April 23, 2001

THE FACULTY MINUTES

The second regular meeting of the Faculty of The College of Charleston for the academic year 2000-2001 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, April 23 in Room 228 of the Lightsey Conference Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. The Minutes of the previous meeting (September 11, 2000) were approved as circulated.

Speaker’s Report

The Speaker began by recalling the old saying that time flies when you are having fun. In contrast, the year just passed had seemed long, and it had not, by any stretch of the imagination, been “fun.” With regard to such important matters as General Education, evaluation forms, long-range planning, and so on, and on: “Are we there yet?” No, but perhaps we are on our way. Something has happened: in the midst of great change and growth, we now have more chances to interact with faculty outside our individual academic departments. She was, she said, continually impressed by the sheer energy of the faculty as a whole, and of the senate in particular. As she stepped down from the job of Speaker, she wished to thank many individuals for their help, especially Bob Mignone, the Parliamentarian, George Pothering, and Andy Abrams and Conrad Festa – in fact, the whole staff of the Office of Academic Affairs. She must also give special thanks to Deanna Caveny and Hugh Wilder, who had contributed so much to the work of the Presidential Search Committee. She concluded by quoting Eudora Welty, who referred to an ancient proverb, to the effect that those who lose dreaming are lost. She hoped we would never lose that capacity.

About the Presidential search: the original pool of about 200 applicants had now been narrowed to a list of semi-finalists. Confidentiality was still extremely important, and the most that could be said is that mid-June was now the target date for having a small number of finalists visit the campus. Hugh Wilder said that Mr. Joel Smith, the head of the Board of Trustees, had originally divided the process of selecting the next president into three phases: search, screen, and select. The job of the Presidential Search Committee, therefore, would be over in a few weeks’ time, at the end of the conclusion of the second, or screening, stage. He asked if there were any questions that he or the Speaker could answer.
One senator asked how many finalists there were? It would not be advisable to reveal this yet. What criteria were being used? Mr. Wilder pointed to the list of about fifteen desirable characteristics that had been circulated earlier in the search. At the very least, a successful candidate should have the experience, and the qualities of leadership, that would earn the respect of an academic community. But, he added, it is desirable to have a broad rather than a narrow range of specific criteria in mind. Herb Silverman asked if being “tenurable” at the College was one of these criteria? The answer: not necessarily.

New Business

Robert Mignone, speaking for the Committee on Nominations and Elections, moved the election of Standing Committees of the Faculty for the next academic year, in accordance with the circulated slate. Committees for which there had been no further nominations were declared elected. Two committees, however, required a run-off election, and the results, reported later in the meeting, were as follows (the additional nomination for the Academic Standards Committee was unsuccessful, and so there was no change from the circulated slate):

**Academic Standards Committee**

- Asleson, Gary  Chemistry & Biochemistry  Professor
- Bakanic, Von  Sociology  Associate Professor
- Boyle, Deborah  Philosophy  Assistant Professor
- Liu, Guoli  Political Science  Associate Professor
- Packer, Lindsay  Mathematics  Associate Professor
- Bjerken, Zeff  Religious Studies  Assistant Professor
- Swickert, Rhonda  Psychology  Assistant Professor

**Faculty Research and Development Committee**

- Barfield, William  PEHD  Associate Professor
- Ward, Patricia  English  Associate Professor
- Grantham, Todd  Philosophy  Associate Professor
- Jones, Linda  Physics  Assistant Professor
- Calini, Annalisa  Mathematics  Associate Professor
- Nenno, Nancy  German  Assistant Professor
- Ayme-Southgate, Agnes  Biology  Assistant Professor
- Seaman, Sheila  Library  Professor
- Toris, Carol  Psychology  Associate Professor

The original slate is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes, and was contained in an e-mail to the faculty from Mr. Mignone, dated April 16, 2001; an updated version my be found in a second email sent on May 23.
The Provost 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. 

Mr. Abrams presented a commemorative plaque to Trisha Folds-Bennett, in celebration of her three years of service as Speaker of the Faculty, and then proceeded to announce the annual Distinguished Faculty awards, asking each person in turn to come on stage to be honored:

**Distinguished Teacher-Scholar:** William V. Moore (Political Science)

**Distinguished Service Award:** Marion T. Doig III (Chemistry/Biochemistry)

**Distinguished Advising Awards:**
- David W. Maves (Music)
- William V. Moore (Political Science)
- Dinesh G. Sarvate (Mathematics)

**Distinguished Research Award:** Barbara Duval (Studio Art)

**Distinguished Teaching Award**
- Caroline C. Hunt (English)

Three faculty were named **Distinguished Professors:**

- Charles E. Matthews  
  Elementary & Early Childhood Education
- Herb Silverman  
  Mathematics
- J. Fred Watts  
  Physics & Astronomy
Mr. Abrams also announced that President Sanders had appointed seven retiring faculty to the rank of Emeritus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frances H. Courson</td>
<td>Educational Foundations &amp; Specializations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca B. Herring</td>
<td>Accounting &amp; Legal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul W. Holmes</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul E. Jursa</td>
<td>Economics &amp; Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William R. Kubinec</td>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha W. Runey</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela C. Tisdale</td>
<td>Educational Foundations &amp; Specializations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Good of the Order

The Secretary was asked to read into the record a formal RESOLUTION OF THANKS:

The Faculty of the College of Charleston wish to thank Trisha Folds-Bennett for her distinguished service as Speaker of The Faculty for the past three years. We commend her notable fairness and even-handed impartiality in dealing with controversial issues, her ability to heal potential divisions among us, and her wisdom, energy, and good humor in a time of important institutional change. Not least, we thank her for her tireless efforts on behalf of the Presidential Search Committee – a labor that will surely bear fruit for many years to come.

Adjournment

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

________________________________________________________Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
April 17, 2001 (Second Part)

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The April meeting of the Faculty Senate resumed at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 17 in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Forty-three senators attended.

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett began the meeting by extending hearty congratulations to William Moore, winner of the College’s first Teacher-Scholar Award, given for outstanding achievement in both capacities. She then reported that the Presidential Search Committee had met earlier in the day, for five hours. Things were proceeding well, she believed, and a highly-qualified pool of applicants was emerging. On being asked how many semi-finalists remained, she said that it would only be proper to say, “more than ten.”

Hugh Wilder offered to answer any questions that he could, within the obvious restrictions of confidentiality imposed by the search process. He reported that it now looked as though final interviews with candidates would take place in early June, and asked the faculty please to communicate questions or concerns directly to the Committee.

The Speaker said that the changes in the grading system approved earlier by the Senate were still being widely discussed; Hugh Wilder would be “leading the charge” on this in his role as Speaker next semester. Another matter of some importance: it looked as though the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual would eventually be put “on line.” Faculty would be able to request a paper version, of course, but would also be able to “download” directly from the Web, when the document was completed. She noted that By-Laws changes passed by the Senate have to be endorsed by the full faculty before being sent “up the line” to the Provost, the President, and finally the Trustees for final approval. She also reported that she had asked the Faculty Welfare Committee to look into the Family Medical Leave Act.

The Long Range Planning Committee was also “gearing up,” the Speaker said, and ideas, if any, about long-range plans could be forwarded to the chair, Conrad Festa, now Provost Emeritus. Peter McCandless said one thing that could do with a little long-range planning was the climate control system in Maybank Hall, which had not worked properly since the building was built a generation ago: perhaps this is the time, now that the leadership of the College is about to change, to make our real concerns as a faculty known.

The Speaker concluded her report with the happy news that Reid Wiseman had once again run in the Boston Marathon.
The Assessment Committee

William Danaher, on behalf of the Assessment Committee, gave a preliminary report on the pilot ETS (Educational Testing Service) Academic Profile Test administered to students enrolled in Freshman Seminar 101 in the Fall of 2000. This pilot program had been designed to begin measure the effectiveness of the General Education Program at the College, and resulted from a report given last year by Rhonda Swickert on how such measurements could be undertaken. A more detailed report would be sent to the Senate in the Fall, as further data became available. Meanwhile, according to these preliminary results from participants in the Freshman Seminar, our current Gen. Ed. program appears, he said, to be quite effective. The results were put in tabular form, on the overhead projector:

ETS Academic Profile
Administered Fall 2000
Summary Results

WHO IS INCLUDED?

Total Students Enrolled in Freshman Seminar-101: 512
Total Tests Sent to ETS for Scoring: 465
Total Tests Used in Analysis Results: 447
Difference*: 18

*The difference is that 18 tests were scored to have a value of 400 where less than half of the questions on the tests were answered. These scores were excluded in the ETS Summary analysis.

WHAT ARE THE RESULTS?

Overall Total Score Average: 444.7

How that compares to:

- Freshmen at Comprehensive Institutions: 444.6 (n=26,511)
- Freshmen at Liberal Arts Institutions: 443.5 (n=33,794)

James Carew wanted to know what was actually being measured by this test. Mr. Danaher said that it measured the effectiveness of the General Education curriculum. Robert Mignone asked whether the test measured student satisfaction with the Gen. Ed. curriculum, or student achievement? The answer was, satisfaction.
New Business

Robert Mignone, for the Committee on Nominations and Elections, nominated a slate of candidates for Senate Committees for next year. The slate was elected:

- Academic Planning:
  - Heldrich Rick
  - Kasman Alex
  - Kattwinkel Susan
  - McNerney Todd
  - Krasnoff Larry
  - Cox Ben
  - Olejniczak Bill

- By-Laws:
  - England Michael
  - Kinard Frank
  - Mignone Robert

- Budget:
  - Beam Charles
  - Diamond Beverly
  - Bodek Richard
  - Cossa Frank
  - Fidalgo-Eick Maria
  - Phillips C. Michael
  - McCandless Peter

For the Curriculum Committee, Lynn Cherry put forward a series of twenty motions. These were taken up and voted on (with evident relief) as a single motion, and passed unanimously:

- S01-063 GEOL 103 & 103L - Environmental Geology
  - New Course (3hrs./1hr.)
- S01-065 GEOL 205 - Environmental Geology
  - Delete Course
- S01-067 GEOL 102 - Earth History
  - Change Course Number & Prereq.
- S01-073 B.S. in Geology
  - Change Degree Req
- S01-074 B.A. in Geology
  - Change Degree Req
- S01-075 B.A. or B.S. in Geology w/concentration in Environmental Geology
  - Change Degree Req
- S01-130 GEOL 102L - Earth History Lab
  - Change Course Num
- S01-132 GEOL 101 - Dynamic Earth
  - Change Descript.
- S01-100 FREN 363 - Advanced French Culture
  - New Course (3)
- S01-120 FREN 452 - Literature of the Maghreb
  - New Course (3)
- S01-121 FREN 461 - The Middle Ages & Renaissance in France
  - Change Course Num
- S01-122 FREN 462 - The 17th Century
  - Change Course Num
- S01-123 MUSC 150 - Physics of Sound & Music
  - Change Credit Hrs
- S01-124 PHYS 150 - Physics of Sound & Music
  - Change Credit Hrs
- S01-125 ASST 240 - Special Topics in Asian Stud.
  - New Course (3)
- S01-126 ASST 340 - Special Topics in Asian Stud.
  - New Course (3)
- S01-127 ASST 390 - Indep. Study in Asian Studies
  - New Course (3)
- S01-128 ANTH 328 - Aztecs, Mayas, and Their Ancestors
  - New Course (3)
- S01-129 HIST 266 - Aztecs, Mayas, and Their Ancestors
  - New Course (3)
- S01-131 LACS Minor
  - Change in Req.
FOR INFORMATION ONLY:

PSYC 410 - Special Topics Course: Behavioral Genetics (3)
PEHD -- Change in Degree Name: B.S.: Physical Education with a Concentration in Athletic Training will change to B.S.: Athletic Training

Constituents’ Concerns

No constituents were concerned, and Trisha Folds-Bennett concluded the year, and her term as Speaker of the Faculty, by thanking the Senate for the opportunity to serve, and the Parliamentarian, George Pothering, for his expert advice and assistance. She received a standing ovation.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned sine die at about 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The eighth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 3, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Forty-nine senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (March 13, 2001) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett said that many groups and constituencies across the campus were now considering the implications of the prospective changes in the grading system which the Senate had formally endorsed at the conclusion of the March meeting. Hugh Wilder would be reporting on this matter during the Fall semester.

Lynn Cherry, foreseeing additional items of business from the Curriculum Committee, moved that the April 4 meeting should be adjourned, at close of the day’s business, until April 17. This passed without objection.

Larry Carlson inquired about the Presidential search. Hugh Wilder responded that there was now a very strong pool of about 200 applicants, but the Search Committee was not even close yet to coming up with a “short list” from this group. Trisha Folds-Bennett confirmed this, and added that of course the process was, and had to remain, confidential, and so not much real information could be given out. Mr. Wilder added that the search was now somewhat behind schedule, and that early June, rather than May, was a likely time for candidates to be visiting the campus.

Caroline Hunt asked if the names of candidates would be available by the time of Graduation in May. Possibly, the Speaker replied, but this was by no means certain.

Would it be possible, Reid Wiseman asked, to have a report on the new Library? The Speaker said that the graves recently discovered on the building site had caused a number of uncertainties, but she would try to find out what the latest information was and let the Senate know. In the meantime, the timetable had been set back.

New Business

Lynn Cherry introduced a series of motions on behalf of the Curriculum Committee. First, however, two of the proposals on the circulated list were temporarily withdrawn, as indicated below (S01-065, deletion of GEOL 205, and S01-075, change in degree requirements for concentration in Environmental Geology), to be reintroduced on April 17. During a brief
discussion, Phil Dustan wanted to know why the numbers on some of the other Geology courses had been raised, and James Carew answered that the new numbers accurately represented the content and the relative difficulty of the courses now. Beverley Diamond asked if PEHD, Beginning Figure Skating, carried two credit hours; this was confirmed.

The Curriculum Committee, Lynn Cherry announced, has been working on a new form to use in submitting proposals for new minors or new programs; this will be available for downloading on the Web. There had also been a good deal of discussion about cross-listing graduate with undergraduate courses; the SACS criteria for doing this could be obtained from the Registrar’s Office. Michael Katuna wanted to know whether proposals for new minors and new concentrations had to go through the Commission on Higher Education (CHE), and the answer was no.

A total of fifty-two motions passed, with two additional items introduced as information:

S01-064 -- GEOL 492 Senior Seminar New Course (1 hr.)

[S01-065 -- GEOL 205 Environmental Geology Course Deletion: withdrawn]

S01-066 -- GEOL 390 Intro. to Research Course Deletion
S01-068 -- GEOL 202 Paleobiology Change Course Number
S01-069 -- GEOL 215 Structural Geology Change Course Number
S01-070 -- GEOL 220 Hydrogeology Change Course Number
S01-071 -- GEOL 330 Sedimentary Petrology Change Course Number
S01-072 -- GEOL 340 Igneous & Metamorphic Petrology Change Course Number

[S01-075 -- GEOL BA or BS w/concentration in Environmental Geology: withdrawn]

S01-076 -- ENGL 358 Colonial & Post-Colonial British Literature New Course (3)
S01-077 -- MATH 203 Linear Algebra Change Prerequisites
S01-078 -- PSYC 394 Systems of Psychology Change Course Title
S01-079 -- PEHD 104 Beginning Figure (Ice) Skating New Course (2)
S01-080 -- ARTH 310 African Art New Course (3)
S01-081 -- ARTH 381 Spanish Baroque Painting and Sculpture New Course (3)
S01-082 -- ARTH 255 Latin American Art: Colonial to Modern New Course (3)
S01-083 -- ARTH 393 Introduction to Film Art New Course (3)
S01-084 -- FREN 302 Le Concept de Marketing Change Course Number
S01-085 -- FREN 328 French Language Study Abroad Change Course Number
S01-086 -- FREN 329 Contemporary France Abroad Change Course Number
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S01-087</td>
<td>FREN 331 French for Business I</td>
<td>Change Course Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-088</td>
<td>FREN 332 French for Business II</td>
<td>Change Course Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-089</td>
<td>FREN 421 Current Issues in France</td>
<td>Change Course Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-090</td>
<td>FREN 446 History of the French Language</td>
<td>Change Course Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-091</td>
<td>FREN 463 Literature of the 18th Century</td>
<td>Change Course Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-092</td>
<td>FREN 464 Literature of the 19th Century</td>
<td>Change Course Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-093</td>
<td>FREN 465 Literature of the 19th Century</td>
<td>Change Course Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-094</td>
<td>FREN 466 Literature of the 20th Century</td>
<td>Change Course Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-095</td>
<td>FREN 470 African Literature of French Expression</td>
<td>Change Course Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-096</td>
<td>FREN 471 The Baroque and Classic Theater in France</td>
<td>Change Course Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-097</td>
<td>FREN 474 French Women Writers</td>
<td>Change Course Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-097a</td>
<td>FREN 473 The Novel in France</td>
<td>Change Course Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-097b</td>
<td>FREN 499 Bachelor's Essay</td>
<td>New Course (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-098</td>
<td>FREN 313C French Conversation</td>
<td>New Course (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-099</td>
<td>FREN 314C French Conversation</td>
<td>New Course (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-101</td>
<td>FREN 438 French Theater of the 20th Century</td>
<td>New Course (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-102</td>
<td>FREN 483 Fairy Tales: Word &amp; Image</td>
<td>New Course (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-103</td>
<td>French Minor</td>
<td>Change Degree Req.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-104</td>
<td>ACCT 307 Accounting Information Systems</td>
<td>New Course (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-105</td>
<td>ACCT 336 Government and Not-for-Profit Accounting</td>
<td>New Course (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-106</td>
<td>B.S. in Accounting</td>
<td>Change Degree Req.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-107</td>
<td>B.S. in Accounting</td>
<td>Change Degree Req.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-108</td>
<td>ACCT 308 Cost Accounting</td>
<td>Change Prerequisites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-109</td>
<td>ACCT 316 Intermediate Accounting I</td>
<td>Change Prerequisites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-110</td>
<td>ACCT 317 Intermediate Accounting II</td>
<td>Change Prerequisites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-111</td>
<td>ACCT 341 Federal Taxation I</td>
<td>Change Prerequisites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-112</td>
<td>ACCT 342 Federal Taxation II</td>
<td>Change Prerequisites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-113</td>
<td>ACCT 409 Auditing Theory</td>
<td>Change Prerequisites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-114</td>
<td>MKTG 444 Marketing Internship</td>
<td>New Course (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-115</td>
<td>MGMT 444 Management Internship</td>
<td>New Course (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-116</td>
<td>TRAN 444 Transportation Internship</td>
<td>New Course (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-117</td>
<td>DSCI 444 Decision Science Intern.</td>
<td>New Course (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-118</td>
<td>MKTG 329 Consumer Behavior</td>
<td>New Course (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01-119</td>
<td>Concentration in Marketing</td>
<td>New Concentration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR INFORMATION ONLY:

COMM 380/URST 399 – Special Topics: Images of the City (3)
Speaking for the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs, Rohn England introduced a motion to delete the following requirement from the Graduate Program in Marine Biology:

A knowledge of a foreign language (normally French, German, Russian, or Spanish) is required. This must be demonstrated through successful completion of a reading examination.

The reason for this deletion, he said, is that the curriculum is densely packed already, and no other marine biology M.S. program still requires a foreign language component, since it is widely held that foreign language skills should be part of the undergraduate, not graduate, curriculum. The motion to delete passed unanimously, on a voice vote.

Speaking for Robert Russell, David Maves put forward a proposal to change the Humanities General Education Requirement, by treating courses in Art History, Music, and Theatre as belonging to separate categories, rather than “lumping them together under the no longer appropriate term Fine Arts.” This would allow students “to take six hours from any of the three disciplines, just as they may presently take six hours from Philosophy and six hours from religious studies, two ‘areas.’ in fact, from the same department.”

This proposal was contained in a letter from Dean Valerie B Morris, dated March 15, 2001, signed by Diane Johnson, Steve Rosenberg, and Mark Landis, the respective chairs of Art History, Music, and Theatre. The original is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.

Rich Heldrich moved immediately to send this proposal to the Academic Planning Committee. His motion passed unanimously, on a voice vote, and it was so ordered.

**Constituents’ Concerns and Adjournment**

Richard Nunan requested that this portion of the meeting, normally left out of the record, be included. He then referred to the proposal put forward at an earlier meeting [Spring, 2000] to make student evaluations of faculty teaching available to students. This had been sent to the Faculty Welfare Committee, Mr. Nunan said, with the charge of consulting with the Student Government Association (SGA) about the issue. The SGA had come up with a proposal of their own, but it was in fact a different proposal from the one the Welfare Committee was to consult with them about. Mr. Nunan, therefore, had two questions. First, does a “charged” committee have to report back as charged, or can they just not bring an item back? And second, will this
issue, as he hoped, reemerge from the Welfare Committee next semester?

The Speaker answered by saying that the By-Laws say nothing about the first question. As to the second, she believed there was a report being readied by the Welfare Committee and that it would appear sometime next year. They had been charged to work with students, however, and so perhaps the By-Laws needed revising. The issue itself was not dead.

Kem Fronabarger commented at the end of the discussion that the Senate should rule its committees, and not the other way around. Someone pointed out, however, that the Faculty Welfare Committee was a faculty, not a senate, committee and, as such, not directly subject to being “ruled” by the senate, at least not in the sense suggested.

Shortly before six o’clock, the meeting adjourned until April 17.
October 3, 2000

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

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

Reports

The Speaker

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

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

Assessment Committee

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

New Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

New Business (cont.)

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

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

F00002 - HEAL 317 Course Change
F00003 - PEHD 399 Course Change
F00004 - PEHD 430 Course Change
F00005 - PEHD 431 Course Change
F00006 - PEHD 437 Course Change
F00007 - PEHD 440 Course Change
F00008 - PEHD 458 Course Change

F00010 - ASST 101 New Course: Introduction to Asian Studies
F00011 - Asian Studies Minor

FOR INFORMATION ONLY:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Original motion and rationale (from the Minutes of the April 4, 2000 Senate Meeting):
That the Faculty Senate establish a standing committee on Educational Technology.
Composition:

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

Duties:

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

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

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

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

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

Rationale:

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

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

The Faculty Senate should take a proactive approach to planning for the use of educational technology, including policy concerning faculty compensation, development, and workload. A long-range, strategic plan is critically needed. This faculty committee would guide not only the long-term planning, but also the short-term decisions that 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.]]
MOTION TO AMEND THE BY-LAWS (No. 2)

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

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

Change the wording for the Academic Planning Committee

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

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

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

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

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

Rationale

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

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

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

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

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

James Carew then introduced a motion about the grading system:

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

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

Signatories:

James L. Carew                    Richard Nunan                        A. Kem Fronabarger

Michael P. Katuna

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

Constituents’ Concerns

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt,
Faculty Secretary

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

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The sixth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 13 in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Forty-three senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (January 23) were approved as circulated, with one addition: Faye Steuer suggested adding the word “new” toward the end of the first paragraph on p. 2 to emphasize that the “new Library” is “fully funded,” and hence protected from anticipated cuts in funding, but presumably not the library budget in general.

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett reported briefly on the efforts of the Presidential Search Committee, and urged the faculty to get in touch with any member with suggestions or questions. A professional consultant has now been hired to aid in the search process. She mentioned the Student Government Association’s invitation to members of the Senate to attend a reception at the President’s house on February 22, and said she hoped there would be a substantial turnout. In addition, a substantial “challenge grant” had been offered for a scholarship, with the condition that 50% or more of the faculty contributed to the annual College of Charleston Foundation fund drive. She concluded her report by urging faculty to make nominations for the Distinguished Teaching, Research, Service, and Advising awards.

Old Business

Jorge Marban was recognized for the Post-Tenure Review Committee and recommended two policy changes which had been discussed at the November meeting and remanded for further study:

Senate Agenda Item: Meeting of February 13, 2001
From: Post Tenure Review Committee

Recommendations for Additions to Post-Tenure Review Policy

1. The Senate at its November 28 2000 meeting remanded to the 2000-2001 Post-Tenure Review Committee the issue of the rating of candidates who failed to receive the requested superior rating. The original proposal did not clarify who would assign the rating.

After careful evaluation the Committee recommends the addition of this article to the Post-
Tenure Review Policy:

In the event that a candidate who has applied for a rating fails to receive that rating, a different rating must be assigned at each level of review.

Rationale: A final rating should be given to a candidate who has failed to receive a requested rating. A rating assigned at each level of review (Chair, Dean, PTR Committee, Provost) should be helpful to the President in determining the final rating that must be assigned by law to each candidate.

2. At the November 28, 2000 Senate Meeting, Mike Katuna suggested that an article be added to the Post-Tenure Review Policy indicating that this committee is the “central office” handling all petitions and correspondence related to post-tenure review. After careful consideration of this item the Committee recommends the addition of this article to the Deferment section of the Post-Tenure Review Policy:

All petitions for a deferment or a waiver of post-tenure review due to an announced retirement must be addressed to the Post-Tenure Review Committee. All official communications regarding postponements or waivers of reviews will be issued by said committee.

Rationale: This new article clarifies that the Post-Tenure Review Committee is the central office receiving and issuing all official communications related to post-tenure reviews.

Both motions passed unanimously, on a voice vote.

New Business

Lynn Cherry then introduced a series of motions on behalf of the Curriculum Committee:

F00018 – PSYC 410 - Change in number of hours for credit
S01046 – EDFS 351 - Change in course title
S01047 – EDFS 353 - Change in course title
S01048 – EDFS 354 - Change in course title
S01049 – EDFS 411 - Change in course title
S01050 – EDFS 412 - Change in course title
S01051 – EDFS 413 - Change in course title
S01052 – Classics: - Change in degree requirements for the B.A. in Classics

[For Information Only:

PHYS 298 - ST: Medical Spectroscopy
ENGL 395 - ST: British Literature in an Age of Empire]
These motions passed right away, with no changes.

Jorge Marban then recommended an additional change in Post-Tenure Review Policy, as an item of New Business:

**Senate Agenda Item: Meeting of February 13, 2001**
**From: Post-Tenure Review Committee**

**Recommendation for a Change in Wording in the Post-Tenure Review Policy**

The 2000-2001 Post-Tenure Review Committee recommends unanimously a change in wording of the first section of article 4 of the Post-Tenure Review Policy (“Evaluations of the Post-Tenure Review committee can take one of three forms:”)

**From**

‘Superior’

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

**To:**

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

*Rationale: All the members of the 2000-2001 Post-Tenure Review Committee believe that the current Post-Tenure Review Policy restricts eligibility for the Superior rating, among candidates with a terminal degree, to Full Professors. The proposed change of wording will avoid any possible confusion with regard to eligibility for the Superior rating.*

Richard Nunan then began the discussion with an alternative recommendation. This was treated as an amendment to the main motion, so that both proposals could be discussed on equal terms.

**Amendment to P-T Review Committee Senate Motion:**

Instead of adding the proposed language to Article 4 of the Post-Tenure
Review Policy, append the following sentence at the end of the paragraph describing a 'Superior' rating:

A Superior rating requires performance at the level of Full Professor, but does not require a tenured faculty member to hold the rank of Full Professor.

In support of this amendment, Mr. Nunan made the following points:

• The current policy does not explicitly state that Associate Professors with a terminal degree are excluded from consideration for a "Superior" rating.

• The current policy does however state that faculty who do not hold terminal degrees are eligible for consideration for a Superior rating if they are performing at the level of Full Professor. Why shouldn't the same be true for those with terminal degrees?

• Some departments on campus have higher standards for promotion to Full Professor than the College requires. Tenured Associate Professors in these departments should still be eligible for a Superior rating in the Post Tenure Review process, evaluated in terms of a college-wide standard for such a rating.

• The Tenure and Promotion process is a separate and distinct process from that of Post Tenure Review. These enterprises ought to remain separate, especially in light of the fact that the decision to seek promotion to Full Professor is never compulsory and is exercised solely at the discretion of each individual faculty member. Since promotion is not compulsory, failure to apply for promotion should not be used to deny a Superior rating.

• The Post-Tenure Review Committee's function is to review the evidence presented in support of a faculty member's self-evaluation (particularly in the case of Superior ratings) and make a recommendation to the Provost that either concurs with the self-evaluation or details the reasons for their negative decision. It is not the function of that Committee to decline to exercise its judgment in this matter, in order to implement some other administrative policy that falls outside its charge as a Committee.

Discussion of the main motion, and the amendment, then began in earnest, and occupied close to an hour and forty-five minutes. The central argument in support of the main motion was that the text of the existing Post-Tenure Review policy, as passed by the Senate and approved by the Administration, leaves no choice but to interpret it in the way suggested, and that to change the rules of eligibility more than half-way through the academic year would create a very difficult legal and administrative situation. The main argument in favor of the opposing amendment was a
common-sense perception that the faculty, in its collective wisdom, cannot have intended to say that only Full Professors are capable of performing at a superior level.

Mr. Marban introduced the following arguments against accepting the amendment:

Misreading of the Post-Tenure Review Policy in the Sponsored Motion to Change the PTR Policy

1. Proponent states: “According to policy, a faculty member’s self evaluation may take one of three forms: Superior, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory.”

The Post-Tenure Review Policy states: “Evaluations of the Post-Tenure Review Committee can take one of three forms: ‘Superior’…’Unsatisfactory’…’Satisfactory’.

2. Proponent states: “In order to ensure that all roster faculty are eligible for consideration for “Superior” ratings, any tenured faculty who do not have terminal degrees are eligible for consideration for a Superior rating if they are performing at the level of Full Professor, without regard to their current rank or their ability to hold the rank of Full Professor in the future. It is inconsistent with the broad intent of this facet of the policy to exclude similarly outstanding faculty who are also performing at the level of Full Professor, simply because they hold a terminal degree.”

Proponent is equating the language in the first sentence of the PTR policy’s section on Superior with the second one. The first sentence reads: “Candidate has continued to perform at the level expected for promotion to the rank of Professor or Librarian IV…”

This is an important distinction that should not be ignored. Candidates and Department chairs may think that a certain candidate is “performing” at the level of professor. We can only say objectively that a candidate is performing at the rank of Professor after he/she has been awarded the rank of Professor following a full review. Therefore, “has continued to perform” can only refer to candidates who have attained the rank of Professor.

The second sentence in the Superior section of the Policy refers to “Tenured Assistant and Associate Professors or Librarians who lack a terminal degree but who otherwise meet the standards of promotion to the rank of Professor or Librarian IV…” This is an exclusionary clause that further confirms that faculty members holding the above ranks with a terminal degree are not eligible to apply for a Superior rating.

Reasons for Excluding Associate Professors with a Terminal Degree from Eligibility for a Superior Rating.

The Post-Tenure review process has two main purposes:
a) to correct the deficiencies of tenured faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory;

b) to reward tenured faculty members whose outstanding performance should be recognized.

Associate Professors holding a terminal degree and whose performance is outstanding can be recognized by being promoted to the highest rank, a promotion which entails a significant boost in salary.

Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Librarians without a terminal degree as well as Full Professors cannot rise in rank. A Superior rating with a salary boost is the only way (besides the limited number of annual awards) that their outstanding performance may be recognized.

If approved, the sponsored motion could have these repercussions:

1. It will create an unequal and inequitable situation in which Associate Professors with a terminal degree could have three chances in six years to boost their salaries while Full Professors and tenured faculty members without a terminal degree would have only two:

   ASSOC. PROF.  2001 (PTR) 2002 (Prom.)  2007 (PTR)
   FULL PROF.      2001 (PTR)                       2007 (PTR)

2. It could increase dramatically the potential number of applicants for Superior, reducing the chance of a sizeable increase of the small salary boost now given ($500).

   And, the worst and most worrisome consequence would be…

3. It would affect the process of promotion to Full Professor. A candidate who receives a Superior rating before petitioning for promotion to Full Professor could use that previous rating as leverage to influence the T and P committee. This could conceivably put two College committees (using the same standards of evaluation) at odds with each other. If denied promotion by the T and P committee, the faculty member who had received a Superior rating could use that rating as support for an appeal or legal action.

Mr. Marban then quoted from the records of a 1998 meeting of the original Ad Hoc Committee on Post-Tenure Review, to indicate that his position had been part of the original conception of PTR since the very beginning:

Post-Tenure Review Development of Superior Standards
Marion (Doig) proposed *that no one could get a superior rating until after promotion to Full Professor* (reasoning that, under our conception, the standard is the same for each anyway). To which Richard [Nunan] asked: *What about faculty who are tenured, but not promotable to Full Professor, because they don’t have terminal degrees?* (Marion said: satisfy requirement for their last promotable level).

In addition, Mr. Marban quoted or referred to several other memoranda, and to statements made at meetings of the Faculty Senate over the past several years. One such statement was made by Robert Mignone at the Senate meeting of December 7, 1999 that *“in general, only Full Professors would qualify for a Superior rating.”* *(The full text of these memoranda and statements is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes)*.

Finally, after further discussion, Beverly Diamond called for the question on the amendment. Mr. Nunan’s amendment to the main motion passed by a vote of 21 to 20, on a written ballot.

James Carew then asked for a quorum count; a quorum was present. At length, the question was called on Mr. Marban’s motion, as amended by Mr. Nunan. The amended motion failed, on a tie vote of 19 to 19, on a written ballot. This deadlock could not be resolved because the Speaker had had to leave just before the end of the meeting, and Hugh Wilder, Speaker pro tempore, had already cast a ballot and could not vote a second time to break the tie.

Mr. Nunan had intended to introduce the following resolution, as devised by Lynn Ford and previously circulated with the agenda for the meeting:

> The Senate requests that the Faculty Committee on Post-Tenure Review approach its work in the 2000-01 academic year consistent with the intent and spirit of the motion passed by the Senate. All tenured faculty requesting a "Superior" rating should be reviewed according to the policy guidelines and criteria, regardless of their rank.

Since, however, the motion was not “passed by the Senate,” this resolution became moot.

**Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment**

After a very brief discussion of constituents’ concerns, the meeting adjourned shortly after 7:00 o’clock.

Respectfully submitted,
Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary

2000-2001 Senate Meetings:
September 5, October 3, October 31, November 28;
January 23, February 13, March 13, April 3 (second part, April 17)
Faculty Meetings: September 11, 2000; April 23, 2001
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fifth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 23, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Forty-nine senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (November 28) were approved as circulated, with one correction, to be made in this sentence on p. 3: “The Speaker concluded her report by noting that one of the nicest aspects of the AAUP conference had been that several of our own Trustees had attended.” In fact, these trustees were from other institutions, not The College of Charleston.

Reports

The Provost

Andy Abrams began by saying that the current budget crunch was a little like Hurricane Hugo. Even though it seems quite far away right now, it really is coming, and it’s going to hit. The last set of budget figures for the month of February will determine the final size of the cuts that will have to be made in accordance with the 15% across-the-board reduction mandated by the State. It’s not that South Carolina is in a recession; it’s the State has been a victim of its own success. It has taken surplus dollars (unlike the College) and treated them as recurring budget items, not one-of-a-kind expenditures. There will still be a budget surplus this year, but it will be a good deal smaller than anticipated, and hence the budget crunch – rather like a huge “Ponzi” scheme, adding up to a shortfall of five hundred million dollars. Secondary education (K through grade 12) has been exempted from these cuts, and an attempt has been made to get higher education exempted, too, but it now appears this is unlikely. We will be facing cuts. The Legislature, however, is not necessarily in agreement with a 15% across-the-board reduction. But the danger is that this may provide them with an opportunity to wade in and eliminate programs they don’t like.

As far as the College is concerned, we may be able to get the cuts down to single digits. We will absolutely not lay off any roster faculty. Trident Tech may, as a recent newspaper interview suggested, but we won’t. People come first at The College of Charleston. “I don’t care,” Mr. Abrams insisted, “what USC, for example, is doing – we have got where we are because of people, who come first at this institution, and we will continue to do what we do best.” Every indication now is that the “crunch” will turn into a budget adjustment – not a budget disaster – and the State will be healthy again next year. The President has accepted this, and so have the Board of Trustees. We are not going to axe personnel and programs. To allow this to happen on account of a one-year blip caused by fiscal anomalies in Columbia would make no sense. There may be some limited growth in class size, but that is not our intention if we can help it. Some of our revenue shortfall can be made up by accepting more students from out of state – out of state applications are up 13% – since they bring in more tuition dollars, and we can increase our revenues by small general increases in tuition as well. And there may be other ways...
of increasing revenues, such as upping the enrollment at the North Area campus. But our basic commitment to undergraduate liberal arts education will not change. Raising money by going in for “Distance Education” is not the answer, either. What we **can** do, is defer some projects for the time being, as another way of holding down expenditures now **(not the Library, which is fully funded)**. The academic side of our house now receives, and will continue to receive, more than its share of funds available to the institution as a whole. Judge Sanders has even said he will forego his sabbatical to save money! We are also looking at ways to cut travel expenses, particularly Administrative travel.

When the smoke clears, the College should be in at least as good a position at the end of the next academic year as it will be at the end of this. We are **not** going to lose faculty, either through attrition or because we become less attractive to able teachers and scholars. What the President **will do**, is to allow the Division of Academic Affairs, for the first time, to carry forward money left over at the end of this fiscal year into the next, rather than having it revert to the state at the end of the budget year; other divisions of the College will not be allowed to do so. The good part is that monies that have been “lost” that way in the past, won’t be this time around. The basic fact is that there has been sound and conservative fiscal management at The College of Charleston for many years, and this is going to pay off in the present crunch. The College, he concluded quietly, will be fine.

David Hall asked if it will be hard to replace faculty who are on leave. The answer: we will be replacing some through adjuncts. Originally, the President put in place a hiring freeze – but replacement hires will, in general, be permitted, and will be handled at the department level. Existing “lines” will definitely remain.

The Provost received an enthusiastic round of applause for his report.

**Dean Lindstrom**

William Lindstrom discussed current enrollment at the College, noting that the FTE count has gone down slightly, from 9606 last year, to 9570. Applications, however, appear to be going up, though these numbers are obviously a “moving target.” As of January 7, the number of applicants for admission to the College appears to be going up steadily, when measured against figures obtained at the same time in previous years, rising from 4485 in 1999, to 4888 in 2000-2001, to 5587 for next fall. The Office of Enrollment Management has been given its marching orders, with three specific targets for the fall of 2001. First, there should be no growth in the size of the student body. Second, we should work for a continuing improvement in the quality of our students. With applications on the rise, we are now in a position to be more selective; the result is that test scores are going up steadily as well. Third, the President and the Trustees have called for a substantial increase in minority admissions, with the goal of attracting at least 200 more students in this category for the fall of 2001. All in all, the enrollment picture is encouraging, to say the least. One especially bright spot is that the retention rate for provisional students is now virtually the same as that for students regularly admitted. This is a significant achievement.
The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett then reported on the activities of the Presidential Search Committee, whose membership is as follows:

- Mr. Joel E. Smith: Chair of the Committee, and of the Board of Trustees
- Dr. John Clark: Board of Trustees
- Mr. Timothy Dangerfield: Board of Trustees
- Mrs. Marie Land: Board of Trustees
- Mr. F. Creighton McMaster: Board of Trustees
- Mr. Lawrence O. Thompson: Board of Trustees
- Dr. Deanna Caveny: Faculty
- Dr. Trisha Folds-Bennett: Faculty
- Dr. Hugh Wilder: Faculty
- Mr. Frederick Daniels: Administration
- Dr. Conrad Festa: Administration
- Dr. James B. Edwards: Alumnus
- Ms. Kelly Lindsay: Student
- Mr. Theodore S. Stern: Member At Large

The Search Committee, she said, had met twice, and had agreed on the requirements for the position. The published job description had been very carefully devised:

**COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON**

**PRESIDENT**

The Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston invites nominations and applications for the position of president. The search is prompted by the resignation of Alexander M. Sanders, Jr., who will leave office on October 1, 2001, after a highly successful eight-year term as president.

Founded in 1770 as the first municipal college in America, the College has been part of the higher education system of South Carolina since 1970. Fifty undergraduate programs are offered to 9,800 undergraduates from 50 states and 72 countries. The College has a long history of, and commitment to, a strong liberal arts and sciences tradition with an emphasis on undergraduate teaching. Students have the opportunity to participate in study abroad programs around the world, and the College maintains campuses in Spain and France. Graduate education includes offerings in 16 fields to approximately 2,000 students. Additional information about the College is available at www.cofc.edu.

A successful capital campaign has recently been completed. The College is
engaged in a major building program which will provide students and faculty with state-of-the-art facilities for its library and for its programs in the fine arts, sciences, and business.

The College is seeking an individual of integrity and enthusiasm to lead its effort to become a nationally preeminent public liberal arts and sciences institution. The individual selected must be able to articulate effectively this vision and, through fiscal and administrative skills, translate this vision into action. He or she will have accomplishments that earn the respect of the academic community and significant leadership experience. The President of the College must be an advocate who can work successfully within complex educational, political, and social environments.

The Presidential Search Committee will begin reviewing nominations and applications immediately and will continue until the position is filled. To insure full consideration, materials should be received no later than March 1, 2001. Confidentiality will be maintained until finalists have been named and references will not be contacted until the applicant is notified. The candidate's materials, including a cover letter and the names and telephone numbers of three references, should be sent to Mr. Fred Daniels, Senior Vice President for Executive Administration, College of Charleston, 66 George Street, Charleston, SC 29424.

The College of Charleston is an equal opportunity employer.
is what the State seems to expect. In conclusion, she hoped that faculty would e-mail her with questions for the candidates, and send in names of nominees – and also stay around a little longer than usual in May, after the conclusion of the academic year, to meet the finalists.

During a brief discussion, David Gentry asked whether the schedule would really allow enough time for a new president to take up the office in October. Trisha Folds-Bennett replied that Ted Stern had been a great help here. Mr. Stern said that in his experience six months was a good “lead-time” to expect between the end of the applications process and the beginning of an actual appointment., and this is provided for with the March 1 application deadline. One senator asked who had applied so far, and the answer was that this had to remain strictly confidential until the finalists were announced. The timing was not, in fact, ideal, but the Board had been very sympathetic to the idea of candidates visiting the campus at a time when at least some faculty were likely to be at hand. Originally, the finalists were to have come in July, not May.

**New Business**

* Lynn Cherry then introduced a series of motions on behalf of the Curriculum Committee:

COMM 221 -- Intercultural Communication - New Course (3 hrs.)
COMM 222 -- Small Group Communication - New Course (3)
COMM 320 -- Advanced Interpersonal Comm. - New Course (3)
PHYS 110 -- Conceptual Physics - New Course Proposal (3)  [see correction below]
HTMT 353 -- Hospitality Sales & Negotiation - New Course (3)

Minor in Hospitality and Tourism -- New Program

POLS 333 -- Politics of Contemporary Brazil - New Course (3)
SOCY 350 -- Sociology of Music - New Course (3)
SOCY 345 -- Social Policy - New Course (3)

PHYS -- Change in the B.S. degree
PHYS -- Change in the B.A. degree

PHYS 101 -- Change in Course Title and Description
PHYS 102 -- Change in Course Title and Description
PHYS 105 -- Change in Course Description
PHYS 201 -- Change in Course Title and Description
PHYS 202 -- Change in Course Title and Description
PHYS 298 -- Change in Course Prerequisites
PHYS 301 -- Change in Course Prerequisites
PHYS 306 -- Change in Course Prerequisites
PHYS 308 -- Change in Course Prerequisites
PHYS 320 -- Change in Course Prerequisites
PHYS 330 -- Change in Course Prerequisites
PHYS 370 -- Change in Course Prerequisites
PHYS 390 -- Change in Course Prerequisites
These courses passed, without change. [Secretary’s note: after the meeting, a typographical error was pointed out in the second sentence of the Catalogue Description of PHYS 110 (Conceptual Physics), which should be corrected as follows: “The course uses a carefully structured questioning pattern and investigative laboratory activities that help [not “helps”] students develop new explanations and mental models.” This correction has been made in the copy sent to the Registrar.]

Rohn England, for the Committee on Graduate Education, introduced two motions, which were approved with no changes:

Accounting and Legal Studies: Change in Degree Requirements

Hispanic Studies–Bilingual Legal Interpreting Program – New Course:

INTR 511  Spanish in the United States  (3hrs.)

William Moore then introduced a motion in two parts, originating with the Student Government Association, about the use of cell-phones on campus and in the library. After a good deal of discussion, Caroline Hunt moved to divide the question; this was approved by a vote of 34 to 14, on a show of hands. The first motion was then amended and passed:

“That it be required that all audible cell phones and pagers be turned off, with the exception of emergency workers and EMT, upon entering classrooms on campus.”

The second motion, about using such devices inside the library, proved impossible to clarify after forty-five minutes of discussion, and was remanded to the Library Committee.
Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment

The problem of computer viruses, and the idea of making faculty evaluations available to students, each received brief mention. The Faculty Welfare Committee was working on the latter with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Student Government Association.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary

*******

2000-2001 Senate Meetings :
September 5, October 3, October 31, November 28;
January 23, February 13, March 13, April 3 (second part, April 17)
Faculty Meetings: September 11, 2000; April 23, 2001
November 28, 2000

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fourth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 28, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty-five senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (October 31) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett reported on a conference of the AAUP which she had recently attended. In the past, she had not been particularly impressed with these conferences, but this year’s turned out to be much more interesting. The theme of this conference was the challenges facing the academic world from outside of academia itself. The first was the challenge of acceptability. Eighty per cent of the American population are now eligible for college. This rapid growth was leading to pressures for yet more persons to be accepted, and to more degree programs to accommodate this growth. At the same time, there is an increased focus on job training, and on what is coming to be referred to as “distance learning.” These pressures, in turn, seem to be leading in many cases to an increased workload for many members of the teaching profession, to compromises in the classroom experience because of larger and larger classes, and to questions about the value of research, especially published research.

The academic world is also facing pressure to evolve toward a “corporate” model for decision-making, which is perceived as more efficient than the “shared” model of academic governance. This carries with it the danger of undermining the role of faculty in their institutions. Ironically, however, there is now growing evidence that the corporate model is not working very well for business and industry, who are actually in the process of broadening their mechanisms of governance in order to reach and include more of their constituents in the process of decision-making.
The AAUP is now working on a new copy of their handbook (the “red book”). The Speaker said that she felt fairly good about the standing of the College of Charleston in all this. Our structures of faculty governance seem to be working fairly well, and we have played a responsible role, for example, in choosing representatives to the Presidential Search Committee. We still have some distance to go, and real concerns about the ways some decisions are made, but on the whole, the picture is encouraging. As a matter of fact, we do pretty well when judged by a list called “The Criteria for Effective Faculty Senates” developed by participants at meetings of the AAHE’s National Network of Faculty Senates over the past ten years. This list was developed within the SUNY (State University of New York) system, which also has a state-wide faculty senate made up of representatives from the individual senates of the separate colleges and universities.

Effective faculty senates have:

–Permanent office space, files, archives
–Annual budget (travel, telephone, computer, supplies, etc.)
–Secretarial assistance
–Adjusted workload for officers
–Regular meetings with college president
–Consulted on creation of all non-senate committees
–Senate president (faculty officer) presides at senate meetings
–Bylaws specify areas where senate decisions are normally determinative, co-determinative, or advisory
–Meetings and activities advertised in advance and records of actions widely published
–Attracts both junior and senior faculty who are esteemed as academic leaders
–Is regarded by the campus as dealing with crucial issues
–Has effective representation on other key governance groups
–Senate leadership visible in the ceremonial and symbolic affairs of the campus
–Initiates a major portion of its agenda items
–Defends the core values of academic freedom, determines curriculum
–Provides an effective forum for controversial issues
–Is seen as an agent of necessary institutional change

–Grounds its practices in parliamentary procedure and published and endorsed principles of governance.

The Speaker concluded her report by noting that one of the nicest aspects of the AAUP conference had been that several of our own Trustees had attended. There was nothing, as yet, to report about the Presidential Search. But if senators or faculty know of outstanding candidates, they should please urge them to apply.

**New Business**

● Jorge Marban, speaking for the Post-Tenure Review Committee, introduced a series of recommendations for deletions and additions to the Post-Tenure Review Policy. The eight-page original document, as amended at the meeting, is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes. The recommended changes were discussed at some length, and may be summarized as follows.

1. **Formation of panels evaluating department chairs [passed]:**

   When the department chair herself/himself is up for post-tenure review, the most senior tenured member of the department (other than the chair) will convene, and chair, a departmental post-tenure review panel consisting of three tenured faculty (including the panel chair). Panel members will normally be drawn from the home department according to seniority. When necessary to complete the panel, additions will be drawn, following the same criteria, from Departments with related areas of study. The panel may not include chairpersons from external departments. No tenured faculty member concurrently subject to post-tenure review may serve on this panel. The panel will exercise the same responsibility with respect to the department chair's candidacy that the chair exercises in all other cases. This department panel will also review all other cases coming up for post-tenure review at the same time as the department chair.

2. **Deletions:**

   [passed]:

   Page 1 Article 3:

   {*In the event of subsequent approval of teaching portfolios as part of the post-tenure review process, starred elements may be incorporated as components of those portfolios.}  
   {*In the event of subsequent approval of peer teaching evaluations as part of the post-tenure review process, these letters will include peer teaching evaluation comments.}  
   {[withdrawn; not voted on:}  

   Page 3 Article 5:
5. Whenever the Post-Tenure Review Committee assigns a rating of ‘superior’, such a rating must be accompanied by a permanent merit increase normally not less than that given for promotion to the rank of Professor, effective the academic year following the year of evaluation.]

3. Additions:

[passed]:

Add to Article 1 (page 1) after the sentence which ends “…like other standing committees”:

A faculty member whose packet comes before the Post-Tenure Review Committee cannot serve on this committee during the academic year in which he/she is being evaluated.

[[Proposed new Article 6: remanded to committee; not voted on.

6. In the event that a candidate who has applied for a Superior rating fails to receive all the necessary endorsements, his/her rating will revert to Satisfactory.]]

[passed as amended]:

A new section on Deferments (with friendly amendments in sections 2 and 3 suggested by Beverly Diamond and David Gentry, incorporated in this text):

Deferments

1. Faculty members may petition the Post-Tenure Review Committee for postponement of their post-tenure reviews based on extenuating personal circumstances, exceptional professional commitments, or valid medical reasons which must be documented in the petition. Petitions must be endorsed by the faculty member’s Chair and Dean. Postponements will be approved only under extraordinary circumstances and will not normally extend more than one academic year. Decisions by the PTR Committee regarding deferments may be appealed to the Provost within one week of the candidate’s notification. The Provost’s decision shall be final

2. Faculty members who announce their decision to retire within three years of their scheduled time for post-tenure review (by submission of a letter to the Dean of his/her school and the Provost) will not have to undergo that review. However, if a faculty member postpones the announced time of retirement for more than one year, he/she will be evaluated in the year of that announcement.

3. A faculty member scheduled for post-tenure review in a given year will not have to undergo that review if he/she petitions for promotion to Associate or Full Professor that same year or announces (in writing) his/her intention to do so during the following academic year. However, if the promotion process is postponed, a post-tenure review will take place no later than one year after the originally scheduled time for post-tenure review.
4. Administrators (such as Deans) rejoining the ranks of the faculty will undergo post-tenure review within three years of their return to faculty status.

5. If a faculty member takes a sabbatical or a leave of absence in the same academic year he/she is scheduled for post-tenure review, the post-tenure review will take place during the following academic year, unless the faculty member decides to undergo the review at the originally scheduled time.

4. Changes in the PTR calendar [passed]:

1. A new deadline in Post-Tenure Review Calendar to be inserted after first entry (Sept. 11):

   Sept. 18 Deadline for submission of requests for post-tenure review deferments to the Post-Tenure Review Committee.

2. A change in the sixth deadline entry in the calendar.

   From: Dec. 18 Department 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.

   To: Dec. 18 Department Chair or Panel Chair will inform the candidate of the departmental recommendation and forward to the appropriate office 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. Normally, packets of candidates receiving the requested Satisfactory rating from the Chair or Panel Chair will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs. Other packets will be forwarded to the appropriate Dean.

Lynn Cherry, on behalf of the Curriculum Committee, recommended a new Language course. This was approved without discussion:

   New Course: SPAN 447 Spanish Dialectology (3hrs.)

Rohn England, for the Committee on Graduate Education, introduced three motions, which passed without change:

1. New Course Proposals:
   a. SMFT 639 - Genetics and Molecular Biology for Teachers (3hrs.)
   b. CSCI 601 - Data Modeling (3)
   c. CSCI 603 - Object-Oriented Design Patterns (3)
   d. CSCI 614 - Advanced Operating Systems (3)
   e. CSCI 632 - Data Communications and Networking (3)
f. CSCI 638 - Data Base Design (3)
g. CSCI 672 - Human Computer Interaction (3)

2. Course Change Proposals:
   a. CSCI 620 to 602
   b. CSCI 640 to 604

3. Program Change Proposal (Master of Environmental Studies)
   MES Policy Track: change required number of hours from 38 to 41.

---

Speaking for the Academic Standards Committee, Walter Pharr introduced a motion on Attendance Policy, affecting p. 19 of the Undergraduate Catalogue and p. 121 of the Faculty/Administration Manual. During the brief discussion, William Moore commented that the requirement that a student notify his instructors on the very first day of class about when he would be absent was simply unworkable. Caroline Hunt said that professors need to state their absence policies, whatever they are, more clearly than is often the case. Lynn Cherry objected that some students (not just athletes) might not know when they would need to be absent on the first day of classes – members of the Debate Team, for example. Accordingly, Hugh Wilder proposed two separate amendments. These were approved, and the main motion passed, as follows:

Since class attendance is a crucial part of any course, students are expected to attend all classes and laboratory meetings of each course in which they enroll. During the first week of classes instructors will announce and distribute their attendance policies, [insert, at the suggestion of Hugh Wilder: including criteria to be used in determining excused absences]. The professor determines whether absences are excused or unexcused, whether make-up work will be permitted, and whether both excused and unexcused absences count in determining the basis for a grade of "WA." If attendance is used for grading purposes, the professor is responsible for keeping accurate attendance records. Each student, whether absent or not, is responsible for all information disseminated in the course. If a student has more than the maximum allowed absences, as defined in the course syllabus, the professor may instruct the registrar to record a grade of "WA" for the student. The grade of "WA" is a failing grade. The procedure for assignment of this grade requires that the professor provide written notification to the Registrar on or before the last meeting day of the class. The registrar will then send a courtesy copy of the notice to the student. The student is responsible for keeping addresses current through the Office of the Registrar.

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

Julia Eichelberger then introduced a motion for the Faculty Welfare Committee, aimed at improving benefits for Adjunct Faculty. The Committee proposes:

That the College of Charleston provide health insurance to all adjunct faculty teaching three or more courses per semester, and to all full-time visitors or other full-time faculty not occupying state lines. We move that the College provide these faculty with health insurance coverage comparable to the coverage provided to roster faculty.

The Welfare Committee had reached the conclusion that this proposal was financially workable. It would probably cost, she said, just under $400,000 to implement, and the College appears to have at its disposal over sixty-five million dollars in unrestricted funds. Lynn Cherry supported the proposal, but said that she hoped it would not disqualify adjuncts from other proposals to improve their working conditions. Basically, this proposal is about the least we should do for them. One senator commented that if adjuncts cost more, they might be less likely to be used as a “cash cow” and exploited by the administration. Was there any reaction from the Office of Academic Affairs? Yes; they had concluded that the proposal was not feasible.

Michael Katuna was worried about the logistics of implementation. Some adjuncts teach three, as opposed to two, courses, and some drop in and out of health insurance programs from one semester to another. Also, there would be a problem with summer employment, because of the state law about nine-month contracts, and so forth. Susan Morrison pointed out that many adjuncts have spouses with better health coverage than anything offered by the College of Charleston, and so not all of adjuncts would be likely to participate; this would skew the statistics being used to estimate the cost of the plan. Hugh Wilder countered that we should let the Human Resources Office handle the implementation issues. What was important was to go on record affirming the principle that the College should do better by its adjunct faculty. Caroline Hunt thought it would be premature for the Faculty Senate to endorse such a proposal without really knowing what its legal and financial ramifications would be, and she moved to remand it to the Welfare Committee. Richard Nunan disagreed, saying the present arrangement for adjuncts is, quite simply, abominable. Caroline Hunt agreed, but said that we would look like idiots if we vote for something that is simply illegal. She would happily vote for a Resolution to help adjuncts, but not for a specific proposal that might not, as Academic Affairs suggested, be feasible.

Peter McCandless urged the senate to endorse the proposal as a moral issue, and Stephanie Low agreed. Hugh Wilder remembered that some similar ideas had been bruited about at a meeting of the AAUP last spring, and that Andy Abrams had said at the time that, yes, the College of Charleston could put such a proposal into practice if it really wanted to. The motion to remand failed. After a further call for clarification from Mr. Katuna, the question was called, and the main motion carried, on a voice vote.
Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment

Several senators joined in asking the Speaker to obtain accurate and comprehensive statistics on the current use of adjuncts at the College, and to find out how the present situation compares with seven or eight years ago. In particular, it would be useful to get a breakdown of these statistics by School, as well as Department.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about twenty past seven.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary

*******

2000-2001 Senate Meetings:
September 5, October 3, October 31, November 28;
January 23, February 13, March 13, April 3 (second part, April 17)
Faculty Meetings: September 11, 2000; April 23, 2001
September 5, 2000

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The first regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston for the academic year 2000-2001 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 5, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty-two senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (first session, April 4, 2000; second session, April 18) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

The Speaker welcomed the senate for the start of the new academic year, and announced that she would not give a formal report but proceed immediately to the rest of the agenda.

New Business

The Speaker began by reappointing George Pothering as Parliamentarian, and then called for the election of the Speaker of the Faculty pro tempore. Hugh Wilder was nominated and elected.

Mr. Wilder then introduced a Resolution which, he explained, had three main purposes: first, to thank President Sanders for being genuinely responsive to the concerns of the faculty in the important matter of appointing a new Provost; second, to congratulate Andy Abrams, who would succeed Dr. Festa at the end of the fall semester; and third, to express the faculty’s hope that a full national search would be undertaken to fill this position at the conclusion of Mr. Abrams’ two year term. The College, Mr. Wilder said, is now in the happy position of being able to attract a very strong applicant pool for such an appointment, and he thought that going on record now about the desirability of a national search would provide an important message for whoever succeeded Judge Sanders as the next President of the College.

Beverly Diamond, in response to a suggestion made by one of her constituents, proposed as a friendly amendment changing “expecting” to “encouraging” in the last sentence; this was accepted by Mr. Wilder. Anthony Leclerc then moved to divide the resolution into three separate paragraphs; this passed, on a voice vote. Dr. Festa commented, with an evident sense of relief, that the change in wording was an excellent idea, and made the resolution much more acceptable. The senate, he said, should be very wary of moving into an area of clearly Administrative “prerogative.” We certainly would not want to jeopardize good relations with the next President by appearing to give instructions on how senior appointments are to be made.
David Mann thought the resolution was “bizarre” because it appeared to be giving away power on the one hand, and then trying to snatch it back some years down the road. Richard Nunan said that ratifying this resolution might very well raise some hackles, but the faculty have a positive duty to express their opinions, on matters of central concern to the College, in an advisory capacity. He then called for a secret ballot, which was approved unanimously. In the event, the Resolution passed, as amended, by a written vote of 37 to 14, with one abstention:

The members of the Faculty Senate hereby express our appreciation for President Alex Sanders' recent termination of the search for Provost and for his appointment of Andy Abrams as Provost for a two-year term. We appreciate the President's willingness to reconsider his plans for the search and [thank him] for his attentiveness to faculty concerns about the process.

We congratulate Mr. Abrams on his appointment as Provost and look forward to working with him in that capacity during this interim period. We also appreciate President Sanders’ statement that his appointment of Mr. Abrams to a two-year term does not imply any limitation on the new President to have a Provost of his or her own choosing.

While understanding that the President is responsible for appointing the Provost, we wish to be on record now, as members of the Faculty Senate, as favoring and [expecting deleted; encouraging added] the next President to initiate a full national search, with substantial faculty involvement, to fill the position of Provost at the completion of Mr. Abrams’ term.

(At the conclusion of the discussion, and while the ballots were being counted, William Moore asked the Provost why, just out of curiosity, he had decided to step down at midyear? Dr. Festa said that his regime had been so free of controversy, that he thought he should generate some.)

""" The Speaker then spoke of the search for the next President of the College, and of how faculty members should be chosen to serve on the search committee (though it was not yet clear, she said, how many faculty representatives would be on it, or when it would start meeting). The Committee on Nominations and Elections would nominate, and the senate would elect, these representatives. We might have to have a Special Called Meeting for this purpose, and to discuss the whole issue. Hugh Wilder said that he had been very impressed last year with Mr. Joel
Smith’s address to the faculty, as head of the Board of Trustees, about “strategic planning.” Why not invite him to meet with us now? Mr. Wilder was, however, very concerned with the problem of timing, and he hoped that the search committee would not be set up or start work before the senate could make some of its concerns known. This would be an argument for inviting him to a special meeting, rather than waiting until the regular meeting in October. The Secretary commented that the regular October 3 meeting would probably be in plenty of time; there was no need, he thought, to hold a special meeting before then.

Mr. Wilder then proposed the following motion, which passed on a voice vote:

That the Speaker of the Faculty shall request a meeting of the Faculty Senate with Mr. Joel Smith, and any other members of the Board of Trustees who might wish to attend, to discuss the Presidential search. The purpose of the meeting would be to provide Mr. Smith and other Board members, if they consider it appropriate, with an opportunity to review plans for the search with faculty Senators, and to give Senators an opportunity to discuss concerns such as faculty representation on the search committee with members of the Board. The Speaker will consult with Mr. Smith about the timing of the Board’s plans for establishing a Presidential search committee, and then invite him and other Board members to attend either a special called meeting of the Faculty Senate or the regular meeting on October 3.

Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment

Phil Dustan asked why the College never seems to get Labor Day off, even though it is a recognized national holiday. Partly, it was suggested, this is because of instituting a “fall break” in the academic calendar, in parallel with the spring semester. William Moore commented that his memory at the College went back twenty-eight years, well before there had been any fall break, and Labor Day had never been a holiday at the College of Charleston. His best guess was that this had originally had to do with “anti-union” politics.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary
2000-2001 Senate Meetings:
September 5, October 3, October 31, November 28;
January 16, February 13, March 13, April 3 (sec. session, April 17)
Faculty Meetings: September 11, 2000; April 23, 2001
September 11, 2000

THE FACULTY MINUTES

The first regular meeting of the Faculty of The College of Charleston for the academic year 2000-2001 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, September 11 in Room 228 of the Lightsey Conference Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. George Pothering served as Parliamentarian. The Minutes of the previous meeting (April 24) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

The Speaker welcomed the faculty for the start of the new academic year, and immediately recognized President Sanders, so that he could address the question that was uppermost in everyone’s mind: the process of selecting the next president of the College.

The President

President Sanders began by saying that he would defer his customary report on The State of the College in order to make two central points. First, he cautioned against narrowing the field of potential presidential candidates by imposing, in advance, any absolute criterion for appointment, such as having a particular kind of academic degree. To do so might very well foreclose the possibility of selecting the best person for the job. He pointed out how many outstanding figures in the history of American higher education, like Derek Bok of Harvard, Terry Sanford of Duke, C. D. Spangler of the University of North Carolina, and Timothy Sullivan of William and Mary, had lacked certain kinds of “academic” degrees and would not have been eligible to serve had such a requirement been arbitrarily imposed ahead of time. Good teaching, he said, cannot be reduced to mere training or technique; it comes from the identity and the integrity of the teacher, and the same is true of a good college president.

Second, he urged the faculty not to sink into a “We/They” mentality. The dangers of this attitude had come to the fore recently during the discussions surrounding the appointment of Provost. Some were of the opinion that the Provost should occupy an adversarial position in relation to the President, constantly challenging the decisions of the President on behalf of the faculty. Not surprisingly, he thought this was a bad idea, and had said so at the time. But the main problem was not so much the relationship between Provost and President, as with the mentality it suggested. Rudyard Kipling had expressed this idea satirically in his poem, “We and They”:

Father, Mother, and Me,
Sister and Auntie say
All the people like us are We
And everyone else is They.
“If ever,” Mr. Sanders said, “I could persuade you of anything in the best interest of the College, I would seek to convince you that you should not think of the administration as something separate and apart from the faculty, much less the adversary of the faculty. In my experience over the course of the last eight years, there is nothing so poisonous to the spirit of the institution and all of its components – including most especially the faculty – than that idea,” which tends to become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Good college presidents, if they are given the chance, will view themselves as the servants of their faculty, and not the other way around. This does not, of course, mean automatically following the faculty’s advice on each and every issue. It does mean allowing the next President to be a colleague, not an adversary. Mr. Sanders thanked the faculty of the College of Charleston for having accorded to him this wonderful opportunity.

**New Business**

Trisha Folds-Bennett then invited the Secretary to read a formal RESOLUTION OF THANKS, which he said a colleague had requested be entered into the permanent records of the College:

The Faculty of The College of Charleston wish to thank our Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Conrad D. Festa, for his many years of devoted service to this institution, which has continued to grow in effectiveness and increase in excellence, in no small part because of his hard work and sustaining vision. We congratulate him on his outstanding achievements, and we look forward to welcoming him once again, at the end of the semester, as he returns to the first love of his life, teaching and scholarship.

Dr. Festa himself was then recognized, and received a standing ovation. After a few opening remarks, he began the traditional introduction of new faculty by mentioning some important new appointments, included in the lists below, and inviting the several deans and department chairs to introduce new members of the faculty in their respective areas:
**ACADEMIC DEANS/DEPARTMENT CHAIRS  2000-2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of the Arts</th>
<th>Ms. Valerie Morris, Dean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Art History</td>
<td>Dr. Diane C. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Music</td>
<td>Prof. Steve Rosenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Theatre</td>
<td>Prof. Mark Landis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Studio Art</td>
<td>Prof. Michael Tyzack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Business</th>
<th>Dr. Clarence M. Condon, III, Dean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Accounting and Legal Studies</td>
<td>Dr. Linda Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Economics and Finance</td>
<td>Dr. J. Michael Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Management and Marketing</td>
<td>Dr. Rhonda Mack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Education</th>
<th>Dr. Nancy Sorenson, Dean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Foundations, Secondary and Special Education</td>
<td>Dr. Frances Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Elementary and Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Dr. Virginia Bartel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education and Health</td>
<td>Dr. Andrew Lewis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</th>
<th>Dr. Samuel M. Hines, Jr., Dean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>Dr. Idee Winfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Dr. Douglas A. Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Dr. Nan Morrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Dr. Marvin Dulaney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Languages</td>
<td>Dr. Earl M. Rickerson, Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Classics and German,</td>
<td>Dr. Frank Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including Italian, Japanese and Russian</td>
<td>Dr. Jeff Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of French</td>
<td>Dr. Andrew Sobiesuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Hispanic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy/Religious Studies</td>
<td>Dr. Richard Nunan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Dr. Lynne Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Dr. Charles Kaiser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# School of Science and Mathematics

**Dr. Gordon Jones, Dean**

**Associate Dean**

Dr. Robert Dukes

**Biology**

Dr. Michael Auerbach

**Chemistry and Biochemistry**

Dr. James Deavor

**Computer Science**

Dr. Christopher Starr

**Geology**

Dr. Mitchell Colgan

**Mathematics**

Dr. Deanna Caveny

**Physics and Astronomy**

Dr. Jon Hakkila

---

## NEW “ROSTER” FACULTY 2000-01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Legal Studies</td>
<td>Sean Chen</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Legal Studies</td>
<td>Jeffrey Yost</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Thomas Arnold</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>Raisa Gomer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Julie Davis</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Bill Manaris</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Renee McCauley</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics &amp; Finance</td>
<td>Rita Balaban</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Carol Ann Davis</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Myra Seaman</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Renee Tursi</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Dennis Williams</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Erin Beutel</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td>Maria Fidalgo-Eick</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td>Maria Luci DeBiaji Moreira</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td>Sarah E. Owens</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td>Silvia Rodriguez</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Laura McGough</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Florence E. Glaze</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>Jose Gavidia</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>Harland Hodges</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>Robert Hasbrouck</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Sophia Agrest</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Thomas Ivey</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Mary Rivers</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mathematics
- Oleg Smirnov, Assistant Professor
- James Young, Assistant Professor

### Music
- Jim Bastian, Assistant Professor
- Trevor Weston, Assistant Professor

### PEHD
- Robert Lindsey, Assistant Professor
- Thomas Mendez, Instructor

### Physics & Astronomy
- Jon Hakkila, Chair

### Political Science
- Richard Dunn, Assistant Professor

### Psychology
- Mark Hurd, Assistant Professor

### Theatre
- Mark Landis, Chair
- Brent Laing, Instructor

### Avery Research Center
- Robert Edison, Director

---

### NEW VISITING FACULTY 2000-01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Carol Pride</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Rebecca Yeomans</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td>Amy Ledbetter</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td>Gretchen E. Potts</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>Stephen J. Della Lana</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>John Powers Kozma</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>RoxAnn Stalvey</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Frances Butler</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Jeffrey W. Lagrone</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Price McMurray</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations, Secondary &amp; Sp. Ed.</td>
<td>Patricia Miller</td>
<td>Visiting Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Erin Beutel</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Elizabeth King</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td>Sam Cogdell</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td>Maria Fidalgo-Eick</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td>William Hope</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td>Peter T. Imoro</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td>Sangsuk Kim</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Robert Crout</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Lorraine Madway</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Sam Ali Mustafa</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Adele Oltman</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Paul D. Roof</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td>Cynthia Fowler</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td>Karen H. Weissman</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theatre Todd Pickett Visiting Assistant Professor

Announcements

The Director of Human Resources, Dolly Bond, then presented a Legislative Update on the South Carolina Retirement System, including information on the “TERI” program, a recently approved deferred options retirement plan scheduled to go into effect on January 1, 2001. Also of note: as of this same date, employees will be eligible for full retirement benefits, without penalty, after 28 years of service instead of 30. A copy of the documents and statistics introduced on the overhead projector is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.

For the Good of the Order

A brief discussion followed For the Good of the Order (traditionally off the record). This was mainly concerned with the faculty’s role, if any, in the selection of the next President of the College.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about 6:00 o’clock.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary

2000-2001 Senate Meetings:
September 5, October 3, October 31, November 28;
January 23, February 13, March 13, April 3 (cont. April 17, if needed)

Spring Faculty Meeting: Monday, April 23, 2001