April 24, 2000

THE FACULTY MINUTES

The second regular meeting of the Faculty of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1999-2000 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, April 24 in Physicians’ Memorial Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. The Minutes of the previous meeting (August 30, 1999) were approved as circulated.

Speaker’s Report

The Speaker began by reviewing the accomplishments and activities of the College during the past year, speaking pointedly about the obvious fact that many members of the faculty seemed unusually fatigued, this year, as the semester was winding to a conclusion. Perhaps, she said, it could even be said that we were doing too much, and risking premature “burn-out.” That would not be surprising in view of some of the statistics she had gathered about our labors. Since the previous August, we have collectively devoted more than 200,000 hours to teaching in the classroom; kept more than 40,000 office hours; graded over 75,000 papers and over 250,000 exams; put in more than 7500 hours of advising; brought in more than 1.5 million in grant dollars; spent more than 300,000 hours in our labs, our studios, in the field, or in our offices reading and maintaining currency in our disciplines; shared approximately 100,000 of those research hours with our students; had more than 100 artistic exhibitions and more than 200 artistic performance; supervised over 200 Independent Study courses and Bachelor’s Essays; and devoted over 100,000 hours to committee work and other “service” to the institution. And these are conservative estimates.

But the list does not end there. We have had several notable lecture series, including the year-long Vietnam War Retrospective, thanks to the unflagging support of the School of the Humanities & Social Sciences, and the School of the Arts – not to mention prominent speakers, art exhibits, and performances of many kinds. One faculty member even produced a documentary called “Where do we go from here,” on the experiences of a group of students, faculty, and members of the community who visited important sites in the civil rights movement during a bus tour last summer.

Some other notable achievements:

– we have made it to the final round of competition for a Regional Humanities Center for the South Atlantic.

– our School of Education has received NCATE accreditation.
– our School of Business and Economics, and Masters of Accountancy programs received accreditation (only 40% of schools are successful in this process).

– our Chemistry, Biology, and Marine Biology programs were recognized for their Commendations of Excellence during a session of the state legislature.

– we have broken ground for a new university library.

– we have begun working with architects on a new science center and on a new wing to the School of the Arts building.

The Senate itself has not been idle, meeting for more than 25 hours, with various faculty and senate committees considering literally hundred of proposals, from the heroically overworked Curriculum Committee (135 new proposals), to the Research and Development Committee (over 550 proposals), with the Tenure & Promotion and Post-Tenure Review Committees handling 25 and 50 laborious cases apiece.

Statistics on the faculty’s scholarly productivity are no less impressive. We have added 56 new faculty this year alone; published nearly 500 journal articles, chapters, and books; made more than 250 presentations at professional meetings; served on the editorial boards of more than 100 journals and 100 professional organizations in various academic fields; and numerous awards, distinctions, and citations have been presented to individual faculty members.

All this good work has perhaps been responsible for the rising test scores of our students: average SAT scores of 1146, for example, among our entering students, with a figure of 1300 for Honors Program students – and these numbers show every sign of rising again next year. Our students have themselves garnered a number of awards and honors, in all fields, ranging from a $10,000 prize from CollegeNET for an essay on “Internet Privacy and Practice in Education,” written by a student in the Honors Program, to the College of Charleston Gospel Choir’s tour of the island of Jamaica.

Because of this tremendous – indeed, exhausting! – record of achievement, the Speaker said, she wished to focus specifically in the next year on what we need to do as a faculty to take care of us, the faculty. The College has grown at a tremendous rate over the past ten years. We are now at the point where we are slowing that rate of growth and trying to figure out what we need to do to catch up with ourselves. Clearly, we are in a period of transition and change – the fact that we have considered as a faculty several major plans and initiatives in the past few years is indicative of the process of change that we face. The impetus for change is unlikely to away, and in fact the pressure will probably increase because we have to accommodate for our size and for the wonderful diversity that our size has brought. So change is inevitable, but we need to think about ways to manage the process and impact of change better.

We can accomplish this by thinking carefully about the sheer number of hours that we commit or are asked to commit to our teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities. We should develop ways to make our work more efficient, to ensure that we are not duplicating efforts, to build the support services and infrastructure to help us accomplish the tasks that we need to accomplish in a timely fashion. Besides becoming more efficient at what we do, we need – perhaps more importantly – to do a better job of making faculty feel valued for what they do. All too often,
accomplishments slip through the cracks, or months and years of work lead nowhere. So, we need to do a better job of celebrating our individual and collective successes, thus creating a dynamic and rewarding intellectual climate.

In addition, we need as a faculty to think carefully about the process of decision making. Rather than spending hours and hours of precious time, developing ideas into proposals, only to find out that the idea itself has serious opposition, we should figure out how to gauge opinions earlier in our decision making so that we don’t waste our time. We also have to continue to work collaboratively with the Administration and Board of Trustees to ensure that for the most important decisions on this campus, our opinions as faculty matter, and influence the major decisions that are made.

The Speaker closed her report by introducing two recent appointments, Carlos Diaz in Computer Services and Emily Gray at the College Bookstore, who spoke briefly of their backgrounds and past experience, and outlined their plans and high hopes for developments in their areas.

**New Business**

- President Sanders then presented the annual Distinguished Faculty awards, asking each person in turn to come on stage to be honored, as follows:

  **Distinguished Service Award:** William V. Moore (Political Science)

  **Distinguished Advising Awards:** Marion T. Doig III (Chemistry/Biochemistry)  
  Marsha E. Hass (Accounting/Legal Studies)  
  David S. Mann (Political Science)

  **Distinguished Research Award:** Jorge A. Marban (Hispanic Studies)

  **Distinguished Teaching Award**  J. Fred Watts (Physics/Astronomy)

The President then quietly announced that his current contract would expire on October 1 of this year, but that he would remain for another year beyond that date as an “at will” employee. He mentioned that an Executive Session of a meeting of the Board of Trustees had just ended, and that rumors were flying up and flying down, but they were only that, and no more: no action had taken place. The meeting had dealt exclusively with the process of choosing the next president, and no individuals had been named. Provost Conrad Festa would soon be retiring from that position as well, and the process for choosing his replacement had been discussed. President Sanders then asked the faculty to get in touch with him about these important personnel matters, if they wished, either by writing to him, or by speaking to him directly – he would always try to be not only available, but approachable, and was eager to hear suggestions. He asked, however, that the faculty not e-mail him, because he was simply swamped with electronic messages, and quite unable to reply to, or even to read, all of them.
The Provost, Conrad Festa, formally moved the awarding of degrees at Commencement to candidates certified by the Registrar’s Office as having completed all requirements. This passed, on a voice vote.

Dr. Festa then announced that President Sanders had appointed six retiring faculty to the rank of Emeritus:

- Eugenie G. Comer (English)
- Charles Richard Crosby (Computer Science)
- Mary Kathy Haney (English)
- Marsha E. Hass (Accounting/Legal Studies)
- Frank T. Petrusak (Political Science)
- Alexander W. Ritchie (Geology)

These retiring members of the Faculty had served the College, in their several fields, with devotion and distinction, over a period of many years. It was pointed out that Mr. Ritchie had also served, from 1969 to 1974, as a platoon leader in Vietnam.

Tom Kunkle, for the Committee on Nominations and Elections, then moved the election of Standing Committees of the Faculty for the next academic year. There were two changes from the original slate. One nominee had withdrawn from the Committee on Nominations and Elections, and had been replaced; Kathy DeHaan nominated Amy McCandless from the floor for the Honors Program Committee. In the event, these two committees were elected, as follows:

**Committee on Nominations and Elections**

- Terrence Bowers (English)
- Linda Fitzharris (EDEE)
- Annette Godow (PEHD)
- Linda Jones (Physics)
- Anna Krauth (French)
- Tom Kunkle (Mathematics)
- Robert Mignone (Mathematics)

**Honors Program Committee**

- Amy McCandless (History)
- Shaun Nichols (Philosophy & Religious Studies)
- James Smiley (Biology)
- Meta Van Sickle (EDFS)
- Patricia Ward (English)

The other Standing Committees were elected without changes. The original list is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes, and may be seen, with subsequent updates, at:
For the Good of the Order

William Moore asked about the process for choosing the next President. The Speaker said that there would probably be four members of the faculty on the search committee; the present Board of Trustees believes strongly that the faculty should be involved, but no formal procedure had been established yet. Chip Condon commended Marsha Hass, saying that she had given a great deal of herself to the College over many years. Reid Wiseman commended the Speaker for the role she had played during the year.

Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary

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

FALL 2000 Senate Meetings:
(Tuesdays at 5:00 o’clock in ECTR 116):
September 5, October 3, October 31, November 28
April 18, 2000 (Second Session)

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The Second Session of the eighth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 18 in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. X senators attended.

New Business (cont.)

● Clyde Metz proposed the following motions, as approved by The Curriculum Committee on April X, 2000:

●● Speaking for the Academic Planning Committee, Richard Nunan made the following motion:

April 6, 2000

From the Academic Planning Committee
(for the second session of the April Senate meeting)

Note: This motion was passed in Committee, 4-3, with the Chair voting to break the tie.

Motion:

Publication of Student Course Evaluation Statistics & GPA Section Averages

With two restrictions, the quantifiable data generated each semester by the standard course evaluation form currently distributed to students in the classroom, together with course section GPA averages, and overall student GPAs by course section, shall be made available to the College of Charleston Student Government Association, for purposes of public distribution. The restrictions are:

(1) No GPA data will be made available for course sections containing less than 10 students.
(2) No data of any kind will be made available from any faculty during the first three years of service.

**Rationale:**

Through their SGA representatives, CofC students have expressed a strong wish that such information be made available to them, so that they might make more informed choices about which classes to take. Since our students are, in effect, customers paying for a service, they are arguably morally entitled to readily available information about the nature of the product being offered. Moreover, there are obvious benefits to be had, both for students and faculty, by disseminating a broad spectrum of student opinion on instructor performance. This practice might eventually supplant, or at least ameliorate, reliance on anecdotal gossip (of both malcontents and fervent disciples), which currently fuels many registration decisions.

The first restriction is motivated out of concern to protect the privacy of individual students in classes small enough to make informed guesses about individual GPAs. The second restriction is motivated out of concern to alleviate the additional pressure this initiative might impose on very junior faculty, who are already subject to severe scrutiny with respect to their initial renewal and ultimate tenure decision (or promotion to Senior Instructor).

●●●●Reports: The speaker, on the strategic planning initiative

●●●● Constituents’ Concerns

save for correction , changing “moving exp of to cands” to “summer research and development grants”

It was remarked that classroom space is now a problem at the College -- a worse problem, really, than faculty office space, because it is affecting our students. Lynne Cherry noted that appropriate classroom space is the real issue. Lee Drago insisted that the College needs to provide more money for moving expenses offered to candidates; $2000 was simply not enough, and we were losing desirable new faculty to other institutions who offered more competitive incentives. Deanna Caveny concurred, saying $5,000 would be a much more realistic figure.

**Adjournment**

With no further business, the meeting adjourned *sine die* at:
Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary

*******

Fall 2000 meetings:
April 4, 2000 (First Session)

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The First Session of the eighth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 4, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (March 14, 2000) were approved, with two corrections. First, President Sanders had pointed out that two (small but important!) words should be added to his remarks, found at the end of the second full paragraph on p. 2, about finding additional faculty office space:

The new Addlestone Library will permit some [insert: of the] 73,000 sq. ft. in the old library to be used for offices, with probably more opening up in the Bell Building later on. Perhaps we would be able to lease the old Charleston County Library building on Marion Square, or even the Marion Square Building itself, to use for additional office space.

Second, Deanna Caveny noted that in the discussion of Constituents’ Concerns on p. 8, Lee Drago’s comments, and her own, about difficulties in recruiting able faculty referred to obtaining larger summer research grants, not reimbursements for moving expenses; Mr. Drago confirmed this. The corrected section should read:

Lee Drago insisted that the College needs to provide more money for [delete: moving expenses; insert: summer research and development grants] offered to candidates; $2000 was simply not enough, and we were losing desirable new faculty to other institutions who offered more competitive incentives. Deanna Caveny concurred, saying $5,000 would be a much more realistic figure.

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett referred to the draft report from The College of Charleston Long-Range Planning Coordinating Committee, dated March 30, 2000, and suggested that individual senators should think about it and discuss it, and also report back to their departments and ask for comments and feedback at the departmental level. Eventually there should be some sort of discussion in the Senate itself, or perhaps even a faculty forum. The Board of Trustees would receive the document in July and probably act on it (though this is not certain) at their October
meeting next semester. In any case, it is essential, she thought, that the faculty have some input before then. Robert Mignone asked what actions the Board is likely to take with regard to the document. The Speaker said she thought they would probably endorse (or modify) it, and perhaps rewrite the “Mission Statement” of the College in accordance with its recommendations. In other words, the Board was likely, she presumed, to take a fairly “hands-off” approach: this made the faculty’s response, in the form of comments and suggestions, all the more important.

The Faculty Welfare Committee

Victor Puleo, acting for Martin Jones, gave the Welfare Committee’s report on the subject of “Peer Evaluation of Teaching” and “Teaching Portfolios.” He said the Committee had carefully solicited responses from all the department chairs, and a large majority were evidently against imposing any mandatory requirements for the use of either device. Only about 10% had been in favor. There were minor differences in the way the chairs reached their conclusions, but the majority simply asked their departments what they thought. Accordingly, the Committee recommended that these procedures remain strictly voluntary, as they are now.

New Business

Tom Kunkle, for the Committee on Nominations and Elections, put forward the following slate for Senate Committees; one nominee for the Academic Planning Committee (Stephanie Mignone, Classics and German) had withdrawn and been replaced as a nominee by Paige Wisotzka (French).

Academic Planning Committee [7]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>(Senator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robin Bowers</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Heldrich</td>
<td>Chem. &amp; Biochem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Jones</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd McNerney</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Nunan</td>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Rel. Stud.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Sessoms</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paige Wisotzka</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee on the By-Laws & Faculty/Administration Manual [3]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>(Senator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Deavor</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kem Fronabarger</td>
<td>Geology Assoc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Kinard</td>
<td>Chem. &amp; Biochem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget Committee [7]

Charles Beam  Chem. & Biochem.  (Senator)
Beverly Diamond  Mathematics  (Senator)
Charles Kaiser  Psychology
Tom Langley  Physical Education  (Senator)
Robert Mignone  Mathematics
Scott Peeples  English  (Senator)
Michael Phillips  Library

This slate was elected. Nominations were then accepted for next year’s Committee on Nominations and Elections:

Terence Bowers  English
Linda Fitzharris  EDEE
Annette Godow  PEHD
Linda Jones  Physics
Anna Krauth  French
Tom Kunkle  Mathematics
Robert Mignone  Mathematics

[Secretary’s note: Rather than merely having their names placed in nomination, these candidates were at once declared elected, a mistake detected soon after the meeting. They were actually elected by the full faculty, as required by the By-Laws, at the April Faculty Meeting. It’s not a perfect world.]

● ● Clyde Metz then made four motions, as approved by The Curriculum Committee at its meeting on Tuesday, March 14, 2000. Three of these passed, and one, a proposed change in Honors 490, was sent back to the committee for further study:

1. S00014a  LTSP 254  New Course: Society, History, and Culture in Spanish American Literature (3 hrs.)
2. S00018a  HONS 490  Course Change  [remanded to committee]
3. S00024  Fine Arts  Minor Deletion
4. S00025  PHIL 325  Course Change

The following items were presented for information only:

5. S00026  PHIL 298  Special Topics–FYI
6. S00027  PHIL 298  Special Topics–FYI
7. S00028  PHIL 298  Special Topics–FYI
8. S00029  RELS 375  Special Topics–FYI
During the discussion, Larry Carlson said that he opposed approving the “change” in Honors 490 (Senior Honors Seminar) from 3 to 1 credit hour because the course itself had not been given for fifteen years, which meant that it should no longer be “on the books” at all; it was really a new course that we were being asked to approve, but without adequate information. John Newell, the Director of the Honors Program, disagreed, saying that the “two-year rule” is not evenly enforced across the board, and that the reason for offering the course again was that the Honors Program finds a great deal of variation in the kind of support that seniors receive when doing senior-level research. The History Department, he added parenthetically, had also found it necessary to change to a seminar format, in order to provide such support.

Mr. Carlson countered by saying that Honors 490 would simply duplicate what the English Department (for example) and other departments already do. Caroline Hunt agreed, saying that a question of academic freedom might even be involved because of the potential conflict between departments; in addition, she would like to see an actual syllabus before approving what was in essence a new course. Mr. Newell pointed out that it was not a required course, and would be entirely voluntary. Lynn Cherry agreed with Larry Carlson and Caroline Hunt, saying that she saw no merit in the course; in addition, it appeared to have no structure. Mr. Carlson then proposed returning it to the Curriculum Committee and requesting a complete past history of the course: when it was (and was not) given, and what had actually been its content. On a voice vote, the proposal was remanded to committee.

Speaking for the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs, Gary Harrison proposed four new graduate courses, which were approved:

- SMFT 537  Topics in Botany for Teachers (4 hrs.)
- CSCI 620  Foundations of Software Engineering (3)
- CSCI 640  Distributed Computer Systems Architecture (3)
- CSCI 690  Special Topics in Computing (3)

Two PROPOSALS TO CHANGE THE BY-LAWS were put forward and sent (without vote) to the By-Laws Committee:

1. From Stephanie Low and the Computer Science Department, a motion:

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

   Composition:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rationale:

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

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

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

The composition and duties of this proposed committee were adapted from the Faculty By-Laws, Article V, Section 3, B, 4. Committee on the Library (p. 45-46). The issues addressed by the proposed committee are also addressed by the Faculty Welfare, Academic Standards, and Curriculum committees. However, the proposed committee would focus on the use of technology as it relates to academic standards, curriculum, and faculty welfare, and advise the Faculty Senate from that perspective.

Stephanie Low began the discussion by saying the proposal was modeled on the description in the By-Laws of the Library Committee. The big question was, of course, what is “educational technology”? She thought of it as the use of technology to assist the learning process, or to manage and deliver learning resources. “Information technology” is something else, and refers more narrowly to the use of computer systems (“information systems”). She and her department believe that it is important for a Standing Committee of the Faculty to have a say in the acquisition and management of educational technology, as broadly defined, in the years ahead.

Deanna Caveny agreed, but noted that much of this technology is, and would continue to be, very expensive; she therefore moved as a friendly amendment that the third paragraph describing the duties of this proposed committee include the word, “appropriate”: the committee should
receive suggestions “which may aid in the appropriate use of educational technology,” etc. This was accepted.

Hugh Wilder then asked that the By-Laws Committee consider very carefully the membership of this committee – for example, there should surely be some input from those concerned with the Student Information System (SIS). He was worried, however, about the possible additional fragmentation resulting from yet another group being involved with “technology.” Kem Fronabarger pointed out that “educational technology” includes much besides computers. Stephanie Low agreed, saying it would include, for example, anything done in a laboratory. Would technology in the area of the Fine Arts be included, Mr. Fronabarger wondered? Perhaps, was the answer. Lynn Cherry added that the concept should include the cameras and VCR’s and playback equipment used extensively by Communication students. Caroline Hunt entered an additional plea to look closely at the composition of the proposed committee: she would like to see fewer Deans on it, and to consider the idea of perhaps adding a student.

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

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

   Rationale

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

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

   Larry Carlson wondered how this proposal would mesh with the work of the Curriculum Committee. Mr. Nunan said that as things now stand, the Curriculum Committee oversees short-term elements of the General Education program, including individual courses, but no one seems to be in charge of the long-range aspects – which is why he would like to see such long-range oversight assigned to the Academic Planning Committee.

   The Speaker said both proposed changes in the By-Laws would be forwarded to the By-Laws Committee.
   Richard Nunan then put forward the following motion, explaining that he was simply introducing it at the request of the SGA so that it could be discussed and voted on:
On behalf of the Student Government Association of the College of Charleston, I move that, starting with the graduating class of May, 2001, students’ majors shall, at their option, be printed on their diplomas.

Rationale:

March 22, 2000

To: Members of the Faculty Senate

From: Kelly Lindsay
Chairperson, Academic Affairs Committee
Student Government Association

The Academic Affairs Committee of the Student Government Association (SGA) proposes a change to the current diploma format. This change would allow students’ majors to be printed on their diplomas, in addition to the current designation of the student’s overall degree. For many years, graduating seniors have been disappointed to find no indication of majors on their diplomas. In response to numerous complaints lodged by these students to the Registrar’s Office and SGA, we urge the Faculty Senate to approve this change.

Campus-Wide Support

Since the beginning of the 1999-2000 school year, SGA members have conducted a series of opinion polls regarding the inclusion of students’ majors on their diplomas. SGA members contacted faculty members, current students, and alumni to gauge their support of this initiative. The survey results reveal widespread support in favor of printing students’ majors on their diplomas among every group polled.

Fifty-nine percent of the faculty responses (91 total) are strongly in favor of the change. Twenty percent are neutral on the issue, and the remaining twenty-one percent are opposed to the change.

Ninety-five percent of the current student body surveyed (1092 total responses) support having students’ majors printed on their diplomas. One percent is neutral, and four percent oppose the change.

Among the 500 members of the Young Alumni surveyed, we received 65 responses. Of those replies, eighty-five percent support the change, and fifteen percent oppose it.

Although the number of faculty and alumni responses does not constitute a large sample, we do believe that these figures accurately represent the prevailing sentiment of each group.

Liberal Arts Education

One of the most frequently heard criticisms of this proposed change has been that printing students’ majors on their diplomas detracts from the liberal arts mission of the College of Charleston. We recognize and support the strong liberal arts curriculum that the College provides its students. However, our students also closely identify themselves with their chosen major. Students’ commitment to a certain specialization should be recognized on their diplomas, in addition to the overall degree that they earned.

Costs

The Registrar’s Office estimates the direct cost of implementing this change to increase the cost of printing diplomas by less than a dollar. The indirect cost of this change will require the addition of one temporary FTE employee to the staff of the Registrar’s Office. To offset the new staffing costs, SGA proposes a five dollar increase in the graduation fee. The current graduation fee of $25 has not been increased in over twenty years; therefore, we believe the increase does not present an unfair rise in student fees. This fee will generate approximately $10,000 each year.

A phone survey of 208 graduating seniors found that ninety percent of those surveyed would have been willing to pay the increased fee to see this change take place. We believe, and students agree, that this proposal is made at the request of the students and that any costs associated with the change should be shouldered by the students. We are not asking for the funds needed to fulfill this request be allocated from the existing budget, but raised through an increase in graduation fees.
Implementation

We propose that this change be implemented on the diplomas distributed to the graduating class of May, 2001. Under this change, students’ majors will be designated on their diplomas under the current distinction of Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree. The diploma will list the student as graduating with a Bachelor of Arts or Science in whatever major(s) he/she completed. No minors will be included.

Having each student’s major printed on his/her diploma will become the norm, while students will also have the option of having it excluded from their diplomas. This choice will be noted on the student’s Application for Graduation, which is submitted to the Registrar’s Office in order to begin the graduation review process for each senior. The difference will not be noticeable due to the large amount of white space already included on the College’s official diploma design.

In conclusion, the Student Government Association urges the Faculty Senate to approve this change to the current diploma format. Our research demonstrates the strong support behind this change by the faculty, current student body, and alumni. The administration has also worked with us to ensure that any additional costs will be covered by the generation of new revenues. We hope that you will consider and grant our request.

Courtney Hunter was then recognized to speak for the Student Government Association in support of the motion, which, she assured the Senate, had very wide-spread support throughout the student body. George Pothering wondered where the cost-estimates had come from; he thought they were rather high. The answer was, from the Registrar’s Office. Lee Drago asked what percentage of students were actually in favor of the idea; the answer was, about 90%. Phil Dustan noted that ten years from now, most students would be in a different occupation from the one in which they started out; had the SGA considered this? Courtney Hunter said this had been taken into account. Mr. Dustan also noted that there were so many different varieties and sub-specialties in Biology, for example, that it might be difficult to put a student’s real major on the diploma (would “microbiology” or “molecular biology,” for example, be specified? The answer was, that student’s wanted only their major in general terms on the diploma (i.e., just “Biology” would do).

Paige Wisotzka opposed the proposal, saying that she, too, was worried about what would happen ten years down the road.; she thought merely listing Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree was preferable. George Pothering pointed out that you cannot get a degree without picking a major, so he was now in favor of the motion. John Huddlestun supported it, too, though he was curious about what objections the students themselves might have raised. Robert Mignone referred to one of the arguments against the idea which had come up last year, to the effect that Europeans, who had a different educational system, might misconstrue the meaning of our degrees. “So what?” he said; he found European degrees incomprehensible anyway. Courtney Hunter insisted that students do not want to conceal their majors; they are proud of them, and want their diplomas to reflect their real achievements. Dinesh Sarvate asked if there were any data on how many students would like to have their ‘minors’ listed also. The answer was no, that would be too complicated, and had not been contemplated. When the question was called, the motion passed, on a voice vote.

Robert Mignone, speaking for the Post-Tenure Review Committee, made the following four motions regarding the issues remanded to them by the Senate at its February 2000 meeting. These recommendations were contained in a letter to the Speaker dated March 23, 2000, and included in the Senators’ packet for the April Meeting.
In brief, this is what took place: at the first session of the April meeting (April 4), the first two motions were accepted, and the third remanded to the Post-Tenure Review Committee for further study. The fourth motion remained on the table at the close of the meeting, with no action being taken. [Secretary’s note: the fourth motion was taken up and passed, at the second session on April 18; for the text, please see p. 11, below.]

1. **Recommendation:** By a majority vote of those present, the Post-Tenure Review Committee recommends against Richard Nunan’s proposal to revise implementation of post-tenure review. [passed]

   **Rationale:** Eliminating the language governing the standard for a superior rating would imply that less than ‘exemplary’ teaching and less than ‘continuing quality scholarship’ and less than ‘leadership in service’ qualifies for a rating of ‘superior’.

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

2. **Recommendation:** By a majority vote of those present, the Post-Tenure Review Committee recommends against John Newell’s substitute proposal to Richard Nunan’s proposal (above). [passed]

   **Rationale:** A majority of the Post-Tenure Review Committee considered the performance suggested by the proposal did not warrant a superior rating.

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

3. **Recommendation:** By a unanimous vote of those present, the Post-Tenure Review Committee recommends that the post-tenure review policy regarding departmental panels reviewing a chair’s post-tenure review packet not be changed. [remanded]

   **Rationale:** Departmental colleagues (in the form of a panel) are appropriate peers for reviewing the teaching, research, and service of a chair.

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

4. **Recommendation:** [To repeat: the fourth motion, put forward on April 4, was not acted upon, but remained on the table at the conclusion of the first session. It was taken up at the second session on April 18, and passed. For the text, please see p. 11, below.]
During the discussion of the first motion, Mr. Mignone read a rebuttal of the Committee’s decision from Richard Nunan. William Moore then asked to know what the results had been during the year – how many faculty members had applied to the Post-Tenure Review Committee for a Superior rating, and how many had actually received it? Mr. Mignone said he thought it would be unwise to reveal these statistics unless the Senate voted to require him to do so. The Senate so voted, and the information was divulged. Fifteen Senators had applied for a Superior rating; one had been turned down. A question was raised about the Committee’s vote on the first two motions, which were reported as “a majority”: had it in fact been unanimous, or was there some disagreement among the members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee about the merits of Mr. Nunan’s proposal, and John Newell’s substitute proposal. Mr. Mignone said that one person had voted against the first recommendation, and two against the second, and so the term “majority” was not simply a technical formula but represented what took place. In the event, the first two recommendations were accepted, on separate voice votes.

After some further discussion, the senate decided not to accept the third recommendation, which called for turning down Faye Steuer’s motion concerning an evaluation panel of department members evaluating a department chair currently undergoing post-tenure review. Caroline Hunt said there would be problems in making this motion retroactive, and David Mann foresaw serious problems involving conflict of interest in requiring faculty to evaluate the very person who would be evaluating them. In the event, David Gentry moved to remand the motion to the Post-Tenure Review Committee for further consideration, and the Senate concurred.

Constituents’ Concerns and Adjournment

Since it was almost 7:00 p.m. the Speaker said that she would entertain a motion to adjourn the meeting until April 18, with business remaining on the table to be taken up at a second session. After two brief announcements, and without objection, it was so ordered.

************
April 18, 2000 (Second Session)

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The Second Session of the eighth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 18 in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Forty-nine senators attended. The first item of business was to take up the fourth recommendation of the Post-Tenure Review Committee, moved at the first session (April 4) but not acted upon when the session closed. Accordingly, the Speaker again recognized Robert Mignone, who continued his presentation. This motion passed, with no further discussion:

New Business (cont.)

4. The Post-Tenure Review Committee makes the following motion:

Change Current Wording:

From: The department chair (or 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.

To: The department chair (or departmental panel) will forward the candidate’s packet with either a brief letter of 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 third Monday in December. At this time a copy of the letter will be forwarded to the candidate. The candidate may forward a letter of rebuttal due no later than five days before the First day of the beginning of the Spring Semester. The 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.

Rationale:

(1) The Senate approved changing the date of transferal to the dean from the First Monday in December, to the Third Monday in December, at least for the current year. (2) The chair’s (or departmental panel’s) letter currently may serve as a ‘colleague’ letter without the perspective of all colleague letters. The Post-Tenure Review Committee feels that the chair’s (or departmental panel’s) letter should also serve as a summary of annual evaluations, and should be made available to the candidate, with an opportunity for the candidate to respond and have this response a part of the packet.
Clyde Metz then proposed the following motions, as approved by The Curriculum Committee on April 6, 2000. To summarize the results: the Senate passed new courses in Music (MUSC 346), Mathematics (305, 246), Classics (103, 101, 102, 270, 301, 302, 303, 401), and Latin American & Caribbean Studies (256). Four proposals for new Communication courses (221, 222, 320, 231) were remanded to committee. Twelve additional motions about changes in Classics, including a new Minor, were passed (with one correction) as circulated, and seven Special Topics courses (in English, History, and Arts Management) presented for information.

1. S00016 MUSC 346 NEW COURSE: Jazz Theory (3 hrs.)
2. S99-25a MATH 305 NEW COURSE: Elementary Number Theory (3)
3. S99-26a MATH 246 NEW COURSE: Mathematical Computing and Programming Laboratory (1)
4. S00036 CLAS 124 Course Deletion
5. S00037 CLAS 158 Course Deletion
6. S00038 CLAS 153 Course Change
7. S00039 CLAS 154 Course Change
8. S00040 CLAS 155 Course Change
9. S00041 CLAS 156 Course Change
10. S00042 LING 385 Course Change
11. S00043a CLAS 103 NEW COURSE: Classical Mythology (3)
12. S00043b CLAS 190 Course Deletion
13. S00044 CLAS 101 NEW COURSE: Ancient Greek Civilization (3)
14. S00045 CLAS 102 NEW COURSE: Roman Civilization (3)
15. S00046 CLAS 270 NEW COURSE: The Romans in Cinema (3)
16. S00047 CLAS 301 NEW COURSE: Topics in Ancient Greek Literature (3)
17. S00048 CLAS 302 NEW COURSE: Topics in Latin Literature (3)
18. S00049 CLAS 303 NEW COURSE: Topics in Classical Civilization (3)
19. S00050 CLAS 401 NEW COURSE: Research Seminar in Classics (3)
20. S00051 CLAS AB Degree Change
21. S00052 CLAS BA Degree Change
22. S00053 CLAS AB Degree Change [correction: see below]
23. S00054 CLAS Minor New Minor
24. S00063 COMM 221 New Course [remanded]
25. S00064 COMM 222 New Course [remanded]
26. S00065 COMM 320 New Course [remanded]
27. S00066 COMM 231 New Course [remanded]
28. S00073 IntBus Degree Change
29. S00074 LAIB Minor Change
30. S00076 RELS 330 Course Deletion
31. S00077 RELS 350 Course Change
32. S00080 LTSP 256 NEW COURSE: The Magic and the Real: Latin American Literature and Film (3)

The following items were presented for information only:

33. S00032 ENGL 395 Special Topics–FYI
Richard Nunan noticed that Philosophy 220 (History of Ancient Philosophy) had accidentally been left off the list of minimum degree requirements in Humanities, required for the AB degree for non-classics majors, on the second page of item 22 (S00053); this correction was accepted. After a short discussion, John Newell moved to remand the four Communication courses to the Curriculum Committee, and his motion passed.

●●● Speaking for the Academic Planning Committee, Richard Nunan introduced the following for purposes of discussion, noting that his Committee had been divided on the issue, passing it only by a vote of 4-3, with the Chair (Mr. Nunan) casting the tie-breaking vote.

From the Academic Planning Committee: Motion:

Publication of Student Course Evaluation Statistics & GPA Section Averages

With two restrictions, the quantifiable data generated each semester by the standard course evaluation form currently distributed to students in the classroom, together with course section GPA averages, and overall student GPAs by course section, shall be made available to the College of Charleston Student Government Association, for purposes of public distribution. The restrictions are:

(1) No GPA data will be made available for course sections containing less than 10 students.

(2) No data of any kind will be made available from any faculty during the first three years of service.

Rationale:

Through their SGA representatives, CofC students have expressed a strong wish that such information be made available to them, so that they might make more informed choices about which classes to take. Since our students are, in effect, customers paying for a service, they are arguably morally entitled to readily available information about the nature of the product being offered. Moreover, there are obvious benefits to be had, both for students and faculty, by disseminating a broad spectrum of student opinion on instructor performance. This practice might eventually supplant, or at least ameliorate, reliance on anecdotal gossip (of both malcontents and fervent disciples), which currently fuels many registration decisions.

The first restriction is motivated out of concern to protect the privacy of individual students in classes small enough to make informed guesses about individual GPAs. The second restriction is motivated out of concern to alleviate the additional pressure this initiative might impose on very junior faculty, who are already subject to severe scrutiny with respect to their initial renewal and ultimate tenure decision (or promotion to Senior Instructor).
After some discussion, in which opinion seemed to be fairly evenly divided over whether the proposal was a good idea or not, Robert Mignone moved to remand the motion to the Faculty Welfare Committee, with broad instructions to look into the whole question, and specific instructions to consult with representatives of the Student Government Association. He noted that instructing the Welfare Committee to examine the motion in no way implied that the Senate is, at this stage, endorsing the motion itself. Some Senators were opposed to the motion to remand, saying it was clear that most Senators had made up their mind about the basic issue already. Faye Steuer insisted that the Senate instruct the Welfare Committee not to dodge the question by saying that they were too busy. In the event, the motion to remand to the Faculty Welfare Committee was approved, on a voice vote.

Speaker’s Report

Trisha Folds-Bennett then brought up the Preliminary Report of the College of Charleston Long-Range Planning Coordinating Committee, which had been circulated in the form of a draft (Draft # 3, dated March 30, 2000). She announced that there would be two open forums the following week to discuss it, and that what was hoped for was input from several different constituencies, including department chairs, the Senate, and the Faculty in general. Mr. Mignone said that no vote was needed now, but we should take the report very seriously, since future plans might be based upon it. Glenn Lesses wanted to know if the report had a specific author, and the answer was yes: Andy Abrams. Nan Morrison pointed out that, though this was true, Mr. Abrams had incorporated the language of “working reports” written others members of the Coordinating Committee.

Deanna Caveny said that the Mathematics department did not much like the negative attitude toward “research” which the report seemed to reveal, since it suggested, she said, a false dichotomy between “teaching” and “scholarship.” Hugh Wilder called the categorization of different kinds of universities in the report a “caricature,” and suggested that we should be using the standard categories used by the Carnegie Commission, which were not mentioned in the report. Deanna Caveny said the real problem is how the stereotypes in the document will be interpreted by others in the future; in certain fields, the College already outperforms some so-called “research universities” in actual research, even though we are at the bottom of the list in terms of pay, work-load, etc.

Glenn Lesses objected to the way the document emphasizes “collaborative” research with students, saying that in some fields involving students in real academic research is simply not possible. Mr. Mignone said that research was “a hard sell” to outsiders, but that if we emphasize the “collaborative” aspect, that is, if we insist that in many cases research helps our students directly because they are involved, we may benefit in the long run. Phil Jos believed that the faculty itself is polarized on the issue of teaching vs. research.

Constituents’ Concerns
Kem Fronabarger was curious about who was allowed to attend Senate meetings as visitors. James Carew wondered who picks the students who show visitors around the campus, and who coaches them on what to say. He had recently heard one such presentation which made no mention of the College’s intellectual excellence, or its many recent awards, especially in the natural sciences.

Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary

:}
March 14, 2000

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The seventh regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 14 in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty-one senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (February 8, 2000) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett urged senators to answer the call to volunteer for faculty and senate committees, now that the nominating process was under way, and to remind their constituents of how important this service is to the life of the College. She then announced that she had received the following petition:

At its November, 1999, meeting, the Faculty Senate voted 20-17 to REQUIRE all faculty coming up for promotion and tenure to solicit two or more letters from evaluators outside of the College. The outside evaluators must review the candidate's research. The Faculty By-Laws Committee subsequently recommended that external evaluators be left as an option to be decided upon by each candidate and panel chair. This recommendation was rejected in December, 1999, by the Faculty Senate. Unless contradictory action is taken by a body other than the Senate, the new procedure will now be inscribed into the Faculty Manual.

We the undersigned [one-hundred-eleven (111) members of the faculty] request that the Speaker of the Faculty call a special meeting of the Faculty for reviewing and possibly vetoing the Senate action.

Therefore, in accordance with the By-Laws, a Special Called Meeting of the full faculty would be held at 5:30 on Tuesday, March 28 in room 228 of the Lightsey Conference Center, for the purpose of “reviewing and possibly vetoing” the specified Senate action.

The Speaker then welcomed President Sanders, and Andy Abrams, who had been asked to attend in the Provost’s unavoidable absence, for the purpose of addressing the shortage of faculty office space which had been much discussed at the February senate meeting. She thought it would be
helpful to summarize that discussion. The context for raising the campus-wide “space issue” had been the proposal for a new Master’s Program in Computer and Information Sciences, which seemed to make provision for new offices for graduate students in the program, at a time when some regular full-time faculty do not have adequate offices of their own.

President Sanders

The President began by saying that he recognized our space problem from his own experience. Adequate space of every kind (and not merely office space) is, and has been historically, a perpetual problem for the College of Charleston, for the obvious reason of our geographical location in the midst of a surrounding city, itself located on a peninsula. Five years ago, one of his goals had been to make sure that every roster faculty member had a private office, and that all full-time adjuncts would have at least an office to share, with part-time adjuncts having at least a “work-station” for meeting with their students and carrying out their duties. Success in attaining this goal ebbs and flows, as additional space becomes available and as the number of additional faculty needing such space increases, each in turn; right now we are at something of a low point, because the needs of new faculty have temporarily outstripped the additional space needed. In reference, however, to the provision for offices for graduate students, he noted that just because a request had been put into a proposal did not mean that it would happen: clearly, graduate students would have to “give” on this issue before the faculty, if there were unmet needs for offices.

There was, the President reported, some good news. When he arrived, the campus of the College occupied 185,000 square feet of space. In the last five years alone we have added an additional 185,000 square feet, including the Bishop England buildings, the Bell South building, and a number of miscellaneous acquisitions. In this same period, while the student body has increased by 10%, the faculty has grown by 21% (which is of course how it should be). In this five-year period we have added 77 new roster faculty, and 100 faculty offices (and the new offices in the Bell Building are not included in this figure). And we are now negotiating for the old Arcade building on Liberty Street, which would add a substantial increment to our existing square footage. The new Addlestone Library will permit some 73,000 sq. ft. in the old library to be used for offices, with probably more opening up in the Bell Building later on. Perhaps we would be able to lease the old Charleston County Library building on Marion Square, or even the Marion Square Building itself, to use for additional office space.
In the meantime, President Sanders said, he has come to the conclusion that the existing process for allocating campus space is much too elaborate – a kind of “musical chairs,” as departments and administrative divisions move from one location to another – and it has grown in complexity over the past five years. He has decided, therefore, to bring in a top-notch professional architectural firm to do a comprehensive study of our space needs. By law, this may have to be put out to competitive bidding, if it costs more than a certain amount; we are not sure yet. (The firm he is consulting about this is Stevenson & Wilkins.) But in any case, the faculty will be intimately involved in the planning process, and he expected that really experienced professionals, who do space planning projects for all kinds of businesses, institutions, and agencies, should be able to help us with our problems in ways that we might not be able to discover on our own. The President then asked if there were any questions.

Lee Drago mentioned that the historically important Brown Fellowship Society, a Free Black Burial Society in earlier times, was once located on or near the site where the new Library will be constructed. He wondered if some kind of a monument or plaque could be provided, perhaps in the Library itself, to commemorate the earliest free black burial ground in the nation. Mr. Sanders thought this would be a good idea, and noted that the College has insurance to indemnify us against extra costs if the actual building site should, in fact, turn out to be a graveyard. He would like to see a plan for such a memorial. Deanna Caveny commented that she was having trouble with multiple campus meetings being scheduled for the same time. She suggested assigning one “dead hour” for faculty use, and another for the campus as a whole. Mr. Sanders thought this would be complicated enough to ask the space-planning experts to look into. David Gentry asked if there are national standards for the amount of campus space per student. The President said there were no national standards for this that he was aware of, but there was a national norm, and we are nowhere near it. On another matter, Mr. Sanders concluded by saying that he hoped the Senate would at least listen respectfully to a request the Student Government was planning to make in the near future, about getting their majors printed on their diplomas; many had worked hard on preparing a careful proposal, and would understandably be hurt if it were dismissed out of hand.

**Old Business**

Robert Mignone reported that the Senate Budget Committee, as instructed at the February senate meeting, had reviewed the proposal for a new Master’s program in Computer and Information Sciences, and found everything in order. The Committee had suggested two minor corrections. These concern a $2000 increase, from $26,000 to $28,000, in the table of costs for “Facilities (technology)” on p. 21, and the omission of the corresponding description on p. 22:

**Facilities**

The software engineering specialization courses start in year two. Computer Aided Software Engineering tools (software) will be purchased in year two. The lower cost in subsequent years is to maintain the upgrades to the original purchase.
Mr. Mignone also commented on the results of his survey of the faculty on the question of reopening the issue of General Education at the College. Some 210 survey forms had been returned and counted, with 15 more being disqualified as anonymous. The responses to the various questions were as follows:
1. Do you think the College of Charleston’s General Education Curriculum requirement should be changed? Yes: 99 (+ 9 anonymous) = 108 No: 88 + 6 = 94

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

– Begin with a critical reappraisal of the current requirements: 81 + 8 = 89
– Begin with a critical reappraisal of the April 1999 General Education Proposal: 80 + 5 = 85

3. If you have any other comments or observations on this issue, please add them in the space provided. [To be summarized in a later report].

These results, Mr. Mignone said, were so nearly a “wash” that it was now abundantly clear that no mandate exists for major changes in the General Education Program at the College of Charleston. This, he said, confirms the Faculty’s veto of the Gen. Ed. proposal last spring. He felt relieved, because some faculty had expressed concern about the circumstances and procedures of the meeting at which the Senate’s action had been overturned, wondering whether that vote, which had also been very close, had really been an accurate reflection of the will of the faculty.

New Business

● Clyde Metz introduced a series of proposals approved by the Curriculum Committee on February 8, 2000. These passed with no changes, and may be summarized as follows:

1. S00011 PEHD 210 New Course: Concepts in Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription (3 hrs.)
2. S00012 PEHD 209 Course Deletion
3. S00015 PSYC 388 New Course: Psychology of Substance Abuse (3)
4. S00017 HONS Degree Change
5. S00019 HONS Degree Change
6. S00022 MUSC Minor Change
7. S00023 HONS 170 New Course: Honors Introduction to Philosophy (3)

For information:

8. S00020 POLS 379 Special Topics

●● Speaking for the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs, Gary Harrison proposed a change in a course in Hispanic Studies–Bilingual Legal Interpreting:

   INTR 725: Internship in Legal Interpreting

This, too, was approved as circulated. [Sec.’s note: this was mistakenly listed as a “New Course” in the “Highlights” sent out the day after the March meeting. It is only a course change.]
A proposal from the Academic Standards Committee reinstating in the 2000-2001 Undergraduate Catalogue a category of yearly honors, to be called “The College of Charleston Dean’s List,” was passed unanimously, and is here entered into the record:

Interoffice Memorandum

To: Robyn Holman, Chair, Faculty Committee on Academic Standards
CC: Conrad Festa, Provost
From: William A. Lindstrom, Dean
     Sandra M. Powers, Dean
Date: November 4, 1999.
Subject: Yearly Honors

Under the rules of the 1999-2000 Undergraduate Catalog there are 2 types of academic honors accorded our students. The catalog descriptions are:

I. Graduation with Honors

Students who earn a grade point average of 3.950 to 4.000 will graduate summa cum laude. Students who earn a grade point average of 3.800 to 3.949 will graduate magna cum laude. Students who earn a grade point average of 3.600 to 3.799 will graduate cum laude. To be eligible for graduation with honors, at least 62 hours of the course work to be applied to the degree must have been completed at the College of Charleston. For the purpose of calculating GPA for graduation with honors, all course work taken at the College of Charleston will be included in that calculation.

II. Faculty Honors List

After the end of each semester, the Office of the President publishes the Faculty Honors List. Students are named to this list who are enrolled in and complete at least 14 semester hours and who earned a GPA of 3.80 (Highly Distinguished) or 3.60 (Distinguished). In neither case may there be a grade lower than C, nor an I (Incomplete).

In 1991 when the College was switching to the SIS software system, we were informed that a third type of honor, Yearly Class Honors, could not be covered by the SIS system. The description in the 1991 Undergraduate Bulletin was:

Yearly Class Honors

Class honors are awarded to students who have earned GPAs of 3.6 for the year. To be eligible for yearly class honors, students must have been enrolled at the College of Charleston for at least 15 semester hours each semester of the year. Students who enter the College in the second semester are consequently ineligible for yearly class honors for that year. During this time period since 1991, this third category has not been included in the Undergraduate Catalog. In Undergraduate Studies we have continued to process a similar but
more prestigious award by hand, recognizing those students who attain Highly Distinguished faculty honors for both semesters of an academic year. The “yearly honors” under these qualifications are now integrated into the SIS system, and we wish to reinstate such an honors status in the 2000-2001 Undergraduate Catalog.

In the reinstitution we recommend that we rename the once a year honors the **College of Charleston Dean’s List**. “Yearly Honors” is descriptive, but it also sounds generic. Most college and universities have a “Dean’s List.” Each year for more than 10 years, we have seen that these students receive greater recognition by providing their names to the National Dean’s List, a publication made available to students and other interested parties. The publication is very well done, and the students are not continually harassed to buy a copy. We have not in over 10 years had one complaint about the publication, but we have received numerous words of appreciation for inclusion.

I. We propose that the third level of academic honors, a once a year recognition in spring, be reinstated in the 2000-2001 Undergraduate Catalog:

**College of Charleston Dean’s List.**

The honor of inclusion on the College of Charleston Dean’s List is awarded to students who have earned Highly Distinguished Faculty Honors for both the fall and the spring semester of the academic year. Students who enter the College in the second semester are consequently ineligible for yearly class honors for that academic year.

With that change, the cycle of honors will again be complete:

- Each semester:
  - **Distinguished Faculty Honors** – letter from the President, letter from Deans of Undergraduate Studies, notification of local newspaper and SC State representative by public relations

  - **Highly Distinguished Faculty Honors** – letter from the President, letter from Deans of Undergraduate Studies, notification of local newspaper and SC State representative by public relations

  - **Graduation honors** – cum laude, magna cum laude, summa cum laude – medallion and sticker for diploma

- Each Spring:
  - **College of Charleston Dean’s List** – Certificate from Undergraduate Studies, Notification to National Dean’s List for chance to choose publication.

II. We also propose that the statement regarding grades of C and I be amended to read:

“*In neither case may there be a grade lower than C.*”
The rationale is that the grades of “I” are awarded at the faculty members discretion and in almost all circumstances for reasons beyond the student’s control. In Undergraduate Studies, we will take care of the necessary delay in awarding the honors.

●●●● – Three Resolutions, sponsored by Hugh Wilder and Robert Mignone, were presented and discussed. A friendly amendment from David Mann, to substitute “shall” for “should” throughout, was accepted. Richard Nunan proposed to amend the second resolution by extending the provision for private office space to regular faculty, visiting faculty, and full-time adjuncts. Caroline Hunt objected that this made the resolution unwieldy, and this amendment failed, on a voice vote. In the event, these resolutions, as amended, passed unanimously:

Faculty Office Space

Recognizing both the importance of appropriate office space for College faculty as well as current limits on available office space on campus, the Senate resolves that:

1. Renewed emphasis shall be placed on campus planning (both long-range and short-term), including the allocation of office space to faculty members. Faculty shall be involved and consulted in the planning process, and decisions shall be made in a timely way (e.g., to allow for new faculty to occupy and use their offices on August 15 each year).

2. The provision of appropriate office space for faculty shall be given a high priority in campus planning. Specifically, the goal shall be to provide a private office to each full-time faculty member at the College.

3. The methods and priorities used in assigning campus space, including faculty office space, shall be applied uniformly and equitably across schools and programs.

Constituents’ Concerns
It was remarked that classroom space is now a problem at the College -- a worse problem, really, than faculty office space, because it is affecting our students. Lynne Cherry noted that *appropriate* classroom space is the real issue. Lee Drago insisted that the College needs to provide more money for moving expenses offered to candidates; $2000 was simply not enough, and we were losing desirable new faculty to other institutions who offered more competitive incentives. Deanna Caveny concurred, saying $5,000 would be a much more realistic figure.

**Adjournment**

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about ten past six.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary

*******

Remaining Spring Senate Meeting:
April 4 (second session April 18, if needed)

*SPECIAL CALLED FACULTY MEETING:*
Tuesday, March 28,
Room 228, Lightsey Conference Center
5:30 p.m.

Regular Spring Faculty Meeting:
Monday, April 24 (5:00 p.m., Physicians’ Auditorium)
February 8, 2000

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The sixth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 8 in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Forty-eight senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (January 18, 2000) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett reminded senators that individual departments should discuss and make recommendations about “Peer Observation and Evaluation of Teaching,” and that all eligible faculty should voice their opinions on reopening the discussion of General Education, by returning the questionnaire sent out, with the senate’s approval, by Robert Mignone.

New Business

Clyde Metz introduced a series of proposals approved by the Curriculum Committee on January 13, 2000:

1. F99003a  MUSC 232  New Course: A History of Popular Music in the United States (3hrs.)
2. S00001  COMM  BA Degree Change
3. S00002  COMM 382  Course Change
4. S00003  COMM 383  Course Change
5. S00004  COMM 384  Course Change
6. S00005  COMM 387  Course Change
7. S00006  POLS 331  New Course: The Politics of Film and Reality in South Africa (3)
8. S00007  POLS 332  New Course: The Politics of Film and Reality in Latin America (3)
9. S00008  POLS 327  Course Deletion
10. S00009  POLS 343  Course Deletion
11. S00013  LTSP 252  New Course: Contemporary Latin American Literature in Translation (3)
Rob Dillon objected that the proposed new course on the history of popular music in the U. S. was too “sociological” and, in effect, not scholarly enough; it was defended by David Maves, Franklin Ashley, and William Moore. Richard Nunan asked a question about the proposed change in degree requirements in Communication. In the event, all eleven motions passed as circulated, on a voice vote.

Speaking for the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs, Gary Harrison proposed a new graduate program, “Master of Science in Computer and Information Sciences,” to be given jointly by the College of Charleston and The Citadel. Robert Mignone raised a serious point of order: according to a change made in the By-Laws last year, all such new programs must be scrutinized and approved by the Senate Budget Committee. The Committee had only just realized this, and had not had a chance to review the program. Mr. Mignone had been able to speak with members of the Budget Committee, and most thought it would be permissible to go forward with the proposal, even though they had not yet studied it, since there was an obvious element of time pressure involved, and the mistake was an entirely innocent one, which would not be repeated. Nevertheless, Mr. Mignone said, to proceed to a vote on the Master’s program before it had been run past the Budget Committee was technically a violation of the Faculty By-Laws, a fact of which everyone should be aware.

The Speaker, in her capacity as chair of the meeting, formally ruled that the Senate could proceed to a consideration of the program, without the Budget Committee’s prior approval, but she stressed that the lapse in procedure must not occur again. Hugh Haynsworth, Dean of Graduate Studies, assured the senate that everyone involved, including the Graduate Committee, had certainly acted in good faith. The problem had simply not been noticed until Mr. Mignone spotted it just a couple of days ago. For this reason, he urged the Senate to pass the new Master’s program without delay, since time was a factor, and the oversight would certainly not be repeated. Trisha Folds-Bennett added that there had been an oversight on everyone’s part.
James Carew wanted to make a friendly amendment that the ruling of the chair be contingent on the Budget Committee’s subsequent approval of the program; George Pothering, the Parliamentarian, said such a motion was not, directly and in itself, feasible under “Robert’s Rules,” but that a motion to challenge the ruling of the chair would be in order. Glenn Lesses so moved, and his motion was seconded by several senators simultaneously. Richard Nunan enquired what would happen if we did, in fact, overrule the chair. Mr. Haynsworth responded that if the Senate delayed consideration of the Master’s program by even one month, it might conceivably lead to a whole semester’s delay in implementing the program itself, by moving the target date for approval by the CHE in November much further ahead. Robert Mignone promised that the Budget Committee would look at the proposal right away, and he thought negative reactions were very unlikely. (Actually, he added, it was not that a member of the Committee had voted against the proposal, when he polled the members by telephone, but that this person had simply decided to abstain because she had not seen the document.) George Pothering noted that, technically, the vote on the ruling of the chair had to be to sustain, rather than to challenge. In the event, the ruling of the chair was sustained, on a voice vote.

Discussion proceeded to the main motion, the Master’s proposal itself. William Moore pointed out a small anomaly in the table on p. 21: the second entry, estimated “Faculty salaries,” is flagged with footnote no. 7, but there is no corresponding note at the foot of the page. [Secretary’s note: this means that the footnote numbering on the next page, p. 22, should presumably be corrected from “8” to “7”: see the section on “Sources of New Financing” and the corresponding note at the bottom of the page.] Robert Mignone noted a possible source of confusion in the section on “Organizational Structure” on p. 17, and proposed to replace “Students may apply and enroll for courses at either campus, but not both,” with “Students may apply and enroll at only one institution, but may take courses at both.” This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Hugh Wilder, referring to information on pp. 9 and 18 of the text, said that he was very concerned that no provision had apparently been made for new office space, despite plans for hiring new faculty and even providing offices for graduate students in the new program. This, he said, would gobble up existing faculty office space, which is woefully inadequate as it is. He was prepared to vote against the whole program for this reason alone. Hugh Haynsworth mentioned the prospect of faculty offices in the new Science Center. Larry McNitt said that he thought there had not been adequate cooperation with the Business Department, especially Accounting, and that he wished the planners of the program had engaged in more discussion with those potentially affected by it. Mr. Mignone countered by saying that he thought this would be an extremely valuable program, in spite of some fears about drawing resources away from our basic undergraduate programs. Glenn Lesses said there was no need to rush to judgement: no reason whatever to pass it now, in its present form, if we think it can be improved, or if there are significant flaws or even whole areas needing revision. Mr. Haynsworth again commented that a delay of two months now would likely mean five months in fact. Phil Dustan also saw a space problem, especially if the Computer Science Department was going to be involved in the new program: the whole issue of space, he said, seems not seem to have been adequately addressed. Larry McNitt saw this involvement as an extension of the existing undergraduate major, and a very important step.
Lee Drago returned to the space issue, saying it was a major and very real problem throughout the campus, which, for many years now, the Administration has simply failed to face up to. We should register our grave concern in no uncertain terms by simply saying no to this new program now. Martin Jones replied that, while space is certainly a problem, we should not chop the Master’s program down as a scapegoat. But, Richard Nunan retorted, the plan calls for offices for graduate students, and we don’t have offices for regular faculty as it is. Tom Heeney commented that several senior Administrators got 10% pay raises; why not take some of that and use it for offices? Maybe we need a new Standing Committee of the Faculty, a Public Spaces Committee. Larry McNitt said that maybe the Budget Committee should concern itself with such issues. Mr. Mignone said, yes, we desperately need a long-term space plan: curiously, he had found that financial information is far easier to come by than space information, when the Administration’s plans for the future of the College are being discussed.

At this point, Phil Dustan moved

To postpone the vote on the Master’s Program in Computer Science for one month, to allow for, 1) a review of the budget by the Senate Budget Committee, and 2), a report from the Administration to address the “space issue” for the proposed program.

Hugh Wilder spoke in favor of this motion, and said that the Provost should specifically and in no uncertain terms address these two issues. Hugh Haynsworth noted that the Provost, Conrad Festa, had specifically reviewed and approved the proposal already, just as it stands. Larry Carlson commented that, while he approved of the basic Master’s Degree proposal, he was also concerned by the space problem, which the English Department, like many other departments, had been facing for many years. Robert Mignone said that the opening of the new Library in a couple of years would be a help; Academic Computing, for example, would relocate there, and that might mean that some faculty offices might open up in the old, vacated facilities. David Gentry was also concerned about the problems of office space; there just wasn’t enough to go around. Phil Dustan wanted to force the Administration to confront the issue. Mr. Mignone repeated that we need a long-range facilities plan.

The Speaker commented that the issue of space was now “on her radar screen” and that she would make it an issue, whatever happened to the Master’s proposal. Lynn Cherry suggested that the Board of Trustees themselves should be made aware of how serious the space problem is, and that we ought to support the motion to postpone the program for a short time, even if the program is a good one. Lee Drago supported the postponement, too. Caroline Hunt disagreed, saying that personal issues and the concerns of individual departments were clouding the matter – and that the issue of space-allocation is much more complex and difficult than the current discussion would seem to indicate: she opposed the motion to postpone. The question being called, Mr. Dustan’s motion to postpone was defeated, on a show of hands, by a vote of 20 in favor, to 25 opposed.
James Carew asked if the vote-tally, the actual number of votes cast for and against the motion to postpone, would be recorded in the Minutes. The answer was, it would, if the Secretary were so instructed. He was, and it is.

Discussion returned to the main issue, the merits of the Master’s proposal itself. James Deavor spoke strongly in its favor, saying it was an excellent and carefully planned program, that would be beneficial to the College and to the whole region. Mr. Carew then moved to amend the motion itself by making the Senate’s approval of it contingent upon subsequent approval by the Budget Committee. Mr. Deavor spoke against this, saying it would put much too much power in the hands of a small committee. Robert Mignone then promised to introduce a motion to rescind (or to reconsider) the program at the next Senate meeting, in the unlikely event the Budget Committee failed to approve it – which he was confident it would. Lynn Cherry opposed the contingency amendment also, saying it would set a bad precedent. Mr. Carew’s amendment failed, on a voice vote.

The question finally being called on the main motion, and the call sustained, the proposal for a Master of Science in Computer and Information Sciences, as corrected and amended, was approved unanimously, on a voice vote. The text is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.

Martin Jones then presented the following request, as previously circulated, in the form of a motion:

As a member of the Faculty Welfare Committee, I request, because of the large amount of work that will be required of the Welfare Committee in their review of the Proposals for Peer Observation and Evaluation of Teaching, that the Senate send the Post-Tenure Review motions, forwarded to the Welfare Committee at the December meeting, to the Post-Tenure Review Committee for their consideration.

This passed, without objection.

Constituents’ Concerns

Hugh Wilder again voiced his concern, and that of his constituents, about the problem of lack of faculty office space at the College. According to his best recollection, President Harry Lightsey had promised that he would see to it that every full-time faculty member had a private office. The ability to concentrate, with a minimum of interruption, is something needed for good teaching, as well as for productive scholarship. For whatever reason, Mr. Wilder said, that policy has obviously been abandoned, and the situation is rapidly getting worse. That the Administration can contemplate giving offices to graduate students in a master’s program, when even some senior faculty have woefully inadequate spaces to work in, is remarkable. The College of Charleston has other needs beside new graduate programs. He hoped that the President and the Provost could be asked to talk with the Senate about the problem.
Robert Mignone said that asking might not be enough. He thought the Senate should back this up with a formal resolution.

**Adjournment**

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about a quarter to seven.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary

*****

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

Spring Faculty Meeting:
(Monday at 5:00 o’clock in Physicians’ Memorial Auditorium)
April 24, 2000
January 18, 2000

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fifth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate (and the first of the Twenty-First Century) convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 18  in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (December 7, 1999) were approved as circulated, with an addition from Richard Nunan to the last paragraph of p. 3 (please see p. 6, below: Appendix).

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett praised the program of events at the College celebrating Martin Luther King, Jr.’s birthday. She also mention a new and improved version of the College’s website, and said that this would be an appropriate place to post the Minutes of meetings of the Board of Trustees, which Senators are supposed to see. She reported that renovations planned for the Early Childhood Development Center will definitely take place, and that President Sanders is firmly committed to building a new Science Center, as well as to making renovations to the existing facility; the amount of money involved is likely to exceed fifty million dollars. On another matter: departmental reactions to the proposals for Peer Observation and Evaluation of Teaching will be gathered together and sent to the Faculty Welfare Committee, who will be asked to make a recommendation on the scheme to the Senate.

The Dean of Libraries

Using the “Power Point” system and an overhead video projector, David Cohen reported at length on detailed plans for the new Library. He began with a short, illustrated history of Libraries at the College, and then examined the planning process itself, and how the current design had been developed. This design is based on a “bimodal” model: clearly, any new library construction must provide for both printed sources, as in the past, and for the rapidly expanding use of electronic sources. High-capacity networks, increasingly “interactive” technologies, and the World Wide Web, will undoubtedly increase in importance. A library, however, is also a “place” – a special place – and not merely a location for individual “connectivity.” Accordingly, one of the features of the design is the number of locations within the library devoted to group
study and to group access to technology. The building itself will provide a central focus for the interrelationship of books, media, instructional technology, and computing services. We are of course anticipating, over the next fifty years, a geometric increase in knowledge. The new building should be adequate to house new books and journals, if current levels of acquisitions are maintained, for at least the next twenty-five years. One crucial assumption in drawing up these plans has been that the College of Charleston will experience only minimal growth in programs and enrollments during this projected period.

The Robert Scott Small Library, built in the early 1970s, is about 73,000 square feet in size, and houses some 427,000 volumes (18,400 were added in FY 1998-99). The new building will be 140,000 square feet – the size and shape of “three football fields, stacked” – and should hold 1,000,000 volumes. Some other comparisons: the old library has 576 seats, one computer classroom, and one group study facility; the Addlestone Library, when it is completed, will contain 1440 seats, 2 computer classrooms, 24 group-study spaces, and many “open” offices. The new building will also house Academic Computing and the Center for Effective Teaching and Learning. There will be a “dedicated” section for book repairs, and for special collections. And of course “connectivity,” both wired and wireless, will be greatly enhanced. As a matter of fact, Mr. Cohen added, our present library has just put into service thirty lap-top computers that use wireless technology, which is turning out to be an inexpensive alternative to “hard-wiring.” In addition, there will be a small but sociable café right on the premises (in time, the library may come to be known as the “Barnes & Noble” of Calhoun Street); but no bar.

During the question period after the presentation, Lee Drago pointed out that the Library will be built on a place of great historical significance in Charleston, the land used by the Brown Fellowship Society, a Free Black Burial Society in earlier times. The Addlestone Library is to be built on, or adjacent to, the oldest burial site for free blacks in the United States, and he sincerely hoped that the College would set up a suitable memorial to commemorate this. Someone asked whether the design of the new library made any provision for faculty study-carrels, and the answer was no. Mr. Cohen concluded by saying that he expected construction to begin, if all goes well, this coming summer, and to take a about a year and a half to two years to complete.

**New Business**

- For the Academic Standards Committee, Robyn Holman **PROPOSED TWO CHANGES IN THE UNDERGRADUATE CATALOGUE** as requested by Earl Rickerson, Head of the Languages Division, having to do with College policies on foreign language credit for native speakers of languages other than English, and placement credit, as specified on p. 97 of the current edition of the catalogue. After a brief discussion about the “rationale” for these changes, and two short friendly amendments, these recommendations were **endorsed**, on a voice vote, as follows:
I. POLICY ON LANGUAGE CREDIT FOR NATIVE SPEAKERS

[Current Wording (p. 97):

**English as a Second Language**

A student whose native language is not English, who has received formal instruction and is literate in his or her native language, may demonstrate proficiency in English by satisfactorily completing one semester of study at the college and thus fulfill the college's general education requirement for study of a foreign language. Contact the head of the languages division for validation.]

**Proposed New Wording:**

**Native Speakers of Languages Other Than English**

No native speaker of a language other than English will be awarded foreign language placement credit for proficiency in his or her first language. However, a student whose native language is not English, who has received formal instruction or can demonstrate a high level of literacy in his or her first language, may be exempted from further language study. Such students may exempt the general education requirement for language study by demonstrating competency in English by successfully completing a minimum of 12 semester hours at the College. For waivers, contact the Head, Division of Languages.

*The change from previous policy is indicated by the words crossed out.*

The *rationale* for this change is as follows:

The title of the original paragraph is misleading, since this is not policy about ESL (English as a Second Language). The wording is completely revised because the original paragraph raised so many questions. The proposed new wording is an attempt at clarification.

II. POLICY ON PLACEMENT CREDIT

[Current Wording (p. 97):

All entering students must take a placement test in language(s) studied in high school or elsewhere.

The results of the placement test are not binding. A student may choose to take a lower level course than the placement test indicates or to begin a new language.
Students who present two or more years of high school study in a language and who do not place in the LANG 102 or higher course may take the LANG 101 course, or may start the study of a new language. No placement credits will be granted. Students may earn credits through placement tests as described below:

**Proposed New Wording [as amended at the meeting]:**

To fulfill the language requirement, entering students may take any language, other than English, offered by the College. However, students who wish to continue a language studied in high school or elsewhere must take a placement test in the language. The placement test score determines the level at which the student will continue his or her study of the language. Transfer students with college credit in a foreign language, who wish to continue in the same language, should *not* take the placement test.

Students who present two or more years of high school study in a language and who do not place in the LANG 102 course or higher, may take the LANG 101 course, but are encouraged to consider starting a new language [that complements their career goals, stricken at the friendly suggestion of George Pothering].

Credit through placement may be earned for only one language, and no more than a total of 12 placement credits in that language [added as a clarification] will be awarded. Students may earn credits through placement tests as described below: [etc.].

The rationale for these changes is as follows:

The first sentence in paragraph 1 is added because students are sometimes unclear about whether they can start a new language or must continue with language started in High School, or elsewhere.

The second sentence in paragraph 1 replaces words in the old paragraph that require ALL students to take a placement test, even if they have no intention of studying the language for which they take the test, or even if they transfer in with passing grades in the language from another college. In practice, we do not require all students to take placement tests.

The third sentence in paragraph 1 tries to get at the question of the degree to which placement test results are binding. We have generally agreed that we want the results to be binding to some extent, and that we are ready to change the old wording that specifically says “results of the placement test are not binding.”

The wording at the end of the second paragraph is intended to address the question of students who take 101 remedially after 2-3 years of high school
study in the same language. We have not decided to make entry into 102 or higher mandatory, but we want to raise the issue and suggest the alternative of starting a new language.

The final paragraph about limits on credit is new, and has been added to close loopholes in current policy.

Constituents’ Concerns

Constituents were unconcerned. Without further business, the meeting adjourned at about quarter past six o’clock.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary

*****

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

Spring Faculty Meeting:
(Monday at 5:00 o’clock in Physicians’ Memorial Auditorium)
April 24, 2000
Richard Nunan’s Addition to the Minutes of the December 7, 1999 Meeting

[Insert language set up in bold-face into the last paragraph on p. 3, as follows.]

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

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

He briefly reviewed the rationale for this proposal, and then added two comments. First, in response to Caroline Hunt’s objections voiced at the last meeting, that his proposal seemed to favor “research” over “teaching,” and that this would be unwise at an institution whose primary mission is teaching, Mr. Nunan pointed out that his real purpose was to simplify an elaborate process which had been designed at a time when it was assumed that significant financial rewards would be available for faculty earning a “superior” rating. Since this was obviously no longer the case, it made sense to abbreviate the process as much as possible. Faculty wishing a merely satisfactory reading would not, under his proposal, need to do anything differently than they would have done before. [Beginning of Nunan’s Addition] Moreover, he observed that, under the current P-T Review Policy, the evidentiary criteria for a satisfactory performance require no evidence of research for professional development. The proposal to require the addition of some evidence in the area of research, in order to be a candidate for a superior rating, does not privilege research over teaching and service, which are already covered in the materials required for a satisfactory rating. The addition of research evidence simply “evens the score” by insuring that this component of faculty performance is also relevant to a superior evaluation. [End of Nunan’s Addition] Secondly, he thought that his proposal should come into effect immediately, before the first Post-Tenure Review packets had to be completed. [Etc.]
December 7, 1999

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

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

Reports

The Speaker

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

New Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

New Courses:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Faye Steuer then introduced the following motion:

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

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

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

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

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

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

If it is a department's policy to require the inclusion of the comments portion of the student ratings, the department must develop . . . .

rather than: If faculty in a department require the inclusion . . . .

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

本網站 Stephanie Low proposed:

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

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

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

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

(1) Do you think the College of Charleston's General Education Curriculum requirement should be changed? (____ yes ____ no).

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

____ Begin with a critical reappraisal of the current requirements.

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

Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary

******

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

Spring Faculty Meeting:
(Monday at 5:00 o’clock in Physicians’ Memorial Auditorium)
April 24, 2000
November 2, 1999

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The third regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 2 in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Forty-eight senators came. The Minutes of the previous meeting (October 5, 1999) were approved as circulated, after a correction to the first sentence on p. 3 ("last year" should read, "two years ago"); "Richard Nunnan was recognized and reviewed the assumptions under which the ad-hoc post-tenure review committee had worked two years ago."

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett proudly reported that the new Faculty Senate website, which can be reached at <http://www.cofc.edu/-senate/>, has become operational. She fully expected that in future this service will become increasingly important for the entire College community.

The Assessment Committee

Rhonda Swickert and Simon Lewis reported for the Assessment Committee, as instructed at the previous meeting, their suggestions for a questionnaire which could be used to survey the faculty about General Education, if the Senate decides such a survey is a good idea. There were two issues at stake: should such a survey be undertaken in the first place, and if so, should it begin with possible changes to the report which had been vetoed by the faculty at the end of the previous year. The Committee's intention had been to be neutral on both issues, but to be clear and simple in language. Accordingly, their report contained three numbered questions:

1) Do you think the College of Charleston's General Education Curriculum requirement should be changed? (___ yes ___ no).

2) If your answer to question (1) above was "yes," how do you think we might proceed? [check one]

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

In the discussion which followed, Talaat Elshazly thought that perhaps the questions should contain more specific detail. The Committee, however, had rejected this idea on the grounds that more specific questions might be interpreted as a "back-door" way of biasing the outcome of the survey itself. David Mann applauded the structure of the questionnaire, though he wondered what the difference was between "comments" and "observations" in the third part. Glenn Lesses wanted to know what we would do after we got the responses to the questionnaire, assuming that the Senate decided to go ahead with it: "What next?" Rhonda Swickert said this was beyond the Assessment Committee’s charge, and Robert Mignon added that it would be better to deal with questions of what to do next after there was an actual motion on the floor. Andy Lewis thought Part 3 was too "open-ended."

Mr. Mignon wondered whether the second question would be answerable even if an individual said “no” to the first. Simon Lewis said that the Committee had thought of this, but that it had seemed more of a secondary question, to be answered later. Mr. Mignon wondered whether we should just use the first question, because the answer to it would inevitably bias any response to the second question. Mr. Lewis said that the Committee had thought of this, too, and concluded it would be better to use the wording they were now suggesting. Deanna Cavendish was troubled by the problem of one question "biasing" the next, also. David Gentry and Hugh Wilder were both concerned with the question of how to proceed, if the faculty were to begin to consider changes in the General Education program. Julia Eichelberger pointed out that the faculty had undertaken a reassessment of the program over a period of four to five years, and she wondered if we really wanted to start back at "ground zero" all over again; what did the first question really mean? Stephanie Low said she was not sure, either.

In the event, the Senate received the Assessment Committee’s report as information, but no motions were made and no vote taken. The Chair thanked the Committee for their diligence, and Rhonda Swickert replied that they had been honored to be asked.

Old Business

- Glenn Lesses, for the Tenure and Promotion Committee, then re-introduced seven RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN THE FACULTY/ADMINISTRATION MANUAL, as set forth in a memorandum sent to the Provost, dated September 13, 1999, and discussed at length at the previous meeting (October 5, 1999) without being brought to a vote. These recommendations were, Mr. Lesses reiterated, attempts to clarify procedure, or document current practice; many had been previously described in memoranda from the Provost and
successive Tenure and Promotion Committees. He moved to divide the question (successfully) so that each of the seven motions could be taken up individually. The results may be summarized as follows:

I. Comments Portion of Student Evaluations (passed)

II. Recent Graduate Letters (passed)

III. Content of Transmittal Letters (passed as AMENDED, to now read in full!)

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

Each panel should write a letter which, while maintaining the confidentiality of any meeting, summarizes the discussion that takes place among panel members, including positive and negative deliberations.

Justification: On occasion the transmittal letters have simply recorded the vote of the departmental panel or have not included sufficient justification for the recommendations.

IV. Department Chair Colleague Letters (passed)

V. Continuing Review of Senior Instructors (passed)

VI. [Change in] Professional Development Requirement for Senior Instructor Rank (DEFEATED)

VII. External Peer Evaluation (passed as AMENDED).

[From the first sentence in the next-to-last paragraph, strike: “to include their full or summary curriculum vitae with their review,” and from the end of the last paragraph, strike: “(5) the outside reviewers’ full or summary curriculum vitae,” to now read in full, with the excisions indicated.]

Delete the following sentence on p. 76 2 b. (2) of the current edition of the Faculty/Administration Manual:

Both internal and external statements on research and professional development activities.
Statements on research and professional development activities from professional colleagues within and outside the College of Charleston.

On page 98 of the current edition of the Faculty/Administration Manual, renumber items 6. c. through 6. h. to 6. d. through 6. i. and insert a new 6. c. to read:

By early September, candidates should submit to the departmental evaluation panel chair the names of at least three professionals from outside the College in the same area of research as the candidate, who can evaluate the research and professional development of the candidate. Evaluation panel chairs should obtain from that list at least two reviews of the candidate’s scholarship and research. Panel chairs can solicit up to three additional letters of review from outside the institution (for a maximum of five).

After the external reviewers have been determined, a cover letter from the panel chair should accompany the review materials sent to them, stating that we seek a review of the quality of a candidate’s research and professional development and that we do not seek merely a testimonial to the candidate’s accomplishments. A copy of the candidate’s academic curriculum vitae and copies of the materials identified by the candidate as satisfying the criteria in this area should be sent to each of the outside reviewers. Copies of the relevant portions of the Faculty/Administration Manual about research and professional development (currently, IV. J. introduction, IV J. 2., and IV. J. 4.) as well as any additional departmental criteria on file in the Office of the Provost should be included. Additional supporting review materials may also be submitted by the panel or the candidate, provided that these materials are included in the packet.

Reviewers should be asked to identify what relationship, if any, they have with the candidate, to include their full or summary curriculum vitae with their review, and to return their review in a timely manner for the deliberations of the departmental panel. To make it possible that reviews are available prior to those deliberations, external reviewers must be solicited sufficiently in advance of panel deliberations.

The following items must be included in the candidate’s packet: (1) the candidate’s initial list of outside reviewers, (2) a description by the panel chair of the process by which the outside letters were obtained, (3) copies of the letter of solicitation by the panel chair, (4) the confidential outside reviews, and (5) the outside reviewers’ full or summary curriculum vitae.
Justification: Professionals from outside the College working in the same field of expertise as the candidate frequently can make the best judgments about the quality of specialized research.

As at the previous Senate meeting, the seventh item, the question of requiring “outside” evaluation letters, proved once again to be controversial, and many of the same arguments, both for and against, were presented by many of the same persons. Most of the discussion focused on whether or not outside letters would represent a significant change in the standards required for advancement at the College. James Smiley, a former member of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, recommended approval on the grounds that it would clarify procedures that were now murky; the intention, he insisted, was not to increase the requirements or “raise the bar,” but to standardize and codify what have seemed to be sometimes inconsistent evaluation practices. Julia Eichelberger, on the other hand, thought that it represented a substantial ratcheting-up of the requirements, and reported that the English Department was very much opposed to the change on these grounds. Glenn Lesses insisted that this change was procedural only.

James Deavor thought the burdens being imposed on outside evaluators were too severe, and moved to amend the language in paragraphs 4 and 5 calling for the submission of “full or summary curriculum vitae” from such persons. James Carew noted that in all his years of writing “outside” evaluation letters for scholars at other institutions, he had never, ever, been asked to submit such a document; Richard Nunan opposed the amendment on the grounds that evaluation panels need such information. Caroline Hunt supported the amendment, saying that the requirements being imposed on outside evaluators were too burdensome and would likely reduce the responses we received to such requests. The amendment passed on a show of hands, by a vote of 26 to 17.

Rick Heldrich thought that the main argument for having “outside” letters is the possibility that some of our Departments may not be able fully to assess the quality of their own candidates; while he supported the motion, he disagreed with the role which the Tenure and Promotion Committee seemed to be arrogating to itself, of imposing a kind of uniformity on the evaluation procedures of each and every Department. Scott Peebles maintained that, on the contrary, the various Departments at the College understand, better than anyone outside the institution, what our teaching load means in terms of imposing limits on the quantity of research that can be expected. If, he said, we send packets out to be evaluated elsewhere, we may very well be confronted with the very different standards of big universities, which would make our research output necessarily look almost puny in comparison; how are we to convince outside evaluators that we are not really a “research” institution, if we go around soliciting “outside” letters about “research” that suggest we are? Mr. Lesses replied that quality, not quantity, is the issue, and that outside letters can help us distinguish what true intellectual quality is. Robert Russell added that our standards are not low, and he found it insulting to suppose that they are. We are in the process of becoming a better institution, he said, and we do not need to take special steps to protect ourselves against “outside meanies” who might be skeptical of our scholarship.
“What,” David Gentry asked, “can outside reviewers really tell us that we can’t find out internally, on our own?” Herb Silverman replied that people at Harvard or Stanford or Berkeley are perfectly well aware that the College of Charleston is not like their institutions, and will make allowances accordingly. Faye Steuer, however, pointed to what she said was a new assumption and expectation about our research, namely, that advancement should come through the development of a “body” of work, over a period of years; this will surely hurt those people who have been working for long years under a different set of assumptions. Ken Bower claimed that the only reason for doing “research” at a place like the College is that it improves the quality of a teacher’s teaching, a connection no “outsider” is likely to make – and we are a “teaching” institution. Mr. Lesses replied that the Manual does not say this. Hugh Wilder said that he favored the motion, because “outside” letters had often proved helpful in his Department, Philosophy and Religious Studies. Deanna Caveny agreed, but thought that the instructions to outsiders ought to specify what we expect of our faculty. Dinesh Sarvate said that he also was opposed the motion.

Robert Mignone said that, despite all the arguments he was hearing to the effect that the new requirement did not represent a change in standards, he had come to the conclusion that it really did – plainly and clearly – but that maybe the College was not ready for such an upgrade. We are, he said, finally on the road to becoming a really good institution, and one sign of that is to ask for outside letters about our scholarship. Julia Eichelberger replied that the proposal would simply increase the amount of work we all have to do, without producing more or better scholarship. But how much more could we be expected to do? Not all departments, she said, face the same kind of labor-intensive system as the English Department, with its large numbers of necessarily small classes and constant paper-grading – and it was plainly observable that many of the supporters of the motion did not themselves have to cope with a 12-hour teaching load. James Smiley replied that we have no need to be fearful; he had read at least 115 evaluation packets while serving on the Tenure and Promotion Committee and could testify to the obvious truth that we have a superb faculty. He had always found outside letters to be both helpful and understanding of our situation. In addition, he saw this as another chance for our faculty to become “known” in the outside world.

Rick Heldrich spoke again in favor of the motion, but he noted that we should be honest with ourselves and admit that we are raising the requirements for professional advancement. Robert Mignone then said that perhaps it would be unfair, after all, to pass this measure, because teaching loads at the College really are unequal; he was perfectly aware that in his own field, Mathematics, he was not carrying the equivalent of a genuine four-course, 12-hour teaching load, the way departments like Languages and English did. Perhaps it was time for a major reassessment of teaching loads, now that the “12-hour” requirement had been silently done away with in most fields. Deanna Caveny insisted, however, that faculty in the Mathematics Department have plenty to do and spend a lot of time teaching and grading.

When the question was called, Part VII of the recommendations from the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the motion to require “outside” evaluation letters, was approved, on a show of hands, by a vote of 20 to 17. These seven recommendations were then sent to the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, to propose any necessary changes in language.
at the December meeting, before the document is forwarded the Office of Academic Affairs. The full text, as provisionally endorsed by the Senate, is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.

Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment

At 7:00 p.m., the Speaker recommended an adjournment, with the remainder of the agenda to be taken up at the next meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
October 5, 1999

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The second regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 5 in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty-six senators came. The Minutes of the previous meeting (September 7, 1999) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett raised the question of how faculty senators should represent their “constituents.” In her judgement, senators were not “delegates” required to follow the will of their department or “school” in a literal sense, but, like members of other representative bodies, were presumably elected to use their best judgement, and to follow their conscience, in deciding major issues. In the future she would send out an e-mail, at about the time senate packets were distributed, to remind the faculty in general to get in touch with their senators and let them know what was on their mind. She noted that the finishing touches were being put on proposals to add “peer-evaluation” of teaching to the evaluation process; she intended to meet with departmental chairs and inform them of procedures for administering them. She would also post reports from last year’s faculty committees to the senate website; the Faculty Newsletter has been “de-prioritized.” She then welcomed Mr. Hank Bridges as the Student Government Association’s representative to the faculty senate, and urged senators to attend the Fall Festival celebrations in the coming days.

The Provost

Conrad Festa came to discuss the $500 maximum raise for faculty rated “superior” at the time of post-tenure review. He apologized for a statement he had made earlier which suggested that he had accepted in their entirety the faculty’s proposals for implementing the review; in fact, he had always had some reservations about the financial implications. Giving substantial salary now would have very serious consequences in the years after 2000. Such ratings could only, he said, be paid for by taking money away from research funds, or from professional development funds: for example, we could stop hiring new faculty at the present rate (25 this year, 16 and 14 in the two previous years, meaning a ratio of three new roster faculty for every four adjuncts replaced). But bringing down the number of adjuncts is a top priority for the College, and he would not jeopardize this.
The general attitude of many educational professionals throughout the state has been, "post-tenure review, who needs it?" Nobody thinks too highly of it, to say the least. Perhaps $500 is about what it's really worth. But the College has put in extra dollars for faculty salary increases, over and above funds allocated for this purpose by the state, in nine of the past ten years, and this is a record to be proud of. The fact is, Dr. Festa said, the College is now closing in on the Southeastern and even the national average for faculty salaries at comparable institutions. We are planning for the future, and hiring first-rate people, and paying them competitively from the start in order to attract them here. Pay raises for associate and full professors will remain, he said, a high priority, but they will have to be achieved in the usual way, through the same process of thoughtful planning and evaluation that has been in use for many years. He asked for questions.

Phil Dustan talked about "salary compression": this is what he thought post-tenure review pay raises were really about. That was an error, Dr. Festa said; the problem of compression had been, and would continue to be, addressed by carefully reviewing salary figures, and making adjustments as warranted. He had personally gone over the salaries of each of the four hundred or so faculty, not once, but four times, and full professors have actually received more than associate professors by way of compensation for "compression." Larry Carlson asked if the twenty-five new faculty lines were over and above replacements for retiring faculty; the answer was yes. The very highest priority is the replacement of adjuncts and, next to this, helping departments that are conspicuously understaffed.

James Carew countered, that, as matters now stand, about the only way for senior faculty to get paid properly is to leave the College, and go somewhere else. The ad-hoc faculty committee which last year drew up the guidelines for post-tenure review had thought that the process might be a way of reversing this trend, and of keeping competent people here. He pointed out that at Coastal Carolina University, for example, a "superior" rating gets a permanent $5000 pay raise, not $500 – exactly the opposite of the path which the Administration has chosen for the College of Charleston. Dr. Festa replied that Coastal Carolina plans to give $1000 to any faculty member who gets even a "satisfactory" post-tenure review, with $5000 for a "superior" – and of the eleven faculty eligible faculty, no less than eight were rated "superior." He had talked with their provost about this, because he foresaw huge problems in paying for such large raises several years down the line. The response had been, "several years from now doesn’t matter; we’re not going to be here then." This, Dr. Festa said, was most unwise. It would mortgag the future of the institution for the temporary benefit of those clever enough to work the system, and he absolutely would not stand for this at the College of Charleston.

Mr. Carew brought up the issue of adding another rank for the exceptionally meritorious, beyond Full Professor, to be paid for the way existing promotion increases are. Why not ask the state to do the right thing and come up with some entirely new money, instead of trying to squeeze it out of existing operating costs, the way we seem to be doing now? The Provost thought the idea of an additional rank might be worth considering, and remembered having said so some years ago when the question was raised.
New Business

Richard Nunan was recognized and reviewed the assumptions under which the ad-hoc post-tenure review committee had worked last year. The committee’s understanding, he said, was that they had received the following charges:

From the Administration--
In order to secure approval by Commission on Higher Education (CHE), design a post-tenure review process that would be sufficiently substantive to be genuinely consistent with both the letter and the spirit of the “Best Practices” guidelines.

From the Faculty--
Design a post-tenure review process that would not erode or dilute the intellectual freedom protected by academic tenure.

From Both--
Design a post-tenure review process that would be as streamlined as possible, within the constraints of the so-called “Best Practices.”

In keeping with these requirements, the ad-hoc committee had recommended the following criteria as necessary for all post-tenure reviews:

Professional Vitae
Candidate’s Statement on teaching, research & service
Computer-generated student teaching evaluations
Department chair’s annual evaluations
2 letters from intra- &/or extra-departmental peers

Additional criteria, however, were recommended for candidates seeking a ‘superior’ rating. These persons would also furnish clear evidence of exemplary teaching effectiveness (exemplary professional competency in the case of librarians), leadership in service, and continuing quality scholarship. Since “peer refereeing” is one criterion of scholarly quality, the evidence provided would have to include at least two scholarly articles and/or books (or otherwise juried publications, or professional evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts).

Accordingly, the language setting forth the standard for a superior rating was deliberately written to be virtually identical to the language used in The Faculty/Administration Manual, in order to signal that a packet, and the review process, warranting a superior rating ought to be comparable to the packet and review process appropriate for a successful promotion review. This, in turn, derived from two guidelines set out in the CHE’s own “Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review”:
Guideline #9: "The institution must identify the means by which the post-tenure review is linked with faculty reward systems, including merit raises and promotion."

Guideline #10: "The institution must display a commitment to provide funds to reward high achievers on post-tenure reviews."

Since, however, there was obviously no money to speak of being made available, and the Administration had thereby chosen essentially to ignore the recommendations for “Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review” established by the Commission on Higher Education, he intended to enter into the record the following proposal, for action at the next meeting:

Proposal to Revise Implementation of Post-Tenure Review

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

Justification:
The principle that the review process warranting a superior rating ought to be comparable to the promotion review process was appropriate only when we thought there was serious money associated with a superior rating. Since that is no longer the case, the work of the Post-Tenure Review Committee, at all levels except an unsatisfactory rating, ought to be reduced to a checklist enterprise. I.e., no compilation of course materials (unless the candidate feels they are necessary to offset relatively unenthusiastic teaching evaluations), no piles of college service memoranda, no external peer reviews of the candidate’s body of work from the College, perhaps no teaching portfolios, etc.

During the brief discussion that followed, Kem Fronabarger asked whether the $500 the Provost had referred to was going to be a one-time “bonus” (as originally bruited), or an actual salary raise. It was a raise, Dr. Festa said. Caroline Hunt objected to publications being the only criterion for getting a “superior” rating. This was hardly appropriate, she said, for an institution that prides itself primarily on its teaching. Robert Mignone spoke in favor of the proposal, saying that it was only about changing the requirements for the packet. Several senators again raised the problem of salary compression, especially in departments that hired people directly from administrative positions, where salaries of course tend to be higher than among roster faculty working their way up through the ranks. But Dr. Festa assured the faculty that the fact that a mere $500 was involved for post-tenure review did not mean that he would relax his vigilance in trying to eliminate inequities elsewhere. Rewarding faculty through a combination of cost-of-living increases and merit pay for doing excellent work was a quite reasonable system, and it would continue in force.
Robert Mignone moved to reintroduce a motion about surveying the faculty on general education which had been made by John Huddleston at the September meeting, amended by Larry Carlson, and tabled at the end of the meeting. That motion, as amended, reads:

That the Senate consider putting to the entire faculty, by means of a formal ballot, the following question: “Do you favor the continuation of General Education discussion here at the College of Charleston?”

The motion to remove from the table passed, on a voice vote. Mr. Mignone then made a second motion, to refer the original motion, as amended, to the Assessment Committee, so that “an effective survey question might be developed.” “The intention,” he said, “is to survey the faculty as to their wish with regard to the Senate’s continuation of the review of general education reform, and whether such review should begin with possible changes to the vetoed proposal of Spring 1999.”

When asked why he wanted to give this task to the Assessment Committee, Mr. Mignone replied that they are expert in devising questions of this kind. There were several objections, to the effect that the Assessment Committee should first be asked if they would accept such an assignment. David Mann asked whether the Senate actually has the authority to give such directions to a Standing Committee of the Faculty. Mr. Mignone argued that it does. Hank Bridges, the representative of the S.G.A., asked if the student body could vote on the question of reviving the discussion of general education. The Speaker answered that this would be up to the S.G.A.; they certainly had this right, though their vote would not, of course, be binding on the Senate. Mr. Mignone said that devising a fool-proof survey question was no easy matter, and that we should direct the Assessment Committee to formulate an instrument that would work, and then – a separate question altogether – the Senate could decide whether or not to send it out to the faculty at large. In the event, his motion to refer the question to the Assessment Committee passed, on a voice vote.

David Mann, for the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, recommended two CHANGES IN THE BY-LAWS concerning the College Honor Board, derived from a proposal introduced at the September 7 meeting. These two changes were voted on as a single question and unanimously approved, as follows:

1. Article V Committees. Section 1, General Regulations. [Add. p. 41 of the current Manual]:

   K. Service by Faculty members on the College Honor Board is the equivalent of service on any Senate or College Committee.

2. Article V Committees. Section 3-B, Standing College Committees:

   1. Committee on Nominations and Elections, c. Duties.
(4) [Reworded, p. 43 of the current Manual]: To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing College committees and five faculty for the College Honor Board by March 15th.]

[Secretary's note: the text has been adjusted to reflect recent changes ratified by the Faculty but not yet incorporated in the current edition of the Manual.]

Glenn Lesses, for the Tenure and Promotion Committee, then introduced seven recommendations for CHANGES IN THE FACULTY/ADMINISTRATION MANUAL, as set forth in a memorandum sent to the Provost and dated September 13, 1999. These recommendation were, he said, attempts to clarify procedure, or document current practice; many had been previously described in memoranda from the Provost and successive Tenure and Promotion Committees. These recommendations were divided into seven sections, as follows:

I. Comments Portion of Student Evaluations
II. Recent Graduate Letters
III. Content of Transmittal Letters
IV. Department Chair Colleague Letters
V. Continuing Review of Senior Instructors
VI. Professional Development Requirement for Senior Instructor Rank
VII. External Peer Evaluation

Clyde Metz introduced seven motions endorsed by the Curriculum Committee on September 23, 1999:

1. F99001 PSYC 392 Course Change
2. F99002 CSCI 101 Course Change
3. F99007 GEO 232 New Course: Introduction to Petrology (4 cr. hrs., including lab.)
4. F99012 CHEM 490 New Course: Chemistry and Biochemistry Seminar (1 hr.)
5. F99013 CHEM 492 New Course: Senior Seminar (1 hr.)
6. F99015 CHEM 481 Course Change
7. F99016 CHEM 482 Course Change

An additional proposal had received the endorsement of the 1998-1999 Curriculum Committee on March 4, 1999, but apparently had not reached the floor of the Senate last year, even though the requirements for this minor currently appear on page 46 of the 1999-2000 Undergraduate Catalogue:

8. F99022 ARTS Minor in Studio Arts,

All eight motions passed unanimously, and with no changes.
The seventh of these motions, which would not only permit but require letters on research and professional development from evaluators outside the College, immediately became the subject of controversy. (Please note that at the end of the discussion, a vote on these motions was postponed, and no action was taken.) A copy of the original memorandum is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes, and the text of the seventh section reproduced here in full:

VII. **External Peer Evaluation**

Delete the following sentence on p. 76 2 b. (2) of the current edition of the Faculty/Administration Manual:

Both internal and external statements on research and professional development activities.

Insert in its place:

Statements on research and professional development activities from professional colleagues within and outside the College of Charleston.

On page 98 of the current edition of the Faculty/Administration Manual, renumber items 6. c. through 6. h. to 6. d. through 6. i. and insert a new 6. c. to read:

By early September, candidates should submit to the departmental evaluation panel chair the names of at least three professionals from outside the College in the same area of research as the candidate, who can evaluate the research and professional development of the candidate. Evaluation panel chairs should obtain from that list at least two reviews of the candidate’s scholarship and research. Panel chairs can solicit up to three additional letters of review from outside the institution (for a maximum of five).

After the external reviewers have been determined, a cover letter from the panel chair should accompany the review materials sent to them, stating that we seek a review of the quality of a candidate’s research and professional development and that we do not seek merely a testimonial to the candidate’s accomplishments. A copy of the candidate’s academic curriculum vitae and copies of the materials identified by the candidate as satisfying the criteria in this area should be sent to each of the outside reviewers. Copies of the relevant portions of the Faculty/Administration Manual about research and professional development (currently, IV. J. introduction, IV J. 2., and IV. J. 4.) as well as any additional departmental criteria on file in the Office of the Provost should be included. Additional supporting review materials may also be submitted by the panel or the candidate, provided that these materials are included in the packet.
Reviewers should be asked to identify what relationship, if any, they have with the candidate, to include their full or summary curriculum vitae with their review, and to return their review in a timely manner for the deliberations of the departmental panel. To make it possible that reviews are available prior to those deliberations, external reviewers must be solicited sufficiently in advance of panel deliberations.

The following items must be included in the candidate’s packet: (1) the candidate’s initial list of outside reviewers, (2) a description by the panel chair of the process by which the outside letters were obtained, (3) copies of the letter of solicitation by the panel chair, (4) the confidential outside reviews, and (5) the outside reviewers’ full or summary curriculum vitae.

*Justification:* Professionals from outside the College working in the same field of expertise as the candidate frequently can make the best judgments about the quality of specialized research.

Mr. Lesses began the discussion by reminding the senate that, while the faculty has no control over the contents of the *Faculty/Administration Manual* and can only recommend, not legislate, the Administration does want our comments and suggestions, and if the Senate votes to recommend changes, they will at the very least be taken seriously. These seven recommendations are based on the Provost’s annual memoranda to the Tenure and Promotion Committee about how to interpret the language of the regulations governing evaluation procedures. The Committee now wants to incorporate these memoranda and interpretations into the actual text of the *Manual*. In particular, item 7, concerned with external peer evaluation, has caused some confusion over the meaning of “external” — does it mean outside a candidate’s department, or outside the College altogether? The present language, Mr. Lesses said, is designed to remove this potential ambiguity, which different departments have interpreted in different ways.

Julia Eichelberger said that the suggested revisions made her think that she had seriously misunderstood the *Manual* up until now, if this was merely a clarification of existing practice. The requirement for evaluation letters from outside the College seemed to her new, and a major escalation or “ratcheting up” of the criteria for promotion and tenure. They suggested a new emphasis was being given to “research” or scholarly production, at the expense of the teaching mission of the College. Mr. Lesses countered that a “peer review” is surely a logical way of determining the quality of research. Andrew Lewis pointed to the language requiring letters from experts in the same field, and the requirement that outside evaluators must establish their own credentials by submitting a vita to the evaluation panel at the College — in other words, making evaluation panels now evaluate the very outside evaluators they would be asking to evaluate the candidates up for evaluation — a cumbersome and complicated procedure, he thought. Mr. Lesses thought that the credentials of the outside recommender might be highly relevant to an accurate assessment of the candidate being considered for tenure. Herb Silverman agreed, but thought that the outside recommender should not necessarily be limited to someone in a particular academic field, or, indeed, to an academic at all, since there are recognized, knowledgeable experts in many fields who are not professors.
Kem Fronabarger objected to the motion. He thought the language of the proposed change suggested that there were departments at the College who were either unable or unwilling to evaluate their own candidates properly. Caroline Hunt said that, based on her experience on the Tenure and Promotion Committee in the past, some departments were much more “impressionistic” in their evaluation of candidates than others, and that the proposed change would be for the better. Julia Eichelberger again insisted that the changes were raising the bar, and increasing the requirements. Mr. Lesses strongly disagreed, saying they were only clarifications, and were needed in order to conduct rigorous reviews. Richard Nunan pointed out that there could only be two reasons for the suggested changes: either our academic departments are not fully capable of conducting accurate evaluations on their own, or we are suspicious that some of the department chairs are not being fully honest when they give high ratings to candidates. We may not be the University of California at Berkeley, he added, but we are capable, surely, of judging the quality of research in our fields. Trying to keep people honest during the evaluation process could be the only real reason for insisting on outside letters, and he was not convinced there was a real need for this. Richard Heldrich said that he agreed with Professor Eichelberger: the outside letters were a serious ratcheting-up of the requirements. What more evidence do we need beyond the word of a respected scholarly journal about the worth of a candidate’s publications? Tom Heaney agreed, and said there was a clear correlation between scholarly productivity and teaching load; it was not wise to keep on tightening the publication requirements when candidates had to cope with the burden of four courses.

Mr. Lesses countered this argument by insisting, once again, that the proposed language would have no effect whatsoever on existing, already mandated requirements. He saw it, not as a threat, but as an aid to making sound professional decisions – but *not* as a change in the requirements themselves. Faye Steuer thought that flexibility was being written *out* of our evaluation process by writing this requirement (outside letters on scholarship for every decision and every department) *in*. David Hall pointed out that something really new and unprecedented was being added, which nobody had apparently noticed. Nowhere in the published criteria for professional advancement at the College is it stated that candidates have to have a specialty – an area of *specialization* within an academic field, which has hitherto been thought sufficiently specialized in itself; this would change that. Herb Silverman repeated that the requirement for outside letters was not a further tightening of the screw, because most candidates do, in fact, have “outside” letters about their scholarship included in their packet, and these are often very useful to the Committee.

William Moore spoke against this particular change. He called it “overkill” and pointed out the substantial burden it would place on departmental chairs setting up the evaluation process, and on the outside evaluators themselves, not to mention on the candidates, who would have to supply multiple copies of books or articles, and early in the process if the outside evaluators were going to have a chance to read them. He trusted his own colleagues, he said, to do a fair and careful evaluation. James Deavor wanted to have the terms “external” and “within the College” clarified. Phil Dustan said that he had seen “external” letters used as weapons against a candidate; we ought to do the judging ourselves. Rob Dillon said that he thought he ought to report to the Senate that James Smiley (in the Biology department, and until recently a Senator)
had been very surprised – shocked, in fact – that what he saw as minor changes in language – basically just clarifications, as Glenn Lesses had described them – were being interpreted by some members of the faculty as a serious “ratcheting up” of the basic requirements for tenure; he (Smiley) did not see how they could possibly be seen in that light. At this point, John Newell moved to postpone the question until the next meeting, a motion that passed immediately on a voice vote.

Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment

Some constituents were concerned that the extension of the drop-add period by a full week, after Hurricane Floyd, had caused problems. Others were intrigued by the idea of a class-action suit to defend the legal rights of faculty with tenure, which the whole program of Post-Tenure Review seemed to throw into question. With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
September 7, 1999

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The first regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston for the academic year 1999-2000 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 7, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. After the Roll was called, fifty-two senators were found to be in attendance. The Minutes of the third session of the April Senate meeting (April 20, 1999) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The President

President Sanders began with several amusing stories about his early days in politics. It seems that the FBI took a picture of him at a peace rally in 1969, around the time he had helped to author South Carolina’s Endangered Species Act. At a news conference called to announce that legislation, he had brought a South American River Turtle as a prime example of a species facing extinction, to display to the press. The case of conservation had scarcely been helped when then-Governor West (who thought the turtle moving around in a sack might be a snake) announced that he, too, was fond of turtles, especially in the form of turtle soup, and loved to hunt for turtle eggs along the Grand Strand. . . .

Really, Mr. Sanders said, the College budget was like a turtle-egg, the kind that looks like a slightly squashed, leathery ping-pong ball, with a dent in it. You can squeeze the egg into different shapes by stepping on it, but the baby turtle inside just makes a bulge in another part of its casing: nothing really changes. Similarly, you can mold our budget into several different configurations, each one of which could be rationally defended. But if you move more money into one area, that means you have to take it away from somewhere else, because there is only so much turtle to go around. The dent in the egg doesn’t go away. It just moves.

The College has received what sounds like a hefty funding increase of more than 11% over last year, or about $3,200,000. And yet, since about two million of this has to go for one-time or “non-recurring” expenses, the real increase is only about $1,200,000. The President said that his top priorities this year are to cut down on the number of adjuncts being used, and to enhance existing faculty salaries. Accordingly, about half of the “new”
money, the budget increase, will probably go toward hiring 13 more tenure-track faculty, and half toward a 3% salary increase over and above the 2% “across the board” increase provided for state employees in general. Other divisions are of course possible in theory, but the dent in the egg would still be there. If salary increases were made larger, we would get fewer new faculty, and vice versa. A fifty-fifty division, therefore, would seem to be about what we should aim for.

Mr. Sanders noted in passing that because of the continuous pace of technological change, things like computers, which become obsolete almost as soon as they are purchased, have to be treated as recurring, not one-time, expenses. Why not, in that case, charge students a separate “technology fee” to pay for this constant and obviously necessary turnover? Well, the concept of “special fees” always keeps coming up, in one form or another, and, knowing this, the Legislature has effectively nixed the idea by deciding ahead of time the percentage by which a college can increase its total charges in any given year. This percentage is limited by law to the HEIR figure (“Higher Education Inflation Rate”). This means that any increase in revenue from separate “fees” would have to be subtracted from tuition increases, and so nothing would be gained. The dent in the egg can be moved around, but not eliminated.

We also receive a certain amount of new money as the student population slowly grows (about 1.6% this year), but this does not go very far. Why not, as a one-time solution, try to persuade the Legislature to allow us to increase our tuition substantially? After all, places like Williams now charge $32,000 a year. Davidson costs $26,000. Well, in the first place, these institutions are not really our competition. And in the second, those inflated figures need to be looked at closely. Few parents except oil-sheiks and the super-rich actually pay such amounts, because the tuition at many of these institutions is in effect heavily subsidized through loan packages, scholarships, and fee-remissions of one kind or another. The fact is, our tuition is already higher than many near-by institutions – more than William and Mary, more than the University of North Carolina, more than the University of Georgia. Our fees are not unduly low. Why not, in that case, stop being a state school altogether? Well, the State of South Carolina does send us over $30 million a year, and that should take care of that question for a while.

Mr. Sanders also reported that the Provost, Dr. Festa, is considering a bonus of $500 for those rated “distinguished” at the time of “post-tenure review,” to be paid for from the $2,000,000 available for “non-recurring” expenses. To reward the distinguished with a real raise, rather than a one-time bonus, would mean reducing salary increases for all the rest of the faculty, which must be funded from the same, fixed sum of around $1,200,000.

In conclusion, President Sanders asked if there were questions. Someone asked about the cost of the projected new basketball arena. This was a capital expense, and so funded in an entirely different way from the operating budget. To obtain substantial capital funding, you have to have a project that will be appealing to the Legislature – and, make no mistake, this one is. In fact, we may be able to “piggy-back” a number of purely academic building projects onto this one. The basketball arena may also bring in
“matching” funds from city and county, so it may be a very substantial bargain for the College in the long run, not to mention all the favorable publicity. So many people have been enthusiastic about the arena that it has actually taken a good deal of effort to limit the size and scope and cost of the project! Another question had to do with the College of Charleston Foundation. The Foundation has substantially exceeded its original goal of raising $30 million in five years: in half that time, we have $40 million. But much of this is in the form of “tied” gifts — money ear-marked by the givers for scholarships, for example, not faculty salaries. Kem Fronabarger asked when faculty contracts would come off the endangered species list. (By the end of the week, the Speaker said.) There were additional questions about the $1 million gift for a new ECDC school building, and about the perennial problem of parking. Mr. Sanders said parking was not a high priority at the moment, but some thought was being given to a new parking garage.

As he left, President Sanders was warmly applauded for attending the first meeting of the Senate, and for taking the time to give substantial and detailed information about the financial situation of the College.

The Speaker

The Speaker announced that she would omit her report on the “Special Planning Session” held just before the start of the semester, and proceed to the rest of the agenda.

New Business

- George Pothering was reappointed as Parliamentarian.

- Robert Mignone was reelected as Speaker pro tempore. He will also continue to serve as our representative to the Commission on Higher Education, as the implementation of “performance funding” proceeds and develops. He noted that we have learned a number of lessons this past year and fared pretty well, all things considered, in the “ratings.” More “funding indicators” are still being phased in, but it may be that all 37 will never be used. He hoped that the College might obtain up to $1 million in additional funding by doing well in the ratings. The Senate thanked him for all his hard work by a warm round of applause.

- The Curriculum Committee introduced eighteen motions held over from last year. (These were approved by the previous Committee on April 8, 1999, and sent to the Speaker and the Faculty Secretary on May 13, without, of course, being acted on by the Senate.) Seventeen of these passed, and one was remanded to committee, as follows:
During a brief discussion, Glenn Lesses said that he believed item S99-20 (HUM 200 - New prefix and course) was unsatisfactory in several ways and should be returned to this year’s Curriculum Committee for further study; he so moved. Julia Eichelberger agreed, saying that it duplicated Honors Western Civilization. Dean Sam Hines said that as matters now stand, there are problems coordinating special topics courses when they are split between different departments; there is no mechanism yet for dealing with interdepartmental courses that involve different Schools at the College. Mr. Lesses’ motion to recommit passed on a voice vote, with the understanding that the Curriculum Committee would discuss the proposal with Dean Hines. The original documents provided by last year’s Curriculum Committee (48pp.), dated May 13, 1999, are attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes, and a duplicate will be sent to the Registrar.

- For the Assessment Committee, Rhonda Swickert gave a progress report on the work of its general education subcommittee, which is actively looking into ways of evaluating the existing General Education Program at the College. This subcommittee had worked diligently, she said, during the previous semester to develop a systematic approach to the problem of evaluation. One of the issues that many people had had with the original general education proposal which the faculty refused to ratify last year was that there appeared to be very little documentation suggesting anything wrong with the current curriculum, and thus little reason to change it. The answer to this difficulty, she said, is to develop an assessment approach that will enable us to use standardized assessment “batteries” that will point to any weaknesses in our current general education program, as well as to possible areas of excellence.
The first step was to gather instruments that would enable us to assess general education. But, since the subcommittee did not know which curriculum it might be assessing (the old or the new, if it passed), they decided to go back to the “Goals for General Education” as a starting point. These included knowledge of arts, humanities, mathematics, and science; interdisciplinary understanding of political, economic, and social issues; knowledge of diverse cultures; and effective “communication skills.” An attempt would be made to select test instruments that would allow us to assess as many of these goals as possible. In tabular form:

1. Selection of Testing Instruments

   Subject Content Knowledge (English, math, science, social science - history, geography, political and cultural understanding)
   Critical Thinking Skills (critical thinking, problem solving, quantitative and historical analysis)
   Student Experience (use of facilities, like the library or the web; writing experience; art, music, theater; diversity, i.e., interacting with others from different perspectives)

2. Development of Testing Protocol

   Procedure for sampling participants from the student population
   Policy to ensure adequate student participation in assessment
   Protocol for test administration
   Procedures for scoring and reporting data

3. Implementation of Testing Plan

   Summer 2000 (incoming Freshmen) - follow-up test, Spring 2002
   Fall 2000/Spring 2001 (Sophomore/Junior)

Professor Swickert concluded her report by saying the Assessment Committee’s timetable is to have test instruments selected by the end of Fall 1999, and be ready to begin formal assessment of the existing General Education Program by the end of Spring 2000. Since students must be “tracked” and their educational experience followed over a period of time, the testing protocol adopted indicates that three years will be required before real information is obtained.
A proposal was then introduced to make the Honor Board equivalent to a Standing Committee of the Faculty:

a. Composition:
Five faculty members, five staff members, and at least twenty students. The student membership of the Honor Board should be representative of the student body of the College in terms of sex, age, major area of study, race and year in school. Student membership is voluntary and there are no term limits. The Honor Board, with the assistance of the Office of Student Affairs, annually selects new student members to replace graduating members, members dismissed for insufficient grade point average and to maintain the representative nature of the Board. The Office of Student Affairs annually selects new student members to replace graduating members, members dismissed for insufficient grade point average and to maintain the representative nature of the Board. The Office of Student Affairs recruits and selects the five staff members.

b. Duties:
1) To enforce and promote the Honor System, in conjunction with the Office of Student Affairs, of the College of Charleston.
2) To review the Honor Code and Code of Conduct periodically and make recommendations to the administration.
3) To hear cases involving alleged violations of the Honor Code and/or the Code of Conduct.
4) To recommend sanctions in cases involving violations of the Honor Code and/or Code of Conduct.
5) To provide members for appellate board hearings.
6) To provide student members for grievance hearing panels.
7) To hear student government election appeals, impeachment[s added -- Sec ] of officers of student organizations, and requests for judicial review of the actions of the student government (student members only).

This proposal was received and forwarded to the Senate By-Laws Committee for a consideration of its language; no action was taken on the proposal itself.

Robert Mignone then proposed a single change in the Post-Tenure Review Calendar:

Departmental Chair or Panel Chair 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 appropriate dean. Date: December 17 (changed from December 6).

This was approved unanimously.
• John R. Huddleston then introduced this motion, as previously circulated:

That the Senate consider putting to the entire faculty, by means of a formal ballot, the following question: “Do you favor the continuation of General Education reform here at the College of Charleston?”

Considerable discussion followed. Larry Carlson moved to amend the motion by taking out “reform” and substituting the word, “discussion,” so that the question would read, “Do you favor the continuation of General Education discussion here at the College of Charleston?” If the Senate approves the motion, Mr. Carlson said, the language needs to reflect the fact that no “reforms” have actually taken place. This was accepted as a friendly amendment. Glenn Lesses opposed the amended motion, on the grounds that it was, he said, too general and amorphous. Stephanie Mignone added that she, too, would prefer something more definite. Why not have discussions within departments and then come back with specific proposals? Robert Mignone said that he would, in fact, like to consult the faculty as a whole about whether or not to continue discussing the basic issue of General Education. Brian Scholtens said there were really three questions to be asked: do we drop the whole issue; do we continue from where we left off last spring; or do we start over, from scratch? Stephanie Mignone thought the motion could be rephrased in some way to see if the faculty as a whole wanted the Senate to resume General Education discussion. David Mann spoke against the idea of polling the faculty; the Senate, he said, were the faculty’s elected representatives and should take responsibility for deciding these questions. Franklin Ashley spoke in favor of asking the faculty as a whole. Brian Scholtens attempted to put his point about there being three questions (drop, continue, or start over) in the form of an amended question to be directed to the faculty: “How do you wish the Faculty Senate to proceed on the question of General Education: drop the issue, continue from where we left off, or start over?” Mr. Mignone spoke against this amendment. David Mann moved to adjourn; the motion to adjourn failed, on a show of hands. Finally, Robert Russell moved to table the motion. In the event, forty-one senators voted in favor of this. The prime motion, as amended by Mr. Carlson, was tabled.

Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment

Apart from a brief announcement, no one had anything else to say. The meeting adjourned around 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary
August 30, 1999

THE FACULTY MINUTES

The first regular meeting of the Faculty of The College of Charleston for the academic year 1999-2000 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, August 30 in the Physicians’ Memorial Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. George Pothering was appointed as Parliamentarian. The Minutes of the two previous meetings (Special Session, April 28; second regular meeting, May 3, 1999) were approved as circulated.

The Speaker expressed relief that Hurricane Dennis had spared Charleston. She was almost grateful to the storm, in a sense, because it had kept President Sanders in town at a time when he had been scheduled to be away, thus enabling him to open the meeting with his annual report on the State of the College.

President’s Report

President Sanders welcomed the faculty for the start of the new academic year. After some preliminary remarks (including the happy news that sales of Mrs. Sanders’ new cookbook had raised more than $150,000 for endowed scholarships), he emphasized that, despite the usual flurry of rumors, no new “mergers” are in the offing, with any local institution, including MUSC, The Citadel, and Trident Technical College. We have, of course, cooperated fully with the latest committee to look into such matters. Any merger plan, should one ever be developed, would be submitted to the faculty for its advice and consent—and of course the Legislature would be involved, too. But for now, there simply are no such plans. Accordingly, any development of this kind would have to be many miles in the distance.

As to the budget and our funding priorities for 1999-2000: the College had been treated better by the Legislature this year. (In fact, we were treated so well that, at one point, The University of South Carolina threatened to sue us, alleging we had received an illegally disproportionate share of the higher education budget.) We have received partial capital funding for the new sports arena, and for the School of the Arts. We will continue to pursue capital funds for science laboratories, completion of the School of the Arts, the Stern Center, and renovation of classrooms, in that order. The President hoped that everyone had seen the preliminary plans for the new library and the plaza to be built between Calhoun and Bull Streets; they are, he said, truly thrilling.

As in all recent years, our marginal resources, that is, the funds that we have some discretionary control over, have been devoted to three areas. First, we have provided faculty pay raises over and above those provided by the State, though not to the extent that anyone would truly desire. (“I wish we could have done better,” Mr. Sanders said; “I will try to do better.”) Second, we have
added fourteen (14) new tenure-track faculty positions. A total of 137 new faculty lines, he pointed out, had been added since his arrival on the scene seven years ago. Third, we have reduced our dependency on part-time adjuncts in most departments to generally acceptable ratios. This dependency, however, still remains much too high in a number of departments, including the Languages, Management and Marketing (where we use many retired executives), English, Communication, and highest of all, Mathematics. We will strive mightily, he said, to do better in this area as well.

Our available funds have been essentially divided among these three priorities. Reasonable minds can, of course, disagree as to which one should get the most money. It is important, however, to remember that funding for any of the three can be increased only at the expense of one (or both) of the others. We are prohibited from increasing tuition and fees beyond the inflation rate for those things we actually purchase. We therefore have no way of increasing the total amount of money available to us; we can only rearrange the distribution of what we already receive.

In conclusion, President Sanders emphasized two points. One: he was not satisfied. Two: his priority for the College of Charleston would continue to be the quality of education we are giving our students, and the welfare of the faculty (in that order).

New Business

The chair then recognized Andy Abrams, Associate Provost, who announced that the Board of Trustees had honored four members of the faculty as Distinguished Professors:

Marsha Hass (Accounting & Legal Studies)
Clark Reynolds (History)
William Moore (Political Science)
Jorge Marban (Spanish)

Major new appointments for the start of the year included new department chairs (Linda Bradley, Accounting & Legal Studies; Douglas Ferguson, Communication; Mitchell Colgan, Geology; Silverio Almeida, Physics & Astronomy) and associate deans (Idee Winfield, Humanities & Social Sciences; Robert Dukes, Science & Mathematics). These changes are reflected in the following official list:

THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON
ACADEMIC DEANS/DEPARTMENT CHAIRS 1999-2000
(effective August 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of the Arts</th>
<th>Ms. Valerie Morris, Dean</th>
<th>953-8222</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Art History</td>
<td>Dr. Diane C. Johnson</td>
<td>953-8285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Music</td>
<td>Prof. Steve Rosenberg</td>
<td>953-5927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Studio Art</td>
<td>Prof. Michael Tyzack</td>
<td>953-8286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Theatre</td>
<td>Prof. Allen Lyndrup</td>
<td>953-6306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School of Business and Economics

Dr. Clarence M. Condon, III, Dean 953-8106

Department of Accounting and Legal Studies
Dr. Linda Bradley 953-5627

Department of Economics and Finance
Dr. J. Michael Morgan 953-7865

Department of Management and Marketing
Dr. Rhonda Mack 953-6565

School of Education

Dr. Nancy Sorenson, Dean 953-5613

Department of Educational Foundations and Specializations
Dr. Frances Welch 953-5613

Department of Elementary and Early Childhood Education
Dr. Charles Matthews, Acting Chair 953-8045
(Dr. Bartel is on sabbatical 1999-2000) 953-5613

Department of Physical Education/Health
Dr. Andrew Lewis 953-5558

School of Humanities and Social Sciences

Dr. Samuel M. Hines, Jr., Dean 953-5770

Associate Dean
Dr. Idee Winfield 953-5770

English
Dr. Nan Morrison 953-5664

Communication
Dr. Douglas A. Ferguson 953-7854

History
Dr. Marvin Dulaney 953-5711

Division of Languages
Dr. Earl M. Rickerson, Head 953-5720

Department of Classics and German, including Italian, Japanese and Russian
Dr. Frank Morris 953-5714

Department of French
Dr. Jeff Foster 953-5535

Department of Hispanic Studies
Dr. Andrew Sobiesko 953-5537

Philosophy/Religious Studies
Dr. Hugh Wilder 953-5687

Political Science
Dr. Frank Petrusak 953-5724

Psychology
Dr. Charles Kaiser 953-5590

Sociology/Anthropology
Dr. Christine Hope 953-5738

School of Science and Mathematics

Dr. Gordon Jones, Dean 953-5991

Associate Dean
Dr. Robert Dukes 953-8037

Biology
Dr. Michael Auerbach 953-5504

Chemistry and Biochemistry
Dr. James Deavor 953-5587

Computer Science
Dr. Christopher Starr 953-6905

Geology
Dr. Mitchell Colgan 953-5589

Mathematics
Dr. Deanna Caveny 953-5730

Physics and Astronomy
Dr. Silverio Almeida 953-5593

Other appointments include Stephanie Lowe as Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Studies; Angela Hafacre as Director of the Master’s Program in Environmental Science; John Newell, Director of the Honors Program and the Governor’s School; David Goss, Director of the Advising Center; and Ken Gourdin as Director of the Paul T. Nelson Intermodal Transportation Program.
Mr. Abrams then asked the appropriate deans, division heads, and departmental chairs to introduce fifty-four (54) new members of the faculty. (Additional Changes in Division, including lists of Program Directors/Academic Areas, Graduate Program Directors, and faculty receiving tenure and/or promotion, are attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.)

THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON
NEW FACULTY 1999-2000

Shaw, Stacy
Chandler, Karen
Ayme-Southgate, Agnes
Lazzaro, Mark D.
Tomlinson, Patricia T.
Owens, David
Overby, Jason S.
Fenno, Jonathan
Chikuma, Yoshiki
Bass, Jack
Ferguson, Douglas A.
Benigni, Vincent L.
Lacroix, Celeste
Snyder, Marcia
Cozart, Angela
Fife, Eric
Gehr, Katherine
Nel, Philip W.
Schmitt, Richard
Codron, Brigitte Marie-Christine
Morrison, Shawn Eileen
McArthur, Robin G.
DeFelice Jr, John F.
Galvin, Michael T.
McGough, Laura - JAN
Vaughn, Deborah
Kent, Thomas W.
Mueller, James D.
Marlin, Dan
Gourdin, Kent N.
Tankersley, Julia E.
Jurisch, Elizabeth
Cox, Ben L.
Kasman, Alex
Hart, Edward Branley, Jr.
Futrell, Michelle
Wilson, Nancy
Gill, Michael B.
Bjerken, Zeff
Boyle, Deborah A.

Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Visiting Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Chair and Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Instructor (prov. Dir of Prgms, Tate Ctr)
Assistant Professor (prov. Visting)
Assistant Professor (prov. Visting)
Assistant Professor
Visiting Instructor
Visiting Instructor
Director, Foreign Language Tutoring Lab
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Visiting Assistant Professor
Visiting Asst Prof
Assistant Professor
Visiting Librarian
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Physics and Astronomy
Political Science
Psychology
Sociology/Anthropology
Sociology/Anthropology
Sociology/Anthropology
Sociology/Anthropology
Spanish
Spanish
Spanish
Theatre
Theatre

Almeida, Silverio P.
Carr, Jered
Ross, Lisa
Spicer, Clarence Vincent
Stewart, Jennifer
Bennardo, Giovanni
Still, Brenda
Jacobs-Huey, Lanita
Rodriguez Suro, Joaquin
Verlinden, Marianne J.
Graham, Ann Marie
McNerney, Todd J.
Mehler, Michael P.
Interim Chair
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Visiting Instructor
Assistant Professor
Instructor (prev. Visting)
Assistant Professor (prev. adjunct)
Visiting Asst Prof
Assistant Professor
Visiting Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor (prev. adjunct)
Assistant Professor

To conclude this part of the meaning, Dean Samuel Hines disclosed that Klaus de Albuquerque (Sociology & Anthropology) had been named Distinguished Research Professor of Sociology.

Speaker's Report

The Speaker of the Faculty, Trisha Folds-Bennett, then reported briefly on several matters that the faculty would soon be concerned with, including post-tenure review (which would definitely take place, starting this year); “peer-evaluation” of teaching in the classroom, and the possible use of “teaching portfolios”; the process of “strategic planning”; and a possible poll on pursuing the question of General Education. We might also be discussing the creation of a Technology Committee as a standing committee of the faculty; the problem of faculty advising; and some possible revisions to the By Laws. The text of The Faculty/Administration Manual would soon become available on line through the College's website. It promised to be a busy year! The Speaker then introduced Mr. Joel Smith, Chairman of the Board of Trustees.

Strategic Planning

Mr. Smith brought the meeting to a close by addressing the faculty on the subject of Strategic Planning. He said the entire process must be open, and that he wished to assure the faculty (and the administration) of three things. First, this Board really can be trusted. Second, its members do not pretend to have all the answers, but emphatically need, and earnestly solicit, active participation and constructive suggestions, from all those who produce the educational “product” which the College provides, about the best way to plan for the future. Third, the entire Board of Trustees cares deeply about the College of Charleston as an institution, and the welfare of all those who participate in its on-going life. Mr. Smith ended by saying that he thought the College was in excellent shape, and in some ways light-years ahead of other institutions in the state and even the region. One sign of this is that our enrollment applications are way, way up. Partly on the strength of this encouraging trend, the College of Charleston now has the freedom and, indeed, the obligation, to make serious and far-sighted long-range plans.
Adjournment

After a brief discussion For the Good of the Order (traditionally off the record), the meeting adjourned at about 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary

Secretary's Note:

After the Spring Faculty Meeting, the Committee on Nominations and Elections reported that on May 6, 1999 the Faculty had voted by written ballot to ratify five CHANGES IN THE BY-LAWS, as approved by the Faculty Senate in 1998-1999. These concerned (1), the timing of nominations and elections to Senate committees; (2), the timing of nominations and elections to Faculty committees; (3), correction of a sentence in Article V, Section 3, B, 1, covering "Additional Nominations," the first part of which had been inadvertently left out; (4), the terms of members of committees, including "alternates"; and (5), the description of the duties of the Budget Committee.

*****

Next Semester (2000-2001)

FALL Faculty Meeting:
(Monday at 5:00 o'clock in Physicians' Auditorium)
August 28, 2000

FALL 2000 Senate Meetings:
(Tuesdays at 5:00 o'clock in ECTR 116):
September 5, October 3, October 31, November 28