May 3, 1999

THE FACULTY MINUTES

The second regular meeting of the Faculty of the College of Charleston for the academic year 1998-99 convened at 5:04 on Monday, May 3, in Physicians Auditorium, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding.

Speaker's Report

Ms. Folds-Bennett began her report by listing some of the work accomplished by the faculty during the 1998-99 academic year:

SERVICE

- Faculty Welfare Committee—reviewed and revised the Post-Tenure Review proposal and reviewed the College's patent policy, CHE-mandated questions about faculty availability and advising, and the GenEd proposal
- Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review Committee—reviewed and made recommendations on approximately thirty-five evaluation packets
- Curriculum Committee—reviewed many proposals for new courses and course changes and reviewed the GenEd proposal
- Assessment Committee—reviewed and summarized departmental assessment activity and reviewed the GenEd proposal
- Academic Standards Committee—considered many requests and appeals from students and made recommendations about course credit for foreign exchange courses and for degree requirements
- Budget Committee—worked with Academic Affairs in its review of the GenEd proposal
- President's Advisory Committee—worked with President Sanders on issues such as the evaluation of deans, campus safety, and salaries of administrative assistants
- Academic Planning Committee—brought together all other committee reports on the GenEd proposal and submitted a Revised Proposal for General Education
- Nominations and Elections Committee—held elections for all faculty offices and committees and worked with the By-Laws Committee to rectify some discrepancies regarding elections
- Research and Development Committee—awarded $47,376 in grants
• By-Laws Committee—made seven recommendations for By-Laws changes
• Library Committee—worked many hours with library staff and other interested faculty members on plans for the new library
• The Senate—met ten times, seven to vote on all of the motions generated by committees and three to debate the GenEd proposal
• Bob Mignone—worked tirelessly as our faculty representative to CHE, especially on performance funding matters
• an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee and an Animal Care and Use Program were established
• a new Honors Center Director was appointed

RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

• The College received over $2 million in external funding, considerably more than any other institution in our sector
• A new anthropology lab and a new wearable computer lab were established
• The School of the Arts presented six plays, twenty-eight Monday night concerts, eighteen student performances, five piano recitals in the International Piano Series, several jazz performances, and Pro Musica went on a concert tour of France and produced a CD

TEACHING

• We welcomed approximately fifty new full-time faculty members
• We taught over 11,000 students in nearly 3,000 sections
• CETL held 6 faculty development workshops, a reading circle discussion, 7 workshops for new faculty, and a meeting to inform faculty of the results from the 3rd International Mathematics and Science survey

The Speaker ended her report by noting that, despite having so many accomplishments about which to feel pride, we are not ending the year with a sense of satisfaction because of the faculty vote overturning the Senate decision in favor of the Revised Proposal for a General Education Curriculum. She emphasized that the process was fair, open, and rational and that those on both sides of the issue want to continue efforts to review general education. She encouraged anyone interested in determining the next step in that review to join her in working toward that end.
President’s Report

Mr. Sanders praised the Speaker for her accomplishments and then presented the following awards:

- **Distinguished Advising Award**
  - Betsy Martin
  - Penny McKeever

- **Distinguished Teaching Award**
  - Clark Reynolds

- **Distinguished Research Award**
  - Clark Reynolds

- **Distinguished Service Award**
  - Marty Perlmuter

Following the presentation of the awards, Mr. Sanders directed his remarks to the defeat of the GenEd Proposal at the Special Meeting of the Faculty on April 28. He emphasized that none of us should see the vote as a rejection of our commitment to general education and that we should all be grateful to those who worked on the proposal for the challenge they put before us. Instead of the period of healing that some have called for, he proposed a period of learning. Convinced that all the hard work on the proposal has not been in vain and that conflicting interests can be accommodated, Mr. Sanders urged the faculty to respect and learn from each other as we continue our discussion of general education. He warned about the dangers of bitterness and resentment as he asked the faculty to come together to affirm our commitment to general education and to the classic model of the liberal arts college. He ended his report by suggesting that the College of Charleston might consider seeking designation apart from the other teaching institutions in our sector as the Liberal Arts College of South Carolina. The only mistake we can make now, he concluded, is to do nothing.

---

Provoz’s Report: Approval of Degree Candidates

Conrad Festa requested and received by voice vote approval of undergraduate and graduate degree candidates pending completion of all degree requirements.
Election of Faculty Committees

Frank Kinard moved the slate of Standing Faculty Committees as circulated by the Committee on Nominations and Elections. With no further nominations from the floor, the committees were elected.

For the Good of the Order.

On behalf of the faculty, Jim Deavor commended the Faculty Secretary at the end of her three years of service, a commendation endorsed by the Speaker.

Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
April 28, 1999

THE FACULTY MINUTES
(Special Session)

A special meeting of the Faculty of the College of Charleston was called to review Senate vote in favor of the Revised Proposal for a General Education Curriculum. The meeting convened at 5:10 p.m. in the Lightsey Conference Center when a quorum was affirmed with 217 roster faculty in attendance. Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presided.

The Speaker ruled in order David Mann's motion that faculty who had classes scheduled during the time of the meeting could vote on the proposal, and she explained the means by which these faculty would be called to the floor when the vote was to be taken.

Ms. Folds-Bennett thanked all faculty who participated over the years in the discussions of general education. She then singled out for special recognition the Ad Hoc Committee for General Education, whose years of work culminated in the Proposal for a General Education Curriculum at the College of Charleston, and the standing committees that worked on the revision of the proposal—Academic Planning, Assessment, Budget, Curriculum, and Welfare—as well as members of the Senate who debated and amended the proposal.

- William Gudger moved to table the proposal. When the Parliamentarian ruled that a motion to table would mean deferring to the Senate action (approval of the proposal), Mr. Gudger withdrew his motion.

- Pointing to the many amendments already debated by the Senate, John Newell, moved that the General Education Proposal as approved by the Senate be affirmed. The motion was ruled out of order by the Parliamentarian. According to the By-Laws, the faculty can only amend or veto Senate actions.

- Jim Deavor moved that the following sentence be inserted on p. 14 after the last sentence under "Existing Course Review":

  Existing gateway courses or sequences (introductory courses that are prerequisites for upper level courses) for majors and cognates for majors shall automatically count towards meeting General Education requirements.
Speaking in favor of the motion, Sam Hines claimed that the phrasing in Mr. Deavor's motion would remove from the proposal a major objection of many faculty in the sciences. However, Richard Nunan noted that this amendment would apply to courses like ACCT 203, for example, and he argued that the intent of the GenEd proposal is to give students exposure to courses in Liberal Arts. Arch McCallum offered as a friendly amendment (accepted as such by Mr. Deavor) that the motion apply only to courses satisfying existing general education requirements. Lynne Ford spoke against the motion, asserting that the Revised Proposal for a General Education Curriculum approved by the Senate does not rely on any existing courses and that all courses must be reviewed according to the principles of general education outlined in the proposal. The motion was defeated.

- John Newell moved to veto the Senate action to accept the Revised Proposal for General Education.

After a call for the question carried, the Speaker declared a recess so that faculty in class could be called to the floor for the vote.

When the meeting resumed, the Speaker ruled that no motions to amend would be in order after the vote was taken. Richard Nunan moved to appeal the Chair's decision, arguing that the Chair's earlier statements led the faculty to believe that amendments would be in order after the vote. The motion to appeal the Chair's decision failed by a vote of 127 to 96.

A call for a secret ballot was approved, and the balloting was conducted by the Committee on Nominations and Elections,

- The motion to VETO the Senate's decision in favor of the Revised Proposal for a General Education Curriculum PASSED by a vote of 131-127.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
April 20, 1999

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE (third session)

The third session of the eighth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:05 on Tuesday, April 20 in ECTR, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty-eight senators attended. Minutes of the April 6 and April 13 meetings were approved with the following two corrections:

1. In the April 6 minutes change MATH 203 to MATH 103 in Mr. Lesses’ motion (later rephrased) concerning courses used to fulfill the mathematics requirement: any MATH course (MATH 103 and higher) or Phil 215 and 216.

2. The following motion made by Stephanie Low at the April 13 meeting to amend the “Foreign Languages, Classical and Modern” section was accepted as friendly: Replace “and subsequent course” with “and satisfactory completion of one course at or above the 202 level.”

New Business

- For the Committee on Nominations and Elections, Frank Kinard conducted an election for the Budget Committee by written ballot. The following were elected:

  BUDGET COMMITTEE
  Cudahy, Diane (S) EDFS
  Langley, Tom (S) PEHD
  Mignone, Bob (S) MATH
  Wisotzka, Paige (S) FREN
  Nichols, Shaun PHIL
  Peeples, Scott ENGL
  Phillips, Michael LIBR

The following were nominated from the floor for the 1999-2000 Committee on Nominations and Elections:

COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS
  Kinard, Frank CHEM
  VanSickle, Meta EDFS
  Kunkle, Tom MATH
  Jursa, Paul ECON
  Fenno, Jonathan CLAS
  Coombs, Cass GEOL
  McCandless, Peter HIST
• Discussion of the Revised Proposal for a General Education Curriculum at the College of Charleston, presented by the Academic Planning Committee, continued as summarized below.

INTEGRATED LIBERAL LEARNING

• Interdisciplinary Thematic Clusters

Mike Marcell began the discussion by questioning the level of faculty involvement required to staff the ITC’s if the program is fully implemented. Estimating at 4,000 the number of students at the 45-60 hour level and approximately 100 students in each cluster, he figured that 40 sections would be required. During the two years that the 4000 students are enrolled in the three cluster courses, 12,000 enrollments would be devoted to ITC’s. Although John Newell and Lynne Ford pointed out that courses in the clusters can count both toward the major and toward general education requirements, Mr. Marcell called the program unwieldy. He also questioned the added burden of record keeping that must be assumed by the cluster coordinator.

Sam Hines reminded the Senate of interdisciplinary minors currently in place, a model that helped shape the ITC’s. Most of these minors, which already have a director, will be put forward for consideration as a cluster. Bringing up a point raised earlier by Mr. Marcel, Chris Abate asked whether these directors are compensated. Mr. Hines responded that the minors begin with faculty and student interest, and if they succeed, a request is made for administrative support. Compensation for cluster coordinators is not in the proposal, Mr. Abate emphasized.

Glenn Lesses observed that many interdisciplinary minors include 100-level courses, something he thinks should be allowed in the ITC’s, and he moved the following:

• Delete “Courses must be at or above the 200-level and at least one must be at the 300-level” and replace with “Courses can include no more than one approved 100-level course; the others must be approved at or above the 200-level.”

Andrew Lewis and Lynne Ford argued against the motion, pointing out that Thematic Clusters are intended for advanced study; Foundations and Intellectual Traditions are the appropriate places for 100 and 200-level courses. Courses at the 100-level, they argued, are broad introductory courses; Phil Jos added that advanced study in a discipline is indicated with higher numbered courses.

Arguing for the motion, Stephanie Low said that the Computer Science Department wanted some of its Information Technology service courses at the 100-level included in clusters, and the motion would allow for that. Todd Grantham also spoke in favor of the motion, asserting that 100 and 200-level courses vary so much around the campus that emphasis need not be placed on numbers. He also pointed out that discussions of GenEd
in various forums stressed the importance of spreading requirements out over a student’s career and achieving coherence; the shift to requiring 300-level courses came after these discussions.

After a call for the question passed, the motion passed.

- Stephanie Low moved to delete “After 45-60 hours of study.”

Sam Hines argued against the motion, pointing out that we already eliminated part of the structure of the ITC by allowing 100-level courses. The ITC’s, he continued, should parallel work in the major and encourage students to make connections while taking courses in their majors, much as cognate courses used to do.

The motion failed by a vote of 28-22.

Nan Morrison spoke against ITC’s, noting the burden that heavy involvement in existing interdisciplinary minors places on her department. She also mentioned the section of the SGA report about how difficult it will be for a student to complete the new General Education requirements in four years. Angela Kouters responded that just three students wrote the report and added that SGA endorsed the ITC’s.

- Rick Heldrich moved the following: Delete from the sentence “All three courses may be double-counted, but only one may count towards a student’s primary major” the words “but only one may count towards a student’s primary major.”

Speaking in favor of the motion, Deanna Caveny cited Mr. Hines’ argument for cognate courses and added that the change would reward math and science departments that include courses outside the department in their major. Lynn Cherry warned that not all majors have cognates and that the motion could undermine some clusters.

The motion passed.

- Global Perspectives

Bill Olejniczak, while in favor of the global perspectives requirement, objected to the phrase “region of the world” in the description of courses approved for the requirement. He noted that courses like 19th Century Russian Literature would not count because Russia is not region and argued that requirement should be inclusive, not exclusive.

- Mr. Lesses moved to delete the language on pp. 20-21 under “Courses submitted for approval for Global Perspectives designation must” and replace with: “Any course meeting this requirement must show evidence of either (1) study in depth in an area of the world outside the United States, or (2)comparative study across two or more regions of the world, or (3) major content emphasis on global issues or themes (e.g., human rights, environmental issues, etc.).”
Phil Dustan supported the motion, arguing that it allows for true global perspectives. Most of the discussion focused on the fact that the motion would remove Asia, Africa, and Latin America from special consideration in the requirement. While some like John Newell and Mary Beth Heston argued that our students need to learn more about these areas and that the percentage of the world’s population living there justifies the special consideration, others like Rich Bodek and Glenn Lesses asserted that our students are equally unfamiliar with Europe and other parts of the world.

The motion passed.

• Writing Intensive Course

To Tom Kunkle’s question of why the writing-intensive course must be at the 300-level, Ms. Ford replied that students work on writing skills at the beginning of their college career in English 101 and 102. The 300-level course will continue that focus on writing skills during the last part of their college study.

Discussion widened to the other skills required in the proposal—oral communication and statistical literacy—and the demands these would put on departments.

• Glenn Lesses made a motion to remove the Writing Intensive Course as a requirement and include it as one of the recommended skills on pp. 21-23. Revise the language in the section on Skills Progressively Developed through Work in the Major (on pp. 21-23) so that it is recommended that majors as appropriate develop further skills in writing, oral communication, critical thinking, and statistical literacy.

Arguing against the motion, Mary Beth Heston and Andrew Lewis pointed out the importance of our students being able to demonstrate these skills, and Phil Jos emphasized the importance of the writing requirement.

The motion was defeated.

ADMINISTRATION

• Committee on General Education

After consulting the By-Laws, Ms. Ford changed the description of the new committee under “Membership” from Standing Committee of the College to Standing College Committee.
When Stephanie Low and Chris Abate questioned the compensation for committee members, Ms. Ford replied that if committee members are required to work between May 15 and August 15, they will be compensated for their time. Both Jim Deavor and Nan Morrison mentioned the amount of time chairs must spend in evaluating transfer credits, a task to be handled by the committee in approving credits for GenEd.

Much discussion focused on the role of this new committee in relation to the Curriculum Committee. Course proposals will be submitted to the Curriculum Committee, then reviewed by the Committee on General Education, and then sent back to the Curriculum Committee. Proposals will come to the Senate from the Curriculum Committee. Bill Lindstrom and Chris Abate see unnecessary duplication in the procedure, but both Ms. Ford and Mr. Newell stressed the need for the Committee on General Education to look at multiple aspects of the courses; also, they added, the second Curriculum Committee review would be cursory.

- Mr. Lesses moved to change the language under “New Course Proposals” from “Upon approval [by the Committee on General Education]” to “Upon review.”
  Mr. Newell accepted this as a friendly amendment.

David Mann asked about the role of the By-Laws Committee in approving the new Committee for General Education, and Bishop Hunt responded that the By-Laws Committee does not legislate; it approves the language of changes approved by the Senate.

Kem Fronabarger questioned the provision under “Existing Courses Review” requiring courses accepted for general education to be reviewed every three years, and he moved the following:

- Delete the sentence “Once adopted for general education credit, courses will be reviewed by the Committee on General Education every three years.
  The motion passed.

* Director of General Education

- Mr. Fronabarger began the discussion by moving that the Director of General Education be removed from the proposal.

Mr. Lesses spoke in favor of the motion, asserting that most duties can be handled by the Committee on General Education. If the Committee decides that a director is needed, one can be added later. Many more spoke against the motion. Ms. Ford pointed out that research on similar programs links success to having a director. Arch McCallum, Bev Diamond, Sue Sommer-Kresse, and Peter McCandless emphasized the importance of a director to coordinate all components of the proposed general education curriculum.

The motion was defeated.
After discussing all parts of the proposal as agreed, there was a last opportunity to revisit the proposal before the final vote.

ILAS

Mr. Marcell asked how the course could be successful if students arrive on campus not having read the required texts. Both Terry Bowers and Rich Bodek thought that unprepared students could learn a valuable lesson, and Ms. Ford pointed out that the required reading was only part of the ILAS course. Bill Moore asked about the legality of requiring the course only of transfer students with fewer than 30 credit hours.

High Wilder questioned the cost of the course, the most expensive part of the proposal and wondered what programs might be put in jeopardy if it is offered. Agreeing with Mr. Wilder, Stephanie Low moved the following:

- Remove ILAS from the proposal.

A number of people speaking in support of ILAS argued that the course should be allowed the pilot called for in the proposal. The motion failed.

*Statistical Literacy

- Mr. Lesses moved to remove the Statistical Literacy requirement from the proposal.

Although agreeing on the importance of statistical literacy, some faculty found problems with including the requirements in their majors. Mr. Wilder pointed out that, unlike critical thinking and oral communication skills that are recommended in the proposal, statistical literacy is required. Deanna Caveny said that at one point requiring a statistics course of all students was considered, but the Math Department did not support that proposal.

The motion passed.

- Idee Winfield moved that statistical literacy be reinserted as a recommendation rather than a requirement.

Some language changes were suggested such as adding “in majors as appropriate”; then Mr. McCandless suggested using the language from the Critical Thinking section. However, Mr. Mignone pointed out the impracticality of the Senate, exhausted after five hours of debate, trying to draft suitable phrasing. Ms. Winfield modified her motion to say that the Statistical Literacy part of the proposal be remanded to the Committee on General Education (assuming the whole proposal passes).

The motion passed.
* Director of General Education

Hugh Wilder and others compared the position of director to department chairs and questioned the compensation and work load of the Director. Ms. Ford replied that the position parallels that of Director of the Honors Program rather than department chairs.

- Mr. Lesses moved to replace “the director will be expected to teach two courses per year” with “the director will normally be expected to teach half time.” Mr. Newell accepted the motion as friendly.

After a call for a vote on the proposal, Mr. Hunt’s motion for a written ballot did not receive a majority, and then Mr. Mignone’s motion for a roll call vote passed. As a result of the following roll call vote, the Revised Proposal for a General Education Curriculum at the College of Charleston as amended passed by a vote of 31 to 24.

Faculty Senate Roll Call

April 20, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At-Large Senators:</th>
<th>Remaining Years In Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes___ Bah, Alpha (History)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no___ Diamond, Bev (Mathematics)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes___ Heston, Mary Beth (Art History)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no___ Hunt, Bishop (English/Communication)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no___ Mignone, Robert (Mathematics)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no___ Moore, William (Political Science)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes___ Newell, John (History)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes___ Pothering, George (Computer Science)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no___ Smiley, James (Biology)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes___ Sobiesko, Andrew (Spanish)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no___ Stiglitz, Beatrice (French)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes___ Wiseman, Reid (Biology)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes___ Wisozka, Paige (French)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Senators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of the Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Ashley, Franklin (Theatre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Maves, David (Music)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absent</td>
<td>Peacock, Clifton (Studio Arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Russell, Robert (Art History)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Business Administration &amp; Economics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Benich, Joe (Management/Marketing)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Bradley, Linda (Accounting/Legal Studies)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>McNitt, Larry (Management/Marketing)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Michael Morgan (Economics/Finance)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Cudaby, Diane (Ed. Foundations/Spec.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Fitzharris, Linda (Elem./ Early Childhood)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Langley, Tom (PE/ Health)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Lewis, Andrew (PE/Health)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Perkins, Robert (Ed. Foundations/Spec.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>White, Sara (Elem./ Early Childhood)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Humanities &amp; Social Sciences</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Baginski, Tom (Classics/German)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Bakanic, Von (Sociology/Anthropology)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Bodek, Rich (History)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Bowers, Terry (English/Communication)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Eichelberger, Julia (English/Communication )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absent</td>
<td>Heeney, Tom (English /Communication)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Heirs, Martine (French)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Hettinger, Ned (Philosophy/Religious Studies)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Himler, Jim (Psychology)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jos, Phil (Political Science)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Lesses, Glenn (Philosophy/Religious Studies)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Marban, Dottie (Spanish)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
no___  Marcell, Mike (Psychology)  1
yes___  Martinez, Elizabeth (Spanish)  2
yes___  McCandless, Peter (History)  1
yes___  McCollough, Jane (Political Science)  1
yes___  Winfield, Idee (Sociology/Anthropology)  1

School of Sciences & Mathematics

no___  Abate, Chris (Geology)  1
yes___  Biembaum, Chip (Biology)  1
no___  Doig, Marion (Chemistry/Biochemistry)  1
no___  Dustan, Phil (Biology)  2
no___  Fronabarger, Kem (Geology)  2
no___  Hall, David (Physics/Astronomy)  1
no___  Heldrich, Rick (Chemistry/Biochemistry)  2
no___  Johnston-Thom, Kathy (Mathematics)  1
no___  Kunkle, Tom (Mathematics)  1
no___  Low, Stephanie (Computer Science)  2
yes___  Lindner, Lee (Physics/Astronomy)  1
absent  Scholtens, Brian (Biology)  2
no___  Young, Paul (Mathematics)  2

Library

yes___  Gilson, Tom (Library)  1
yes___  Seay, Jerry (Library)  2

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
April 13, 1999

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Second Session)

The second session of the eighth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:10 p.m. on Tuesday, April 13 in Alumni Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty-one senators attended.

New Business

Discussion of Revised Proposal for a General Education Curriculum at the College of Charleston, presented by the Academic Planning Committee, continued as summarized below.

FOUNDATIONS

Foreign Languages, Classical and Modern:

Jim Carew claimed that the two-year language requirement, which many other colleges and universities have dropped, is no longer educationally valid. Our students do not have proficiency in a language after two years, he said, and suggested that if our purpose is to introduce students to some basics of language and culture, that can be accomplished in one year. A two-year requirement, he contended, makes more sense if the two years are spent studying two different languages. Andrew Sobiesuo replied that not all linguists agree that languages should be studied in the early years. Paige Wisotzka added that the language departments do not profess to achieve proficiency after two years; instead, the courses give students not only an appreciation of another language and culture but also a better understanding of their own language. Elizabeth Martinez questioned the logic of reducing the language requirement to one year if our students are not proficient after two years.

Stephanie Low moved that the words "and subsequent course" be dropped from the end of the first sentence in the Foreign Languages paragraph. The motion failed.

Lee Lindner moved that in the Foreign Languages paragraph, the words "competence . . . through the 202 level" be changed to "competence . . . through the 102 level." In response to Mr. Lindner's motion, Ms. Wisotzka asserted that science majors especially need a background in languages because of the many international science conferences they might attend. Both she and Mr. Sobiesuo noted that currently science
majors seldom register for the 6-credit intensive language courses because the requirements for their major leave no room for such a course. After a call for the question, the motion failed.

Returning to a point he made at the April 6 meeting, Glenn Lesses argued the Welfare Committee’s position that the distinction between Foundations and Intellectual Traditions is artificial and that English 101 and 102 should be the only courses required of students in their freshman year. To support his point, he cited the many times the word “skill” is mentioned on pp.18-19 of the Revised Proposal in the list of objectives for the Intellectual Tradition courses. He thinks that the Foundations requirement of the proposal does not give students enough latitude to explore potential majors in their first two years.

Stephanie Low agreed that English should be a Foundations course, but she thinks that math skills are crucial as well. She moved that Foreign Languages be moved from Foundations into Intellectual Traditions.

Speaking against the motion, Lynne Ford argued that the distinction between Foundations and Intellectual Traditions is not arbitrary. The Foundations courses concentrate on the skills students need to communicate in written, oral and numerical forms, and students need to begin building these skills early so that they will be prepared for opportunities like study abroad and global perspective courses. In answer to Mr. Lesses, she contended that skills are mentioned in the objectives for the Intellectual Traditions courses because they must be there with content, and, she added, room for Intellectual Traditions courses is on the Majors Worksheet for every semester of the first two years. Rich Bodek also spoke against the motion, saying that he wants students have English, math, and language courses before enrolling in entry level history courses.

In support of the motion, Kem Fronabarger argued that students come to the College seeking a body of knowledge and preparation for a career. A large number of Foundations courses, he thinks, take away from career preparation. Chris Abate added that Ms. Ford’s defense of Foundations courses was clearly an argument for including natural science courses. Marion Doig supported the motion to move foreign languages out of Foundations and pointed to the pre-med curriculum with its first-semester requirements of two 4-credit science courses, one (usually 4-credit) math course, and Freshman English. Requiring a foreign language course, he said, increases the credit load to 18 hours of required courses. Mike Auerbach echoed Mr. Doig’s argument and added that the proposal disadvantages biology majors.

After a call for the question, the motion to move foreign languages to Intellectual Traditions failed by a vote of 26 to 21.

Chris Abate then moved that the natural sciences requirement be brought into Foundations. The motion failed.
English:

Hugh Wilder questioned the part of the English requirement stating that students must “demonstrate competence in written communication” and argued that we should trust our colleagues in the English Department to determine competence without adding another layer of bureaucracy to the proposal. After a number of senators echoed Mr. Wilder’s objections to the demonstration of competence part of the English requirement, Kem Fronabarger moved to delete from the paragraph describing the English requirement everything after “Students must complete the approved 6 hour English composition sequence.” The motion passed.

Asserting his belief that Freshman English is the only course that must be required during the first year, Chip Biernbaum wants phrasing to that effect in the proposal. Lynne Ford replied that existing policy requires students to enroll in English 101 and 102 and that the proposal does not address existing policy. Noting that the General Education and the Majors Worksheet does not specify that English must be taken in the first year, Mr. Biernbaum moved that language be included on the General Education and the Worksheet informing students that they are required to enroll in the approved English composition sequence during their first year and until successful completion of the sequence. John Newell accepted the motion as friendly.

INTELLECTUAL TRADITIONS

Natural Sciences:

Bob Mignone expressed some concern about depth vs. breadth in the pairings of science courses allowed in the proposal, but Kem Fronabarger claimed that “cross pollination” of introductory level science courses could be quite beneficial.

Finding problems with the phrasing of the paragraph describing the natural sciences requirement, Stephanie Low moved the following replacement paragraph:

Students are required to complete an approved 8-hour lab science requirement in natural science. Normally this requirement will be fulfilled with two 4-hour courses, not necessarily limited to the 101-102 sequences in the same discipline.

The student must complete both courses in order to satisfy the requirement.

The change, she noted, removes references to the approval process and specifically to the role of the Gen Ed Committee (rather than the science departments) in that process. The motion failed.

Phil Dustan claimed that two 100-level courses will not give our students the background in science that an educated person in today’s world needs and argued for a third semester
of science; in other words students need a 101-102 sequence plus at least one more semester of science. Why, he asked, do we privilege languages with a two-year requirement and science with just one. Von Bakanic contended that the 6-hour social science requirement assures that students are exposed to the kinds of training that Mr. Dustan described. Andrew Sobiesuo added that three hours per week students spend in the 1-credit labs required for each science course mean that class hours students spend fulfilling the science requirement are, in fact, equal to those spent on the foreign language requirement.

**History:**

Richard Nunan alleged that the upper-case “H” in “History courses” in the first sentence of the paragraph limits the courses that can satisfy the requirement to ones offered by the History Department. Kathy Johnson-Thom suggested using a lower-case “h.” John Newell admitted that not many courses outside the History Department cover the “multiple aspects of human culture over a significant expanse of time” as called for in the requirement.

Peter McCandless moved two changes in the parenthetical phrase in the History paragraph, both of which were accepted as friendly: change (i.e., political, intellectual, or social history) to “(e.g., political, intellectual, social, or cultural history).”

**INTEGRATED LIBERAL LEARNING**

**Interdisciplinary Thematic Clusters:**

Julia Eichelberger, while in favor of the concept, finds the integrative writing assignment too difficult to be feasible and moved the following:

> That the ITC component of the GenEd proposal drop its requirement that students write an integrative essay or complete another integrative assignment.

In her rationalization, Ms. Eichelberger claimed that the integrative assignment is the most cumbersome andlogistically difficult part of the ITC, that individual ITC courses would likely contain integrative assignments, and that the GenEd committee can devise other ways of assessing the effectiveness of the ITC’s.

Lynne Ford, Angela Kouters, and Phil Jos all spoke against the motion, stressing the importance of the essay as an essential component of the ITC, providing students the means of making the cross-disciplinary connections essential to the clusters.

Speaking for the motion, George Pothering argued for flexibility and pointed out that some clusters have an inherent integrative component. Hugh Wilder and Tom Heaney
questioned who would generate topics for and grade the essay. Bishop Hunt supported simplifying the ITC component, and Glenn Lesses faulted the check off grading of the essay as described on p. 11 of the proposal.

The motion to drop the integrative essay passed.

Mike Marcell spoke against the ITC’s, claiming that the three separate courses do not provide students the dynamic and interesting experience inherent in team-taught courses. He also warned that hidden pre-requisites exist in many of the cluster courses and that resources will be taken from the majors when many departments will have to develop 200-level courses for the clusters. Citing the difficulties in meeting the demands of the Communication major, Tom Heeney agreed with Mr. Marcell’s point about draining resources from the major. Mr. Heeney’s other objections to the ITC’s are that he thinks the budget figures in the proposal much too conservative, that the sequencing of courses will require “immaculate” advising, that students changing majors will likely have their graduation date extended, and that ITC’s will have a negative impact on students’ choosing double majors and study abroad opportunities.

Returning to his concerns about advising, Mr. Heeney moved that the proposal include the recommendation from Sue Sommer-Kresse’s committee on advising that no faculty member have more than 25-30 advisees. Some discussion followed about whether or not preceptors would be included in calculating the advising load. Speaking against the motion, Lynn Cherry asserted that the GenEd proposal is curricular and that advising is not part of the curriculum. Still concerned about the statement on p. 12 about the essential role that advising will play in aiding students in choosing and completing the ITC requirement, Mr. Heeney withdrew his motion with the assumption that his concerns will be addressed during implementation.

Mr. Lesses pointed to a discrepancy in phrasing between 3 (b) in the Academic Planning Committee’s report ( p. 5) and the requirements for ITC’s on the Proposal (p. 9). To remove the discrepancy, Jane McCollough moved that the Academic Planning Committee add the words “and at least one course at the 300-level” to the end of 3 (b) in their preface to the proposal. John Newell accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Motion of Adjournment

At 7:20 a motion to adjourn until 5:00 p.m. on April 20 passed by a vote of 28 to 12.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
April 6, 1999

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE (First Session)

The first session of the eighth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:03 p.m. on Tuesday, April 6 in ECTR 116, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty-nine senators attended. Minutes of the March 3 meeting were approved.

New Business

- The Senate approved the request of the Assessment Committee to send to the By-Laws Committee for review the following change in the charge to the Assessment Committee.

To be included as a second sentence on page 54, 14.b.(3) of the
Faculty/Administration Manual:

3) To review or initiate policy issues related to assessment of institutional effectiveness. The goal of assessment activities at the College of Charleston is to help the College accomplish its institutional mission and meet its departmental goals and objectives through a process of self-analysis at all levels

- Bob Mignone moved that the CHE-mandated question about student satisfaction with advising be administered on April 14 during the 10:00 class period. The motion passed.

- For the Curriculum Committee, Chris Abate made the following motions, all of which passed:

SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

- Course Change (number and title): ANTH 203 Introduction to Physical Anthropology to Introduction to Biological Anthropology [new description submitted to Registrar.]

- Course Change (credit): ANTH 319 Special Topics in Anthropology from 3 hours to 1-4 hours.
• Course Change (prerequisites): ANTH 334 Human Variation and Adaptation
  Add as alternate prerequisites ANTH 101 or ANTH 203 or BIOL 102 or GEOL 102
  or permission of instructor.
• Course Change (prerequisites): ANTH 335 Primate Behavior and Evolution
  Change prerequisites to ANTH 101 or ANTH 203 or BIOL 102 or PSYC 203 or
  permission instructor.
• Course Change (prerequisites): ANTH 340 Medical Anthropology
  Add as alternate prerequisites ANTH 101 or ANTH 203 or permission of instructor.
• Course Change (prerequisites): ANTH 346 Anthropology of Gender
  Change pre-requisites to ANTH 101 or WMST 200 or permission of instructor
• Course Deletion: ANTH 393 Introduction to Archeological Field Methods
• Course Change (description and prerequisites): ANTH 493 Field School in
  Archeology  Drop ANTH 101 as prerequisite [new description sent to Registrar.]

STUDIO ART
• Minor in Studio Art (official approval)

• PROPOSAL FOR GENERAL EDUCATION

The Speaker introduced the discussion by thanking all members of the College who
participated in any way in the discussions and debates that led to the proposal now before
the Senate. She singled out especially the Ad Hoc Committee to Review General
Education and then listed the standing committees most recently involved in reviewing
the Ad-Hoc Committee’s proposal for its presentation today: Assessment, Budget,
Curriculum, Planning, and Welfare.

Ms. Folds-Bennett then reminded the Senate of the rules that will govern the discussion:

• As approved at the November 10, 1998, meeting of the Senate, the proposal will be
discussed by section—Introduction to Liberal Arts and Sciences, Foundations,
Intellectual Traditions in the Liberal Arts and Sciences, Integrated Liberal Learning,
and Administrative and Supporting Structures—before the Senate votes on the
proposal as a whole.

• On any of the parts a person may speak only two times for a maximum of five
minutes each time, Everyone who wants to speak should do so once before anyone
speaks a second time.
• For the Academic Planning Committee, John Newell presented the Revised Proposal for a General Education Curriculum at the College of Charleston.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES COURSE and FIRST YEAR EXPERIENCE PROGRAM

The discussion of the first part of the proposal summarized below centered around five areas: Teaching ILAS, Validity of Credit for ILAS, Assessment of ILAS, Preceptors, and General Comments.

Teaching ILAS: Glenn Lesses argued that the course does not have faculty support: only 39.5% of those responding to the straw poll gave the course a positive rating, and only 42 of over 400 faculty responded to the e-mail call for volunteers to teach the ILAS course. Where, Mr. Lesses asked, would enough faculty to teach the course be found. Reid Wiseman, although opposed to the course, pointed out that 42 volunteers would be enough for the pilot (42 faculty x 22 students per session=920).

Richard Nunan looked beyond the pilot when more than volunteers would be needed and feared “universal conscription” of faculty; he also foresees a “juggernaut” that could be stopped only by massive civil disobedience by the faculty. In response, John Newell pointed out that the pilot would last only five years, after which the proposal requires the ILAS to come before the Senate for approval.

Bob Mignone, one of the 42 volunteers, argued against the expectation that every faculty member would teach the course every three years and moved the following:

Faculty participation in teaching the ILAS course be completely voluntary.

The motion passed.

Validity of Credit for ILAS

Speaking against the course, Mike Marcell pointed out features that he thinks do not provide an introduction to the College of Charleston experience: P/F grading, a three-day course, and unworkable assignments. Phil Jos countered that the ILAS course can send a message to incoming freshmen that they are no longer in high school and introduce them to the idea of a liberally educated person. Julia Eichelberger added that it is important to take advantage of the opportunity when we will have the attention of all freshmen and can focus that attention on the goals of liberal arts.

A number of senators argued that the course should carry 0 credits. Lynne Ford responded that the College signals seriousness of content by awarding credit and that the course meets the requirements approved by the faculty—14 hours of “seat time” for 1
credit. Tom Kunkle contended that three days cannot be the equivalent of an academic course and added that faculty expect 2 to 3 hours outside of class for every hour in class. Mike Marcel and Kem Fronabarger agreed, saying that the ILAS course is not equal in hours or rigor to the 1 credit labs in their departments.

Speaking in favor of credit for the course, Andy Lewis said that we would send a negative message to students if reading lists, class discussions and assignments led to no credit. Paige Wisotzka agreed that the course would not work without the expectation of credit. Rich Bodek labeled the one credit "psychological" and doubted that the 1 credit would be used as a credit needed for graduation.

SGA Representative Angela Kouters said that she could have benefited from an ILAS course to let her know what would be expected of her as a student at a liberal arts institution and that the course would have provided a more appropriate first experience at the College than the one she encountered, sorority rush.

Kem Fronabarger argued that voluntary attendance by students who really want to learn would be preferable to forced attendance by all; however, Sara White and Idee Winfield do not think that most entering freshmen would comprehend beforehand the benefit of the course. Mr. Fronabarger moved the following:

The ILAS course carry 0 credit hours (with no P/F grading). The motion was defeated.

Assessment of the ILAS Course

To Brian Scholtens' question about what assessment would be used to determine the success of the pilot, Ms. Ford answered that the Assessment Committee has considered this question and that the Goals for ILAS in the proposal are assessable. Rich Heldrich disagreed and argued that the course does not address any of the Goals for General Education. Ms. Ford replied that Goal 9, which would have supported the course specifically, was moved to a preamble, but, she added, ILAS includes all goals, not any one in particular. Mr. Heldrich answered that Goal 9 was removed because it was not assessable, and he thinks that the ILAS course cannot be assessed for the same reasons.

Preceptors

Calling the idea of preceptors "a pious wish," Glenn Lesses questioned this part of the proposal, especially when our advisees do not appear as much any more with changes in the registration process. Ms. Ford defended the concept of preceptors by pointing to the evidence that establishing a relationship with a faculty member is one of the most powerful indicators of retention. To emphasize the importance of that relationship, Lynn Cherry cited her experience with students in the Advising Center, and Julia Eichelberger pointed to her experience in Freshman English.
General Comments

Both Nan Morrison and Deanna Caveny questioned the wisdom of the proposal when as much as 35% of the Math and English/Communication Departments, which provide the majority of the foundations courses for liberal arts, are staffed by adjunct faculty and office and classroom space is critically lacking. Ms. Morrison asked why we are considering spending $100,000 on a course that lasts three days when we have such needs for courses that last nine months. Also, she does not think that the 16 new lines per year called for in the proposal take into account the 2% projected growth.

Bill Moore argued that if the course is important for students with fewer than 30 credit hours, it should be important as well for those with more than 30 hours. He moved that all College of Charleston students be required to take the ILAS course. The motion failed.

FOUNDATIONS

Mathematics and/or Formal Reasoning

A number of faculty from the Mathematics and Philosophy Departments questioned why the Ad Hoc and Academic Planning Committees ignored the joint memo from the two departments supporting two logic courses being used to fulfill the math requirement. When John Newell suggested that the Planning Committee would accept a friendly amendment changing the phrasing to “two approved courses in math or logic,” the discussion focused on a time on the approval process. Jim Deavor and others thought that the Math Department should approve appropriate math courses, not the GenEd Committee. Brian Scholtens agreed, saying that the GenEd Committee should review cross-disciplinary courses but should not be empowered to determine which department-specific courses, especially those at the foundations level, are acceptable. Andy Lewis and Mary Beth Heston pointed to the need for overview of General Education and likened the role of the GenEd Committee to that of the Curriculum Committee.

Returning to the math/logic issue, Glenn Lesses moved that any two of the following courses be used to fulfill the mathematics requirement: any MATH course (MATH 203 and higher) or PHL 215 and 216. When Mr. Newell pointed out that no other specific courses are included in the proposal, Mr. Lesses rephrased his motion to change the Mathematics/Formal Reasoning paragraph in the proposal to the following: “Students must complete two approved mathematics or mathematical logic courses.” The motion passed.
FOREIGN LANGUAGES, CLASSICAL OR MODERN

Stephanie Low began the discussion by asserting that the proposal discriminates against students who have worked on languages in high school by requiring them to enroll in a language course to get credit for earlier work. Lynne Ford responded that the under the current policy students can earn 12 credit hours; the proposed change will increase that to 15 hours. Brian Scholtens thinks that languages are getting preferential treatment. He is not opposed to language study but to the lack of flexibility for science majors who must begin languages immediately. Currently, he said, the only flexibility in the science curriculum for many students in pre-professional programs is languages, and the proposed change would remove that flexibility. To Andrew Sobiesuo's argument that students lose their language skills if they delay taking further language courses, Mr. Scholtens and others replied that the gap in learning is not unique to languages.

Pointing to the General Education and the Majors Worksheet (p. 2 of the Revised proposal) where Humanities, Social Studies, and Natural Sciences are included in the first year, Glenn Lesses reminded the Senate of the Welfare Committee's recommendation that Foundations and Intellectual Traditions be combined because the distinction between the two areas is not clear. Ms. Ford replied that although the Ad Hoc Committee recommends some Intellectual Traditions courses in the freshman year, most of that year should be spent on basic skills.

Kem Fronabarger commented that small departments recruit majors from entry-level courses, and he faulted the Majors Worksheet for encouraging students to delay taking science courses. He moved the following change to the General Education and the Majors Worksheet: Change H/SS/(Nat Sci) to "H/SS/Nat Sci" and repeat the phrasing in all four listings during Year One and Year Two. The motion passed.

Motion of Adjournment

At 7:25 p.m. Bob Mignone called for a motion of adjournment until 5:00 p.m. on April 13. The motion passed.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
March 2, 1999

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

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

Reports

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

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

New Business

• For the Academic Standards Committee, Brian Scholtens made a motion for change academic processes and policy for College of Charleston students in Study Abroad Programs:
  • That the process for application and approval of international programs used by College of Charleston students be handled by the Office of International Studies with oversight of approved programs by the Undergraduate Studies Office and the Academic Standards Committee
  • That all international programs be treated as transfer credit with only grades of C or better accepted.

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

1. THE BUDGET COMMITTEE: change in duties

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

To review in particular the projected cost estimates for proposals of new College programs and initiatives, and forward to the Faculty Senate, when the proposals come to the floor for a vote, its recommendations concerning the potential budgetary impact of the proposals.

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

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

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

To review College policies relating to long-range financial planning, budget preparation, and the allocation of funds within budget categories, and to recommend policy changes. To review in particular the projected costs of proposals for new College programs and initiatives, and to inform the Senate, before these proposals are put to a vote, of the Committee's evaluation of their potential budgetary impact. To review each annual College budget. The Chair of the Budget Committee or her or his representative shall attend meetings of the budget Committee of the Board of Trustees.

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

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

1. A new standing faculty committee will be created, the “Post-Tenure Review Committee.” Its membership will be constituted in accordance with the same criteria as the currently existing college-wide T&P Committee, but with no ex-officio members. Its members will be selected through the same process as well (i.e., via the Nominations Committee and the Senate, like other standing committees).

2. The charge of this committee will be to conduct all institutional-level post-tenure reviews (excluding promotions) which fall during its term of office.

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

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

15. Post-Tenure Review Committee

a. Composition:

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

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

(3) No member of this committee may participate in any school or departmental evaluation panel for [delete: "tenure and promotion"; add: "post-tenure"] review except those conducted in her or his school or department.

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

b. Duties:

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

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

The motion passed.

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

3. POST TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE: Procedures

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

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

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

1. A post-tenure review will be conducted for each tenured faculty member during the sixth year since her/his previous extra-departmental review, via the following set of procedures...

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

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

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

Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
February 2, 1999

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The sixth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:04 p.m. on Tuesday, February 2 in ECTR 116, Speaker of the Faculty, Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Forty-nine senators attended. Minutes of the January 19 meeting were approved.

New Business

• For the Curriculum Committee, Dottie Marban made two motions, both of which passed.

STUDIO ART

• New Courses: ARTS 334 Advanced Photography (3);
  ARTS 325 Advanced Photographic Techniques (3)

• For the Faculty Welfare Committee, Glenn Lesses presented the Revised Proposal for a Post-Tenure Review.

Mr. Lesses began by summarizing the history of the proposal. After a Post-Tenure Review was mandated by CHE, an Ad-Hoc Committee for a Post-Tenure Review was appointed. The Ad-Hoc Committee submitted a proposal to the Senate, which was provisionally accepted on April 7, 1998, and then reviewed by Academic Affairs. The charge to the Welfare Committee was to reconcile input from the Provost with the Ad-Hoc Committee’s proposal and to ensure that the document complied with CHE’s “Best Practices for a Post-Tenure Review” and “Best Practices for a Performance Review System for Faculty.” The final version of the proposal, Mr. Lesses emphasized, reflects an accommodation to the Provost and to CHE. He encouraged the Senate to view the document as a framework and reminded senators of the February 15 deadline for submitting a proposal to CHE.

Discussion of the proposal focused on six areas: coordination with promotion, implementation of the review, make-up of the panel to review a department chair, materials necessary for the review packet, the role of the deans in the review, and the appeals procedure.
• **Coordination with promotion:** Idee Winfield questioned the connection between the Post-Tenure Review and the rollback to a sixth year for consideration for promotion to full professor. Mr. Lesses answered that CHE guidelines allow a promotion review to count as a post tenure review regardless of the outcome of the promotion.

• **Implementation of the review:** Lee Lindner raised concerns from his department about implementing the review as described in #10 of the proposal. Mr. Lesses responded that #10 applies only to the transition period as the post-tenure review is phased in. He agreed that the language of #10 was unclear, and, without objection, added the following phrase at the beginning of the item for clarity: “During the transitional period of three years.”

• **Make-up of the panel to review a department chair:** A number of senators questioned 3 (b), especially the determination of “the most senior tenured members of the department” who will conduct a post-tenure review of the chair. At the suggestion of Bill Moore, who first raised the question, and David Cohen, it was decided that the make-up of the panel could be decided later.

• **Materials necessary for packet:** (See Motions 1 and 2 below)

Kem Fronabarger made three motions, all designed, he said, to streamline the process. The intent of the first motion is to reduce the amount of proof required for the satisfactory rating that most reviews are expected to receive.

**Motion 1.** Change 3.a.i to read *in full* [new phrasing underlined]:

3.2.i Professional Vitae

*Narrative statement from the candidate that outlines his/her accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service during the preceding five years*

Department Chair’s annual evaluations for the five years under review; or, in the event that a department Chairperson is being evaluated, the Dean’s annual evaluations of the Chair for the relevant years will be submitted.

In support of his motion, Mr. Fronabarger questioned the need for the additional material called for in the proposal (e.g. teaching evaluations and peer evaluations) when the packet for those seeking a satisfactory rating will not be reviewed by the Post-Tenure Review Committee. A number of senators including Nunan, Cutahy, Low, Diamond, Lesses, and Scholten spoke against the motion, arguing that it violates CHE requirements specified in the “Best Practices” documents, especially the requirement for peer review.
Ned Hettinger asked why the proposal requires peer reviews of the candidate’s teaching when current practice seeks peer evaluation of service. When Bev Diamond noted that “Best Practices for a Post-Tenure Review” document indicates that peer reviews should usually evaluate the quality of research, Bob Mignone replied that CHE requires peer reviews of research for research institutions (the College of Charleston is classified as a teaching institution). Marion Doig added that a requirement for external review of research is satisfied by the proposal’s specifying *juried* publications.

Although Jim Carew and Kem Fronabarger argued that annual evaluations already assess what is asked for in the Post-Tenure Review and that chairs can be considered a peer reviewer, Mr. Lesses argued that the Post-Tenure differs from an annual evaluation: it looks at a career from a period of years, a diachronic look not provided by a sum of annual evaluations.

The motion failed.

**Motion 2** Change 3.a.ii to read *in full* [new phrasing underlined]:

3.a.ii In addition, candidates seeking a “superior” rating (see provision 5) must also furnish clear evidence of continued quality teaching (*continued professional competency in the case of librarians*), *service to the College*, and continued quality scholarship. Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore the evidence must include at least two published scholarly articles and/or books (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). Evidence is to be compiled for the intervening period between promotion evaluation and/or post-tenure review.

Computer generated student teaching evaluations (summary pages with with numbers) for all evaluated courses taught by the candidate during the five years under review must be submitted.

[*In the event of subsequent approval of teaching portfolios as part of the post-tenure review process, they may be submitted as evidence for continued quality teaching.*]

Mr. Lesses pointed out that the language in the proposal was intentionally selected from the *Faculty/Administration Manual* so that the criteria would be the same. While Jane Clary supported the addition of the word “published,” John Newell, Bev Diamond, and Bob Mignone argued in favor of maintaining the language in the *Manual* specifying the requirements for promotion to full professor.

The motion failed.
The role of the deans in the process: Mr. Fronabarger's third motion proposed changes in phrasing about when deans step into the process.

Motion 3. Change 3.c as follows:

The department Chair (or the departmental panel) will forward the candidate's packet... continue as written in the original proposal until the penultimate sentence. Deans may choose to review the packets and forward a recommendation. Normally the Deans will not review satisfactory recommendations unless the candidate requests the Dean to do so... continue as written in the original proposal...

Most discussion of this motion concentrated on the change from “deans may choose to review the packet and write a letter of evaluation” to “normally the deans will not review satisfactory recommendations unless the candidate requests the dean to do so.” Deanna Mc Broom pointed out that the difference is at whose volition the packet is reviewed: in the Faculty Welfare proposal the dean chooses; in the motion the candidate does. Phil Jos, Bob Perkins, Bev Diamond, and Brian Scholtens spoke in support of the dean's role in the process to insure against unfair evaluations and to provide oversight.

Peter McCandless observed that the dean's role would change with the three possible outcomes of the review—superior, satisfactory and unsatisfactory. To clarify the dean's role, Mr. McCandless made the following friendly amendment to the motion:

Deans will review packets and forward a recommendation in cases of superior unsatisfactory ratings. Deans will not normally review satisfactory recommendations but will do so at the request of the candidate.

The amendment passed.

Bill Moore moved the addition of the following (underlined) words to the first sentence of 3.c

The department chair (or the departmental panel) will inform the candidate of the departmental recommendation and forward the candidate's packet...

The motion passed.

The appeals procedure: Questions arose during the discussion about appeals open to candidates denied a superior rating. Mary Beth Heston moved the following addition to 6.b in the proposal (new phrasing underlined):

562
6. (b) A candidate wishing to appeal an unsatisfactory rating or denial of a superior rating must submit a written appeal to the Faculty Hearing Committee within ten days of notification...

Mr. Lesses commented that the Faculty Welfare Committee used language from the Manual in developing the appeals procedure. Pointing out that the Hearing Committee deals only with cases in which a faculty member is being dismissed, Mr. Mignone suggested that appeals for denial of a superior rating should be heard by the Grievance Committee. When some senators suggested that an appeals procedure for denial of superior rating needed to be a separate item in the proposal, Mr. Nunan argued that such a major revision would require that the document be remanded to the Welfare Committee. The Parliamentarian ruled that remanding would mean that there would be no proposal to meet the February 15 deadline. Ms. Heston withdrew her motion, but the Speaker asked the Faculty Welfare Committee to consider a revision to the proposal that would address an appeals procedure for denial of a superior rating.

Following is the Post-Tenure Review Proposal as amended by the Senate that will be submitted to CHE.

POST-TENURE REVIEW PROPOSAL

1. A new standing faculty committee will be created, the 'Post-Tenure Review Committee'. Its membership will be constituted in accordance with the same criteria as the currently existing college-wide T&P Committee, but with no ex-officio members. Its members will be selected through the same process as well (i.e., via the Nominations Committee and the Senate, like other standing committees).

2. The charge of this committee will be to conduct all institutional-level post-tenure reviews (excluding promotions) which fall during its term of office.

3. A post-tenure review will be conducted for each tenured faculty member during the sixth year since her/his previous extra-departmental review, via the following set of procedures:

   (a) In the fall, all candidates will submit to their department chair a packet of materials that must include:

      (i) Professional Vitae*
          Statement from candidate on teaching, research and service, addressing past five years and future plans and goals.*
          Computer-generated student teaching evaluations (summary pages with numbers) for all evaluated courses taught by candidate during five-year interval under review.*
Department chair's annual evaluations (both numerical summaries and narratives) during five-year interval under review. In the event that a department chair is being evaluated, the dean's annual evaluations of the chair will be included instead. Two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers, concerning aspects of candidate's teaching (or, for librarians, professional competency).**

[* In the event of subsequent approval of teaching portfolios as part of the post-tenure review process, starred elements may be incorporated as components of those portfolios.]

[**In the event of subsequent approval of peer teaching evaluations as part of the post-tenure review process, these letters will include peer teaching evaluation comments.]

(ii) In addition, candidates seeking a 'superior' rating (see provision 5) must also furnish clear evidence of exemplary teaching effectiveness (exemplary professional competency in the case of librarians), leadership in service, and continuing quality scholarship. Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore, the evidence must include at least two scholarly articles and/or books (or otherwise juried publications, or professional evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). Evidence is to be compiled for the intervening period between promotion evaluation and/or post-tenure reviews.

(b) This packet will be reviewed by the department chair during the fall semester of the sixth year, to determine whether the candidate's performance warrants an 'unsatisfactory' rating. In that event, the department chair will add a substantive evaluation letter to the packet, explaining his/her reasons for flagging the candidate's performance as unsatisfactory. Department panels will be convened only in the case of review of the chair. When the department chair herself/himself is up for post-tenure review, the most senior tenured member of the department (other than the chair) will convene, and chair, a departmental post-tenure review panel consisting of three tenured faculty (including the panel chair). Panel members will normally be drawn from the home department. No tenured faculty member concurrently subject to post-tenure review may serve on this panel. The panel will exercise the same responsibility with respect to the department chair's candidacy that the chair exercises in all other cases.

(c) The department chair (or the departmental panel) will inform the candidate of the departmental recommendation and forward the candidate's packet with either a brief acknowledgment of the chair's (or panel's) concurrence with the candidate's self-evaluation, or a detailed negative evaluation letter, to the candidate's dean by the first Monday in December. Deans will review packets and forward a recommendation in cases of superior or unsatisfactory ratings. Deans will not normally review satisfactory recommendations but will do so at the request of the candidate. The dean must forward the packets to the Post-Tenure Review Committee by the First day of the beginning of the Spring Semester.

(d) The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall review and forward its recommendation to the Provost by the end of February. Normally, the committee will not review
satisfactory recommendations unless the candidate requests the committee to do so.

(e) The Provost may make a recommendation and will forward all recommendations to the President.

(f) Upon receipt of the recommendations of the department, the appropriate dean, the Post-Tenure Review Committee, and the Provost, the President shall make a final determination and inform the candidate, the Provost, the dean, and the department chair in writing of his/her decision by March 15 or within two weeks of receipt of the recommendation. In the course of deliberation, the President shall have access to all materials used in the evaluation.

4. Evaluations of the Post-Tenure Review Committee can take one of three forms:

'Superior'
Candidate has continued to perform at the level expected for promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the standards of the Faculty-Administration Manual. Tenured Assistant and Associate Professors or Librarians who lack a terminal degree but who otherwise meet the standards of promotion to the rank of Professor or Librarian IV are eligible for superior ratings.

'Unsatisfactory'
Candidate has exhibited evidence of habitual neglect of duty, which means consistently and regularly failing to fulfill the terms and conditions of appointment, as laid out in the Faculty-Administration Manual's section on "Termination of Tenured Faculty Members for Cause" and Termination Procedure.

'Satisfactory'
All other candidates.

5. Whenever the Post-Tenure Review Committee assigns a rating of 'superior', such a rating must be accompanied by a permanent merit increase normally not less than that given for promotion to the rank of Professor, effective the academic year following the year of evaluation.

6. Whenever a candidate receives a rating of 'unsatisfactory':

(a) The case will be remanded to the existing departmental panel, or a new one convened for the purpose (in the latter case, including the department chair and two other tenured departmental faculty), to devise a remediation plan in consultation with the candidate. This plan must be submitted to the college-wide Post-Tenure Review Committee for approval within twenty-one days of the President's final determination of an unsatisfactory rating. The Post-Tenure Review Committee must approve or, in consultation with the department panel, modify the plan within fifteen days.

(b) A candidate wishing to appeal an unsatisfactory rating must submit a written appeal to the Faculty Hearing Committee within ten days of notification of an unsatisfactory rating. The rating may only be appealed when the faculty member alleges the rating was based upon:
(1) discrimination, defined as differential treatment based upon race, religion, sex, national origin, color, age, or handicap; or
(2) violation of academic freedom as it relates to freedom of expression; or
(3) violation of due process as provided in the College’s published rules, regulations, policies and procedures.

7. Ultimate ratification of satisfactory completion of a remediation plan rests with the college-wide Post-Tenure Review Committee, as constituted at the time of the deadline originally assigned for completion of remediation. In the event that the Committee concludes that the candidate has failed to complete the remediation plan to its satisfaction, the Committee will notify the candidate, the department chair or panel, the provost, and the dean of the candidate’s school that the Committee has concluded that proceedings for revocation of the candidate’s tenure ought to be instituted, in accordance with the guidelines of the Faculty/Administration Manual.

8. The Post-Tenure Review Committee operates on a presumption of satisfactory performance. That is, the burden of proof (clear and convincing evidence) for a superior performance lies with the candidate, and the burden of proof for an unsatisfactory performance lies with the department chair or departmental panel. The Post-Tenure Review Committee can request additional information at any time during their deliberations.

9. The normal minimal period for initial eligibility for promotion to Professor shall be reduced from seven years to six (in order to be consistent with the legislatively mandated post-tenure review period of six years).

10. During the transitional period of three years, those eligible for consideration for ratings should be limited to one third of those holding the rank as tenured faculty for six years. Moreover, those eligible in the first round of eligibility should be limited to that third that has been in rank the longest.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
January 19, 1999

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fifth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:08 on Tuesday, January 19 in Maybank 100, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Forty-three senators attended. Minutes of the December 1 meeting were approved.

Reports

The Speaker reported that the most recent revision of the Proposal for General Education will be circulated within the next two days. She then outlined the charges she has given to five committees to review specific components of the proposal. The Speaker asked committees to be mindful of the whole proposal while focusing on specific components and, in their reviews, to summarize both strengths and weaknesses of the proposal.

Committee charges are as follows:

Curriculum Committee (deadline: Friday, February 12 to John Newell)
- review the Introduction to the Liberal Arts and Sciences course. The committee is asked to comment on the course using the same criteria of judgment used for any specific course review
- overall review of the impact the changes in general education requirements might have on other curricular issues and degree requirements
- review of the General Education Committee’s responsibilities. The committee is charged with consideration of the responsibilities of the General Education Committee, particularly responsibilities that may overlap with or conflict with the responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee. Furthermore, the committee is asked to make suggestions regarding the coordination of duties between the General Education Committee and the Curriculum Committee.

Budget Committee (deadline: Friday, February 12 to John Newell)
- review of the budgetary impact of the entire proposal. This review should be accomplished in coordination with the Business Affairs and Academic Affairs offices. Particularly, the committee should examine resource allocations and reallocations made necessary by the Introduction to Liberal Arts course, the thematic cluster courses, and the General Education Committee.
Faculty Welfare Committee (deadline: Friday, February 12 to John Newell)

- review of impact on faculty work environment (workload, flexibility, responsibility to departmental curriculum vs. general education curriculum, commitment to majors vs. nonmajors, research time) brought about by changes in the general education requirements. Particularly, the committee should examine the Introduction to Liberal Arts and Sciences course, the global perspectives requirement, the writing intensive requirement, and the thematic cluster requirement.

Assessment Committee (deadline: Friday, February 12 to John Newell)

- Review of the proposal from the perspective of efficacy assessment. Particularly, the committee is asked to report to faculty how an assessment plan might be used to make decisions about the adoption of new general education requirements and how assessment data might be used in the future to make decisions about the continuation of the program. The committee is asked to address specifically the Introduction to Liberal Arts and Sciences course, the thematic cluster requirement, the global perspectives requirement, the writing intensive requirement, and the proposed changes in distribution requirements.

Academic Planning Committee (deadline: Monday, March 1 to Trisha Folds-Bennett

- receiving the recommendations from the Curriculum, Budget, Faculty Welfare, and Assessment Committees and integrating them into the General Education Program Proposal
- ensuring that the final proposal is coherent, efficient, and well-justified
- sending the proposal to the Senate for review and vote

According to the proposed time line, the Academic Planning Committee (John Newell, Chair) will present the proposal to the Senate on April 6. The Senate will consider the proposal on April 6 and continue discussion, if necessary, on April 27.

(Note: If the Senate votes on the proposal on April 6, the full faculty will be asked to endorse, amend, or veto Senate action at the faculty meeting scheduled for April 19. If the Senate does not vote until April 27, the faculty meeting will be rescheduled for May 3.)

New Business

- For the Committee on Graduate Education, June Mirecki moved the following courses and change in admission requirements. All five motions passed.

- New Courses: ECON 520 Managerial Economics (3); SMFT 555 Applications of Physics for Teachers: How Things Work (4); SMFT 647 Determination of the Structure of Matter: Analytical Tools Employed Across the Science Curriculum (4); SMFT 697 Special Topics in Science or Mathematics for Teachers (1-4)
• Change in Admission Requirements for the Master of Science in Environmental Studies (MES):
  1. One junior/senior graduate level course in applied statistics
  2. In order to be able to fully understand environmental issues, students must have exposure to basic sciences—including laboratory work. Ideally students should have undergraduate coursework in biology or chemistry. However, the admissions committee recognizes that some students with exceptional backgrounds and training in other areas—either another science or social science—may wish to enter the program. These students are encouraged to apply and will be considered on a case-by-case basis but should understand that they may be required to take one or more additional science courses.

• For the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics, Scooter Barnette moved the following:

The Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics would like to recommend that the degree certificate (diploma) contain the name of the students’ majors. If the students were to have two majors, then we would recommend that he/she receive two diplomas.

Some senators and Undergraduate Dean Bill Lindstrom spoke against a proliferation of diplomas. Presently students receive two diplomas only if they are awarded two degrees (BA and BS)

Kem Fronabarger amended the motion as follows: “If students have two majors and one degree, both majors will be printed on the diploma.” The amendment passed.

Some discussion of the main motion focused on the reason for majors being included on diplomas. Ms. Barnette reported that the Student Government Association, which brought the resolution to the Student Affairs Committee, argued that including the major on the diploma would help foreign companies and universities participating in exchange programs because transcripts are very difficult to translate. Alpha Bah agreed about the difficulty with transcripts but added that letters of recommendation carry far more weight. Both he and Rich Bodek pointed out that a major in many other countries means a much more concentrated program of studies than the thirty-six hours typical of our majors. For that reason, including the major on a College of Charleston diploma would not accurately reflect the nature of a liberal arts degree.

To questions from Marion Doig and Bill Moore about common practice, Ms. Barnette answered that the Registrar had surveyed eight institutions in the Southeast about their practice and found that most four-year institutions do not include students’ majors on their diplomas. The main motion failed.
• For the Academic Standards Committee, Brian Scholtens moved that the following be added to the math/logic alternatives policy to keep it in line with the foreign languages alternatives policy:

  Exceptions/Substitutions:
  A. No course taken as an alternative to the math/logic requirement may also be used to satisfy a major or minor requirement without approval of the major or minor department.
  B. No course taken as a part of any other general degree requirements may also satisfy a part of the math/logic alternative program.

  The motion passed.

• For the Budget Committee, Bill Olejniczak requested and received Senate approval to send the following change in By-Laws to the By-Laws Committee, a change that refines the Budget Committee’s duties:

  Proposed changes to Article V., Section 2, Part B2b Budget Committee Duties (Sentence which would be added is in bold)

  To review College policies relating to long-range financial planning, budget preparation, and the allocation of funds within budget categories, and to recommend policy changes. To review in particular the projected cost estimates for proposals of new College programs and initiatives, and forward to the Faculty Senate, when the proposals come to the floor for a vote, its recommendations concerning the potential budgetary impact of the proposals. To review each annual College budget. The Chair of the Budget Committee or her or his representative shall attend meetings of the budget Committee of the Board of Trustees

Constituents' Concerns

Bishop Hunt read the following resolution, drafted by Susan Morrison, commending Bill King for his contributions to the College.

WHEREAS Bill King has, for twenty-three years, regularly coached College of Charleston swimming teams to outstanding performances;

AND WHEREAS Bill King has selflessly and unceasingly promoted swimming by the entire College community through his directorship of the Stern Center Pool and his credit and non-credit offerings of swimming courses;
AND WHEREAS Bill King, throughout his career at the College of Charleston, and without being required to do so, has routinely monitored the academic progress of the students on the swim team and insisted that they place a priority on their academics;

AND WHEREAS the swim team has consistently had a commendable team grade point average;

AND WHEREAS Bill King has vigorously supported students in their pursuit of post-Baccalaureate educational programs and career goals;

AND WHEREAS Bill King is a coach who truly understands the meaning of the term, "student athlete;"

We, the College of Charleston Senate, on behalf of the entire Faculty, wish to thank Bill King for his long-standing and outstanding service to the College, and especially for his dedication to the academic mission of the institution.

At the request of the Speaker, Parliamentarian George Pothering reviewed some of Robert's Rules as the Senate prepares to discuss the proposals for General Education and Post-Tenure Review.

Bob Mignone reminded the Senate that the Proposal for Post-Tenure Review must be sent to CHE by February 15, or the College could lose as much as 3% of its budget for failing to comply with the scheduled implementation of a Performance Indicator. When Idee Winfield said that she has a list of questions from her department about the review, the Speaker assured her and others that the agenda for the February 2 meeting would be cleared to allow time for discussion of the proposal.

**Adjournment**

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

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
December 1, 1998

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fourth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:03 p.m. on Tuesday, December 1 in Maybank 100, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Thirty-eight senators attended. Minutes of the November 10 meeting were approved.

Reports

The Speaker reported on President Sanders’ successful argument before CHE that there be a faculty representative on its Advisory Committee on Academic Planning. The Council of South Carolina University Chairs elected Bob Mignone to be that faculty representative. On behalf of the faculty, the Speaker congratulated Mr. Mignone.

New Business

• For the By-Laws Committee, Lynne Ford reported on the four motions sent to the Committee following the November 10 Senate meeting. The first three motions, which passed at the November 10 meeting, needed no changes in phrasing and are included below. The fourth motion, which had been remanded to the By-Laws Committee, passed.

Motion 1 to Amend the By-Laws

PART A. CHANGE: Article V, Section 2, A. (page 42):
FROM:  "A. Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations and Elections by March 15 and are elected by the Senate by April 1."

TO:  "A. Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations at least 15 days prior to the April Senate meeting, and are elected by the Senate during the April Senate meeting."
PART B. CHANGE: Article V, Section 3, B, 1, c, (3) (page 44):
FROM: "(3) To present to Senators, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing Senate committees by April 15;"
TO: "(3) To present to Senators, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing Senate committees at least 15 days prior to the April Senate meeting;"

RATIONALE: The dates on pages 42 and 44 conflict with one another, and thus some change is required. It appears that the original authors of the by-laws intended that the election be held during the April Senate meeting. The proposed changes eliminate any ambiguity or conflicts that exist in the current by-laws and give Senators a minimum of 15 days to consider the nominees.

Motion 2 to Amend the By-Laws

CHANGE: Article V, Section 3, B, 1, c, (4), (page 44):
FROM: "(4) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing College committees by April 15;"
TO: "(4) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing College committees by March 15;"

RATIONALE: Article V, Section 3, B, 1, c, (4), (page 44) conflicts with Article V, Section 3, A, which states: "Members of standing College committees are nominated by March 15 by the Committee on Nominations and Elections and are elected by members of the faculty (as defined in Article I Section 1) by April 1." The revision corrects the conflict.

Motion 3 to Correct the By-Laws

CHANGE: Article V, Section 3, B, 1, c, (10) (page 45):
FROM: "Faculty, Faculty Secretary, or committee membership may circulate such nomination(s) to the Elections Committee and to the Senate or faculty as appropriate in writing at least one week prior to the date of the election."
TO: Article V, Section 3, B, 1, d: "d. Additional Nominations: Faculty members deciding to make additional nomination(s) for Speaker of the Faculty, Faculty Secretary, or committee membership may circulate such nomination(s) to the Elections Committee and to the Senate or faculty as appropriate in writing at least one week prior to the date of the election."
RATIONALE: The underlined portion of Article V Section 3, B, 1, d was apparently inadvertently deleted during revision R8/96. The wording is taken directly from the manual pages written prior to revision R8/96. Note that reference to Article V, Section 3, B, 1, d is made on page 44. This correction will restore the correct wording.

Motion 4 to Amend the By-Laws

Prelude. There is considerable confusion concerning the status of alternate membership on committees. Should this service as an alternate be viewed as counting toward the three-year limit on membership, or should it be ignored when counting the three-year limit? The manual is unclear, and a clear statement concerning this matter should be made.

CHANGE: Article V, Section 1, B (page 41)
FROM: “Members of committees serve for a term of one year and may be reelected twice and then may serve again on the committee only after a lapse of three years. Terms begin on August 15.”

TO: “Members of committees (including alternates) serve for a term of one year and may be reelected twice and then may serve again on the committee only after a lapse of three years. Terms begin on August 15.”

RATIONALE:

1) The clear intent of the By-Laws is to prevent long-term service by a member of the faculty on any single committee.

2) The By-Laws make no mention of “alternate” service being in a different category from, or less important than, “regular” service on a committee.

3) The addition of the two underlined words will preclude an ambiguous interpretation of the By-Laws on this matter.

The issue affects three committees: the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review, the Faculty Hearing Committee, and the Faculty Grievance Committee. Passing this motion will make it somewhat more difficult to fill these committees; and continuity, particularly on T&P, is probably desirable. On the other hand, more faculty will have a chance to serve on these important committees, and no one could become “entrenched,” even by accident. The By-Laws Committee believes that, on balance, the advantages of this amendment clearly outweigh the disadvantages, and therefore we recommend approval.
• For the Curriculum Committee, Dottie Marban moved the following courses, all of which passed.

BIOLOGY
• Course Change (prerequisite): BIOL 102 Elements of Biology: Add BIOL 101 as prerequisite
• Course Change (prerequisite): BIOL 112 Evolution, Ecology, and Biology of Organisms: Add BIOL 111 as prerequisite

ACCOUNTING AND LEGAL STUDIES
• Course Change (co-requisite): ACCT 431 Advanced and Not-for-Profit Accounting: Add ACCT 317 as a co-requisite
• Course Change (co-requisite): ACCT 409 Auditing Theory: Add ACCT 317 as a co-requisite

ART HISTORY
• New Course: ARTH 391 Contemporary Art (3)

LANGUAGES
• New Course: CHNS 313 Conversation and Composition I (3)
• New Course: CHNS 314 Conversation and Composition II (3)

ENGLISH AND COMMUNICATION
• Change in Degree Requirements (Corporate Communication Track): For the one elective course in the track delete the following courses: MGMT 307, MGMT 320, MGMT 401, MGMT 405, MGMT 420, and MKTG425. Add the following courses: COMM 225, COMM 365, COMM 380, COMM 387, COMM 405, and COMM 495

Constituents' Concerns

When the Speaker mentioned that Post-Tenure Review would be discussed in January, a number of senators urged that the entire faculty be involved in the discussion. Mary Beth Heston moved that the proposal be distributed in hard copy to the faculty before it is discussed in the Senate. The motion passed. Glenn Lesses noted that the proposal from the Faculty Welfare Committee would go from the Senate to the Administration and then back to the Senate. The Speaker pointed out that the Senate can vote the proposal up or down or can remand the proposal back to the Welfare Committee before sending it to the Administration. She added that our development of a Post-Tenure Review has been a
collaborative process involving faculty and administration and has been more careful and deliberate than efforts at other institutions across the state.

Bob Mignone reminded senators that Post-Tenure Review is an administrative process and that the process must be in place during the spring semester or our Performance Funding will be reduced.

The proposal for Post-Tenure Review will be circulated to faculty as soon as the document is ready along with a cover letter from the Speaker announcing when the proposal will be voted on by the Senate and soliciting feedback from the faculty.

Von Bakanic raised a concern about the lag time between advising and registration and asked the Speaker to look into the possibility of shortening the time.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
November 10, 1998

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The third regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:02 p.m. on Tuesday, November 10, in Maybank 100, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty-two senators attended. Minutes of the October 6 meeting were approved.

Reports

The Speaker reported that President Sanders successfully argued for Bob Mignone’s recommendation that faculty have a voice on the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs, which reports to CHE. She also reported on her recent meeting with Dr. Robert Shirley, the consultant for the long-range planning process. She believes that, as President Sanders and Provost Festa have said, the planning process will be an open one. The Long-range Planning Coordinating Committee is not, she stressed, a decision-making body. Its function is to gather information, and it will do so by consulting students, faculty, alumni, and others interested in the future of the College. That process will take fourteen months, after which the Committee’s results will be synthesized and forwarded to the Board of Trustees. She encouraged faculty to meet with Dr. Shirley when he is on campus and to discuss ideas with her.

New Business

- For the Curriculum Committee Chris Abate made the following motions, all of which passed.

MANAGEMENT AND MARKETING

- New Course: HTMT 352 Service Operations Management (3)

ECONOMICS AND FINANCE

- New Course: ECON 316 Evolution of the United States Economy (3)

- Course Change (Catalog description): ECON 305 Money and Financial Institutions
- Course Change (Number): ECON 319 Introduction to Econometrics and Forecasting changed to ECON 419
• Course change (Title and number): ECON 404 Independent Study to ECON 420 Independent Studies
• Course Change (Title): FINC 315 Microcomputers in Finance changed to Intermediate Business Finance
• Course Change (Title and catalog description): FINC 385 Principles of Insurance changed to Principles of Risk Management Insurance

CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY

• Change in Degree Requirements: Add CHEM 351 (Biochemistry) to the degree requirements for a BS in Chemistry and delete the one three-hour elective

PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH

• New Course: PEHD 365 Identification and Treatment of Activity-Related Injury and Illness (3)
• New Course: PEHD 375 Clinical Education Experience in Athletic Training (1 per level)

The two PEHD courses prompted considerable discussion. Both Jim Smiley and Phil Dustan questioned whether a liberal arts college should be providing clinical education for athletic trainers. When Andy Lewis countered that we provide training in other programs such as nursing, Mr. Dustan pointed out that MUSC provides the clinical training for nursing students. Tom Langley added that the College does not have a 3-2 program in Physical Education similar to the Nursing program and that the courses in question make up just a small part of the liberal arts education.

Other concerns about the courses focused on the required hours for PEHD 375, 1000 clock hours of clinical experience during the five levels (one credit each) of the program. Reid Wiseman called the average of 250 hours required per one-credit course excessive. Mr. Lewis pointed out that to sit for national certification, students must meet competencies for each of the five levels and that internship models currently in place require 1500 hours with no credit. Mr. Langley compared the time commitment of this program to that of student teaching. When Mr. Smiley questioned hidden prerequisites, also adding to the hours, Mr. Lewis noted that all requirements, including prerequisites and the 20-hour natural science requirement, are clearly outlined for students who enroll in the program.

Chris Abate and Bob Mignone argued that the requirements should have been questioned when the program was first proposed. The Athletic Training Education Program has been passed by the Senate, approved by CHE, and is now in place. The two courses are designed to meet the guidelines for accreditation by the Commission for Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

Bishop Hunt requested a written ballot for the two courses, and both were approved.
SPECIAL TOPICS COURSES—FOR INFORMATION

* GEOL 290 GeoTour of Extremadura, Spain (3)
* THTR 489 Dramaturgy (3)
* BIOL 453 Photobiology (1)

* For the Committee on Graduate and Continuing Education Hugh Haynsworth made the following motions, all of which passed:

* New Course: EVSS 693 Independent Study (1-4)

* Course change (title): BIOL 601 (cross-listed EVSS 622) Population Biology and Ecology of Marine Organisms changed to Ecology of Marine Organisms

* Changes in Marine Biology Admissions requirements: New wording in the graduate catalog (admission requirement 5 ) will include a) a bachelor’s degree and b) twenty semester hours of upper division biological courses, including a course in cellular or molecular biology (or the equivalent) and a course in ecology (or the equivalent). Other requirements in Chemistry, Physics, and Calculus remain the same.

* For the Ad Hoc Committee to Review General Education, Lynne Ford moved the following:

  a) That upon the submission of the Proposal for General Education, the Senate debate and discuss the proposal by section. The proposal can most naturally be broken down into five sections: A) Introduction to the Liberal Arts and Sciences; B) Foundations; C) Intellectual Traditions in the Liberal Arts and Sciences; D) Integrated Liberal Learning; and E) the Committee, administrative and supporting structures.

  b) That all members of the Ad Hoc Committee be permitted floor privileges so that they may respond to questions from Senators.

  c) That the Senate vote on the proposal as a whole.
Kem Fronabarger asked if the full faculty will have the opportunity to vote on the proposal. Bob Mignone responded that the By-Laws provide for a special called meeting of the faculty by petition to the Speaker by fifty faculty members. At such a meeting, Senate actions may be amended or vetoed by a simple majority vote of those members of the regular College faculty at the meeting, provided there is a quorum present. When Glenn Lesses questioned the mechanism for the Senate to eliminate parts of the proposal, Ms. Ford pointed out that the motion provides for amending the proposal; after all sections have been amended, however, the motion calls for the entire proposal to be reconsidered and voted on.

Some discussion centered around whether parts of the proposal should be remanded to appropriate committees (Curriculum, Academic Planning, Welfare) for review before or after Senate discussion. Phil Jos and Mary Beth Heston argued that the Senate should see the document first to allow for another stage in oversight and to be able to give specific charges to committees when remanding.

Bob Mignone's call for the question passed, and the main motion passed.

• Kem Fronabarger, chair of the 1997-98 Committee Nominations and Elections, made four motions to amend or correct the By-Laws. Motions 1 and 2 correct conflicting deadlines for nominations to standing committees, and Motion 3 restores wording inadvertently deleted in the most recent edition of the Faculty/Administration Manual. All three motions passed and will be sent to the By-Laws Committee for review.

Motion 4 addresses the status of alternate membership on committees and whether such membership should count toward the three-year limit on membership and proposes the following addition to the Manual: “Service as an alternate committee member counts the same as service as a regular committee member.” After brief discussion, John Newell moved amend the motion and remand the issue of alternate membership to the By-Laws Committee for study and recommendation to the Senate. Both the amendment and the main motion passed.
• For the Faculty Welfare Committee Glenn Lesses moved that the following question be added to the course evaluation forms:

How often during the semester did you make an appointment or go to the instructor’s office during posted office hours?

0
1-3
4-6
7-9
10 or more

In a brief discussion of the motion, some senators saw value in pairing this question with the CHE-mandated one about the availability of faculty to students outside the classroom, but others questioned whether the items would, in fact, be paired and the data analyzed. The motion failed.

Constituents’ Concerns

Frank Kinard announced that Diane Cudahy had been appointed to fill a vacancy on the Budget Committee.

The Speaker welcomed Reid Wiseman, who won the recent election for an at-large Senate seat.

Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
October 6, 1998

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The second regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:02 p.m. on Tuesday, October 6, in Maybank 100, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty senators attended. Minutes of the September 1 meeting were approved.

Reports

The Speaker

Ms. Folds-Bennett reported progress on the Senate web page, which will soon include pictures of senators as well as lists of committees and committee chairs. Plans are also being made to post course proposals and supporting documents submitted to the Curriculum Committee. She reminded senators and all faculty of the questionnaire soliciting input about the new library and announced that she will report on strategic planning at the next Senate meeting.

The Speaker thanked Bob Mignone for his willingness to continue representing the College at CHE during discussions of performance funding. Mr. Mignone also chairs the Council of South Carolina University Chairs.

At the end of her report, the Speaker made two recommendations:

1. That the second of two items approved by the Senate last year be added to the course evaluation forms. [The first item, suggested by CHE, about the availability of faculty to students outside the classroom was added to the forms; however, an additional question asking how often the student made an appointment or went to the instructor’s office during office hours was not included.] Redesigning the forms will cost approximately $1,000 to be paid by the Office of Educational Services. Since 44,000 forms have already been printed for fall semester, the redesigned form would not be used until spring semester. After Andy Lewis, Deanna McBroom, and Phil Dustan questioned the value of the additional question, John Newell moved to remand the item to the Faculty Welfare Committee for further review. The motion passed.
2. That the By-Laws Committee clarify phrasing in the Faculty/Administration Manual about counting years of service to determine eligibility to serve on the Senate or committees.

Ad-Hoc Committee on Post-Tenure Review

Richard Nunan, chair of the 1997-98 Ad-Hoc Committee, reported that the Committee’s proposal and the Provost’s response are being reviewed by the Faculty Welfare Committee in consultation with Mr. Nunan, former Speaker Bob Mignone, and Associate Provost David Cohen. The Faculty Welfare Committee will submit a revised proposal to the Senate, which, if approved, will be reviewed by the Office of Academic Affairs and returned to the Senate before being sent to the Provost for final approval.

Mr. Nunan listed the following points of contention the Provost had with the Committee’s proposal:

- Applying Faculty/Administration Manual standards may eliminate from eligibility for a superior rating deserving faculty, such as those who excel in teaching and service but do not meet promotion standards for research or those tenured at the assistant or associate professor level who are not eligible for promotion.
- The proposal does not involve departments, chairs, deans, the Provost, and the President.
- The Provost cannot guarantee monetary rewards specified in the proposal.
- Only administrators who hold faculty rank and who teach should be evaluated by the post-tenure review process.

Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education

Lynne Ford reviewed the Committee’s charge and progress to date.

Year One (1996-97): Following a forum in August, inquiry groups met during fall semester to discuss the question "What is the nature of an educated person?" and to set goals for a GenEd program that would produce such an educated person. After a January forum, inquiry groups reviewed current programs using these goals, and the Senate endorsed in principle a draft version of the goals.

Year Two (1997-98): A forum in September included representatives from Miami U. of Ohio, Portland State U, and James Madison U., who gave presentations on GenEd programs at those institutions. Five inquiry groups were formed and charged with developing a framework for GenEd at the College to achieve the GenEd goals. In March proposals from the five groups were presented in written and poster form followed by a series of open meetings and forums.
Year Three (1998-99): After meeting during the summer to synthesize the five proposals, the Ad-Hoc Committee sponsored an August retreat during which it presented a comprehensive proposal for discussion. At the end of October, the Committee will present revisions to the proposal addressing concerns raised at the retreat and will hold three forums. In November the Committee will revise the proposal one more time and will begin meeting with departments and chairs to develop models of how the GenEd program would impact their majors. These models will be disseminated as attachments to the proposal. At the November meeting of the Senate, the Committee will forward a motion recommending a process for deliberation and action on the proposal, suggesting that one meeting be devoted to a discussion of the proposal with a vote taken at a subsequent meeting.

Future: If the proposal is accepted, the Ad-Hoc Committee envisions a two-year time period to allow courses and procedures to be developed, making 2001-02 the first year a new General Education program would be in place.

Ad-Hoc Committee on Teaching Portfolios and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Chair George Pothering reviewed the Committee’s charge to review/amend/endorse the recommendations from the deans to use portfolios and peer evaluations in the evaluation process. The Committee has been meeting since February reviewing the literature and drafting a proposal. Mr. Pothering said that the Committee plans to hold a forum in early January to present a proposal, which it will revise and present to the Senate in February or March. Phil Dustan asked if these recommendations would not add to faculty workload, and discussion focused on the portfolio. Mr. Pothering suggested that a portfolio would reduce in volume the amount of material currently being submitted in packets.

New Business

- For the Curriculum Committee, Chris Abate moved the adoption of one new course. The motion passed.

HISTORY

- New Course: HIST 333 Witches, Saints, and Heretics in Medieval and Early Modern Europe (3)

FOR INFORMATION: SPECIAL TOPICS COURSE

- PHYS 412 Photophysics Journal Club (1)
• The Committee on Nominations and Elections conducted an election to fill a vacancy on the Budget Committee. Talat Elshazly was elected.

Committee chair Frank Kinard announced that Anna Krauth (French) and Marsha Hass (Accounting/Legal Studies) had been nominated as alternates to the Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review and that an at-large senator will be elected by mail ballot.

Constituents' Concerns

Jack Parson, Director of International Studies, addressed an issue raised at the September meeting of the Senate about changes in the International Studies minor appearing in the 1998-99 Undergraduate Catalog. He pointed out that the required core courses of INST 100 and INST 200 were never taught as such but were always cross-listed as POSC 103 and 200. When the Political Science Department reformed the major, changes in curriculum affected those two courses plus the third core course, POSC 261.

To accommodate those changes, POLS 103 and POLS 360 replaced POSC 103 and POSC 360 as equivalent courses. However, the elimination of POSC 200 (Problems of the Third World) from the curriculum led to the following substitution satisfy one of the three core courses for the minor: “POLS 104 World Geography or one of the introductory international interdisciplinary non-western courses such as AFST 101 Introduction to African Civilization”

Because of incremental changes over the past few years, both the 1997-98 and 1998-99 catalogues included a statement that requirements for the minor are under review. Mr. Parson acknowledged a “curriculum creep” not approved by the Curriculum Committee or the Senate and announced two steps to address this problem: (1) he will suspend new enrollment in the minor until the curriculum Committee and the Senate have reconsidered the requirements; (2) he will convene a working party of faculty involved in the minor to make recommendations to the Curriculum Committee and the Senate about the minor and its requirements.

Adjournment

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

Respectful submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
September 1, 1998

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The first regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:04 p.m. on Tuesday, September 1, in Maybank 100, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty senators attended. Minutes of the April 7 and April 21 meetings were approved with a correction to the April 21 minutes. [File copies of the minutes will correctly list the members of the 1998-99 Committee on Nominations and Elections, and the correct list is included at the end of these minutes.]

Reports

The Speaker

Ms. Folds-Bennett reminded the Senate that this year will be a very busy one. She sees her role as an advocate for the faculty and will attend as many meetings as she thinks necessary to assure that the voice of the faculty is heard. The role of senators, she added, is to represent constituents. To do this, senators must be prepared to commit the time required to read carefully and discuss with colleagues the major proposals that will come before the Senate this year, especially the general education proposal, post-tenure review, and peer evaluation of teaching. She said that the Senate will not deal with more than one major proposal at a time and that some proposals may be divided. To allow for full discussion, she will clear the agenda as much as possible when these proposals reach the Senate.

Another large part of Senate deliberations will be course proposals. The Speaker is working with Chris Abate, chair of the Curriculum Committee, to develop a one-page committee report to accompany each proposal. All supporting documents will be on file in the Faculty Secretariat Office but will not be duplicated for each senator’s packet. Ms. Folds-Bennett plans to pilot the new form at the October meeting.

The Speaker announced a Senate web page under construction, on which she plans a pictorial directory of senators. She also asked for assistance from senators in departments that had not yet submitted information for the Faculty Newsletter.
committee requests a willingness to serve on any committee if preferences cannot be
honored. He and the Speaker agreed that service other than on committees
should be considered in tenure and promotion decisions, especially as the faculty
continues to grow but the number of committee positions remains fixed.

Bill Moore asked about changes in the International Studies minor appearing in the
1998-99 catalog that he does not recall being approved by the Curriculum Committee or
the Senate.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary

COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS (1998-99)
7 faculty members

Berg, Karen
Fronabarger, Kem
Jursa, Paul
Kinard, Frank
Kunkle, Tom
Van Sickle, Meta
Ward, Trish

Spanish
Geology
Economics/Finance
Chemistry/Biochemistry
Mathematics
Educational Foundations/Specializations
English/Communication
August 31, 1998

THE FACULTY MINUTES

The first regular meeting of the Faculty of the College of Charleston for the academic year 1998-99 convened at 5:02 p.m. on Monday, August 31 in Physicians Auditorium. Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Minutes of the previous meeting (April 13, 1998) were approved as circulated.

President’s Report

President Alex Sanders announced the beginning of a formal process to develop a long-range plan for the College of Charleston. He launched the process last spring by sending the Board of Trustees a tentative outline that begins with identifying the nature of our institution (a comprehensive metropolitan university? a highly selective liberal arts college? something in between?) and includes four components: I. Students/Enrollment; II. Faculty; III. Financial; and IV. Facilities/Resources. (A copy of the outline is available in Mr. Sanders’ office.)

Mr. Sanders then asked the Board to take three steps—to spend a full, uninterrupted day discussing the future of the College, to commit an extra ten days a year for the next two years to working on the long-range plan, and to read the following five books: The Closing of the American Mind by Allan Bloom, The Opening of the American Mind by Lawrence W. Levine, Jefferson’s Children by Leon Botstein, Straight Man by Richard Russo, and Forbidden Knowledge from Prometheus to Pornography by Roger Shattuck. Mr. Sanders said that he hopes to remain at the College until the planning process is completed and implementation is underway.

Agreeing to Mr. Sanders’ suggestions, the Board took the first step when thirteen of the seventeen members met with him all day on July 29. They expressed enthusiasm about the project and decided to hire a consultant to help design a process. Mr. Sanders announced that the consultant is Dr. Robert C. Shirley, most recently President Emeritus and Professor of Leadership and Management at the University of Southern Colorado, who has designed strategic plans for over a hundred institutions.
The planning process will involve all aspects of the College, but Mr. Sanders emphasized that the faculty is central to the process and encouraged active participation of the faculty. He promised that the process will be entirely open and that everyone’s ideas will receive full consideration. We will, Mr. Sanders affirmed, proceed in partnership and parity with no hierarchy and no secrets.

Praising the ongoing review of general education as a model of the faculty working together toward a common goal, Mr. Sanders described the general education review as the most important thing taking place at the College. He thanked everyone who has been involved to date and gave special recognition to Lynne Ford, Henry Donato, Deanna Caveny, and Trisha Folds-Bennett for their leadership as well as to members of the GenEd Committee—Todd Grantham, Arch McCallum, Andy Lewis, Peter McCandless, John Newell, Lynn Cherry, David Cohen, Jeri Cabot, Charles Kaiser, Sam Hines, Gordon Jones, Chip Condon, Nancy Sorenson, Sharon Fross, Diane Johnson, and Angela Kouters. General education, he said, is central to our mission; our goal must be to integrate general education with learning in the major and include a new focus on coherence. Mr. Sanders pledged that he will find the resources to reward faculty and departments who make a commitment to reaching that goal.

Mr. Sanders called the current state of the College “excellent” and noted first the recent developments that are solving our problem of inadequate space: the new library underway; completion of the Entrepreneurship Center; acquisition of Bishop England High School, the Wachovia Bank Building, and the Bell South Building (with other BellSouth properties expected soon); plans for new science labs and an addition to the School of the Arts; construction of athletic fields at Patriots Point; and perhaps even a new basketball arena somewhere.

In addition, the Capital Campaign surpassed its goal more than two years early, the number and quality of students applying for admission continue to increase, and the College’s scores on the performance indicators are the best in the state. In fact, as a result of performance funding, the College received an additional $627,455 this year, which was allocated to extra faculty raises above the state-funded ones and to new faculty lines.

Mr. Sanders ended by describing a scene in the movie Amistad to remind us of our debt to those who have gone before us at the College of Charleston as well as our obligation to improve the quality of learning for future generations of students.

Provost's Report

Provost Conrad Festa welcomed the faculty and then asked the chairs of departments with new members to introduce them to the faculty; all were greeted with warm applause.

Below is a list of all chairs and deans followed by an alphabetical list of new faculty (including faculty with new positions).
ACADEMIC DEANS/DEPARTMENT CHAIRS 1998-99

School of the Arts
Department of Art History
Department of Music
Department of Studio Art
Department of Theatre

Valerie Morris, Dean
Diane C. Johnson
Steve Rosenberg
Michael Tyzack
Allen Lyndrup

School of Business and Economics
Department of Accounting and Legal Studies
Department of Economics and Finance
Department of Management and Marketing

Clarence M. Condon, III, Dean
Andy Abrams
J. Michael Morgan
Rhonda Mack

School of Education
Department of Educational Foundations
and Specializations
Department of Elementary and Early
Childhood Education
Physical Education and Health

Nancy Sorenson, Dean
Frances Welch
Virginia Bartel
Andrew Lewis

School of Humanities and Social Sciences
English and Communication
History
Division of Languages
Departments of Classics and German
Department of French
Department of Spanish
Philosophy and Religious Studies
Political Science
Psychology
Sociology and Anthropology

Samuel M. Hines, Jr., Dean
Nan Morrison
Marvin Dulaney
Earl Rickerson, Head
Frank Morris
Jeffrey Foster
Andrew Sobiesuo
Hugh Wilder
Frank Petrusak
Charles Kaiser
Christine Hope

School of Sciences and Mathematics
Biology
Chemistry and Biochemistry
Computer Science
Geology
Mathematics
Physics and Astronomy

Gordon Jones, Dean
Michael Auerbach
James Deavor
Christopher Starr
Michael Katuna
Deanna Caveny
Robert Dukes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alward, Peter</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenault, Steven J</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird, William H.</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks, Kenneth</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boviar, Susan</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhler, Paul Allen</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkett, Tracy</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carens, Timothy L.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chowning, James A.</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cozart, Angela Crespo</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuppa, Diana M.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delisi, Stephanie</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edelson, Max</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Jean B.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaherty, Edward Eugene</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner, Geoffrey</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geiser-Bush, Katherine</td>
<td>Visiting Instr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham, Kelley Anne</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halfacre, Angela</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart, Edward</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hays, Maureen</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodges, Harland</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollings, Marie F.</td>
<td>Head, Special Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope, William</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeter, Deborah</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kille-Marino, Joyce</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krasnoff, Larry D.</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaCroix, Celeste</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang, Michael</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeMesurier, Brenton</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, Cynthia (Jan. 99)</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazzone, Marian</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendez, Tomas</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, Valerie</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noguer, Norma</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novak-Cogdell, Cheryl</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, Linda</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips, Darryl</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccione, Peter</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittas-Giroux, Justin</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preyer, Norris W.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puelo, Victor Anthony</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riggs-Gelasco, Pamela</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyon, Mary Theresa</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srinivas, Ravi</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinhoff, Anthony J.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stine, Robin</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy/Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting/Legal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics/Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology/Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English/Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English/Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Foundations/Special.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics/Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry/Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology/Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management/Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy/Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Education/Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of the Arts—Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem./Early Childhood Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem./Early Childhood Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classics/German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English/Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics/Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics/Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry/Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Foundations/Special.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting/Legal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem./Early Childhood Ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Speaker's Report

Trisha Folds-Bennett began her report by discussing why she thinks we can all feel fortunate to work at the College: effective teaching and quality research are valued, and we enjoy a quality of life that many people envy. To support her claim that we have a strong faculty who effectively balance teaching with research, she cited our academic credentials, vibrant classrooms, and interdisciplinary discussions and debates. Equally important, she thinks, are our shared governance system and culture of faculty involvement in critical decisions. To keep this culture alive as the College grows larger and more diverse, she challenged each member of the faculty to stay engaged in campus decision-making, either formally through the Senate and committees or informally through e-mail and participation in forums and discussion groups.

Three critical issues face the faculty this year—the general education proposal, the post-tenure review proposal, and a proposal for peer evaluation of teaching—and each of these issues will have an impact on how we do our jobs. In dealing with these issues, as well as with plans for the new library and the Bishop England property, she urged the faculty not to let the culture of shared governance erode by attempting to silence the minority; instead, we must keep the spirit of intellectually motivated, respectful, and productive debate alive on our campus.

The Speaker then recognized Frank Kinard for the Committee on Nominations and Elections, who solicited nominations for three vacancies, an at-large Senate seat and two positions on the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary