing as reducing its customer base rather than its personnel."

The Charlotte Observer had recently put it this way:

The United States is undergoing a wrenching economic transition, brought on by the globalization of capitalism. For many jobs, workers in the Carolinas will be competing with workers from Mexico to India. Either we will create a well educated, readily adaptable work force, or we will risk creating a large class of workers whose highest employment aspiration is burger-flipping. In both public schools and higher education, Americans will be expecting their dollars to do more. Business as usual won't do.

At the College of Charleston, President Sanders said, we are doing what we can to buck the more unfortunate aspects of these trends. We could, for example, have expanded our undergraduate population substantially this fall, but we chose deliberately not to. Generally speaking, the College is in basically good shape, especially in comparison with some other institutions in South Carolina--not to mention other states. As everyone knows, hundreds of employees have been laid off at the Medical University; thirty-one tenured faculty have been let go at Clemson; Winthrop and even the central Columbia campus of USC have experienced declining enrollments for the first time in recent memory. Meanwhile, and in a relatively short period of time, we have been able to secure a 25% increase in the number of tenured faculty, a figure that has risen twice as fast as the gradually rising enrollment in our student body. How do we do it?

There are two major reasons, Mr. Sanders said. First, we are far better off than other institutions in our ratio of faculty to staff: in fact, we have more faculty than all other kinds of employees put together. Second, at other comparable institutions in South Carolina, there are about six full-time students for every full-time employee; at the College, there are twelve students, a much more efficient ratio. This explains, in part, why we are able to hire more faculty even in a time of economic distress. But there is a price to be paid. Some of our physical facilities are woefully inadequate, and our hard-pressed maintenance staff face extraordinary difficulties in trying to take care of the campus, often by "making do" and improvising as best they can.

President Sanders concluded by saying that he had recently been reading in Easterby's History of The College of Charleston, which he found moving for its vision of the continuity of our
historic institution. Some fifty years ago, Professor Easterby had insisted that little of fundamental importance had changed at the College, despite all the momentous events of the nineteenth century, since its foundation in the aftermath of the Revolutionary War. "The old graduate," Easterby had written,

will find the College much changed, but the changes are in the externals. There are still to be found the same democratic spirit that has ever pervaded the true republic of letters, the same respect for intellectual honesty, and the same high regard for the fundamental value of a liberal education. These have been its principal articles of faith since the days of Bishop Smith.

Remarkably, President Sanders said, there is in this statement no mention of any particular theology or religious doctrine, and no appeal to some sort of patriotism, but merely an invocation of "the democratic spirit pervading the republic of letters." This spirit, he concluded, should continue to serve us well, now and into the next century.

The faculty responded with a grateful round of applause.

**Provost's Report**

The Provost, Conrad Festa, was then recognized, and once again welcomed old and new faculty. Dr. Festa said that his administrative division, the Office of Academic Affairs, would be especially concerned with four major projects during the year: the real start of the SACS accreditation process, being coordinated by Hugh Haynsworth; a comparative faculty salary study, to be completed some time this term; a revised sabbatical leave policy (a subject that has obviously awakened the curiosity of the Legislature); and a comparative faculty work-load study, which might also be ready before the end of the fall term. This year, we will need to be especially careful about generating new programs and proposals, because funds usually held in abeyance have already been substantially used up, with the result that there are fewer resources left over to cover possible emergencies. As a result, the Curriculum Committee, for example, will be asked to look very hard at the real costs of new programs. We seem, however, to be well regarded by the Commission on Higher Education, a favorable sign. We are in good shape academically, Dr. Festa said, and could look forward to an exciting and productive year.

**New Business**

The Speaker then introduced the following Resolution, proposed jointly by Rohn England and Nan Morrison and circulated in a memorandum dated August 25, 1994:
Resolution of Appreciation of Zoe Sanders

The Faculty of the College of Charleston expresses its appreciation and gratitude to Zoe Dutrow Sanders for her work and leadership in making the Faculty House a reality.

Behind every successful leader there stands a spouse without whose support success would not have been possible; thus, we also thank President Sanders for his efforts.

With energy, determination, and charm, Mrs. Sanders secured enough donations to fund the remodelling of 20 Glebe Street entirely through voluntary contributions. Because of her judgement and attention to detail, the elegance and architectural integrity of this historical nineteenth-century house have been preserved, adding one more jewel to the crown.

The efforts of Zoe Sanders have too often gone unrecognized but never unappreciated. For our Faculty House, and much more, the Faculty of the College of Charleston expresses its appreciation and gratitude.

This Resolution was approved by acclamation.

The Speaker then called upon Dr. Festa, who announced and introduced new Deans and departmental chairs; the Deans and chairs, in turn, introduced new members of their departments, as follows (for convenience, these lists are also given alphabetically):

THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON
ACADEMIC DEANS/DEPARTMENT CHAIRS
(as of 8/15/94)

School of the Arts
Department of Art History
Dr. Edward C. McGuire, Dean
Department of Music
Dr. Diane C. Johnson
Department of Studio Art
Prof. Steve Rosenberg
Department of Theatre
Prof. Michael Tyzack
Prof. Allen Lyndrup

School of Business and Economics
Department of Accounting and Legal Studies
Dr. Howard Rudd, Dean
Department of Economics and Finance
Dr. Robert Rouse
Department of Management and Marketing
Dr. J. Michael Morgan
Dr. Rhonda Mack
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Education</th>
<th>Dr. Nancy Sorenson, Dean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Educational Foundations and Specializations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Elementary and Early Childhood Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education/Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr. Robert Fowler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Virginia Bartel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Andrew Lewis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</th>
<th>Dr. Samuel M. Hines, Jr., Dean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English and Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Classics and German</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology/Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr. Nan Morrison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. George Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Michael Pincus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jozef Modzelewski (Co-Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Frank Morris (Co-Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jeff Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Michael Pincus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Hugh Wilder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jack Parson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Gentry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. George Dickinson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Sciences and Mathematics</th>
<th>Dr. Gordon Jones, Dean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr. Louis Burnett</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Charles Beam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. George Pothering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Michael Katuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. William Golightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robert Dukes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEW ROSTER FACULTY**
(listed by School)
1994-95

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of the Arts</th>
<th>Director of the Halsey Gallery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Sloan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Douglas Russell, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Ashley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor of Art Hist./Arch.Hist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Business and Economics</th>
<th>Professor and Chair of Management and Marketing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Walker Mack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School of Education
Nancy Sorenson
Linda H. Fitzharris
Carol Maurice McClain
Sara Davis White
William Roy Barfield
Marie Barnett
Green Thomas Waggener

Dean, School of Education and
Professor of Elementary/Early Childhood Ed.
Assistant Professor of Elementary Education
Assistant Professor of Elementary Education
Assistant Professor of Elementary and Early
Childhood Education
Assistant Professor of PE/Health
Instructor in PE/Health
Assistant Professor of PE/Health

School of Humanities and Social Sciences
Terence N. Bowers
Chanley Michelle Bregman
Robyn A. Holman
Janice Wright
Anthony Artuso
Jeremy D. Browning
Idee Winfield

Assistant Professor of English Literature
Instructor in English
Assistant Professor of French
Assistant Professor of Spanish
Assistant Professor of Political Science
Assistant Professor of Political Science
Assistant Professor of Sociology

School of Sciences and Mathematics
Jack DiTullio
John Fauth
Paul Christopher Marino
Duncan Munro
John S. Peters
Craig Joseph Plante
Lawrence Fulton
Christopher Abate
Cassandra Coombs
Leslie Sautter
June Mirecki

Assistant Professor of Biological Oceanography
Assistant Professor of Ornithology/Herpetology
Assistant Professor of Plant Ecology
Instructor in Biology
Instructor in Biology
Assistant Professor of Benthic Ecology
Instructor in Computer Science
Assistant Professor of Geology
Assistant Professor of Geology
Assistant Professor of Geology
Assistant Professor of Environmental Geochemistry
Assistant Professor of Atmospheric Physics

Avery Research Center
Marvin Dulaney

Director of Avery Research Center
NEW ROSTER FACULTY  
(Alphabetical Listing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Abate</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Artuso</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Ashley</td>
<td>Professor of Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Roy Barfield</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Physical Education and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Barnett</td>
<td>Instructor in Physical Education and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence Bowers</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of English Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanley Michelle Bregman</td>
<td>Instructor in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy D. Browning</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra Coombs</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Environmental Geochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack DiTullio</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Biological Oceanography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Dulaney</td>
<td>Director of Avery Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fauth</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Ornithology/Herpetology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Fitzharris</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Fulton</td>
<td>Instructor in Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn A. Holman</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard L. Lindner</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Atmospheric Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Walker Mack</td>
<td>Professor and Chair of Department of Management and Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Christopher Marino</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Plant Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Maurice McClain</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Elementary and Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Mirecki</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Environmental Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Munro</td>
<td>Instructor in Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Peters</td>
<td>Instructor in Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Joseph Plante</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Benthic Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Douglas Russell, Jr.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Art History/Architectural History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Sautter</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Sloan</td>
<td>Director of the Halsey Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Sorenson</td>
<td>Dean, School of Education and Professor of Elementary and Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Thomas Waggener</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Physical Education and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Davis White</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Elementary and Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idee Winfield</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Sociology/Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Wright</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW AND RETURNING VISITING FACULTY
(listed by School)

**School of the Arts**
- Deanna McBroom (New)  Assistant Professor of Voice
- Angela Seymour (New)  Instructor in Theatre

**School of Humanities and Social Sciences**
- Marie Fitzwilliam  Instructor in English
- Ellen Lane Haggar  Instructor in English
- Catherine D. Holmes  Instructor in English
- Holly H. LaGrone  Instructor in English
- Matthew J. Morris  Assistant Professor of English
- Scott Peeples (New)  Instructor in English
- Mary A. Sadler  Instructor in English
- Catherine J. Tufariello (New)  Instructor in English
- Jon Cowans (New)  Assistant Professor of History
- Stephen Keck (New)  Assistant Professor of History
- Marjorie Plummer  Assistant Professor of History
- Janet Pope (New)  Assistant Professor of History
- Jeremy Telman  Assistant Professor of History
- Jean Alvares  Assistant Professor of Classics
- Eileen Howe  Instructor in Languages
- Shannon Lachicotte  Instructor in Spanish
- Ruth Mercado  Instructor in Spanish
- Ellen Kay Sisk (New)  Instructor in Spanish
- Paul Keim  Assistant Professor of Philosophy
- Peter A. Saltzstein (New)  Assistant Professor of Philosophy
- Tracy Snipe (New)  Assistant Professor of Political Science
- William Melvin Gardner (New)  Assistant Professor of Psychology
- Warren Reich (New)  Assistant Professor of Psychology
- Alfred A. Witkofsky (New)  Assistant Professor of Psychology
- Jian Li (New)  Instructor in Sociology

**School of Sciences and Mathematics**
- Archibald McCallum (New)  Assistant Professor of Biology
- Kalin N. Godev (New)  Assistant Professor of Math
NEW VISITING FACULTY
(listed alphabetically)

Jon Cowans
William Melvin Gardner
Kalin N. Godev
Stephen L. Keck
Jian Li
Deanna McBroom
Archibald McCallum
Scott Peeples
Janet M. Pope
Warren Reich
Peter A. Saltzstein
Angela Seymour
Ellen Kay Sisk
Tracy Snipe
Catherine J. Tufariello
Alfred A. Witkofsky

Visitng Assistant Professor of History
Visitng Assistant Professor of Psychology
Visitng Assistant Professor of Math
Visitng Assistant Professor of History
Visitng Instructor in Sociology/Anthropology
Visitng Assistant Professor of Voice
Visitng Assistant Professor of Biology
Visitng Instructor in English
Visitng Assistant Professor of History
Visitng Assistant Professor of Psychology
Visitng Assistant Professor of Philosophy
Visitng Instructor in Theatre
Visitng Instructor in Spanish
Visitng Assistant Professor of Political Science
Visitng Instructor in English
Visitng Assistant Professor of Psychology

**************

After some miscellaneous announcements, and a brief period of discussion "For the Good of the Order" (by tradition, off the record), Maggie Pennington moved to adjourn. The meeting ended at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The first regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1993-94 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 6 in Room 118 of The Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty David Mann presiding. Forty two Senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (April 5, 1994) were approved as circulated.

President's Report

President Alexander M. Sanders, Jr. was recognized and spoke to the Senate briefly about the state of the College. The opening of the school year had been invigorating and pleasingly uneventful; so far, he had talked to a mere forty-three students with problems, the smallest number yet (for the time of year) during his tenure at the College. Happily, the College is in good shape, generally speaking, especially in comparison with some other institutions in South Carolina--not to mention other states. As everyone knows, hundreds of employees have been laid off at the Medical University; thirty-one tenured faculty have been let go at Clemson, Winthrop and even the central Columbia campus of USC have experienced declining enrollments for the first time in recent memory. Meanwhile, and in a relatively short period of time, we have been able to engineer a 25% increase in the number of tenured faculty, a figure that has risen twice as fast as the rising enrollment in our student body.

There are two major reasons for this financial success, Mr. Sanders said. First, we are far better off than other institutions in our ratio of faculty to staff; in fact, we have more faculty than all other kinds of employees put together. Second, at other comparable institutions in South Carolina, there are about six full-time students for every full-time employee; at the College, there are twelve students, a much more efficient ratio. This explains, in part, why we are able to hire more faculty even in a time of economic distress. (The price we pay is that some of our physical facilities are woefully inadequate, and our hard pressed maintenance staff face exceptional difficulties.)

President Sanders concluded by saying that he had recently been reading in Easterby's History of The College of Charleston, which he found moving for its vision of the continuity of our historic institution. Some fifty years ago, Professor Easterby had insisted that little of fundamental importance had changed at the College, despite all the momentous events of the nineteenth century, since its foundation in the aftermath of the Revolution. "The old graduate," Easterby wrote, will find the College much changed, but the changes are in the externals. There are still to be found the same democratic spirit that has ever pervaded the true republic of letters, the same respect for intellectual honesty, and the same high regard for the fundamental value of a liberal education. These have been its principal articles of faith since the days of Bishop Smith.
Remarkably, President Sanders said, there is in this statement no mention of any particular theology or religious doctrine, and no appeal to some sort of patriotism, but merely an invocation of "the democratic spirit pervading the republic of letters." This spirit should continue to serve us well, now and into the next century.

The Provost, Conrad Festa, was recognized and said that the past year had seen some remarkable success, thanks, he believed, largely to the efforts of the faculty. The College has maintained a high degree of credibility with the CHE, and now that the various attempts to change or abolish the Commission have proved unsuccessful, a new spirit of cooperation seems to have developed in Columbia, thanks in large part to President Sanders. Dr. Festa said that his office would be concerned with four major projects during the year: the real start of the SACS accreditation process, which would be coordinated by Hugh Haynsworth; a salary study, which should be completed some time this term; the sabbatical leave program, which has now drawn the attention of the Legislature; and with a work-load study, which should also be ready before the end of the fall term. We will need to be very careful about generating new programs and proposals this year, because funds usually held in abeyance have already been substantially used up, with the result that there are fewer resources left over to cover possible emergencies. One practical result of this will be that the Curriculum Committee will be asked to look very hard at the real costs of new programs.

Speaker's Report

David Mann then thanked Susan Morrison for agreeing to serve once again as Parliamentarian, the fifth time she had done so, during his years as Speaker. Thanks should also, he said, be given to Dr. Festa for his help in setting up the Faculty Secretariat, which is now located in an office next to the Faculty Lounge in Maybank Hall. Word-processing equipment was still being installed but should be operational soon. The office will have a WANDO connection on the College's optical data-link system, an "E-mail" address ("MACKA"), and a fax-modem. The telephone number, which is not in the College telephone directory yet, is 953-5425.

New Business

Mr. Mann then called for nominations for Speaker of the Faculty Senate pro tempore. Beverly Diamond suggested Robert Mignone. A motion to close the nominations passed, and Mr. Mignone was declared elected by acclamation. A nomination was also required for the College's second delegate to the South Carolina Conference of University Faculty Chairs (SCCUFC). Hugh Wilder nominated Jack Parson, who had been a founding member of the organization, and he, too, was declared elected.

Von Bakanic was then recognized for the Academic Standards Committee and proposed two changes in the Undergraduate Bulletin. The first motion, which would "preclude students taking lower level foreign language courses on a Pass/Fail basis," failed after some discussion. The second change reads like this:
The committee also suggests that the policy regarding credit for work at another institution by transient students be clarified in the Undergraduate Bulletin. We suggest the following be appended as item 4 on page 120 of the 1994 Undergraduate Bulletin: 

"4) Criteria for acceptable transfer credits also apply to transient students (see page 24)."

Hugh Wilder wanted to know when this would take effect. Von Bakanic, speaking for the Committee, replied that the change would be incorporated in the next Bulletin, and would come into effect starting with the Fall Term of 1996. (Dean William Lindstrom confirmed this.) Caroline Hunt wanted to know if this rule was intended to apply only to our students who are transient students studying elsewhere; the answer was yes. The second motion passed, on a voice vote.

Constituents' Concerns

James Carew asked why no faculty salary data had been received from last year's Welfare Committee. Chip Condon said that the Committee had not been able to finish the project in time, and had experienced difficulties in getting some of the necessary data. Mr. Carew, on another subject, suggested that the Senate should refer to Mr. Sanders, not as Judge Sanders, but as President Sanders, as this would be more in keeping with his present occupation. The Speaker replied that the title, "Judge," was a merely honorary appellation, a form of courtesy, and not an official designation of his duties. Beverly Diamond questioned the date on which Minutes of Senate meetings were being distributed; the By-Laws say they should appear within two weeks of the meeting (Article 4, Section 4, Letter M). The Secretary said that he tried to comply with this regulation by sending out a detailed summary, or "Highlights," of each meeting the next day after it took place, followed by a fuller account timed to appear shortly before the next meeting, when the Minutes were to be approved or amended; he would continue to do so unless instructed otherwise. Hugh Wilder said he thought the Speaker should arrange not to hold Senate meetings on religious holidays. The Secretary said the Speaker was not at fault; setting the dates for Faculty and Senate meetings had been mostly his doing, and that, given the alternatives, the present schedule had seemed the least objectionable. Hugh Haynsworth pointed out that changes in our health insurance (specifically, involving disability coverage and "pre-existing conditions") had been put in place without consultation with the faculty: this was a bad practice, and it ought to be stopped. David Mann said that he thought the Welfare Committee should definitely investigate; we should have access to the information on which these changes were based, and make any necessary decisions ourselves, rather than having decisions made for us by the Personnel Office. Caroline Hunt suggested that Jack Parson and David Mann, as delegates to the Conference of University Faculty Chairs, should find out how such matters are handled at other institutions, and report back. The Speaker agreed. With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary