April 22, 1996

THE FACULTY MINUTES

The second and final regular meeting of the Faculty of the College of Charleston for the academic year 1995-1996 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, April 22 in the recital hall of the Albert Simons Center for the Arts, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian. The Minutes of the previous meeting (September 11, 1995) were approved as circulated.

President Alexander M. Sanders, Jr. was introduced and spoke very briefly, saying that he apologized for not being able to stay for the balance of the meeting, but that urgent business required his immediate attention, and he hoped everyone would have a good summer. After the President left, the Speaker thanked the outgoing Faculty Secretary for his “seventy two years” [sic] of service in that capacity [actually, only fifteen] and presented him with a really beautiful gift -- a fountain pen -- and a card signed by several past Speakers, inscribed “for all the years of quiet competence and a steady hand.” The Secretary believed this was intended as a compliment, and gratefully shook hands with David Mann, George Pothering, Michael Finefrock, Herb Silverman, and Mr. Mignone.

The Provost, Conrad Festa, then thanked the faculty for a successful year, and noted that some fundamental issues have arisen, such as the impending review of General Education at the College, that will offer a rare and perhaps unique opportunity to make a contribution to higher education in general: not hyperbole, he said, but the truth. He also conveyed his best wishes for the summer.

New Business

The Speaker then asked for a motion to “suspend the rules” to allow discussion of a matter not on the agenda, which had been raised at the concluding meeting of the Faculty Senate on April 16 -- namely, the pending legislation to permit the carrying of concealed weapons. On the next day, April 17, the Board of Trustees had adopted a Resolution on this issue, and the Speaker said he thought it would be both useful and appropriate for the faculty, in turn, to endorse the Trustees’ statement. The motion to suspend was approved, on a voice vote. Accordingly, the following RESOLUTION was introduced on behalf of the faculty:
THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON FACULTY JOINS WITH THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES IN THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION OPPOSING "...ANY LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PERMIT THE PRESENCE OF FIREARMS ON THIS CAMPUS, OTHER THAN THOSE CARRIED BY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS OR OTHER APPROPRIATE PERSONS, AND WOULD URGE THE DEFEAT OF ANY LEGISLATION THAT PERMITS, CONDONES OR ENCOURAGES THIS PRESENCE AT THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON."

This was the language of the Trustees:

The College of Charleston is a community committed to the ideals of higher learning. In order to carry out this mission, the College strives to provide a safe and secure campus. Accordingly, the College of Charleston employs an extensive security force, consisting of well-trained, professional state law enforcement personnel. Additionally, to maintain the peace and protect the various College constituencies, the College of Charleston bans the presence of firearms on campus, except for those carried by law enforcement or other authorized persons.

It is our understanding that the South Carolina General Assembly is currently considering legislation regarding permits for carrying concealed weapons. This legislation, as it is presently written, poses a tremendous risk to the College of Charleston community, since it authorizes individuals to carry firearms on this campus. Though the legislation prohibits carrying these weapons into college athletic events and school administration buildings, these prohibitions are wholly inadequate to address the danger to the college community caused by having firearms on campus. Clearly, in a college or university setting, the risks posed by armed individuals on campus significantly outweigh whatever perceived benefits of self-protection arise by allowing persons to carry firearms on our campus.

It is the fervent belief of the College of Charleston Board of Trustees that the presence on campus of firearms, whether concealed or open, jeopardizes the safety and well-being of the entire College community and is wholly antithetical to the mission of this institution. THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED this 17th day of April, 1996, that the College of Charleston Board of Trustees is wholly opposed to any legislation that would permit the presence of firearms on this campus, other than those carried by law enforcement officers or other appropriate persons, and would urge the defeat of any legislation that permits, condones or encourages this presence at the College of Charleston.
During the discussion, George Pothering asked about the background of the gun bill in the Legislature: was it going to pass? Mr. Mignone said that the bill itself may pass, but if enough opposition around the State becomes evident, then there may be an amendment to ban the carrying of guns on campus. Guns are already banned in public schools. Andy Abrams insisted that the Board's Resolution is not an attempt to rewrite the actual legislation, but to let the legislators know what their constituents are thinking on this important issue. The Board at the University of South Carolina is considering making a similar statement. Stephen Jones vigorously opposed the Resolution, saying that he taught at night and simply wished to claim his Second Amendment rights; he should be allowed, he said, to carry a legal and duly authorized concealed weapon on campus for the purpose of legitimate self-protection. Mr. Abrams said that there were serious difficulties in defining what the exact, legal area-limits of "the campus" are; but these difficulties may not be a bad thing in getting the legislation amended. In the event, the Resolution passed unanimously, on a voice vote. [Secretary's note: a single, clear "nay" was heard, but from an Adjunct Instructor who was not a member of the "roster" faculty and, therefore, not entitled to vote.]

A motion was then introduced to approve the preliminary list of degree candidates for graduation in May. Andrew Lewis asked, as a point of information, whether this approval carried with it the usual provision that it was contingent upon the completion of all requirements, as certified by the Registrar's Office. The answer was yes, and the motion passed. The list is attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes.

**Election of Faculty Committees**

At the request of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, standing committees of the faculty for the next academic year were approved as previously nominated, with three exceptions: First, a replacement had been necessary on the slate of the Library Committee; this was accepted, and the Committee declared elected. Then, ballots were handed out to elect two committees for which additional nominations had been received (the Committee on Nominations and Elections itself, and the Faculty Welfare Committee). Results were reported later, and a corrected list of "Committees and Officers of the Faculty for 1996-97" circulated as part of the "Highlights" of the meeting. This list is attached to the Secretary's copy of the Minutes, and will be updated near the start of the Fall Semester.

**For the Good of the Order**

Richard Nunan then requested that his remarks that follow, and the Resolution they contain, be read into the permanent record of the meeting.
"During the College of Charleston Faculty Senate meeting of Tuesday, 4/16/96, the Faculty Committee on Tenure, Promotion, & Third Year Review submitted its annual report to Bob Mignone, Speaker of the Faculty, and distributed copies to Senate members. This memo included an expression of concern, on the part of the Committee, that the College Administration has occasionally initiated promotion proceedings for selected faculty members outside the criteria required for promotion by the College of Charleston Faculty/Administration Manual. The T&P Committee went on to make requests that the Administration desist from this practice, and that the Faculty Senate issue its own opinion concerning the practice.

"At our AAUP Chapter meeting on Wednesday, 4/17/96, the members present approved the attached resolution on behalf of the CofC Chapter of the AAUP on this issue. It was subsequently put to a mail ballot among all CofC AAUP members, and received unanimous support from responding faculty.

"I would like to preface this resolution with a few observations:

"First, this resolution is offered in a constructive spirit. Members of your local AAUP chapter believe that President Sanders and Provost Festa are to be commended for their energetically vocal public advocacy of the institution of academic tenure in the face of some ongoing legislative and media attacks on that important tradition. Not all chief executive & academic officers of colleges and universities around the State have been as supportive of academic integrity; indeed, some of them have been overtly hostile to the preservation of tenure as an institution. But we don't live in a perfect world even here at the College. Therefore your local AAUP Chapter members feel that it is important to remind our Administration that careful attention to the process which jointly governs Faculty and Administration officials involved in tenure and promotion decisions is essential to the future preservation of the integrity of that process.

"Second, apart from the possible ill effects which inattention to process may create for the integrity of the peer review system upon which we rely for tenure and promotion decisions, any decisions made outside the normal channels of evaluation are likely to invite litigation by faculty who were denied tenure and/or promotion as a consequence of going through the standard process.

"Finally, this resolution does not speak to cases where rank and tenure are being negotiated at the time of initial employment. The AAUP recognizes that Colleges and Universities need flexibility in the terms of initial employment in order to attract distinguished researchers for senior faculty positions and to attract able candidates for higher-level positions in academic administration. Accordingly, the AAUP Red Book furnishes guidelines about maximal, but not minimal, length of probationary status for academic appointees with previous experience (cf. Red Book 4, 22, 69-70)."
RESOLUTION ON CoC TENURE & PROMOTION EVALUATION PRACTICES

AAUP, COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON CHAPTER

4/17/96

The College of Charleston Chapter of the AAUP believes that all tenure and promotion decisions should be entertained through the normal & usual procedures and should be evaluated by the criteria provided in the College of Charleston Faculty/Administration Manual. Tenure and promotion decisions initiated by the Administration outside the normal procedure (and for which there are no stated criteria) will ultimately result in precedents that are bad for the morale of those faculty attempting to comply with provisions of the Manual. Should faculty perceive that tenure and promotion decisions are sometimes made by the Administration for personal or political reasons, then the criteria & standards of the Manual could be undermined. This could place in question the quality of the academic programs and the faculty at the College.

Furthermore any instances of faculty promotion proceedings which don't adhere to either the procedures or the criteria set forth in the Faculty/Administration Manual may violate AAUP recommendations concerning tenure and promotion practices. The 1990 Edition of the AAUP Policy Documents & Reports Red Book states:

Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal...Scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues...Likewise there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

--Section V,
"Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities"*
In view of these concerns, the AAUP respectfully recommends that the Administration discontinue the unwise practice of awarding tenure or promotion outside of the procedures and requirements outlined in the Manual.

*Statement jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors (endorsed by Board, October, 1966; by general membership, April 1967), the American Council on Education (endorsed October, 1966), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (endorsed November, 1966).

After Mr. Nunan was through, Reid Wiseman suggested strengthening the language of the Resolution by substituting "would" for "could" in the first paragraph, to make the last two sentences read, "Should faculty perceive that tenure and promotion decisions are sometimes made by the Administration for personal or political reasons, then the criteria of the Manual would be undermined. This would place in question the quality of the academic programs and the faculty at the College." The Resolution passed unanimously, on a voice vote.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned sine die, at about 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary

*******

CHANGE IN THE BY-LAWS

[Note: later in April, by a vote of 181-8 on a written ballot, the faculty ratified the following CHANGE IN THE BY-LAWS, as introduced at the February Senate meeting, amended by the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, and amended again and approved at the March Senate meeting:

Append to Article IV, Section 2F:

If an at-large Senator needs to be replaced in the second year of a term, the Senate will elect the replacement by written ballot. The Committee on Nominations will provide a slate of at least two candidates circulated to the faculty at least two weeks before the Senate meeting. Additional nominations from the faculty may be sent to the Chair of the Committee on Nominations at least ten days before the Senate meeting.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The Second Session of the April meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 16, in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Forty-six Senators attended; Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian.

Speaker's Report

Mr. Mignone called attention to the fourth annual Holocaust Memorial Observance, which was scheduled to take place later in the evening, starting with a candlelight march from Washington Square Park. He announced that President Alexander M. Sanders, Jr. was organizing a gesture of support for Kevin Baltimore and his family. As the faculty was doubtless aware, the Baltimore family property along the Ashley River had been vandalized with racial slurs, an apparent attempt at intimidation. The President, Mr. Mignone said, was planning for a group from the College consisting of faculty, students, and staff to go the Baltimore property to help remove the letters “KKK” from trees, a dock, and so on, and had asked the Speaker to help organize the faculty contingent.

The Speaker’s report included a memorandum from the Provost, dated March 11, 1996, on “Changes to the Faculty Manual,” which asks the Speaker, and the Chair of the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, Herb Silverman, for any comments on these changes, to be forwarded to the Provost before the end of the semester. The most important of these changes has to do with a detailed “Workload Policy” statement from the Office of Academic Affairs. Mr. Mignone circulated this memorandum at the meeting, and asked the Senate to bring to his attention any comments or concerns which they might have.

The Speaker then distributed copies of two committee reports delivered to the Senate. The first, from the Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review, summarized the Committee’s activities for the year and particularly requested the Senate’s advice about the problem of decisions apparently being made outside the normal procedures specified in the Manual:

The practice of making tenure and promotion decisions outside the provisions of the Manual, though valid de facto in cases already past, should now be discontinued.

It is the committee’s view that awarding tenure or promotion outside of the procedures and requirements outlined in the Manual is a very unwise practice. It is especially unwise given that there are no existing procedures or standards for determining personnel decisions other than those provided by the Manual, and that such a practice would be subject to abuse by future Presidents and Administrators.
Consequently, we respectfully recommend that the Administration not make such decisions, and we seek guidance from the Faculty Senate concerning the propriety of such actions. (Part 6)

The Committee also sought guidance from the Faculty Senate, “at an appropriate time,” on whether the Manual should be amended to provide that evaluation panels for promotion be composed only of faculty members who are tenured and hold the rank being sought, or a higher rank. (For instance, a panel for a candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Professor would consist only of tenured Professors.) (Part 7)

The second item, from the Faculty Welfare Committee, concerned (1) Retirement and (2) Faculty Salaries. The full texts of these reports, and of the Provost’s memorandum mentioned above, are attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.

**New Business**

Lindsay Packer was then recognized for the Academic Standards Committee, and introduced a motion on allowing students to “walk” at Graduation:

Proposal to the Faculty Senate
Re: Students who may participate in the commencement ceremony

To most students and their families, the commencement ceremony represents the culmination of the student's undergraduate career. In practice, there are some students for whom, due to incomplete documentation, only tentative degree verification can be provided before commencement. In addition, there is always a handful of students participating in the ceremony who have not completed all their degree requirements but whose status could be described as “all but done.” These students are permitted to walk either by hiccups in the system or because of extenuating circumstances. In acknowledgment of this, the printed program for the commencement ceremony carries an explicit disclaimer that while “appearance of a name on this program is presumptive evidence of graduation...it must not be regarded as conclusive.” In an effort to address the inconsistencies of current procedures, the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid proposes that the following criteria be used to determine which students be allowed to participate in the December and May commencement ceremonies.

*A student may participate in the commencement ceremony at the end of any given semester if he or she either has completed all graduation requirements or satisfies all of the following three criteria:*
1. At the beginning of the semester immediately preceding the commencement ceremony, the student has a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or better, as well as a GPA in the student's major of 2.0 or better.

2. After the final withdrawal date in the semester immediately preceding the commencement ceremony, the student is registered in all courses required for the completion of his or her degree, but is not registered in more than 18 hours of courses.

3. The student has received a failing or incomplete grade in no more than 4 hours of course work taken during the semester immediately preceding the commencement ceremony.

All students who have filed an application for graduation through the Office of the Registrar will be notified in writing of these criteria and of their status with regard to graduation. This notice will explicitly warn students who do not meet all of the above criteria that if they make graduation plans, they do so at their own risk.

**Rationale:**

The degree check to determine who may participate in the commencement ceremony is typically completed by between 2 and 4 days before the ceremony (for example, 2 days in Fall 1995 and 4 days this semester). At that time, the Deans of the various schools try to contact by phone those students who have failed to graduate. It is not unusual that, at such short notice, the student's family plans cannot be canceled. Even if they can, and although the student's failure may not come as a great surprise, the very short notice of the current procedure results in at least considerable inconvenience for the student's family, and quite often considerable ill will directed at the College.

Given the haste in which the checking process must be carried out, it is inevitable that, despite the diligent efforts of administrators and faculty, some mistakes will be made, both in denying permission to some students who have in fact completed their degrees and in granting permission to others who have not. The proposed criteria for participation in the commencement ceremony expand the class of eligible students to include a small group of students who are all but done at the time of the ceremony. The Office of the Registrar estimates that, in each of the last three long semesters, there were between 10 and 20 students who failed to graduate but who would have satisfied the above criteria.

The aim of the criteria is to define those students who, by virtue of their GPA and remaining degree requirements at the beginning of the semester, have a reasonable
expectation of graduating. The second and third criteria are intended to prevent students from loading up with classes in their final semester for the express purpose of being allowed to participate in commencement.

It has been argued that to allow nongraduates to participate in commencement would devalue the ceremony for those who are truly graduating. The SGA was asked for their input on the above proposal, especially with regard to this issue, and the senate of the SGA gave the proposal its unanimous support.

The proposed procedures will give students early warning of exactly where they stand. In addition, the College will be making a gesture of goodwill to its students and their families by allowing students who have a reasonable expectation of graduating to carry through with their commencement plans.

In summation, Mr. Packer maintained that this proposal, which had appeared before the faculty in a number of earlier versions in the past, would preserve the spirit of "presumptive but not guaranteed" graduation, while making it a little easier on students and especially on their families. The message was essentially this: "Provided you don't mess up too badly, you can go ahead and 'walk.'" Marion Doig strongly opposed the motion, saying that when you redefine what graduation means, you are heading down a slippery slope; why not just rename the ceremony? In the event, the proposal passed, by a vote of 24 to 17, on a show of hands.

Trisha Folds-Bennett, for the Curriculum Committee, then introduced eight motions. After brief discussion, these were passed as circulated and may be summarized as follows:

DIVISION OF CLASSICAL AND MODERN LANGUAGES:

SPANISH AND ITALIAN

1. Minor in Italian (requirements)

2. Minor in Italian Studies (requirements)

3. New courses:  
   ITAL 361 Survey of Italian Literature I (3hrs.)
   ITAL 362 Survey of Italian Literature II (3)
   ITAL 452 Twentieth-Century Italian Literature (3)

4. New course:  
   SPAN 381 Introduction to Spanish Linguistics (3)
BIOLOGY

5. New course: BIOL 445 Systematic Biology (3)

6. Change in Environmental Studies Minor: inclusion of BIOL 406 (Conservation Biology) and BIOL 444 (Plant Ecology) in the list of suitable Science and Math courses

PSYCHOLOGY

7. New Course: PSYC 313 Sensation and Perception (3)

   Course deletion: PYSC 380.

Constituents’ Concerns

William Moore mentioned that the prohibition against “double counting” of courses in Minors was probably not being followed because there is no procedure in place for checking. Frank Kinard said that we need to have much better records kept for Minors in general. Susan Morrison noted that the Senate had as yet taken no stand about guns on campus (this was in connection with proposed legislation legalizing the carrying of concealed firearms in the State of South Carolina); should we not express some opinion? Mr. Mignone said that he would try to make copies of the law available. Susan Morrison pointed out that the legislation had not yet passed, and that now was the time to go on record; Caroline Hunt agreed. The Speaker thought, however, that we should look at the Bill first, before making specific comments. Mr. Moore wanted to know if college campuses were specifically covered in the legislation, that is, were places where firearms would not be allowed? Mr. Mignone said that he would acquire a copy of the proposed legislation, so we could find out. Caroline Hunt repeated that she thought the faculty should make some kind of a statement on this important issue, if necessary asking for a “suspension of the rules” at the General Faculty meeting on April 22 in order to introduce a resolution making our views known.

At about 5:45 p.m., with no further business, the meeting adjourned sine die.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary
April 2, 1996 (First Session)

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The first session of the eighth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 2, in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Forty-seven Senators attended. Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian. The Minutes of the previous meeting (March 12, 1996) were approved, after a clarification and two corrections. David Cohen said that his statement in the second paragraph on p. 1 of the March Minutes, which reported that the “suggestions” of the SACS accreditation team “included more rigorous evaluation of graduate programs,” should be clarified to more accurately reflect the words of the SACS team, who recommend “frequent systematic evaluations of graduate curricular offering and program requirements.” On p. 5, items 3 and 4 of the Curriculum Committee report, having to do with changes in the Business and Economics curriculum, should be corrected to read: “3. Change math requirement for business and economics majors from MATH 231, to MATH 104 or 106,” and “4. Add BADM 302 as prerequisite to BADM 330” (corrections are in italics).

Speaker’s Report

Mr. Mignone reported that on April 4, the Mathematics Department would hold a reception at the Faculty House in honor of Professor Emeritus James P. Anderson, whose portrait will reside henceforth in the living room of that facility. Secondly, he called attention to a draft of the “New Program Policy” from the Office of Academic Affairs, which, according to a cover-letter from the Associate Provost, dated February 16, “gives faculty developing new curricular programs a sense of the internal and external calendar requirements that need to be met to assure appropriate approvals.” No action was required from the Senate, since the policy had already been approved by the Deans and Directors in Academic Affairs, but apparently the Deans thought it might be a good idea to show it to the Senate anyway. Mr. Mignone asked that any comments or questions about the policy be forwarded to him; a draft was included in the Senate packet for the April 2 meeting, and would be attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes. The Speaker concluded by noting that an additional meeting would be needed to take care of remaining business, and called for a recess rather than an adjournment at the end of the day. The Senate agreed to “suspend the rules” in order to allow additional items to be added to the agenda for the second session.

New Business

Beverley Diamond, for the Committee on Nominations, proposed a slate of ten faculty for the new ad hoc committee on general education. The slate was displayed on the overhead projector and approved, as follows:
ARTS: Diane Johnson, Al Lyndrup  
BUS: Roger Daniels, Paul Jursa  
ED: Andy Lewis, Monica Janus  
HUM & SOC: Lynne Ford, Todd Grantham  
SCI & MATH: Henry Donato, Arch McCallum.

The three Standing Committees of the Senate were then elected, with no changes from the slate recommended by the Nominating Committee:

**ACADEMIC PLANNING**  
7 faculty members, the majority of whom must be faculty senators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cherry, Lynn</th>
<th>English &amp; Communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courson, Frances (S)</td>
<td>Educational Foundations &amp; Specializations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantham, Todd</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Martin (S)</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser, Charles (S)</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBroom, Deanna</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison, Susan (S)</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUDGET**  
7 faculty members, the majority of whom must be faculty senators

| Donato, Henry                    | Chemistry                 |
| Friedman, Doug (S)               | Political Science         |
| Leclerc, Anthony                 | Computer Science          |
| Livingston, Tom                  | Economics                 |
| Olejniczak, Bill (S)             | History                   |
| Sarvate, Dinesh (S)              | Mathematics               |
| Wilder, Hugh (S)                 | Philosophy                |

**BY-LAWS**  
3 faculty members, the majority of whom must be faculty senators

| Doig, Marion (S)                 | Chemistry                 |
| Hunt, Bishop (S)                 | English & Communications   |
| Parson, Jack                     | Political Science         |
Nine persons were then nominated from the floor for next year’s Faculty Committee on Nominations & Elections: John Newell, Deanna Caveny, Glenn Lesses, Caroline Hunt, Kem Fronabarger, Patricia Ward, Von Bakanic, Frank Kinard, Roger Daniels. Further nominations were in order. [Secretary’s note: in the event, further nominations were forthcoming, and the composition of this committee was finally determined by written ballot at the April 22 meeting of the Faculty. For the sake of clarity, those results are given here, as follows:]

**COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS**

7 faculty members (as defined in Article I, Section 1) with at least 3 years of service completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caveny, Deanna</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fronabarger, Kem</td>
<td>Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, Caroline</td>
<td>English &amp; Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesses, Glenn</td>
<td>Philosophy/Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newell, John</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steuer, Faye</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward, Patricia</td>
<td>English &amp; Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three proposals concerning the Graduate School were then introduced.

1. **New Program: Master of Education in Science and Mathematics**

   Two friendly amendments were suggested and accepted. First, the program must in some way include a substantial component of Evolutionary Biology. Second, in Category C on p.26 (“Capstone Experiences”), the description of SMFT 700 was shortened, and now reads simply, “Thesis,” without further definition or qualification. After some discussion, this proposal passed as amended.

2. A list of “Graduate Student Candidates for Graduation -- Spring, 1996,” dated March 22, 1996, was approved, pending completion of all requirements.

3. **New Graduate Courses**

   **BIOLOGY**

   - BIOL 503 Special Topics in Ecology (3-4hrs.)
   - BIOL 645 Systematic Biology (3)

   **ENGLISH AND COMMUNICATION**

   - ENGL 557 Creative Writing--Poetry (*New Title and Description*)
   - ENGL 563 Creative Writing--Fiction (3) (*New Course*)
BIOLOGY

EVSS 628 Plant Ecology (4)
EVSS 629 Conservation Biology (3)
EVSS 681 Capstone Seminar (2), for the Masters in Environmental Studies (MES)

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

PUBA 650 The Essential Elements of Non-Profit Administration (3)

These courses were approved, on a voice vote.

Lindsay Packer, for the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards, then introduced a motion about credit for course work taken as part of an external pre-approved program, requiring that:

All course work taken as part of an external pre-approved program (specifically the International Student Exchange Program, the National Student Exchange Program, and the Bilateral Exchange Program) be considered for credit and academic enrollment status the same as if it were completed at the College of Charleston. The Senior Year Residency requirement is not altered in any way by this policy.

This policy is to be included in the Policy and Procedures Manual of Student Records. Stephanie Mignone commented that this policy would not apparently affect our current procedures for giving transfer credit. Frank Kinard asked if these three “Programs” were the only ones affected by the proposal; the answer was yes. The motion passed.

Trisha Folds-Bennett then introduced six motions from the Curriculum Committee. These passed as circulated, and may be summarized as follows:

1. ART HISTORY

Minor in Historic Preservation and Community Planning
Course change (ARTH 410)

2. PHYSICS

Inclusion of HIST 251 ("The Cosmos in History") among electives for the Minor in, and Concentration in, Astronomy
Proposal #2: Representatives of The College of Charleston who have necessary authority should meet with City of Charleston officials to develop strategies to improve bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular safety in and around campus. These should include but are not limited to:

a. establishing designated bicycle lanes on streets bounding and intersecting the campus;
b. adding a crosswalk on St. Philip Street at Liberty Street;
c. slowing traffic during peak school hours on Calhoun, Coming, St. Philip, and Wentworth;
d. closing George Street (between St. Philip and Coming) between 7:30 and 4:30.

President Alexander M. Sanders, Jr. added that “No bikes on bricks” ought to be “the law of the land.”

Mr. Moore concluded his committee report by saying that data on faculty salaries had been obtained and put together by the Welfare Committee, and were now on file at the Library.

Constituents’ Concerns

The Speaker said that a reception would be given in honor of Peter Yaun, Professor of Education, who was retiring at the end of the year. Frank Kinard raised the issue of using money generated by the undergraduate FTE funding formula to pay for graduate programs. This, he said, was a “basically dishonest” procedure, and ought to be stopped. President Sanders said a total cost/benefit analysis would suggest otherwise: paying for college and university operations is a complex matter. Mr. Kinard objected that the faculty never get to see the real numbers involved. Mr. Sanders replied that the dollar is what he as President has to look at, and keep in mind at all times.

The Speaker recessed the meeting at about 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The seventh regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 12 in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Forty-one Senators attended; Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian. The Minutes of the previous meeting (February 6) were approved as circulated.

The Speaker recognized David Cohen, for the Office of Academic Affairs, who reported that the first part of the SACS accreditation process had now been completed, with the College apparently coming through with flying colors. The visitation team had apparently singled out only six areas for possible improvement, a far lower figure than was customary at most institutions. Their suggestions included more rigorous evaluation of graduate programs; having a single plan at the top for integrating all information technologies on campus; arranging for the Office of Institutional Research to evaluate itself more thoroughly; and having more faculty involvement in the periodic review and revision of our institutional “mission statement.” Mr. Cohen said that thanks were due to all concerned for their many splendid efforts in facilitating the accreditation process. Hugh Haynsworth said that he hoped many faculty would come to the scheduled discussions with our visitors, starting the next day, and that a number of letters about the accreditation itself were on file for those who might be interested.

Speaker's Report

Mr. Mignone noted that the schedule of meetings with the accreditation team was in the Newsletter, as well as on campus-wide e-mail. He then mentioned four matters of general interest, as outlined in the handout of his Report circulated at the meeting. First, the Academic Standards Committee is indeed now working on a form for evaluating Administrators, as instructed by the Senate at the March meeting a year ago; in fact, they expect to complete their work soon. Secondly, with regard to the issue of honorary degrees: President Sanders has said that he is completely amenable to having the President’s Advisory Committee play a more active role in soliciting, reviewing, and recommending individuals for Honorary Degrees. The chair of the Advisory Committee, Roger Daniel, has said that his committee will come up with a schedule and plan for next year. For the Senate’s information, the President presents honorary degrees at commencement with these words:

By the authority of the State of South Carolina, granted to the Board of Trustees and committed to me, I declare that . . . is now admitted to the degree of Doctor of Humane Letters of the College of Charleston (etc.).
Third, the Speaker had prepared a status report on Motions passed by the Faculty Senate during the previous academic year. The complete text runs to several pages and is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes; Mr. Mignone’s summary (kindly supplied) is included here:

**Summary of Senate Votes 1994-95**

(Exclusive of most curriculum and program changes)

September 6, 1994
Credit for work at another institution by transient students **APPROVED**

November 1, 1994
By-Laws change regulating nominations to the Committee on Nominations **APPROVED**

November 29, 1994
1) **Guidelines for the use of Special Topics Courses** APPROVED
2) **Overlapping graduate and undergraduate course Review in Progress**
3) **Sabbatical Leave Policy Amendments Rejected**
4) **Smoking Policy Adopted**
5) **Parking Regulations Rejected**

February 7, 1995
1) **Termination of Probationary Faculty** APPROVED
2) **Five Year Optional Pay Review for Faculty** Rejected

March 14, 1995
1) **Not changing “Honors Program” to “Honors College”** APPROVED
2) **Academic Affairs Policy Formation Document** APPROVED
3) **Make Registrar an ex officio member of the Curriculum and Graduate Education Committees** APPROVED
4) **Charge to the Academic Planning Committee to develop a form for evaluating administrators** In Progress

April 4, 1995
1) **By-Laws changes regulating nominations and elections to senate and standing committees** APPROVED
2) **Charge to the Academic Standards Committee to review advising of undeclared majors** In Progress
3) **Charge to Academic Planning Committee to review “Three Year Degree Program”** Review Complete

April 18, 1995
1) **Revised Sabbatical Leave Policy Amendment Rejected**
2) **Sexual Harassment Draft** APPROVED
3) **Attendance Policy for students on College sponsored activities** APPROVED

Fourth, the Speaker included excerpts from the “Higher Education Joint Legislative Study Committee” report of February, 1996. Once again, the full text of the Speaker’s report is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes. The first part of this unusual document, however, and the ensuing description of the mission of higher education in the State of South Carolina, are of such exceptional interest as to warrant inclusion *in extenso*:
Report on the Higher Education Joint Legislative Study Committee

What follows are excerpts from the Higher Education Joint Legislative Study Committee report of February 1996. Senator Nikki Setzler chaired the committee. The other members were: Edward E. Saleeby, James E. Bryan, Warren K. Giese, John W. Matthews Jr., Addison G. ("Joe") Wilson, John E. Courson, John R. Russell and McKinley Washington Jr.

Issues and Concerns

The issues which the Committee felt spurred the establishment of the Committee and were an essential component of their deliberations and decisions were that:

No criteria or standards exist for quality.

No clear missions or goals exist for the state or the postsecondary institutions allowing institutions to overlap and compete for the same student.

The existing funding formula, which is primarily based on the number of enrolled students, has no rewards for quality, therefore breeding mediocrity.

An adversarial relationship exists between the Commission on Higher Education and the colleges and universities.

Tuition costs at senior colleges and universities are no longer affordable or reasonable.

Lack of coordination has created wasteful duplication.

Institutions have not changed to meet the needs of the students and job market demands of the economy.

Lack of trust and turf protection between and among institutions.

Inadequate relationship with public education (K-12).

Essentially our work came down to answering three very basic questions:

What do we expect our education buck to buy?

How can we get more bang for the buck?

Where does the buck stop?

The answer to that first question is obvious. We expect (our) higher education system to achieve:

High Academic Quality

Affordable and Accessible Education

Instructional Excellence

Coordination and Cooperation with Public Education (K-12)

Economic Growth...

...how to get more bang from our buck?

We want to emphasize that while we recognize the need for flexibility and periodic re-examination, we call for an end to "mission creep" where technical colleges try to become community colleges, two year colleges become four year institutions and four-year institutions seek to become full-fledged research universities. Similarly, wasteful duplication drains financial resources and inhibits the drive for excellence that can more easily be achieved by concentrating those resources.

We also seek more bang for our buck by development of a post-tenure review system that will insure instructional quality; by increasing the number of hours professors spend teaching and assisting students inside and outside the classroom; and by examining class size and student/teacher ratio.

Finally, we call for the implementation of performance-based funding that will reward those institutions that meet the goals we established, seek to strengthen those that are moving toward accomplishing these goals, and penalize those which consistently fail to carry out their defined mission and achieve the goals this plan establishes...

We call on the General Assembly to let the buck stop with the restructured Commission on Higher Education by giving the Commission authority to take real action to enforce compliance with these defined missions, quality criteria, and performance indicators. This includes the authority to re-engineer, consolidate, reduce and/or expand the number of existing institutions of higher learning as judged by the performance criteria recommended by this committee...

Recommendations...

Missions

The mission for higher education in South Carolina should be to be a global leader in providing a coordinated, comprehensive system of excellence in education by providing instruction, research and life-long learning opportunities which are focused on economic development and benefit the state of South Carolina.

********

New Business

Herb Silverman, for the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, recommended approving a PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE BY-LAWS having to do with replacing At-Large Senators who do not complete their term of office. This had been introduced at the February meeting and amended by the Committee in the interim. Beverly Diamond suggested a further friendly amendment from the floor (changing "seven" to "ten" days), in order to allow the Committee on Nominations and Elections enough time to administer the election properly. This was accepted by Mr. Silverman for the Committee, making the proposal read as follows:
Append to Article IV, Section 2F:

If an at-large Senator needs to be replaced in the second year of a term, the Senate will elect the replacement by written ballot. The Committee on Nominations will provide a slate of at least two candidates circulated to the faculty at least two weeks before the Senate meeting. Additional nominations from the faculty may be sent to the Chair of the Committee on Nominations at least ten days before the Senate meeting.

The Senate unanimously approved the amended proposal, on a voice vote.

Trisha Folds-Bennett, speaking for the Curriculum Committee, then introduced six motions for action, and an additional item for information. These proposals were considered one by one and discussed very briefly. They passed as circulated (with one minor amendment to the second motion, noted below) and may be summarized as follows. The original documents are attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.

1. ENGLISH

   Course deletion: English 90

2. MUSIC

   2) New Course: Music 222, Special Topics for Non-Majors (3hrs.)

   [Note: this course was passed with an amendment from the floor: Caroline Hunt moved to strike section 5 of the proposal, “Prerequisites (or other restrictions): MUSC 131 or permission of the instructor,” in its entirety; this amendment passed on a voice vote.]

3. BUSINESS

   Change in requirements:

   Change math requirement for business majors from MATH 231, to MATH 104 or MATH 216

4. BUSINESS (cont.)

   Change in prerequisite:

   Add BADM 330 as prerequisite to BADM 330
5. MATHEMATICS

Course deletion: MATH 231

6. GEOLOGY and also COMPUTER SCIENCE

Change in requirements:

Change math requirement in both departments from MATH 231 to MATH 216

[7. For information: Special Topics courses in GEOLOGY, and in PHILOSOPHY]

Susan Gurganus, speaking for the Faculty Welfare Committee, then put forward a Proposal Regarding Bicycle Traffic on Campus. After some discussion, and several attempted amendments, this proposal was remanded to committee on the suggestion of Frank Kinard, for clarification and further study.

Lynne Ford then presented a motion from the "General Education Discussion Group" calling on the Senate to form an ad hoc committee to review the current state of general education, in order "to facilitate a campus-wide discussion regarding general education at the College of Charleston."

Rationale

There has been no comprehensive review of the general education curriculum and structure in 25 years. In the intervening years, goals and objectives were established for general education without broad campus-wide discussion. These goals and objectives have become the benchmarks for assessment and new course development although many faculty remain unaware that such goals and objectives exist. Three standing committees share jurisdiction with individual departments over general education: Academic Planning, Curriculum, and Assessment. None of the three committees have as their primary responsibility review of the general education curriculum and all three committees are burdened with specific duties which may make them reactive to specific proposals rather than capable of initiating a comprehensive review. While Academic Planning is most clearly charged with long-term planning, their specific duties relate to consideration of new programs and goals advocated by others in light of budgetary constraints and existing programs.

Several factors make this the appropriate time for the campus community to undertake a review of General Education. In the Spring of 1993, four faculty members attended an AAC&U-sponsored conference on General Education at the request of the Provost. Upon returning to campus, a General Education Discussion Group was formed to examine the current state of General Education at the College in light of information gathered at the conference. To expand the discussion, a campus-wide
Forum on General Education was held August 15-16, 1995, and over 120 faculty, staff, and students participated. The purpose of the Forum was to use the AAC&U publication Strong Foundations to assess our current efforts in light of twelve principles for effective general education programs. While the purpose of the Forum was not to consider specific changes to the curriculum, many important general and specific recommendations were generated through small group discussions that should become the basis for future campus-wide debate. Meanwhile, the SACS Self-Study has generated recommendations that bear directly on the General Education curriculum and their report suggests that the "General Education Committee" consider those recommendations. At the Forum and within the SACS discussions there has been considerable support for the formation of some type of committee. Following the Forum, the General Education Discussion Group solicited materials from other institutions that had undertaken comprehensive reviews of their own general studies requirements. The Group came to the conclusion that to institute a standing committee at this point in the process of review would be premature since it seemed to affirm the existing structure and content of general education rather than encourage a wide-ranging open examination that may include recommendations for change. This proposal calls for an open discussion of general education at the College of Charleston to take place. At the conclusion of the review process, a decision should be made as to the necessity of a standing General Education Committee for long-term review and maintenance.

During the discussion, David Kowal moved to change the composition of the proposed ad hoc committee by (essentially) equalizing the representation from each School. Hugh Wilder thought the idea of such a committee was excellent, but he was concerned that with so many members it might turn out to be unwieldy. Michael Friedman criticized the length of time being suggested (three years) for the committee to complete its work, but John Newell maintained that less than this had been found not to work elsewhere. Others thought the "Duties" of such a group should not be spelled out in elaborate detail but left in part to the committee itself to work out; accordingly, the "Duties" section was thinned by nearly a page. In the end, the proposal passed as amended:

Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Current State of General Education

Composition

Twenty-three (23) members in total: ten faculty appointed by the Senate (two from each of the five Schools: Humanities & Social Sciences, Mathematics & Science, Arts, Education, Business & Economics); three faculty serving ex officio as Chairs of the Academic Planning, Curriculum, and Assessment committees; five Deans (one from each of the five Schools); one representative from each of the following administrative offices, serving ex officio: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Enrollment Management; and two students. The committee shall be chaired by one or more tenure-track, roster faculty.
Duties

(1) Convene and facilitate a three-year campus-wide discussion on General Education to be completed by August of 1999.

(2) Make a report annually to the Faculty Senate and a full report to the Faculty Senate and full faculty by the end of three years (1999), at which time the faculty will be asked to affirm or modify the General Education curriculum.

(3) At the end of three years, make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate as to the need for a standing General Education Committee.

Constituents' Concerns

Mr. Mignone began by remembering Professor Michael Pincus, Chairman of the Languages Department, whose recent death had saddened so many in the College community. Susan Morrison called attention to the danger of legislators trading votes on key issues in return for obtaining college admission for their constituents. This, she said, had actually happened recently at another institution, even though the candidates for admission were completely unqualified. The faculty of the College must, she said, be prepared to resist granting admission to any individual in response to political pressure. Hugh Wilder thanked the Speaker for making available the report of the "Higher Education Joint Legislative Study Committee," and he recommended that everyone should read the full document on file at the Secretariat and elsewhere, as well as the excerpts in the Faculty Newsletter. He thought that perhaps there should be some sort of official response on the part of the Senate. Mr. Mignone agreed, and mentioned possibly holding a forum to discuss the serious issues raised.

Jeff Frkonja wondered whether there was any connection between the enforced dropping of remedial courses at state institutions and forthcoming changes in admissions policy. The Provost, Conrad Festa, was asked to speak to this and said that he did not really think there was a connection; there are always some students who lack the necessary math or English skills to perform at the college level. He noted that SACS had recommended that faculty take a greater part in writing and revising the mission statement of the College. It looks, however, as though the Legislature wants to put more power, not less, in the hands of the educational Commissions. If this really happens, it may mean mean that we will have to give up some very important things as an institution.

James Carew asked what role, if any, the Faculty Senate ought to play in trying to hold on to the strengths that we now have. Dr. Festa said that he thought, to be honest, there was not much the Senate could do directly in this regard, and what role we can play is likely to be more effective if we avoid getting heavily involved in trying to bring direct political pressure on the Legislature, especially at the moment. The faculty certainly does have a positive role to play, however, in affirming standards, which is one of its natural and inescapable functions. As a matter of fact, there now seems to be more support in Columbia for higher education than there was a year ago -- the mood, the atmosphere seems better -- but they want proof that we are doing the good job we say we are doing.
This may lead to a lot of unnecessary paperwork -- but in exchange, perhaps, for better funding, based on "performance" rather than on the "head-count" or "FTE" system. Frank Kinard noted that this seems like the umpteenth time the Commission on Higher Education, in one or another of its guises, has tried to grab power, only to be turned down eventually by the Legislature. Mr. Mignone noted that we do seem clearly to be headed for a "performance-driven" rather than "enrollment-driven" system of funding for higher education. William Olejniczak asked whether the question of eliminating tenure was still alive. The Speaker said there had been a vote, last year, to table the issue for a year, but it may be about to come around again, since that time is almost up. There seems to be more interest now, however, in the idea of "post-tenure review" rather than in outright abolition. Finally, Mr. Carew reported that the President was genuinely concerned to know whether the Senate wanted him to attend our meetings, or not; we should send him some sort of signal.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about 6:45.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
Speaker’s Report
March 12, 1996

1) With regard to a concern raised at the February 6, Senate meeting concerning the charge given to the Academic Planning Committee on March 14, 1995 to develop a form for evaluating administrators, the Academic Planning Committee has assured me that they are working on it and that they expect to have their work completed shortly.

2) With regard to the issue of honorary degrees, the President was completely open to having the President’s Advisory Committee play a more active role in soliciting, reviewing and recommending individuals for Honorary Degrees. Roger Daniels, Chair of the Committee said his committee will come up with a schedule and plan for next year.

For your information, the commencement script for honorary degrees reads: “By the authority of the State of South Carolina, granted to the Board of Trustees and committed to me, I declare that ...is now admitted to the degree of doctor of humane letters of the College of Charleston....

3) This report includes a status report on motions passed by the Faculty Senate in 1994-95.

4) This report includes a report on the Report on the Higher Education Joint Legislative Study Committee.
Summary of Senate Votes 1994-95

September 6, 1994
Credit for work at another institution by transient students APPROVED

November 1, 1994
By-Laws change regulating nominations to the Committee on Nominations APPROVED

November 29, 1994
1) Guidelines for the use of Special Topics Courses APPROVED
2) Overlapping graduate and undergraduate course Review in Progress
3) Sabbatical Leave Policy Amendments Rejected
4) Smoking Policy Adopted
5) Parking Regulations Rejected

February 7, 1995
1) Termination of Probationary Faculty APPROVED
2) Five Year Optional Pay Review for Faculty Rejected

March 14, 1995
1) Not changing “Honors Program” to “Honors College” APPROVED
2) Academic Affairs Policy Formation Document APPROVED
3) Make Registrar an ex officio member of the Curriculum and Graduate Education Committees APPROVED
4) Charge to the Academic Planning Committee to develop a form for evaluating administrators In Progress

April 4, 1995
1) By-Laws changes regulating nominations and elections to senate and standing committees APPROVED
2) Charge to the Academic Standards Committee to review advising of undeclared majors In Progress
3) Charge to Academic Planning Committee to review “Three Year Degree Program” Review Complete

April 18, 1995
1) Revised Sabbatical Leave Policy Amendment Rejected
2) Sexual Harassment Draft APPROVED
3) Attendance Policy for students on College sponsored activities APPROVED
Status Report On Motions Passed by the Faculty Senate 1994-95
(Most curriculum and program changes are not included.)

September 6, 1994
Credit for work at another institution by transient students  Passed/APPROVED
A recommendation was made by the Academic Standards Committee to clarify the
policy regarding credit for work at another institution by transient students in the
Undergraduate Bulletin. Append item 4 on page 120 of the 1994 Undergraduate Bulletin:

“4) Criteria for acceptable transfer credits also
apply to transient students (see page 24).”
(Note: this rule is intended to apply only to our students who are transient
students studying elsewhere.)

November 1, 1994
By-Laws change regulating nominations to the Committee on Nominations
Passed/ APPROVED
A recommendation was made by the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and
Faculty/Administration Manual to approve a change in the By-Laws regulating
when and how nominations to the Committee on Nominations can be made. Article
V, Section 3B.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.

November 29, 1994
1) Guidelines for the use of Special Topics Courses Passed/ APPROVED
A recommendation was made by the Curriculum Committee that
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.

2) Overlapping graduate and undergraduate course Passed/REVIEW IN
PROGRESS
The Academic Planning Committee was directed to look into and report on
the question of overlapping graduate and undergraduate courses.

3) Sabbatical Leave Policy  Passed with amendments/amendments
rejected
A policy on Sabbatical Leave from Academic Affairs had been forwarded to
the Welfare Committee for it to be forwarded to the Faculty Senate. The Welfare
Committee revised the policy and put it on the agenda for the November 1 meeting
of the Faculty Senate. Since no one from the Welfare Committee was at the
November 1, 1994 Senate meeting, it was deferred to the November 29, meeting.
A revised version of the Sabbatical Leave Policy offered by Academic
Affairs was proposed by the Welfare Committee. This proposal was amended and
endorsed by the Faculty Senate at the November 29, 1994 meeting. The most notable differences between the policy endorsed by the Faculty Senate and the policy offered Academic Affairs was that the Faculty Senate policy left out the requirements of disclosing additional income while on sabbatical and for giving a public lecture or demonstration of the findings resulting from the sabbatical.

On July 21, 1995 a memo from Conrad Festa to the Academic Deans, Department Chairs and Program Directors, presented the Sabbatical Leave Policy which Academic Affairs would adopt. The current policy includes the requirements of disclosing additional income while on sabbatical and for giving a public lecture or demonstration of the findings resulting from the sabbatical.

4) Smoking Policy  Passed/Adopted
A College of Charleston Smoking Policy was proposed by Andy Abrams, VP for Legal affairs, put forward by the Welfare Committee, passed by the Faculty Senate and adopted by President Sanders.

5) Parking Regulations  Passed/Rejected
The Welfare Committee recommended that the provision, which gives credit to state employees who transfer years of service into the College, be removed from the parking guidelines. It recommended that those who have previously transferred into the College and received credit not be penalized. Rather, this new policy be applicable to new employees beginning January 1, 1995.

February 7, 1995

1) Termination of Probationary Faculty  Passed/ APPROVED
A recommendation was made by the Welfare Committee that the following changes in the Faculty-Administration handbook be approved, where brackets indicate deletions and italics indicate additions.

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, termination 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)

2) Five Year Optional Pay Review for Faculty  Passed/Rejected
A recommendation was made by the Welfare Committee that 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... (See enclosure for the remainder of the proposal.)

March 14, 1995
1) Not changing "Honors Program" to "Honors College" Passed/ APPROVED

A recommendation was made by the Academic Planning Committee that the name of the Honors Program not be changed to "Honors College".

2) Academic Affairs Policy Formation Document Passed with amendments/ APPROVED

A recommendation was made by the Academic Planning Committee that the draft of an "Academic Affairs Policy Formation" document, developed by the Office of Academic Affairs be approved.

The motion to endorse the "Academic Policy Formation" document with two changes was passed by the Senate.

a) change 1 replaced the word "may" with "shall" in the following sentences:

The Provost shall refer appropriate draft policies that directly affect the faculty to the Speaker of the faculty.

and

The Speaker of the Faculty, in turn, shall refer the policy draft to a faculty committee or ad hoc group for review and comment.

b) change 2 recommends that consideration be given to the two month time limit on (faculty) consideration of policy changes if the two month period intersects the summer recess.

3) Make Registrar an ex officio member of the Curriculum and Graduate Education Committees Passed/ APPROVED

A recommendation was made by the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual to make the Registrar an ex officio member of the Curriculum Committee and the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs.

4) Charge to the Academic Planning Committee to develop a form for evaluating administrators Passed with amendment/In progress

A motion was presented by Frank Cossa, acting on his own behalf, asking the Faculty Welfare Committee to develop a form whereby the Faculty could evaluate administrators. The Senate amended the motion replacing the Faculty Welfare Committee by the Academic Planning Committee.

April 4, 1995
1) By-Laws changes regulating nominations and elections to senate and standing committees Passed/ APPROVED
Recommendation by the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual to approve a change in the By-Laws regulating nominations and elections.

a) 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.”

b) Article V, Section 3 A, to read: “Members of standing College committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations and Elections by March 15 and elected by the Senate at the April Senate Meeting.”

c) Article V, Sections 3 B 3 and 3 B 4 should similarly change “April 15” to “March 15”.

2) **Charge to the Academic Standards Committee to review advising of undeclared majors** Passed/In Progress

A motion was made by Frank Cossa, acting in his own behalf, recommending that the Faculty Senate instruct the Academic Standards Committee to review the current system for advising undeclared majors, and to recommend revisions in, or alternatives to, this system.

3) **Charge to Academic Planning Committee to review “Three Year Degree Program”** Passed/Review complete

A motion was made by Hugh Wilder, acting in his own behalf, recommending that the Faculty Senate instruct the Academic Planning Committee to review the proposal “Three Year Degree Program” and to issue a report to the Senate.

April 18, 1995

1) **Revised Sabbatical Leave Policy** Passed with amendment/amendment rejected by Conrad Festa.

A recommendation was made by the Welfare Committee to approve the revised Sabbatical Leave Policy. The Senate amended the revised policy by striking the sentence “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.”

2) **Sexual Harassment Draft** Passed with changes/Adopted

A recommendation was made by the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics to approve a draft document “Sexual Harassment Complaint Procedures” as developed over the years by Sue Sommer-Kresse, with advice from the faculty.

3) **Attendance Policy for students on College sponsored activities** Passed with amendment to text/ APPROVED

A recommendation was made by the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics to approve an addition to the existing Attendance Policy. “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.”
Report on the Higher Education Joint Legislative Study Committee


“Issues and Concerns

The issues which the Committee felt spurred the establishment of the Committee and were an essential component of their deliberations and decisions were that:

No criteria or standards exist for quality.

No clear missions or goals exist for the state or the postsecondary institutions allowing institutions to overlap and compete for the same student.

The existing funding formula, which is primarily based on the number of enrolled students, has no rewards for quality, therefore breeding mediocrity.

An adversarial relationship exists between the Commission on Higher Education and the colleges and universities.

Tuition costs at senior colleges and universities are no longer affordable or reasonable.

Lack of coordination has created wasteful duplication.

Institutions have not changed to meet the needs of the students and job market demands of the economy.

Lack of trust and turf protection between and among institutions.

Inadequate relationship with public education (K-12)...

Essentially our work came down to answering three very basic questions:

What do we expect our education buck to buy?

How can we get more bang for the buck?

Where does the buck stop?

The answer to that first question is obvious. We expect (our) higher education system to achieve:

High Academic Quality

Affordable and Accessible Education
Instructional Excellence

Coordination and Cooperation with Public Education (K-12)


Economic Growth...

...how to get more bang from our buck?

We want to emphasize that while we recognize the need for flexibility and periodic re-examination, we call for an end to "mission creep" where technical colleges try to become community colleges, two year colleges become four year institutions and four-year institutions seek to become full-fledged research universities. Similarly, wasteful duplication drains financial resources and inhibits the drive for excellence that can more easily be achieved by concentrating those resources.

We also seek more bang for our buck by development of a post-tenure review system that will insure instructional quality; by increasing the number of hours professors spend teaching and assisting students inside and outside the classroom; and by examining class size and student/teacher ratio.

Finally, we call for the implementation of performance-based funding that will reward those institutions that meet the goals we established, seek to strengthen those that are moving toward accomplishing these goals, and penalize those which consistently fail to carry out their defined mission and achieve the goals this plan establishes...

We call on the General Assembly to let the buck stop with the restructured Commission on Higher Education by giving the Commission authority to take real action to enforce compliance with these defined missions, quality criteria, and performance indicators. This includes the authority to re-engineer, consolidate, reduce and/or expand the number of existing institutions of higher learning as judged by the performance criteria recommended by this committee...

Recommendations...

Missions

The mission for higher education in South Carolina should be to be a global leader in providing a coordinated, comprehensive system of excellence in education by providing instruction, research and life-long learning opportunities which are focused on economic development and benefit the state of South Carolina...

The primary mission or focus for each type of institution should be

1. Research Institutions (USC, Clemson and MUSC)

   College level baccalaureate education, master's degrees, professional degrees and doctoral degrees which lead to continued education or employment.
Research through the use of government, corporate, non-profit organization grants and/or state resources.

Public service to the State and their local community.

2. Four Year Colleges and Universities

College level baccalaureate education and selected master’s degrees which lead to employment and/or continued education.

Limited and specialized research.

Public service to the State and their local community.

3. Two Year Institutions-Branches of the University of South Carolina

College level pre-baccalaureate education necessary to confer Associates Degrees which lead to continued education at a four year or research institution....

4. State Technical and Comprehensive Education Systems

All postsecondary vocational, technical and occupational training and diploma and associate degree programs leading directly to employment or maintenance of employment and associate degree programs for nontraditional students to gain access to other postsecondary education.

Up-to-date and appropriate occupational and technical training for adults.

Special school programs that provide training for prospective employees for prospective and existing industry in order to enhance the economic development of South Carolina....

SUCCESS FACTORS AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

1. Focused on Mission

-Expenditure of funds
-Curricula offered
-Approval of mission statement
-Adoption of strategic plan to support mission statement
-Attainment of strategic plan goals

2. Quality of Faculty

-Credentials of professors and instructors
-Performance review system for professors and instructors (to include student and peer evaluations)
-Post-Tenure review for professors
-Compensation of faculty
-Student contact hours out-side the classroom
-Public service (within normal compensation)

3. Classroom Quality
- Class size and student teacher ratio
- Credit hours taught by instructional staff
- Program and degree accreditation
- Emphasis on quality teacher education and reform

4. Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration

- Sharing and use of technology, equipment, supplies, and source matter experts
- With business community

5. Administrative Efficiency

- Percentage of administrative cost
- Use of best practices
- Elimination of unjustified duplication and waste
- Overhead Costs

6. Entrance Requirements

- SAT and ACT scores
- Class standing/GPA/activities
- Post secondary achievement
- SC residents a priority

7. Graduate’s Achievements

- Graduation rate
- Employment rate of graduates
- Employer feedback
- Prof/Certif. exam scores
- Continued education
- Credit hours earned to graduate

8. User-friendliness of the Institution

- Transferability of credits
- Continuous, lifelong educational offerings
- Accessibility to all citizens

9. Research Funding

- Support for improved teacher education
- Public and private sector grants...

The Commission on Higher Education (CHE) should...

1. Develop acceptable standards for the performance indicators of the success factors...by January 1, 1999...

2. Develop and implement a funding formula based on performance standards...by July 1, 1999...
3. Design a reporting system that accurately and efficiently reflects performance in relationship to designated performance standards.

4. Review and approve institutional mission statement development by the institutions boards of trustees to ensure they are within the overall mission for their particular type of institution and within the overall higher education mission of the State...

While legislation is not needed the Committee further recommends that:

2. The goal for all existing research institutions should be to become Carnegie Research I Institutions...

4. Each Board of Trustees should have an audit committee made up of members of the Board...

6. Approval of new doctoral programs should be “frozen” until further study by CHE, in cooperation with the Boards of Trustees, to determine the need for increase or closure of existing programs.

7. CHE should strengthen the requirements for being considered an in-state student in order to ensure that the tax paying citizens of South Carolina have first priority in attending South Carolina’s public colleges and universities.

8. A need-based and/or scholarship assistance program should be developed and funded for public college and university students.
Speaker's Note

This has been a tragic season. In the three weeks since the Special Issue of this Newsletter reported the drowning death of Jozef Modzelewski and the serious automobile accident of Ewa Wojcicka, Ewa died and another member of our college community, Laura Griffin, was killed by a hit-and-run driver as she was jogging on the sidewalk by the Battery.

Stunned and grief-stricken, our College Community is in a continuous state of mourning. Three truly extraordinary individuals are gone forever and the voids which they have left are shrouded in the senselessness of their deaths.

This issue is dedicated to their memory.

The Joint Legislative Committee on Higher Education is due to make its report to the South Carolina Legislature on February 6. A report on their report will appear in the next Newsletter.
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Senate Meetings (100 Maybank Hall, 5 p.m.)

- Tuesday, March 12
- Tuesday, April 2
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(Please remember that agenda items need to be received in my office by two Thursdays before a given Senate Meeting.)

Spring Faculty Meeting (Recital Hall, Simons Center for the Arts at 5 p.m.)

- Monday, April 22

Ewa Wojcicka, 1955-1996

With sorrow and regret the Department of Mathematics reports that Dr. Ewa Wojcicka, Associate Professor of Mathematics at the College of Charleston, died on January 14, 1996. We mourn the loss of a valued colleague and dear friend.

On December 10, while travelling north on Highway 17 near Beaufort, Ewa's car swerved into the southbound lane and into the path of a pickup truck. It took an emergency crew some time to cut her out of the wreckage. Due to the apparent severity of her injuries, the crew was reportedly astounded to find Ewa alive and actually conscious. She fell unconscious during the helicopter ride to Savannah Memorial Hospital. The trauma unit rushed her to emergency surgery that evening and returned
the next morning to visit her, astonished that she was still alive. By now her family had arrived at the hospital. Ewa’s fiancee, David Sumner, had arrived at 2:00 a.m. the night of the accident, just after they admitted her into the ICU from the emergency room. The first reports were discouraging, there was little hope for survival. A few days later her condition was critical, with a mere twenty percent chance of survival. Survival could well mean severe brain damage, perhaps paralysis. But when the doctor told David that only two of ten in Ewa’s condition could be expected to survive, David brightened. He knew Ewa better than anyone and with those odds Ewa would make it. And make it she did. Her struggle was heroic. In the thirty-three days between December 10, 1995 and January 13, 1996 Ewa found her way out of the abyss. With each step the light grew brighter and Ewa drew closer to wholeness. After serious talk that she might remain in a coma for months or as long as a year, there was the first time she smiled at David, first a faint flicker, then a full, sparkling Ewa smile. At one point the doctors needed to determine if she could move her fingers. Knowing that Ewa was a mathematician, a young resident asked her: “Ewa, what is the square root of four?” Ewa raised two fingers and the room went into cheers and high-fives. There was the first time Ewa sat up in a chair and breathed without the respirator, but still with a trachea tube. Gradual movement was returning to all of her. She was pronounced “recovered” and ready for transfer.

On Tuesday January 9, Ewa was transferred to a rehabilitation center in Columbia, where David and Ewa’s family live. Ewa’s progress in Columbia was nothing short of amazing. Ewa communicated by mouthing words (the trachea tube was still being used), by writing and by computer. David said that he had some of the best conversations of his life during those days with Ewa. On Friday, January 12 Ewa wrote to David on a pad “I love you more than I can say.” David left the hospital that night filled with excitement for the things he and Ewa would do together. Ewa was back.

During the night of Friday, January 12 or early morning of January 13, Ewa was found with her legs in the bedrails, face down, not breathing and without a pulse. Her heart was restored by CPR at the rehabilitation center before the EMS crew arrived. She was brought to a nearby hospital. Life support was terminated the next day at the request of her family.

Ewa Wojcicka was born in Gdansk Poland on April 24, 1955. She received a Bachelor of Science in Mathematics in 1978 from the University of Gdansk. In 1978 her family immigrated to the United States and settled in the Columbia area. Soon after arriving in Columbia, Ewa entered graduate school at the University of South Carolina and received a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Mathematics in 1985. Ewa came to the College of Charleston as an Assistant Professor in 1985 and was an Associate Professor of Mathematics at the time of her death. During her career she published several highly regarded research papers in mathematics, first in the area of Analysis and later in the area of Combinatorics. Ewa was an excellent teacher, she lectured with clarity and energy. Her enthusiasm for mathematics was contagious and mirrored her enthusiasm for life. She was generous with her time and patient with her students, always demanding the highest standards of performance from herself and others. Ewa’s considerable talents as a researcher and teacher made her respected by her students and her peers. Ewa was a member of the American Mathematical Society and the Mathematical Association of America.

Ewa’s remarkable gifts were not limited to her professional life. Fitness and athletic competition were a lifelong passion. She had a 5.0 Volvo ranking in tennis and had been the captain of the championship volleyball team at the University of Gdansk. When Ewa walked she sprinted, even if it was going down the hall to her next class, she moved with strength, speed and grace. And Ewa’s heart was as warm and generous as her wonderful smile. Although she was a critic of organised religion, she lived by the commandment Love thy Neighbour. She gave a great deal of herself to community service: whether it was tutoring and caring for the girls and young women at the Florence Crittenden Home for Unwed Mothers or working with a mathematically gifted child at Buist Academy, Ewa gave from the heart.

We will miss Ewa, we’ll miss her sparkling smile and radiant energy.
Why Not Run a Business Like a Good University? by Robert Woodbury

"If you only ran your college like a business..." is a phrase we in university administration hear from our friends in the business world.

Frankly, we in higher education have learned much about operating in a more business like manner. The stringency of the last few years in particular have helped us weed out unnecessary functions, use technology more effectively, plan more strategically, and use limited resources more efficiently. Most of us are better managers than we would have been if we had been less attentive to recent developments in the private sector. Those in the private sector, however, might reflect on some comparisons and strengths in the university world that might be helpful, in turn, to them.

First, higher education is one of the few United States "industries" universally recognized as the best in the world. This is no longer true of cars or electronics or most other areas of manufacturing. But our colleges and universities, as a whole, dominate the globe as do few sectors other than the entertainment industry, munitions, and soft drinks.

Second, our favorable balance of payments is estimated to exceed $5 billion and is expanding. Almost 420,000 foreign students the vast majority funded from abroad, study full time on our campuses. Perhaps 80,000 US students study abroad and then only for brief periods and mostly for "cultural" reasons.

Third, higher education has been a growth industry for four decades, despite a dramatic decrease in the college-age population over the past 20 years. We have expanded from 2 million students to over 14 million since World War II. Growth in related areas, such as continuing education or sponsored research, has grown as dramatically.

Fourth, cases of college bankruptcy, defaults on loans, or higher level malfeasance are all but unknown. Certainly many colleges are run better than others, but the overall record of fiscal stewardship would be the envy of many boards of directors.

Fifth, no other industry that I know has assembled, retained, and energized so much educated talent at such a low cost. At a single institution, thousands of people have studied an average of six full years past their bachelor's degree (more than many Mds) and earn only $45,000 (the average salary of a university professor in the US).

Sixth, undergraduates get a bargain, despite the perceptions of parents or taxpayers. A college supplies housing, food, association with the best minds in many fields, art centers, athletic events, entertainment, libraries, and all the amenities and intellectual resources of a small city. Who else can do this for an average cost of $12,000?

Seventh, the return on investments is enviable. Aside from any benefits of a human or cultural dimension, a graduate of a four-year institution earns approximately 50 percent more than a high-school graduate, or $500,000 more over a lifetime. The contributions of university research and ancillary activities to society are incalculable.
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It is worth exploring the managerial reasons for this success. Decision-making is highly decentralized. Issues of curriculum, teaching, scholarly support, admissions, selection of staff, rest with an academic department—a group of faculty with common aspirations for the department, their discipline, and their students to succeed.

The fundamental work of teaching and learning is controlled by the faculty member, the "front-line worker."

The most critical issues depend on creativity, energy, and commitment in a particular classroom or laboratory. There is minimal bureaucratic control over "the work." The basic assumption is that management's job is to provide the tools, encouragement, and security for faculty to use their creativity and imagination. In this sense, a faculty member is treated as a professional.

The enterprise is daily in touch with the consumer. However passive some students may be, colleges are influenced incessantly by consumers on campus as well as indirectly by those who choose not to come. When the "traditional" consumer market shrank, colleges aggressively pursued nontraditional markets.
Our apparatus for quality control and improvement are highly developed and regular. We have complex procedures for program evaluation, institutional or professional accreditation, self-study, government program approval, peer-review journals, and even teacher evaluation mechanisms. No less important are mechanisms for colleague review in a department or profession. Whatever the critique of the tenure system, no profession requires as intensive a year-long review of an individual after six years of probation than does a good university.

Opportunities for professional renewal, growth, and continuing education are well developed. Faculty and other professionals are expected not only to keep up in their field, but are provided opportunities, including study leaves, for major scholarly and professional development. Faculty are hired for the long-term.

Universities are structured in a mode of “shared governance,” a relatively flat bureaucracy and open information across the entire enterprise. In an age when the notion of proprietary information is disappearing, academic disciplines have been internationally open for decades. In addition, universities have a reward system where the president is paid about three times the average faculty member, four times the average employee, and five times an entry level employee - a sharp contrast with the 70 plus multiplier in large businesses.

Finally, universities and colleges seek long-term results. The real measures involve institutional reputation, successes of graduates, and accomplishments of faculty, which require more sophisticated qualitative assessments over long periods. Investment is something to assure stewardship over the long haul.

Does some of this sound familiar? Many of the current guides to improved business structures and enterprises, from “total quality management” to quality circles to other modes, are similar to processes and approaches that colleges and universities have developed over decades. Plenty is wrong with many colleges. More than most realize, however, businesses can learn a great deal from higher education about management and leadership.

Robert L. Woodbury is the director of the McCormack Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Massachusetts-Boston. He is a past chairman of the New England Board of Higher Education and former chancellor of the University of Maine System.

(Note: This article first appeared in the March 23, 1993 issue of the Christian Science Monitor and appears here with the author's consent.)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Foundation Faculty/Staff Pledge Drive (Contributed by Stephanie Mignone)

A representative from your department will be contacting you soon regarding faculty pledges to the College of Charleston Foundation. Please bear in mind, as you consider giving, that the Foundation supports faculty activity such as travel, research, speakers, and candidate interviews, as well as scholarships and awards for students. Although large donations are by all means encouraged (contributorsof $100.00 are entered in a drawing for dinner at Celia’s), most important to the College’s overall fundraising efforts is the percentage of faculty participation. A high participation figure helps convince outside donors (and also State legislators) of the faculty’s dedication. Individual pledges can be directed to specific programs, departments or funds with a simple notation on the pledge card. NOTE: Memorial Funds are in place for each of our recently deceased colleagues, Jozef Modzelewski, Ewa Wojcicka, and Laura Griffin.

To those who have already pledged, many thanks.

The Self-Study Report (Contributed by Hugh Haynsworth)

The focused self-study is nearing completion. The self-study report is rolling off the printer now and will be mailed to members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) consulting team and distributed widely among the offices of the college community. Many thanks go to our tireless editor, Prof.
Caroline Hunt, all the members of the six self-study committees and the steering committee, and to Paula Edwards, our administrative assistant.

The self-study report includes the report of each of the six self-study committees and a strategic plan which addresses the goal of becoming an international, multicultural liberal arts institution. The strategic plan, developed by the steering committee, reflects the recommendations of the six self-study committees and the discussions which took place at the President’s Retreat last September. The plan describes the actions the steering committee feels will best address the goal of the self-study. However, it is a still a draft plan that will be modified, based on your comments and the advice of the team of SACS consultants, who will visit the college the week of March 10 - 15.

On behalf of the self-study steering committee, I solicit your help. Please read the strategic plan and ask questions or make suggestions. We need your feedback. Every full-time faculty member and many administrators will receive a copy of the strategic plan, and copies of the entire self-study document will be placed in every departmental office. In addition, the entire self-study document will be accessible online; we will be distributing particulars about access in a few days. Give us your written comments on the plan, before the visit of the SACS consultants, by mailing your comments directly to Hugh Haynsworth, Mathematics Department or by accessing the self-study documents online and typing your comments into the space provided as an e-mail message. In addition, we will hold a series of public forums on March 13 or March 14 with the consultants. We hope you will attend and express your thoughts.

Thank you for participating in this important process.

THE LUNCH EXPRESS (Contributed by Dining Services)

Working through lunch? Don’t skip lunch or order fattening pizza. Dining Services LUNCH EXPRESS will be delivering Healthy Choice deli sandwiches, tossed salads, fruit, cookies, and bottled beverages beginning February 5th right to your desk. Only a $5 minimum order is required and regular menu prices are in effect. The convenience is incomparable. Look for the specialty designed menu in your department mailbox or the Stern Center Food Court. You may also call Dining Services at 953-5669 for more information.

THE PROGRAM IN THE CAROLINA LOWCOUNTRY AND THE ATLANTIC WORLD (Contributed by Rosemary Brana-Shute)

1) Changes in Seminar Scheduling and Speakers

On February 23, Thomas Cohen of Catholic University will give a public lecture at the Blacklock house at 1 p.m. His topic is “The Fire of Tongues: Antonio Vieira and the Missionary Church in Colonial Brazil.” Students as well as faculty are encouraged to attend.

The previously scheduled speaker for the Faculty Seminar series for February 23, 1996 has been changed. Dr. John Russell-Wood of the History Department at the Johns Hopkins University will offer a paper for discussion entitled “Through an African Diaspora in Colonial Brazil” at the Blacklock House from 3-5 p.m.

To receive Dr. Russell-Wood’s paper in advance, please contact Randy Sparks or Rosemary Brana-Shute, Program Co-Directors, at the History Department (953-5711) or FAX 953-6349 or email Sparksr@CofC.edu or Branashuter@CofC.edu.

The two presentations amount to a Brazil Day and will deal with the encounters among Europeans, Africans, and Native Americans.

2) “Center and Periphery in the Atlantic World” Symposium

The College of Charleston’s Program in the Carolina Lowcountry and the Atlantic
World will host an interdisciplinary symposium entitled “Center and Periphery in the Atlantic World” on April 12-13, 1996 on the College campus. The symposium is intended to explore the most prominent theoretical constructs underlying the study of the Atlantic World. Invited speakers, representing the disciplines of geography, political science and sociology, will prepare brief discussion papers which will be circulated before the symposium. In order to receive the papers in advance and to reserve a place at the symposium, pre-registration is requested.

Program

Friday, April 12: The Blacklock House
2:00 p.m.: Jack P. Greene (Program Director, The College of Charleston and Department of History, The John Hopkins University)
Welcome and Introductory Comments

2:10 p.m.: Christopher Chase Dunn (Department of Sociology, The John Hopkins University)

4:00 p.m.: John Agnew (Department of Geography, Syracuse University)

7:00 p.m.: Buffet Dinner
No fee, but pre-registration required

Saturday, April 13: Lightsey Conference Center
8:30 a.m.: Continental Breakfast

9:00 a.m.: Ronald Chilcote (Department of Political Science, University of California, Riverside)

11:00 a.m.: Roundtable Discussion
Chair: Samuel M. Hines, Jr. (Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences, College of Charleston)

To pre-register or further information, contact Randy Sparks or Rosemary Brana-Shute, Program Co-Directors, at the History Department (953-5711) or FAX 953-6349 or email Sparksr@CofC.edu or Branashuter@CofC.edu.
February 6, 1996

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The sixth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston convened at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 6 in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. (This meeting began half an hour later than usual because of a memorial service for Laura Griffin, Director of the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention/Education, whose untimely death following an apparent hit-and-run accident had saddened and perplexed the entire College community.) Forty-four Senators attended; Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian. The Minutes of the previous meeting (January 16) were approved as circulated.

[Appended to the Minutes of this meeting: election results for at-large Senate seats and Faculty Officers, and TWO CHANGES IN THE BY-LAWS, approved by majority faculty vote, on a written ballot. This information became available on February 15, and is included here for convenience.]

Speaker's Report

Mr. Mignone requested permission to circulate a petition begun by the Student Government Association calling for stiffening the laws that apply to hit-and-run accidents, making the offense comparable to “DUI” cases; Susan Morrison explained briefly that the penalty for hit-and-run accidents in South Carolina seems far too light at the moment, and ought to be revised. Without objection, the petition was circulated. The Speaker then mentioned that the issue of abolishing tenure appears to have been removed, at least for the moment, from the current legislative menu. The Joint Legislative Commission on Higher Education was scheduled to give a report on this very day, and details should become available shortly.

New Business

Hugh Haynsworth reported that the SACS report was completed and had actually been put in the mail that afternoon. He asked for faculty reactions, either orally or in writing, and noted that SACS consultants would be visiting the College for several days, starting with the evening of March 12; the exact schedule would be circulated, and he hoped that many faculty members would take the time to participate in the discussions that would take place. Caroline Hunt added that the report would soon be available “on line,” a step that should help to conserve the forests of the world; e-mail instructions for accessing this document via “gopher” and the College’s “Home Page” would be sent out next week.
Beverly Diamond, for the Committee on Nominations and Elections, then introduced for
information a **PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE BY-LAWS**, having to do with procedures for
replacing at-large Senators who do not complete their term of office:

*Append to Article IV, Section 2F:*

In the event that an at-large Senator needs to be replaced and the time
remaining in the Senator’s term is less than one academic year, the
replacement is selected as follows. The Committee on Nominations
provides a slate of at least two candidates to the faculty, allowing for
further nominations from the faculty. The Senate then elects the
replacement by written ballot.

This reason for this proposal was that full-scale elections by circulated ballot are costly and
take a good deal of time to set up and administer. If the time remaining in a Senator’s term is less
than a year, it would seem sensible to find a more efficient way of providing a replacement. The
selection of needed replacements on faculty committees is now handled by the Senate; the
proposed change would continue to allow for faculty input and an actual election, while simplifying
and speeding up the process.

The Speaker said that this proposal would be duly referred to the Senate By-Laws Committee
for their recommendation, and action at the next meeting.

**Constituents’ Concerns**

David Kowal recalled that at the March 14, 1995 meeting, the Senate had unanimously
directed the Academic Planning Committee to devise an instrument for evaluating Administrators;
where was it? Mr. Mignone promised to look into the matter, and to issue a progress report. Susan
Morrison noted that the Committee had last met, during the summer, on the question of accelerated
degrees, but the chairman had not called a meeting since, and therefore no progress had been made.
James Carew was not enamored of this failure, as he saw it, and urged the Speaker to ask the
chairman of the Committee to resign. Beverly Diamond thought it would be better simply to **remind**
the Committee. Often, she said, there was some lack of continuity between outgoing and incoming
faculty committees, especially with regard to matters raised toward the end of an academic year.

Hugh Wilder spoke about honorary degrees awarded by the College: there was no longer any
consultation with faculty about who gets them. The President’s Advisory Committee is supposed
to consult with, and advise the President on, who does. If the Faculty sees fit, we could specify a
procedure requiring faculty input; after all, the Faculty is responsible, at least nominally, for
conferring degrees. Perhaps we should ask for a specific report on the subject of honorary degrees
from the Advisory Committee, and move eventually in the direction of some kind of By-Laws
change. Roger Daniels (on the Committee) said they had not looked at this issue yet. Frank Kinard
said that selecting honorary degree recipients has become solely the province of the President of the
College; some time ago, when the faculty had asked to have some input, we had been told to mind our own business. Caroline Hunt recalled that there used to be an Honorary Degree Committee, appointed by the President. They could be counted on to obey, too; one year, either late in the Collins or early in the Lightsey regime, the College had awarded something like thirty-eight honorary degrees, all rubber-stamped by the faculty committee. In other words, Deborah Miller commented, it behaved just like other faculty committees. Joe Benich asked what colleges elsewhere do: for example, Clemson or USC. Mr. Kinard said that awards are given for the good of those institutions, and there is always a problem getting adequate faculty input. Mr. Mignone recalled that an honorary degree had recently been awarded to the President of the Ukraine, but that it had been thought prudent to check him out beforehand, to make sure he was not “the Butcher of Minsk” or some other catastrophic embarrassment to the institution.

Mr. Carew commented on the Senate in general. It seemed to him that our operations were just like those of the old faculty system of governance, only writ small. Why not, if we have a senate, behave like a senate? Why not hold hearings on issues that the Administration responds to unsatisfactorily? Why not summon administrators to testify? According to the By-Laws approved by the Trustees, some representatives of the Administration are supposed to attend Senate meetings now — but they seem not to have been much in evidence lately.

Mr. Benich moved to adjourn, at about 6 o’clock.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary

APPENDIX

ELECTION RESULTS

(Elected by faculty vote, on a written ballot)

Elected to two-year terms as at-large Senators, beginning Fall 1996:

Julia Eichelberger (English)
Trisha Folds-Bennett (Psychology)
Lynne Ford (Political Science)
Bishop Hunt (English)
Susan Morrison (Biology)
William Olezniczak (History)
Dinesh Sarvate (Mathematics)
Elected to a one-year replacement position as at-large Senator:

Deborah Miller (Physical Education & Health)

**Faculty Officers for 1996-97:**

Speaker of the Faculty: Robert Mignone (Mathematics)
Faculty Secretary: Kathy Haney (English)

**CHANGES IN THE BY-LAWS**

(Passed by Majority Faculty Vote, on a written ballot, as of Feb. 15, 1996)

1. Proposed at the April 18, 1995 meeting, and approved by the Senate on October 3, 1995:

   *Add to Article IV, Section 2 A:*

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

2. Proposed October 3, 1995, and approved by the Senate November 7, 1995:

   *Add to Article IV, Section 2C:*

   2C6: A candidate for the position of Speaker cannot be a candidate for an at-large senate seat in the same election. In the event that a candidate for Speaker is in the middle of a term as an at-large senator and wins the election for Speaker, of those unsuccessful in the election for at-large seats, the person obtaining the most votes will complete the second year of the Speaker-elect's term.
MEMORANDUM

TO: The Faculty Senate
FROM: Bob Mignone
RE: Senate Meeting to begin at 5:30 p.m. on February 6
DATE: February 1, 1996

The memorial service for Laura Griffin will begin at 4 p.m. on Tuesday, February 6. A request was made that the Senate meeting begin later so as to reduce the likelihood of a conflict for those who plan to attend the memorial service and the Senate meeting. There is little business to attend to at the February 6 meeting so this change in starting time should not extend us past a normal adjournment time. Let's plan to begin the Senate meeting at 5:30 p.m. for this February meeting. I hope this does not inconvenience anyone.
Memorandum

To:         All Faculty Senators
From:      Committee on Nominations and Elections
Re:       Proposed By-Laws change
Date:       January 26, 1996

The Committee on Nominations and Elections recommends the following change in the By-Laws:

append to Article IV, Section 2F: In the event that an at-large Senator needs to be replaced and the time remaining in the Senator's term is less than one academic year, the replacement is selected as follows. The Committee on Nominations provides a slate of at least two candidates to the faculty, allowing for further nominations from the faculty. The Senate then elects the replacement by written ballot.

Rationale- Elections are somewhat costly and take some time to set in place. If the time remaining in a term is less than a year, it seems reasonable to look at a more efficient way of providing a replacement. The selection of replacements for committee members is also done through the Senate. The proposed selection process continues to allow for faculty input and an actual election.
ELECTION BALLOT
for
AT LARGE SENATE SEATS
SPEAKER OF THE FACULTY
FACULTY SECRETARY

At-large Senate Seats (vote for no more than 7):

- Phillip Dustan (Biology)
- Talaat Elshazly (Acc. & Leg.St.)
- Trisha Folds-Bennett (Psychology)
- Kem Fronabarger (Geology)
- Tom Heeney (Eng. & Comm.)
- Bishop Hunt (English)
- David Kowal (Art History)
- Deanna McBroom (Music)
- William Olezniczak (History)
- Peter Rowe (Psychology)
- Jim Smiley (Biology)
- Julia Eichelberger (Eng. & Comm.)
- William Finley (Library)
- Lynne Ford (Political Science)
- Myrtle Glascoe (Ed. Found. & Sp.)
- Rick Heldrich (Chemistry)
- Robert Johnson (Biology)
- Jorge Marban (Spanish)
- Susan Morrison (Biolo)
- Clifford Peacock (Studio Art)
- Dinesh Sarvate (Mathematics)

One year replacement (vote for no more than 1):

- Kathy Johnston-Thom (Math.)
- Deborah Miller (Phys. Ed. & Health)

Secretary of the Faculty (vote for no more than 1):

- Kathy Haney (Eng. & Comm.)
- Frank Petrusak (Political Science)

Speaker of the Faculty (vote for no more than 1):

- Robert Mignone (Mathematics)

BY-LAWS AMENDMENT RATIFICATION BALLOT

Amendment 1-- (Article IV, Section 2A.,) add:
Faculty members on leave are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators.

- Approve
- Disapprove

Amendment 2-- (Article IV, Section 2C.,) add:
2C.6. A candidate for the position of Speaker cannot be a candidate for an at-large senate seat in the same election. In the event that a candidate for Speaker is in the middle of a term as an at-large senator and wins the election for Speaker, of those unsuccessful in the election for at-large seats, the person obtaining the most votes will complete the second year of the Speaker-elect's term.

- Approve
- Disapprove

Ballots must be received by Beverly Diamond, Dept. of Mathematics, no later than Thursday, Feb. 15, 1996.
February 2, 1996

Memorandum
To: All regular faculty
From: Committee on Nominations and Elections
Re: Elections for at-large Senators, Speaker of the Faculty, and Faculty Secretary; By-Laws amendments ratification

Enclosed is a ballot and ballot envelope for at-large Senate seats, Speaker of the Faculty, Faculty Secretary, and two By-Laws amendments approved by the Senate in the fall of 1995.

Please fill out your ballot, place it unsigned inside the blank ballot envelope, and return the ballot envelope (to Beverly Diamond) inside the preaddressed campus mail envelopes. Upon receipt, the ballot envelopes will be removed and set aside to be counted after the election period ends on February 15th. The return addresses on the outer envelopes will be used only for the purpose of marking each faculty member's name off a master list as having voted. Since the ballot envelope and outer envelope will be separated, the anonymity of the individual voters will be preserved.

Please use the outer campus mail envelope provided, without defacing or removing the return address. In order to insure against the (remote) possibility of vote fraud, the Committee on Nominations and Elections will invalidate ballots received without this form of identifying eligible voters.
MEMORANDUM

TO: All Regular Faculty
FROM: Committee on Nominations and Elections
Re: Elections for at-large Senators, Speaker of the Faculty, & Secretary of the Faculty

The Committee on Nominations and Elections is placing the following names in nomination for the indicated positions. Nominations or self-nominations are in order until noon, February 2, and can be made by communicating with Beverly Diamond in the Mathematics Department (Committee Chair). The Committee will be distributing mail ballots to all regular faculty immediately following the close of nominations.

At-large Senate Seats (7 open):

- Julia Eichelberger (English & Comm.)
- William Finley (Library)
- Lynne Ford (Political Science)
- Myrtle Glascoe (Educ. Found. & Spec.)
- Rick Heldrich (Chemistry)
- Robert Johnson (Biology)
- Jorge Marban (Spanish)
- Susan Morrison (Biology)
- Peter Rowe (Psychology)
- Jim Smiley (Biology)
- Talaat Elshazly (Account. & Legal St.)
- Trisha Folds-Bennett (Psychology)
- Kem Fronabarger (Geology)
- Tom Heeney (English & Comm.)
- Bishop Hunt (English)
- David Kowal (Art History)
- Deanna McBroom (Music)
- William Olezniczak (History)
- Dinesh Sarvate (Mathematics)

One year replacement (1):

- Kathy Johnston-Thom (Mathematics)
- Deborah Miller (Phys. Ed. & Health)

Normally senators serve for two years and are eligible to serve consecutively for two full terms.

For your information, continuing at-large Senators are James Carew (Geology), Kathy Haney (English & Comm.), Hugh Haysworth (Mathematics), Caroline Hunt (English & Comm.), Amy McCandless (History), William Moore (Political Science), and Hugh Wilder (Philosophy).

Secretary of the Faculty:

- Kathy Haney (English & Comm.)
- Frank Petrusak (Political Science)

The Secretary serves for one year, has a one-course reduction in teaching load per semester, and is eligible to serve 3 consecutive terms.

Speaker of the Faculty:

- Robert Mignone (Mathematics)

The Speaker serves for one year, has a half-time reduction in teaching load per semester, plus a salary supplement, and is eligible to serve 3 consecutive terms.
ELECTION BALLOT
for
AT LARGE SENATE SEATS
SPEAKER OF THE FACULTY
FACULTY SECRETARY

At-large Senate Seats (vote for no more than 7):

- Phillip Dustan (Biology)
- Talaat Elshazly (Acc. & Leg.St.)
- Trisha Folds-Bennett (Psychology)
- Kem Fronabarger (Geology)
- Tom Heeney (Eng. & Comm.)
- Bishop Hunt (English)
- David Kowal (Art History)
- Deanna McBroom (Music)
- William Oleznitzak (History)
- Peter Rowe (Psychology)
- Jim Smiley (Biology)
- Julia Eichelberger (Eng. & Comm.)
- William Finley (Library)
- Lynne Ford (Political Science)
- Myrtle Glascoe (Ed. Found. & Sp.)
- Rick Heldrich (Chemistry)
- Robert Johnson (Biology)
- Jorge Marban (Spanish)
- Susan Morrison (Biology)
- Clifton Peacock (Studic Art)
- Dinesh Sarvate (Mathematics)

One year replacement (vote for no more than 1):

- Kathy Johnston-Thom (Math.)
- Deborah Miller (Phys. Ed. & Health)

Secretary of the Faculty (vote for no more than 1):

- Kathy Haney (Eng. & Comm.)
- Frank Petrusak (Political Science)

Speaker of the Faculty (vote for no more than 1):

- Robert Mignone (Mathematics)

BY-LAWS AMENDMENT RATIFICATION BALLOT

Amendment 1-- (Article IV, Section 2A., ) add:
Faculty members on leave are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators.

- Approve
- Disapprove

Amendment 2-- (Article IV, Section 2C., ) add:
2C.6. A candidate for the position of Speaker cannot be a candidate for an at-large senate seat in the same election. In the event that a candidate for Speaker is in the middle of a term as an at-large senator and wins the election for Speaker, of those unsuccessful in the election for at-large seats, the person obtaining the most votes will complete the second year of the Speaker-elect's term.

- Approve
- Disapprove

Ballsots must be received by Beverly Diamond, Dept. of Mathematics, no later than Thursday, Feb. 15, 1996.
Memorandum
To: All regular faculty
From: Committee on Nominations and Elections
Re: Elections for at-large Senators, Speaker of the Faculty, and Faculty Secretary; By-Laws amendments ratification

Enclosed is a ballot and ballot envelope for at-large Senate seats, Speaker of the Faculty, Faculty Secretary, and two By-Laws amendments approved by the Senate in the fall of 1995.

Please fill out your ballot, place it unsigned inside the blank ballot envelope, and return the ballot envelope (to Beverly Diamond) inside the preaddressed campus mail envelopes. Upon receipt, the ballot envelopes will be removed and set aside to be counted after the election period ends on February 15th. The return addresses on the outer envelopes will be used only for the purpose of marking each faculty member's name off a master list as having voted. Since the ballot envelope and outer envelope will be separated, the anonymity of the individual voters will be preserved.

Please use the outer campus mail envelope provided, without defacing or removing the return address. In order to insure against the (remote) possibility of vote fraud, the Committee on Nominations and Elections will invalidate ballots received without this form of identifying eligible voters.
At-large Senate Seats (vote for no more than 7):

- Phillip Dustan / SJ 5\(+\)10 + 7 + 9 + 2 + 7 + 17 / 57
- Talaat Elshazly 4\(+\)4 + 4 + 5 + 4 + 8 + 15 / 44
- Trisha Folds-Bennett 8\(+\)11 + 14 + 15 + 12 + 14 + 18 / 92
- Kem Fronabarger 3\(+\)5 + 4 + 6 + 0 + 8 + 6 / 34
- Tom Heeney 4\(+\)3 + 3 + 2 + 5 + 6 + 12 / 35
- Bishop Hunt 11\(+\)14 + 18 + 15 + 11 + 19 + 35 / 123
- David Kowal 5\(+\)4 + 4 + 6 + 6 + 5 + 17 / 57
- Deanna McBroom 4\(+\)5 + 1 + 5 + 4 + 3 + 11 / 33
- William Olezniczak 5\(+\)8 + 6 + 7 + 11 + 10 + 20 / 67
- Peter Rowe 3\(+\)4 + 6 + 8 + 5 + 5 + 8 / 39
- Jim Smiley 4\(+\)6 + 9 + 6 + 2 + 12 + 17 / 56

Julia Eichelberger 5\(+\)8 + 6 + 6 + 14 + 6 + 25 / 70
William Finley 4\(+\)1 + 2 + 2 + 5 + 4 + 9 / 27
Lynne Ford 11 + 10 + 8 + 18 + 13 + 8 + 26 / 94
Myrtle Glascoe 3 + 6 + 2 + 6 + 5 + 3 + 6 / 31
Rick Heldrich 3\(+\)8 + 10 + 7 + 3 + 15 + 12 / 58
Robert Johnson 3 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 6 + 6 / 21
Jorge Marban 9 + 8 + 3 + 11 + 8 + 7 + 17 / 63
Susan Morrison 9 + 12 + 15 + 17 + 11 + 21 + 26 / 111
Clifton Peacock 4 + 1 + 3 + 2 + 6 + 0 + 7 / 23
Dinesh Sarvate 10 + 6 + 10 + 9 + 7 + 9 + 21 / 72

One year replacement (vote for no more than 1):

- Kathy Johnston-Thom 11 + 8 + 16 + 4 + 8 + 14 + 35 / 86
- Deborah Miller 8 + 14 + 8 + 16 + 13 + 14 + 34 / 97

Secretary of the Faculty (vote for no more than 1):

- Kathy Haney 11 + 22 + 13 + 16 + 34 + 17 + 39 / 142
- Frank Petrusak 8 + 5 + 7 + 8 + 7 + 11 + 20 / 66.
The following have been elected to two year at-large terms in the Senate, beginning Fall 1996:

Julia Eichelberger
Trisha Folds-Bennett
Lynne Ford
Bishop Hunt
Susan Morrison
William Olezniczak
Dinesh Sarvate

Debbie Miller has been elected to a one year replacement position as at-large Senator.

Kathy Haney has been elected Faculty Secretary, and our current speaker continues.

Both By-laws amendments were overwhelmingly approved.

Press return for more...

EMAIL>

Please congratulate Julia, Kathy, B, H, T, on the above!
January 16, 1996

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fifth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 16 in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Thirty-four Senators attended; Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian. The Minutes of the previous meeting (November 28, 1995) were approved as circulated.

Speaker’s Report

Mr. Mignone asked that the meeting begin with a minute of silence in memory of Professors Jozef Modzelewski (German) and Ewa Wojcicka (Mathematics), whose untimely deaths during the holiday season had saddened their families, their colleagues, and everyone in the College of Charleston community.

New Business

The Speaker then asked to “suspend the rules” in order to permit filling a vacancy on a faculty committee. The suspension was approved on a voice vote. Beverly Diamond, for the Committee on Nominations and Elections, then put forward the name of Craig Plante (Biology) to replace Helen Nivison on the Honors Program Committee. With no further nominations, he was declared elected.

Lindsay Packer, for the Academic Standards Committee, then proposed to change the requirements for earning a minor at the College of Charleston by stipulating that:

At least 9 hours in the minor at the 200 level or above must be earned at the College of Charleston.

This language was to be inserted on p. 108 of the Undergraduate Bulletin, following the sentence, “Either program must include a minimum of six three-hour or four-hour courses selected from a formally designated group.”

During a brief discussion, Joe Benich, who was in favor of the motion, asked how the proposal differs from routine transfer credit. Mr. Packer said that the Committee had reasoned that if the College is to put its stamp on a “minor,” then a certain number of hours should be taken at the College. There were some inquiries as to how compliance would be verified; Frank Kinard thought that record-keeping on who was minoring in what was rather sparse. The motion passed, on a voice vote.
ART HISTORY

-- new course:

ARTH 265 The City as a Work of Art (3)

The only significant discussion was to clarify a question from Frank Kinard about the motion in Physics and Astronomy: it is not possible to major and minor in the same department. Joe Benich asked if the hours in Chemistry were being increased by the present changes; the answer was yes, but only to bring the program into line with accreditation standards. Trisha Folds-Bennett noted that there were a few very minor editorial changes to be made in the document circulated to the Senate. The original document (i.e., without changes) is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.

Constituents’ Concerns

James Carew asked whether there was ever going to be a report from the Faculty Welfare Committee on faculty salaries, as promised. William Moore, speaking for Susan Gurganus, the present chair of the Committee, said that he thought it really was “in the works” and had been seen by the Provost, Conrad Festa, at a meeting in December. With no further business, Marion Doig moved to adjourn at about 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
For the Curriculum Committee, Trisha Folds-Bennett put forward five motions, as previously circulated to the Senate. These were approved without change, and may be summarized as follows:

**PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY:**

--a Minor in Astronomy

--a Concentration in Astronomy for Physics majors

**CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY**

--course changes:

CHEM 441 (change in prerequisite)
CHEM 571 (change number to 371, amend description)

--new course:

CHEM 512L Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Laboratory (1)

--change in degree requirements:

CHEM 512L added to B.S. in Chemistry
CHEM 511 added to B.S. in Biochemistry

**PHYSICS**

-- new course:

PHYS 105 Introduction to Meteorology (3)

**EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND SPECIALIZATIONS**

-- course changes:

EDFS 455 (description, content)
EDFS 326 (title and description)
November 28, 1995

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fourth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 28 in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Forty-two Senators attended; Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian. The Minutes of the previous meeting (November 7, 1995) were approved as circulated.

Speaker’s Report

The Speaker reported that President Sanders had decided not to accept the Senate’s vote, last year, not to count previous State employment outside the College for priority in parking assignments. He added that a follow-up list will be made concerning the status (accepted, rejected, or not yet decided) of recommendations made by the Faculty Senate to the Administration. He also referred to a statement on Tenure to be presented shortly to the Conference of South Carolina University Faculty Chairs, for adoption as a policy statement. The full text would appear in The Faculty Newsletter. Midyear Graduation would take place at 2:30 p.m. on Sunday, December 17, in the F. Mitchell Johnson Physical Education Center.

New Business

The Provost, Conrad Festa, moved the approval of degree candidates, pending completion of all requirements, at the midyear Commencement. There were some accidental discrepancies in the list circulated, which in some places contained only odd-numbered pages, but these were not deemed consequential because the intention to approve properly certified candidates was clear. The list contained names of undergraduates, graduate students, and some corrections, and was approved on a voice vote; it is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes. Frank Kinard wanted to know how many candidates did not usually complete the requirements. Dean William Lindstrom said that usually only a very few persons, sometimes just two or three, were either added or subtracted to the graduation list at the last minute.

Trisha Folds-Bennett, for the Curriculum Committee, then made two proposals. These were approved as circulated -- with, however, a friendly amendment replacing “POSC” in no. 1 with the new acronym for Political Science, “POLS” -- and may be summarized as follows:

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Include POLS 364 (International Environmental Politics) in the list of optional
classes within the Environmental Studies Minor [the course itself was approved by the Senate at the November 7 meeting].

RELIGIOUS STUDIES


The minor in Religious Studies requires a minimum of 18 semester hours in Religious Studies which must include the following:

1. RELS 102: Intro. To World Religions
2. Any one course in religious traditions, from a list of eight (RELS 225, 230, 235, 240, 245, 248, 250, 260)
3. One sacred text course (RELS 201, or 202, or 310)
4. Three additional courses in Religious Studies, one of which must be at or above the 300-level.

During a brief discussion, Douglas Friedman questioned whether these changes in the Religious Studies Minor were in fact minor, that is, small, or rather broader in their implications, particularly in their effects on other departments, than was being suggested. Trisha Folds-Bennett replied that the Curriculum Committee had consulted widely about the proposal, but that Hugh Wilder should be asked for his comments. Mr. Wilder maintained that these changes would merely bring the minor in Religious Studies into line with the Major; Religious Studies is a recognized discipline, he said, in exactly the same sense as Political Science. Tom Heeney asked if additional faculty lines would be needed; the answer, from Mr. Wilder, was no.

Constituents’ Concerns

No constituents were concerned. The meeting adjourned at about 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
November 7, 1995

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The third regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 7 in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Forty-six Senators attended; Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian. The Minutes of the previous meeting (October 3, 1995) were approved as circulated, with one correction: on p. 4, under “Constituents’ Concerns,” remarks attributed to Bernard Powers were actually made by William Olejniczak, who said the College ought to have clearly articulated policies in place to deal with financial exigencies before they arise.

Speaker’s Report

The Speaker announced that a copy of the final report of the “Advising Task Force,” dated October 16, 1995 -- a hefty document of almost 100 pages, including appendices -- could be picked up by Senators at the end of the meeting and distributed to their constituencies. It was accompanied by a letter from Sue Sommer-Kresse, Vice-President for Enrollment Management, summarizing the activities of the Task Force since its formation in February, 1994, and asking that members of the “Provost’s Deans and Directors Group” study the document and be ready for a full discussion at their next meeting on November 15. Mr. Mignone then addressed two other matters. First, the Misconduct Policy and the Conflict of Interest Policy pertaining to research/sponsored programs have been added to the Academic Affairs Policy Manual; the Associate Provost, David Cohen, should be consulted if there are any questions. Second, he reported on a meeting with Gail Morrison of the Commission on Higher Education. Apparently the General Assembly seems hostile toward higher education and considers faculty to be too permissive with students with respect to how long they are allowed to take to get their degrees. They are considering a bill to limit the credit hours for a degree. They perceive higher education as wasteful and duplicative. It is not appropriate for continuing education to receive tax-payer support. Four-year institutions should not be teaching basic skills, which ought to be taught by two-year institutions. There is a sense that in the future several things may be required:

- adding new programs will mean giving something up;
- more financial information will be needed for proposals for new programs;
- a clear distinction will be needed between proposals for changes in existing programs and proposals calling for new programs.

In addition, the $37,000,000 expected to be realized from Barnwell to use for student aid/educational assistance has not yet been “finalized” and is uncertain. Tuition in South Carolina at state institutions of higher education is the second highest in the Southeast, second to Virginia. There is currently no extra-institutional state aid for South Carolina students attending
state schools. In conclusion, some current initiatives of the CHE include:
--completion of a data base on faculty information;
--obtaining appropriations to link state libraries electronically;
--creating a pool of money to help meet matching grants.

Mr. Mignone asked if there were any questions. Caroline Hunt wanted to know just what a “data base on faculty” will involve. The Provost, Conrad Festa, replied that he thought this would include data on faculty work-loads, and also what is now contained in our own “personnel files,” but nothing else.

**Committee Reports**

Herb Silverman, for the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty-Administration Manual, introduced a series of recommendations:

1. A **CHANGE IN THE BY-LAWS**, adding this language to Article IV, Section 2C:

   2C6: A candidate for the position of Speaker cannot be a candidate for an at-large senate seat in the same election. In the event that a candidate for Speaker is in the middle of a term as an at-large senator and wins the election for Speaker, of those unsuccessful in the election for at-large seats, the person obtaining the most votes will complete the second year of the Speaker-elect's term.

2. In the Manual, under Senior Instructor on p. 18, **delete:**

   Promotion to senior instructor will occur only upon the positive recommendation of the department tenure and promotion panel.

3. Under Instructor on p. 17 of the Manual, **add (as amended):**

   Instructors and senior instructors will be granted full privileges in all matters of faculty governance, except that departments may restrict voting privileges in personnel matters.

*These three motions passed, the first unanimously,* the second and third only after considerable discussion, as follows.

Hugh Wilder asked, with regard to the second motion, what the rationale for our current policy toward Senior Instructors is. The Provost answered that the present policy had been phrased the way it is because some departments had been afraid that Senior Instructorships might be imposed on them from above. Marion Doig then noted that those departments that did choose to hire Senior Instructors had done so under the existing guidelines, and that to change them now, after the fact, might not be fair. Mr. Silverman thought that the recommended change
would be a safe-guard for all concerned. Mr. Doig countered that departments had been encouraged to hire Senior Instructors because, originally, they had had control of the process; the change being suggested would eliminate that control. John Newell thought that sufficient autonomy would still retained by the individual departments; the proposed change does not apply, for example, to Visiting Instructors. Mr. Silverman agreed with this; the proposed change in promotion procedures applies only to the category of Senior Instructor.

Virginia Benmaman (referring to the third motion) recalled that there had been much speculation about the “powers” of Senior Instructors, when the idea of this rank had first been broached, and that many departments, she believed, had agreed to hire Senior Instructors only on the understanding that the voting powers of Senior Instructors could be limited, in various ways, if individual departments chose to do so. Since then, more and more has been added to the scope of these positions, so much so, that she thought the faculty would not have voted to approve Senior Instructorships in the first place if they had originally been what they now seemed to have become. Changing the rules retroactively, she thought, was not a good idea, because it substantially limited the authority of individual departments in areas where they had assumed they had control. Herb Silverman, in reply, referred to the original documents passed by the Senate, which specified that departments could restrict Senior Instructors from voting on “personnel matters” but not in other ways. Andrew Sobiesu also questioned the proposed change in procedures. Mr. Silverman said that if Senior Instructors had the right (as they do) to be elected as full-fledged faculty Senators, then surely they ought to be granted voting privileges at the departmental level -- and incidentally, there is a “service” component in the minimum requirements for their promotion. Frank Kinard repeated Mr. Doig’s contention that to change the rules of promotion “after the fact” is a mistake.

Stephanie Mignone then raised a question: if the system remains as it is (and the proposed changes are rejected), what recourse would a person going through the process of promotion to Senior Instructor have in the event of unfair treatment (real or perceived)? Dr. Festa replied that “due process” is always in effect. Martin Jones suggested the possibility of departments “grandfathering in” some Senior Instructors, if they wished to keep the old procedures; Herb Silverman said this was a possibility, but would be apt to cause a lot of confusion. Virginia Benmaman maintained that there should be uniformity of procedures, rather than separate regulations governing different Senior Instructors; had the Manual Committee requested any “input” from Departments who have actual experience with this new rank, or consulted with the Faculty Welfare Committee? Mr. Silverman said that he thought there had been some consultation with the Welfare Committee, though not on the exact wording of the proposal. Dana Cope asked what would happen if a Senior Instructors held a divided appointments, half in one department and half in another? Presumably, Mr. Silverman said, nothing would happen to them that did not happen to other faculty.

William Olejniczak pointed out that the Faculty Welfare Committee had discussed the question of Senior Instructors some time ago. The Committee had been concerned, he said, to introduce some kind of College-wide “quality control” into the process of appointing Senior Instructors, and also to prevent their becoming “second-class citizens.” Accordingly, he wished to speak in favor of the motion deleting the absolute requirement for a “positive
recommendation” from the departmental tenure and promotion panel. This change would help to ensure that Senior Instructors have essentially the same right of appeal beyond the judgement of their immediate departments that other faculty have in the course of the full evaluation process. Caroline Hunt asked whether the Manual Committee had considered what effect the third proposal, allowing unrestricted voting privileges to Senior Instructors at the departmental level, might have on the curriculum, especially on the graduate curriculum? Herb Silverman said the Committee had thought about this, too, but had felt Senior Instructors would be likely to abstain from voting on such matters as the graduate curriculum. William Olejniczak noted that graduate courses were generally determined by the graduate faculty, in any case; Caroline Hunt pointed out, however, that in some departments, such as English and Communication, everyone votes on the graduate program. At this point, \textit{the second motion was put to a voice vote, and passed.}

Discussion of the third motion continued. Several Senators said that their departments wanted clarification about what Senior Instructors could, or could not, vote on under the new proposal. Herb Silverman said that the change which he had made on the “overhead” version at the start of the meeting was designed to bring the language of the proposal into exact accord with what the Senate had already passed, as recorded on p. 5 of the Minutes of the January 11, 1994 meeting. Virginia Benmaman then asked if this proposal meant that the involvement of Senior Instructors can be \textit{expanded} by departments, but not \textit{restricted}, according to the new wording? Mr. Silverman said that this would seem to be a correct interpretation. Joseph Kelly noted that, while he wished to speak in favor of the motion, the English Department had just recently voted to hire Senior Instructors, for the first time, on the clear understanding that they would not be able to vote in department meetings on matters involving the curriculum. Beverly Diamond said that she preferred the unmodified version of the text, as circulated to the Senate before the meeting (“With the exception of voting privileges on personnel decisions, instructors and senior instructors will be granted full privileges in all matters of faculty governance” -- \textit{amended on the “overhead” to: “Instructors will be granted full privileges in all matters of faculty governance, except that departments may restrict voting privileges in personnel matters”}). The amended version, she thought, would mean that departments would now have to vote on this matter every time it came up. In the event, the motion was put to the vote. A voice-vote proved inconclusive; ballots were distributed. When counted, the vote was twenty-four (24) in favor, and twenty (20) against, with one abstention: \textit{the third motion passed, as amended.}

For the Faculty Curriculum Committee, Trisha Folds-Bennett introduced a comprehensive proposal for changes in Political Science. Highlights of these changes, amounting to some thirty pages, were circulated to the Senate before the meeting; the complete proposal, which is several times as long, is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes, and is also on file at the Faculty Secretariat in Maybank Hall. With almost no discussion, these proposals were passed as circulated, in three parts, with no changes except a minor “friendly” amendment in the third part.

I. Curricular changes in Political Science (requirements, etc.)
II. A “package” of course changes, including 19 new courses, in Political Science

III. The cross-listing of POSC 104 (World Geography) with GEOG 101 (World Geography) \(\text{[number amended from GEOG 100]}\), and the inclusion of this course (GEOG 101) in a list of courses that satisfy the social science minimum degree requirement.

These changes were summarized and displayed on the “overhead” under nine headings, as follows.

1. Political Science majors and minors must take either World Politics or World Geography.

2. American Government, Politics and Political Inquiry I, Politics and Political Inquiry II, and either World Politics or World Geography must be taken within the first 15 hours of the major and minor.

3. Political Science majors must take a minimum of 12 credit hours at or above the 300 level in political science.

4. No student may apply more than 6 hours of Independent Study nor more than 6 hours of Internship toward the major in political science.

5. Organized renumbering of courses to reflect subfields in Political Science.

6. Addition of 19 new courses \(\text{[see below]}\), deletion of 9 courses (that either overlap with existing/proposed courses or are no longer relevant), moderate changes in 23 courses.

7. Change in acronym from POSC to POLS (in order to accommodate the renumbering and to avoid overlap with course numbers in the existing course inventory.

8. Addition of GEOG as course designation to accommodate students who need Geography credit.

9. Cross-listing of POSC 104 (World Geography) and GEOG 101 (World Geography) \(\text{[amended from GEOG 100]}\) and inclusion of GEOG 101 \(\text{[amended from 100]}\) in list of courses that satisfy social science minimum degree requirement.
These are the nineteen new courses referred to in #6:

**POLITICAL SCIENCE**

New Courses:

- POLS 103 World Politics
- POLS 104 World Geography
- POLS 301 Politics of the Administrative Process
- POLS 303 Advanced Policy Studies
- POLS 304 American Foreign Policy Process
- POLS 305 Urbanization and Urban Geography
- POLS 325 Politics of Central/Eastern Europe
- POLS 339 Special Topics in Comparative Politics
- POLS 349 Contemporary Constitutional Issues
- POLS 359 Special Topics in Political Theory and Public Law
- POLS 362 Case Studies in Foreign Policy
- POLS 364 International Environmental Politics
- POLS 365 International Political Economy
- POLS 367 The Geography of International Conflict
- POLS 379 Special Topics in International Politics
- POLS 388 Elections, Participation and Voting Behavior
- POLS 393 Religion and Politics
- POLS 399 Special Topics in American Politics
- POLS 403 Seminar in Public Administration and Public Policy

**Constituent’s Concerns**

No constituents were concerned. With no further business, the meeting adjourned at shortly after 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
OCTOBER 3, 1995

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The second regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 3, in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Forty-eight Senators attended; Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian. The Minutes of the previous meeting (September 5, 1995) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker noted that the new College Catalogue should be ready in early November. He then recognized Herb Silverman, who reported that the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual unanimously recommended approving a CHANGE IN THE BY-LAWS, first proposed at the April 18, 1995 meeting, adding this sentence to Article IV, Section 2 A., under "Composition and Election of Senators":

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

This recommendation was endorsed unanimously. It will be submitted for a final vote to the full faculty, by means of a written ballot, with a simple majority required for passage. Mr. Silverman also reported that the Committee had considered the question of who is eligible to vote at Senate meetings, and had concluded that only those Senators who were properly elected and listed on the regular roll of the Senate were entitled to do so; temporary substitutes, even if designated by their departments, or by an individual Senator who had to be absent, were not eligible to vote. This matter did not involve a change in the By-Laws, merely an interpretation of them. The Speaker said that he agreed with this interpretation, and would rule that it was correct, but that the ruling of the Chair could be appealed if wished. No one wished, and the ruling was therefore silently sustained. What about replacements for At-Large Senators, Frank Kinard wondered? The answer: no substitutes for them either. If they cannot attend regularly, they should resign. Of course, any faculty member can come to a Senate meeting, and ask to make a point, or report back to his department (or to anyone else) what transpired -- but only those duly elected can vote.

For the Committee on Nominations and Elections, Beverly Diamond recommended that Ewa Wojcicka (Mathematics) be placed on the Honors Program Committee (replacing Helen Nivison) and Phillip Powell (Library) on the Advisory Committee on Student Information Technology. Both recommendations were approved. The Committee also proposed to change the By-Laws by adding this language to Article IV, Section 2C:
2C6: A candidate for the position of Speaker cannot be a candidate for an at-large senate seat in the same election. In the event that a candidate for Speaker is in the middle of a term as an at-large senator and wins the election for Speaker, of those unsuccessful in the election for at-large seats, the person obtaining the most votes will complete the second year of the Speaker-elect's term.

This proposal would be duly forwarded to the By-Laws Committee, who will report their recommendation at the November meeting.

For the Faculty Curriculum Committee, Trisha Folds-Bennett put forward a series of motions concerning Art History and “Arts Management.” These were considered severally and, after considerable discussion, passed as circulated, without amendment. The “packet” sent to the Senate by the Curriculum Committee, dated September 25, 1995, and the complete text of a “New Degree Program Proposal for a Bachelor of Arts in Arts Management,” dated September 18, are attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes. A summary:

ART HISTORY

New requirements for the Major in Art History

Change in course number, title and description:

ARTH 414 (Senior Seminar) becomes ARTH 299 Art History Seminar: Research and Methods in Art History (revised description)

ARTS MANAGEMENT

Proposed New Degree Program: Bachelor of Arts in Arts Management

Change in Course Description:

ARTM 310 Advanced Arts Management (add ARTM 200 as prerequisite)

New Courses:

ARTM 340 Arts Financial Management (3hrs.)
ARTM 380 Ind. Stud. In Arts Management (1-3)
ARTM 400 Internship in Arts Management (3)
ARTM 420 Policy in the Arts (3)

Discussion focused almost exclusively on the proposed new major in Arts Management. Richard Godsen asked where the program would be “housed.” In the School of the Arts, said Edward C. McGuire, Dean of the School of the Arts. Would there be a full-scale Department of “Arts Management”? Not for the moment, Mr. McGuire responded, but perhaps eventually. Mr. Godsen said that he thought he saw some problems of compatibility between the proposal as written, and the existing
language on p. 107 of the Bulletin, having to do with the number of required hours; but there would be no difficulty as long as the program was not a separate Department but merely located (“housed”) in the School of the Arts. William Moore said he thought there would be some problems with the Bulletin in any case, and that the descriptions of programs in the School of Business (for instance) were not wholly in line with actualities. Trisha Folds-Bennett replied that the Curriculum Committee would be happy to look into these anomalies, if any. John Newell said that the real question was whether the new program, as written up in the present proposal, conflicts with existing regulations, and, if so, do we wish to pass it? Mr. McGuire said that there was a disclaimer in the Bulletin about changes in programs, which, he thought, provided some degree of protection. Amy McCandless pointed out that the proposal really does refer to the Arts Management “Department” -- what about “truth in advertising?” Trisha Folds-Bennett noted that at no time had the Curriculum Committee discussed the formation of a full-fledged Department of Arts Management, but only of a degree-program. Hugh Wilder said that he definitely supported the basic idea behind the proposal, but saw a larger problem: Arts Management will be the first truly interdisciplinary major, yet the course descriptions are not set up to reflect this -- but rewriting the Bulletin would be a very large undertaking. Why not house the program permanently in Art History? The answer: because other majors are involved. Mr. McGuire added that “arts management” is not really a part, intellectually, of the discipline of Art History, because it has nothing to do with the history of art, in any traditional or recognizable sense; the Program in Arts Management is likely, in fact, to draw students from many different Departments. Carla Lowrey suggested going ahead with a vote on the Program, while at the same time instructing the Curriculum Committee to be sure to request that the anomalies in the Bulletin be taken care of. Mr. McGuire said that he expected that a full-time Director of the Program would be hired within a year or two; the program in Urban Studies would be a model.

At this point, David Hall called attention to the fact that, in some cases, the language of the Bulletin reflects policies and procedures developed by the faculty over a period of many years. Some matters, he said, cannot be changed simply by subjecting them to a “rewriting” -- they can only be altered by faculty vote. Joe Benich asked if the Business courses were to be a permanent part of the program, or could they be dropped? The answer was, they are a permanent part of the major, and this fact should be entered into the record. Several Senators wondered about the number of hours being required for the major, and whether or not this was in violation of College policy. Chip Condon said that he would like to focus on another question: was a major in Arts Management really desirable, in and for itself? Jeff Frkonja answered that he thought it was highly desirable. Managers in his field, for example -- Theatre -- tended to be woefully undertrained. Either they knew about theatre, or about business, but rarely about the two together. A major that offered training in both areas would, therefore, serve a real purpose. Trisha Folds-Bennett agreed that this “double exposure” was one reason why the Curriculum Committee was enthusiastic about the proposal. Susan Morrison pointed out, however, that nothing in the description of the major actually required much knowledge of the arts, except at the most elementary level. It would be possible to complete the major without going into any depth, except, perhaps, in the “business” side of the program. Trisha Folds-Bennett replied that, while this was technically true, it did not seem like a likely scenario for the majority of ordinary undergraduate students who would be likely to take the program; most would want to do more that the bare minimum. Stephanie Mignone wanted to know what Mr. Frkonja would think about students who did, in fact, take only the minimum number of courses in the arts; the answer was, that it would always be better to do more than the bare minimum, in any field. Caroline Hunt said that she would like to see a “Field Component” built into the program. Trisha Folds-Bennett pointed out that the proposal does provide for this; some further opportunity for independent study “in the field” might also be useful.
Constituents’ Concerns

James Carew asked what had happened to the Salary Study which the Administration had been working on; could the Speaker find out about this, and, if no information is forthcoming, ask the Faculty Welfare Committee to look into the matter? Frank Kinard wanted to know how many different majors there actually are at the College, and how many students are enrolled in them; could we get the Curriculum Committee to find out? Tom Heeney spoke of the Senate Budget Committee. It was, he said, a “Stealth” Committee, because it was practically invisible. In fact, the members were not absolutely sure what, as a committee, they were supposed to be doing. They were discussing three matters: a possible merger with the Planning Committee; a putative new procedure for approving new majors, to involve the Budget Committee as well as Curriculum; and the need for more direction from the Senate. If there were issues that the Senate wished them to address, then they certainly would meet to address these issues. Hugh Wilder confirmed that the Budget Committee was indeed “looking for work.” Joe Benich pointed out that the duties of this Committee were established by the Trustees directly, and concerned “financial policies” -- but there were no “policies,” at least that he knew about, and so there seemed to be some misunderstanding. Bernard Powers said that the College ought to have clearly articulated “policies” in place to deal, for example, with financial “exigencies.” Who decides what an “exigency” is? Perhaps the Budget Committee should look into the whole question of having a “policy” in place for coping with a downturn in the economy, so that procedures for dealing with serious financial cutbacks could worked out ahead of time and put in place before an emergency situation arose. Ken Bower said that he would be happy if the Budget Committee could just explain the Budget so that the faculty could understand it.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
September 11, 1995

THE FACULTY MINUTES

The first regular meeting of the Faculty of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1995-1996 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, September 11 in the recital hall of the Albert Simons Center for the Arts, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian. The Minutes of the previous meeting (April 24, 1995) were approved as circulated.

President's Report

President Alexander M. Sanders, Jr. greeted the faculty for the start of the new year and reported that registration seemed to have gone very smoothly. Actual enrollment was close to what had been projected. He noted with pleasure that in a poll of entering freshman, fully half of those surveyed had said they had chosen The College of Charleston because of our academic reputation. (Intriguingly, another two per cent. had listed the College’s “religious affiliation” as their prime mover.) He then spoke about the ominous atmosphere that now threatens higher education in South Carolina and elsewhere. The special committee in the Legislature, for example, set up ostensibly to “study” higher education in the state, seemed to be working toward foregone conclusions before even asking any questions. We were hearing all the usual rumblings about abolishing tenure, eliminating sabbaticals, moving to across-the-board 15-hour teaching loads, 12-month contracts for all employees, no more than 30 days’ out of the classroom (with Christmas and New Year’s accounting for half of that), no release time whatever except for departmental chairs, and so on, and on.

These alarming circumstances were one reason he had proposed his four “reforms.” To insist that we are doing everything right, and therefore have no need to change our ways, would be a form of egregious folly. His four ideas, which he had talked about on other recent occasions -- including a guaranteed tuition plan, an accelerated degree program, the involving of administrators in teaching, and providing further training to our Education graduates if they should need it -- might, he thought, help to ensure that the College of Charleston continues to be perceived as the dedicated, hard-working, public-spirited institution that we truly are. As President, he wanted to assure the faculty that he had no intention of “going gentle” into the night, as the poet Dylan Thomas had said, but would indeed “rage against the dying of the light.” He would never compromise on such basic issues as tenure or academic freedom. The faculty of this College are not lazy, feckless, arrogant (etc.), but dedicated and often incredibly hard-working.

Nor would he compromise on the issue of Affirmative Action. The assault on what it stands for, now apparently being spearheaded by the State of California, will surely have a devastating impact on their educational system, which used to be the envy of the world. Anyone,
Mr. Sanders said, who seriously thinks that racial discrimination has ended in America, *believes in the Tooth Fairy*. It is especially important, as The Beast circles our campfire in the darkness, not to allow the strains of the times we live in to separate and divide faculty from administrators, administrators from faculty. We are not (to quote Donne) islands unto ourselves, nor do we exist in isolation from other educational institutions in the state. If the bell tolls, it is likely to toll for all of us: we share a common future. As John Winthrop urged his brethren in the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1630, we must try to enlighten each other.

Mr. Sanders asked for questions or comments. Jack Parson urged that the Beast can be kept at bay by *building up our fire*, as well as by feeding it with “reforms.” The President agreed, saying we need all the fuel we can get.

**Announcements**

A message was relayed from Amber Jones, for the College Activities Board. This year, one goal of the Board was to bring about more faculty involvement. Student organizations wanted real “input” from the faculty, and would like to know what sorts of things they could do to be helpful. According to a handout, sample activities planned by CAB for the coming year include lectures by Catherine Crier, co-anchor of CNN’s “The World Today” and “one of twelve stars who will blaze across television in the ‘90s,” and by Richard Leakey, Chairman of the National Museums of Kenya, Paleoanthropologist, and Ex-Director of the Kenya Wildlife Service. In addition, there will be “A multi-media show of a Danish vagabond’s personal journey through the American underclass,” which should be of special interest to the faculty.

The Speaker then recognized the Provost, Conrad Festa. Dr. Festa also welcomed the faculty, and read out the names of those recently awarded tenure and promotion.

---

*(Effective July 1, 1995)  PROMOTIONS/TENURE  (List compiled 3/22/95)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Rosenberg</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td><em>Promotion to Professor</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James McKee</td>
<td>Accounting and Legal Studies</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mack Tennyson</td>
<td>Accounting and Legal Studies</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence M. Condon, III</td>
<td>Economics and Finance</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Espinosa</td>
<td>Physical Education/Health</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Miller</td>
<td>Physical Education/Health</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Carlson</td>
<td>English &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Devet</td>
<td>English &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Bodek</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Newell</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Festa followed this by announcing the appointment of new Deans and departmental chairs, some of whom were present at the meeting. They, in turn, introduced new members of their respective departments, to the accompaniment of much applause. (For convenience, the names of new faculty have been arranged alphabetically.)

THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON
(Effective 8/16/95) ACADEMIC DEANS/DEPARTMENT CHAIRS 1995-96

**School of the Arts**

- Department of Art History
- Department of Music
- Department of Studio Art
- Department of Theatre

**School of Business and Economics**

- Department of Accounting and Legal Stud.
- Department of Economics and Finance
- Department of Management and Marketing

**Dr. Edward C. McGuire, Dean**

- Prof. Diane C. Johnson
- Prof. Steve Rosenberg
- Prof. Michael Tyzack
- Prof. Allen Lyndrup

**Howard Rudd, Dean**

- Robert Rouse
- J. Michael Morgan
- Rhonda Mack
**School of Education**
- Department of Educational Foundations and Specializations
- Department of Elementary and Early Childhood Education
- Physical Education/Health

**School of Humanities and Social Sciences**
- English and Communication
- History
- Division of Languages
- Department of Classics and German
- Department of French
- Department of Spanish and Italian
- Philosophy
- Political Science
- Psychology
- Sociology/Anthropology

**School of Sciences and Mathematics**
- Biology
- Chemistry
- Computer Science
- Geology
- Mathematics
- Physics

**NEW FACULTY 1995-96**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Agrest</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Phys/Astronomy (previously adj.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Alexander</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Bushnell</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>History (on LOA through May 96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Coates</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Cormack</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Ditullio</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Hefner</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Economics/Finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(8/25/95, 9/11/95)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Beifuss</td>
<td>Instructor (VST)</td>
<td>English/Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Benatar</td>
<td>Assistant Professor (VST)</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther Brown</td>
<td>Instructor (VST)</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Clark</td>
<td>Assistant Professor (VST)</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Clark</td>
<td>Assistant Professor (VST)</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard J. DeGrandpre</td>
<td>Assistant Professor (VST)</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desmond Dewsnap</td>
<td>Instructor (VST)</td>
<td>English/Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Jennings</td>
<td>Assistant Professor (VST)</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ande Kidenimarian</td>
<td>Assistant Professor (VST)</td>
<td>Sociology/Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Portwood</td>
<td>Instructor (VST)</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Vandervort-Cobb</td>
<td>Assistant Professor (VST)</td>
<td>Theatre (previously adjunct)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Associates:**

- Derek Buzasi: Physics
- Tim Herrlinger: Biology (February 1995)
- David Jones: Biology (March 1995)
- Ouida Meier: Biology
- Fred Phillips: Biology

Dr. Festa closed the introductions by saying how much he looked forward to the coming academic year.

Hugh Haynsworth then reported that the SACS evaluation process was now in the home stretch and our “focused” self-study proceeding on schedule. There would be a “retreat” at the end of the week to discuss the whole issue, and he asked that any additional persons interested in attending get in touch either with Caroline Hunt, or with himself, for details. Morning sessions
would consider reports from the various self-study committees, and afternoon sessions, the criteria for re-accreditation. He was pleased that a copy of the committee reports left in the faculty lounge in Maybank Hall already looked suitably “dog-eared,” showing that people were indeed reading it.

Robert Lyon, from the Office of Institutional Advancement, discussed the early stages of the Campaign for the College of Charleston, explaining how the money would eventually be used. The ultimate goal is to raise $33 million over the course of five years, to be allocated as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase endowed scholarships for students</td>
<td>$8,050,000</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endow faculty chairs to attract top-ranking teacher-scholars to the College</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip computer classrooms and science, mathematics, and language laboratories across campus</td>
<td>$4,525,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and endow significant programs</td>
<td>$6,370,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a new facility for the library and the School of the Arts; complete the renovation of the Avery Research Center</td>
<td>$6,250,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase support to the Annual Fund and the Cougar Club</td>
<td>$3,305,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Lyon explained why the College, even though a state institution, still needs private sector funding, and went on to explore, for example, the combination of public and private financing arrangements that would be used to pay for construction projects. We have, he said, already raised some $3.7 million dollars toward the new Library from private sources. Even though our tuition is very low, we still need to raise money for scholarships. Fully 75% of our students receive financial aid, mostly in the form of loans, and sometimes these loans place a tremendous burden on both students and their families. An endowment fund of significant proportions for the College of Charleston would have a positive impact not only on our ability to attract bright but needy students, but on the quality of teaching as well, in all sorts of ways. (Mr. Lyon’s detailed information sheet, handed out at the meeting, is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.)

To conclude, the Speaker reported the happy news that Edward J. Lawton, Professor of
Education, appointed in 1977, and Arthur W. McDonald, Professor of Theatre, appointed in 1982, had been named Distinguished Professors by the Board of Trustees. After some miscellaneous announcements, and a brief period of discussion "For the Good of the Order" -- by tradition "off the record" -- the meeting adjourned at about 6:00 o'clock.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
September 5, 1995

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The first regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1995-96 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 5 in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Forty eight Senators attended. Somewhat after proceedings started, the Minutes of the previous meetings (April 4 and April 18, 1995) were approved as circulated. First, however, President Alexander M. Sanders, Jr. was recognized and reported to the Senate on the state of the College.

President's Report

Mr. Sanders began by saying that some of the matters he would address today would need to be repeated at the full faculty meeting next week, but not in as great detail. Today he would go into the background of the four "reforms" he had been suggesting recently; they had generated a good deal of publicity already. Quite simply, the reason for urging these reforms is that "things are not good" in Columbia. What is happening there, however, is clearly part of a national anti-government mood, one by-product of which is a wide-spread onslaught against the academy. A new committee, for example, has been set up in Columbia to study all aspects of higher education in the State. It is scheduled to report to the Legislature in February. It seems, however, to be entirely composed of our enemies, and to have already determined on the answers to the questions it intends to ask. In short, there is a Ravenous Beast circling our campfire. The reforms he proposes are designed to keep the Beast at bay by feeding it -- but not with anything too appetizing, lest its hunger be not assuaged but increased. At all times we should keep in mind who this Creature is. It is not The Media, and certainly not The Legislature: "It" is The People, and therefore far more dangerous, because genuinely hungry.

Even, however, if the reforms he is proposing were only gimmicks -- and they are much more than that -- they might still be useful. Consider: tenure is on the table. So are fifteen-hour workloads, and twelve-month contracts for all employees, with no additional pay. There is talk of abolishing "release-time," as well as sabbatical leave, altogether. We must, therefore, try to capture the public imagination and move it away from these negative and unwholesome trends. Nor should we be under any illusions about drawing in our wagons around the fire and just waiting for the crisis to fade away. The College must and will have to change, along with every other institution in a rapidly changing world.

The first of these ideas to help the College is to set up a guaranteed tuition plan, which would allow parents to "lock in" the future cost of a college education by making payments to the Foundation at today's rates. There is a "dirty little secret" attached to this proposal: by law our tuition increases are tied to the rate of inflation, and so there is no risk whatever to the Foundation. A parent could withdraw from this plan at any time, with a full refund of principle
(but we would keep the interest). If the applicant is turned down for any reason and denied admission, then everything would be refunded. Public interest in this plan has already been absolutely amazing, the President said, and a good deal of money has already come in to the Foundation from parents and grandparents, too. Second, creating a three-year Accelerated Graduation Program for students who, for whatever reason, need to get through in a hurry, will be an excellent public-relations gesture. The plan starts out by saying that we do not recommend it -- but if you have to do it this way, it will be available. The faculty committee that looked at it thought only one real change was needed, and that was to require summer school courses to be taught with less than the usual number of students needed for the course to "make." Accordingly, an amendment has been added to this effect (whether it was really needed or not).

The third idea is to require that senior Administrators teach one course a year. They will have to receive an invitation from a Department head to do so, of course. (Perhaps, the President added, such invitations will be more eagerly sought out by said Administrators if, in the absence of such an invitation, they are required to take one course a year. . . .) And the fourth "reform" is, in effect, to guarantee the quality of our graduates in Education, by agreeing to cover the cost of retraining any who turn out to be deficient after they start teaching in the South Carolina school system; we will take them back and reeducate them at no cost. Of course, Mr. Sanders said, there is an element of "gimmick" in all these proposals, but we are in a struggle for survival. We must remain vigilant and try to regain the high ground. He asked if there were questions.

Hugh Wilder commented on the guaranteed tuition plan by saying that elsewhere, it had not worked unless it was state-wide, with other institutions participating. President Sanders said that such a plan had succeeded in Florida, but failed in Michigan; Michigan, however, had had bad financial planning, but the eagle eyes in The College of Charleston Foundation have assured him that our proposal is sound. Phil Dustan wanted to know if a mechanism could be developed for tracking students who abused the system by obtaining priority in pre-registration for courses, as 3-year students, after dropping out of the program. Mr. Sanders replied that the elaborate computer set-up this would require would probably not be worth it for such a small number of students. The Vice-President for Enrollment Management, Sue Sommer-Kresse, added that her office would monitor these students very carefully and would know if they deviate from the plan of study that they have to prepare in order to be admitted to the Accelerated Graduation Program in the first place. The President concluded by pointing out that the College had already received a good deal of favorable notice in the media as a result of these ideas.

**Reports**

The Speaker reported that he had appointed Susan Morrison as Parliamentarian. Amy McCandless was nominated as Speaker pro tempore and elected by acclamation.

Rhon England was then recognized for the Academic Planning Committee and reported on the Accelerated Graduation Program. In keeping with the instructions of the Senate in the Spring, the Committee had reviewed the proposed program, and had discussed it with President
Sanders, Dr. Sommer-Kresse, and the previous Speaker, David Mann. The Committee, Mr. England emphasized, was not trying to "sell" or promote the program, but only to make it available to the occasional student who might benefit from it; the best guess was that only about a dozen students were likely to be involved at any given time. The Committee generally approved the program, subject to the following criteria:

- The program be identified as a pilot program and reviewed annually until the overall cost and benefit of the program is better understood.
- It be made clear that the College does not recommend this program over the traditional 4-year program. To this end, all expressions in the AGP announcements, contracts, etc., that indicate that there is any prestige associated with the program should be eliminated.
- Ensure careful screening and monitoring of students in the program.
- Ensure that faculty will not be pressured to teach a Summer AGP course in which the enrollment is fewer than 12 students.

These criteria had been discussed with President Sanders, the Provost, and the Vice-President for Enrollment Management, and were regarded by them as appropriate. Accordingly, these changes had been incorporated in the draft description of the Program, as in items 1-3 above; and the Provost had sent Mr. Mignone a memorandum dated August 15, 1995 agreeing to "fund full summer school compensation no matter what the enrollment" in a particular course, when that course was needed by students in the program -- an agreement applying, of course, "only to those duly enrolled in the three year [AGP] program," and not to just "any student who needs a course for graduation." The draft of the Program, and the Provost's memorandum, are attached to the Secretaries copy of the Minutes as part of the Committee's report.

During the discussion, Douglas Friedman asked if the Academic Planning Committee had looked at any other such programs at other institutions. No, Mr. England replied; they were not aware of any such programs. Sue Sommer-Kresse said that there had been an "implementation group" that previously discussed this; there were a few such programs in various parts of the country, but for the most part they had just been started up, so there would be no useful data yet about the effects on students, etc.; mostly they served a specialized clientele, not standard undergraduates. Martha Runey pointed out that you really would not save any money by going through in three years, and in fact just the opposite because of the fees for summer school. The financial aid office, Dr. Sommer-Kresse said, would be accommodating and try to prevent adverse financial effects on scholarship students. David Hall said that the Physics Department should be listed as a participating in the program. This was an oversight, Dr. Sommer-Kresse said, and she had already discussed it with the chair of the department. Each department should have a chance to decide whether it wishes to participate. Ken Bower asked what were the criteria for success in the AGP program? This had not been fully defined yet. Chip Condon wondered what would happen to a student enrolled in the program who (say) got sick and had to
drop out for a semester; would that student still be enrolled in the program, one semester removed, so to speak? Also, could you enroll retroactively, after the first year, for example, if the three year program turned out to fit your needs, or your circumstances changed? Mr. England answered that he was not certain about the first question; there was at the moment no provision to enroll retroactively. Sue Sommer-Kresse added that students must adhere to their proposed plan of study in order to stay in the program; we will have ample opportunity to stop any abuses in the system, while still remaining flexible enough to make exceptions in cases of emergency. Hugh Wilder asked if some textual suggestions could still be made, and the answer (from Dr. Sommer-Kresse) was a definite yes.

The Speaker then reviewed the textual history of the proposal. During the Spring Term the Academic Planning Committee had been charged with reviewing it, not with bringing a recommendation about it before the Senate. A vote was not needed because nothing in the proposal was actually new or involved substantive changes -- except for certain pay problems, which were a Faculty Welfare Committee issue, and which would be put to a vote at a later date. Robin Bowers asked how advising for the program would be handled. Dr. Sommer-Kresse said that students would need to develop a detailed plan of study for the full three years of the program, and would be held to it. They could always elect, of course, to drop out of the accelerated program and proceed in the standard way. In any case, their progress would be monitored after each semester. Rohn England reiterated that departments are not required to participate in the program. One of the Planning Committee's concerns had been that no faculty should feel pressured to teach in the summer -- and that the College should certainly not be perceived as a three-year diploma-mill. James Wilkinson inquired about the numbers of students who were expected to participate. Not many, Dr. Sommer-Kresse answered, and the Fall of 1996 would be the earliest the program could be implemented. Dana Cope suggested looking at the number of Freshmen who declare a major right away, for an indication of who might be interested in participating.

New Business

The Speaker then called for nominations for a representative to the South Carolina Conference of University Faculty Chairs (SCCUFC). Hugh Wilder nominated Jack Parson, who was reelected by acclamation.

Lindsay Packer, for the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, introduced two motions concerning lists of courses that could be used by SNAP students to satisfy the minimum degree requirements in foreign languages and in mathematics or logic. These motions were taken up in order, and a protracted discussion ensued. Martin Jones made a friendly amendment to delete Political Science 355 from the list of courses satisfying the language requirement; this was accepted. William Moore then moved to remand the motion to the Committee, on the grounds that there had not been enough consultation with the faculty and departments involved. Mr. Packer disputed this and staunchly defended the Committee's procedures, maintaining that there had been a lengthy process of consultation reaching as far back as 1994; many individuals and departments had been involved. Mr. Moore countered by
saying that some of the courses on the list were actually misnumbered, and that such obvious errors did little to increase the Senate's confidence in the thoroughness of the Committee's efforts. The course numbering, Mr. Packer said, was an administrative matter, and of no great consequence. Douglas Friedman said that, on the contrary, such mistakes were indicative of something much more serious, and showed that there obviously had not been adequate consultation on the part of the Committee; the whole proposal should be rejected. Jack Parson agreed; he had not been asked to consult with the members of his department. Dana Cope added that the Anthropology Department also had many questions and reservations about the arrangements that were being suggested; for one thing, if you looked at what the courses proposed actually entailed under the surface, there were just too many "hidden requirements." At this point, Marty Perlmutter called for the question. The first motion was remanded to committee, on a unanimous voice vote.

The second proposal then came up for discussion. William Gudger objected that the Music Department had not been asked about the inclusion of Music 246 on the list of courses that could be used to fill the math/logic requirement, and felt that it was completely inappropriate for SNAP students. David Hall said that the Physics Department had been asked about this course -- Music 150, The Physics of Sound and Music, taught jointly by the two departments -- and had recommend against including it, since it involved a great deal of actual mathematics. In defense of the motion, Stephanie Mignone commented that in the last analysis it was not up to individual departments to judge whether SNAP students should be eligible to take certain courses, but only what courses should be listed as acceptable substitutes for the existing minimum-degree requirements. Phil Dustan said that he had had problems lately with SNAP students becoming, in effect, arrogant and demanding, just because they had been admitted into the program. Tom Heeney commented that he would not want to see problems with individual students weaken our support for the basic objectives of the SNAP program itself, which he thought were admirable. David Hall asked why any students in SNAP would want to take a course like "The Physics of Sound and Music," which was 50% mathematical in content, if they had medically certifiable difficulties with mathematics? Martin Jones agreed, saying that the lists proposed should contain courses that are reasonably appropriate for disabled and handicapped students. Roger Daniels said that the inclusion of ACCT 200, Accounting for Non-Business Majors, should have been discussed with his department (Accounting) but had not been at any point along the line. Joe Kelly cautioned that we would defeat the purpose of the SNAP program if we refer all decisions back to the departments. Deanna Caveny agreed, saying the SNAP program simply gave students more options in fulfilling the existing requirements.

Douglas Friedman then wondered why the faculty in the Mathematics Department itself should not be the ones to design acceptable substitute courses in mathematics (Languages likewise)? Why are the alternatives not designed by the people who teach the subject in the first place? Susan Morrison pointed out that this issue had been discussed a good deal by past Academic Standards committees, and the question continued to be whether designing special courses for "special" students would really fulfill the objectives of the SNAP program. Dana Cope pointed out that by law we cannot set up special classes; we are not qualified as an institution to do this.
At this point, Dean William Lindstrom commented that one purpose of the SNAP program was to give students more choices about how to fulfill basic academic requirements established by the departments. But we have to be careful here. Setting up a large-scale special program for learning-disabled students would make the College more, not less, attractive to such students, and we would be likely to get many more than we have now. Marion Doig said that there have clearly been objections raised by individual Senators to having a list of courses that are inappropriate for these students (for example, The Physics of Sound) -- but why have any truly "quantitative" courses on the list at all, if quantitative operations are what such students cannot successfully do? Ken Bower wanted to know who the Academic Standards Committee had actually consulted in his department, and moved to remand the second motion. Carla Lowrey wanted to know what we would be asking the Committee to do by returning the proposals to them. "Consult with the departments," Mr. Bower replied. Martin Jones wondered what the departments, meantime, should be doing about all this; creating lists of possible courses by departmental recommendation would be very difficult. Mr. Jones called for the question. The second motion was also remanded to committee, on a voice vote.

Constituents' General Concerns

Phil Dustan asked about whether faculty on sabbatical, but remaining in the Charleston area, could continue to serve as Senators. The Secretary said that this was an issue that the By-Laws Committee would be addressing at the next meeting. (There might also be a question about Senators designating someone to take their place when they could not get to a meeting; as the rules now stand, any faculty member can attend Senate meetings and ask to speak to an issue, but only the officially elected Senator has a vote.) Marion Doig wondered what had happened to the report about Computers on Campus that an outside consultant had been paid to prepare. William Gudger said that the Music Department wanted to thank the Speaker for doing such a fine job with the Faculty Newsletter, but that he was too modest: his name did not appear anywhere on the document, which made giving credit where credit was due unduly difficult. Hugh Haynsworth said that draft reports of the various Self-Study committees would be put in the Faculty Lounge in Maybank Hall, and elsewhere, and might make useful reading for the upcoming President's Retreat. Members of the SACS visiting team would be on campus on September 13 and 14, and a "drop-in" would be arranged in the President's Board Room, which he hoped faculty, and especially Senators, would wish to attend.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary