April 2, 2002

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The eighth and final regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston for the academic year 2001-2002 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 2, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Hugh Wilder presiding. Forty-seven senators attended. Herb Silverman served as Parliamentarian pro tempore, substituting for Robert Mignone. The Minutes of the February 12 meeting, provisionally approved on March 12 after a distribution problem, were given formal approval, along with the Minutes of the March 12 meeting itself.

Reports

The Speaker

The Speaker announced that the Administration has approved the Student Course Information Publication (SCIP), which will be implemented in 2003, and several other recommendations made by the Senate in March, including revised policies on language courses and the residency requirement, to go into effect in August, 2002, and the new grading system, starting in 2006. Mr. Wilder gave a brief progress report on searches for various Deans, and the new Provost, and again encouraged nominations from the faculty, saying there would be open forums and visits from leading candidates. He reminded chairs of faculty and senate committees to send in their annual reports by the first of May, for publication in the Faculty Newsletter; technically, the By-Laws call for committee reports at the end of each semester, but in practice once a year is sufficient.

President Higdon would speak at the final meeting of the full faculty on April 22. Faculty awards would be presented at that time, and there would be a special tribute for Coach John Kresse, followed by a reception given by the faculty to honor President Higdon and his outstanding achievements during his first year in office.

The Speaker concluded by providing an update on the Implementation Report now being prepared for the College’s Long-Range Plan. Eleven separate working groups were putting together individual reports on implementation strategies. These would be merged into a single draft document, to be circulated for comments later in the month; there were likely to be open forums for discussion, and the hope was to send a final plan to the Board of Trustees at some point about half way through the Fall semester.
New Business

Speaking on behalf of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, Richard Bodek announced the slate for the three Standing Committees of the Senate for next year; without objection, they were declared elected:

**Academic Planning Committee:**

- Kasman, Alex Mathematics
- Kattwinkel, Susan Theatre
- Olejniczak, Bill History
- Friedman, Douglas Political Science
- Folds-Bennett, Trisha Psychology
- Johnson, Diane Art History
- Krasnoff, Larry Philosophy

**Budget Committee:**

- Elshazly, Talaat Accounting and legal studies
- McCandless, Peter History
- Morris, Frank Classics/Germ./Ital./Jap./Russian
- Martinez-Gibson, Elizabeth Hispanic Studies
- Perlmutter, Martin Philosophy
- DeHaan, Kathleen Communication
- Ross, Tom Psychology

**Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty-Administration Manual**

- Nunan, Richard Philosophy & Religious Studies
- Hunt, Bishop English
- Mignone, Robert Mathematics

Seven faculty were then nominated from the floor to serve on the Committee on Nominations and Elections: Richard Bodek, Deanna Caveny, Angela Cozart, David Gentry, Todd Grantham, Rick Heldrich, and Thomas Langley. Herb Silverman moved to close the nominations from the floor. Additional nominations could be made in writing until April 12, and the election would take place at the Faculty Meeting on April 22.

After favorable recommendations from the Budget and Academic Planning Committees,
reported by Beverly Diamond and Todd McNerny, Maureen Hays, speaking for the Committee on Graduate Education, moved the approval of two new Master’s Degree programs: a Master of Education in Languages, involving a number of new courses, and in Middle Level Education. After a brief discussion in which some faculty expressed concern at the potential costs involved (Frank Kinard: “Our budgetary process makes Enron look like a pillar of the community”), both programs were approved, on a voice vote. The new courses may be summarized as follows:

M. Ed in Languages: New Courses

CATEGORY A: CORE CURRICULUM (15 HOURS)

- LALE 601: APPLIED LINGUISTICS (3)
- LALE 602: ADVANCED LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODOLOGY (3)
- LALE 603: SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION (3)
- CLAS 602: HISTORY OF LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE (3)
- EDFS 670: PRINCIPLES AND STRATEGIES OF TEACHING ENGLISH TO K-12 SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES (3)

CATEGORY B: LANGUAGE-SPECIFIC COURSES (15 HOURS)

- SPAN 612: DESCRIPTIVE SPANISH LINGUISTICS
- SPAN 613: SPANISH SOCIOLINGUISTIC ISSUES: PRESENT, PAST AND FUTURE
- SPAN 614: TOPICS IN SPANISH CULTURE AND CIVILIZATION
- SPAN 615: TOPICS IN LATIN AMERICAN CULTURE AND CIVILIZATION
- SPAN 616: CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN SPAIN
- SPAN 617: CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN SPANISH AMERICA
- SPAN 620: STUDIES IN SPANISH LITERATURE
- SPAN 622: STUDIES IN SPANISH AMERICAN LITERATURE
- SPAN 630: SEMINAR IN HISPANIC STUDIES
- FREN 601: MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTAX
- FREN 602: MODERN APPROACHES TO LITERATURE AND TEXTUAL ANALYSIS
- FREN 603: STYLISTICS
- FREN 626: FRENCH CIVILIZATION
- FREN 650: FRENCH LITERATURE AND CULTURE IN NORTH AMERICA
- FREN 680: FRENCH PHONETICS AND PHONOLOGY
- FREN 681: EDUCATION SYSTEMS IN FRANCOPHONE COUNTRIES
- FREN 682: FRENCH FOR MASS MEDIA
- FREN 683: REALISM AND NATURALISM IN FRENCH LITERATURE AND ART
- FREN 690: SPECIAL TOPICS IN FRANCOPHONE LITERATURE
- LATN 674: RENAISSANCE LATIN
- LATN 690: SPECIAL TOPICS
In addition, a new Graduate course was passed (SMFT 514, GEOMETRY FOR ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS). For information: cross-list SPAN 590/INTR510 (Language and Culture) and SPAN 590/INTR 511 (Spanish in the U.S.).

Joe Kelly, acting for Doug Friedman, introduced twenty-three motions, as approved by the Curriculum Committee at their March 15 meeting, including new Guidelines for Interdisciplinary Programs, seven new courses (PHIL 245 & 206, ENGL 213, ARTH 389, LING 125, PORT 390, EUST 400), and new Interdisciplinary Minors in Linguistics and in European Studies. In detail:

1. Interdisciplinary Programs Proposal [amended: please see below]
2. S02-090 Change Religious Studies degree requirement
3. S02-091 PHIL 180 Philosophy of Art - Delete course
4. S02-092 PHIL 235 Nineteenth Century Philosophy - Change course number
5. S02-093 PHIL 245 Environmental Philosophy - New Course
6. S02-094A PHIL 210 Ethics and the Law - Delete course
7. S02-094B PHIL 206 Topics in Law and Morality - New Course
8. S02-095 PHYS 298 ST: Introduction to Weather Analysis - For information
9. S02-096 ENGL 213 Introduction to African American Literature - New Course
10. S02-097 Change Art History degree requirement
11. S02-098 Change Art History degree requirement for Arts Management double majors
12. S02-099 ARTH 389 19th Century European Art - New Course
13. S02-100 ARTH 390 Modern European Art - Change course title and description
14. S02-101 ARTH 265 The City as a Work of Art - Change course by removing all prerequisites
15. S02-102 Change Environmental Studies Minor - Add existing departmental courses to the minor:
   Under Natural Sciences/Math courses:
   - GEOL 449 Geographical Information Systems
   Under Social Sciences/Humanities courses:
   - PHIL 240 Topics in Environmental Philosophy
   - SOCY 355 Science, Technology and Society
16. S02-103 Minor in Linguistics
17. S02-104 LING 125 Introduction to Language and Linguistics - New Course
18. S02-105 Narrative description and requirements for a Minor in Linguistics
19. S02-106 Letters of support for a Minor in Linguistics
20. S02-107 PSYC 103 General Psychology - Change course description and title
21. S02-110 PORT 390 Special Topics in Portuguese - New Course
22. S02-108 Minor in European Studies [corrected: please see below]
23. S02-109 EUST 400 European Studies - New Course

During the brief discussion, Robert Perkins moved to amend the proposed Guidelines by adding a seventh provision, which was accepted, as follows:

Guidelines for All Interdisciplinary Programs
1. All interdisciplinary minors and majors should have either a required introductory course, capstone, or experience type course that pulls together the various interdisciplinary threads.

2. At least one-third (defined as such in the course syllabus) of the content of a course included in an interdisciplinary minor or major must be relevant to the subject of the minor and major.

3. Students must take courses from at least two disciplines or courses that are explicitly multi-disciplinary.

4. A complete or substantial list of courses that constitute the interdisciplinary minor or major should be published in the catalog.

5. Proposals for interdisciplinary minors and majors must indicate, by signature of the department chair, an explicit commitment by the department to deliver courses designated as part of the interdisciplinary minor or major.

6. All of the guidelines above will apply to all new interdisciplinary programs and all existing programs. Existing programs have a period of two years to comply with these guidelines and must report their progress to the Speaker of the Faculty before the start of the second year.

[amendment:]

7. Program directors for interdisciplinary programs should normally receive a stipend and/or course release.

Item 22, the Minor in European Studies, was corrected to include English 306 (Milton) in the list of English courses in “Cluster B.”

The Guidelines, and the twenty-two other curricular changes, passed as amended and corrected, on voice votes. The complete documents, as circulated to the Senate, are attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.

---

A Proposal for Rewording and Changing the Post-Tenure Review Policy, introduced by the Post-Tenure Review Committee and referred to the Senate By-Laws Committee at the March meeting, was passed, after some discussion, in two stages. Frank Kinard presented the recommendations of the By-Laws Committee, and Lou Burnett argued in favor of the original recommendations of the Post-Tenure Review Committee.

In the event, the Senate voted, first, to approve a small CHANGE IN THE BY-LAWS describing the composition of the PTR Committee itself: Section a.(3) should read: “No member
of this committee may participate on any departmental post-tenure review panel except those conducted in her or his [delete: school or] department.” This would have to be ratified by the Faculty, through a mail ballot.

Second, the reworded text of the PTR Policy, as proposed by the Post-Tenure Review Committee for use in the Faculty/Administration Manual, was approved after all modifications recommended by the By Laws Committee were accepted. Of importance: the change advocated by the PTR Committee requiring that “satisfactory” packets be reviewed, in addition to those rated unsatisfactory or superior, was turned down by the By Laws Committee, and would not be incorporated in the text sent (as a recommendation) to the Office of Academic Affairs. The original proposals of the PTR Committee, dated February 2, 2002 (eight pages), and the response of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty–Administration Manual, dated March 20 (five pages), are attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.

"- - - - " After a motion to recess until April 16 failed, by a vote of 13 to 16 taken by a division of the house, Rob Dillon moved that two questions be added to the five already approved at the March meeting for use on a questionnaire in the Student Course Information Publication (SCIP):

6. I would recommend this course to students majoring in the subject:  
   Strongly agree - Agree - Neutral - Disagree - Strongly disagree

7. I would recommend this course to all students:
   Strongly agree - Agree - Neutral - Disagree - Strongly disagree

Faye Steuer, raising a point of order, objected that this was really a motion to reconsider, and therefore out of order, but was overruled by the Parliamentarian. After a brief discussion, the proposal was unanimously defeated, on a voice vote.

Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned, sine die, a little after 7:00 o’clock.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The seventh regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston for the academic year 2001-2002 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 12, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Hugh Wilder presiding. Forty-two senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (February 12) were provisionally approved, as electronically circulated: printed copies had not been delivered to all departments.

Reports

The Speaker

The Speaker reminded faculty about upcoming deadlines for making committee requests (March 13), for electing departmental senators (March 15), and for being placed on the agenda of the April senate meeting (March 21). The Presidential Inauguration would take place on Tuesday, March 26, in the Sottile Theater; faculty will receive invitations and will be welcome to join the procession if they wish. Mr. Wilder also reported on the forthcoming perimeter parking plan, which was expected to go into effect on a trial basis in August. More specific information should be available by late April, but the seniority system for assigning spaces will continue to be in effect, and fees will increase with proximity to the central campus. Spaces in outlying areas will be served by free shuttle-bus service, and fees will be substantially lower. Frank Kinard commented that the College should provide parking like any other downtown business, and that parking space should be made part of all building plans from now on. One senator asked what the hours of shuttle service would be, and the answer was 7:00-10:00 a.m. and 3:00-7:00 p.m. The Speaker noted that President Hidgon is committed to making the parking plan work.

On another matter: the Curriculum Committee will improve their website and will post detailed procedures for making curricular changes. There seems to be a general lack of information about how to go about this at the moment. Eventually, the senate website will be used for the bulky agenda packets that are now printed and circulated through the campus mail -- a small step toward saving the forests of the world.

New Business

For the Graduate Education Committee, Maureen Hays moved the passage of a two new graduate certificate programs (ESOL Certificate I and II), together with ten accompanying new courses (EDFS 670, 671, 672, 673; 680, 681, 682, 704, 683, 684). On a point of order, Hugh Haynsworth noted that graduate certificate programs, in keeping with the senate’s vote of April 21, 1998, do not need the approval of the senate. The two programs were therefore presented for
information, and the ten new courses, which did require approval, passed on a voice vote. In detail:

NEW GRADUATE CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS
AND
SUPPORTING NEW GRADUATE COURSES

1. ESOL Certificate I Proposal (Initial) [for information]

2. ESOL Certificate I New Courses
   a. EDFS 670 – Principles and Strategies for Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
   b. EDFS 671 – Teaching Reading and Writing to K-12 Speakers of Other Languages
   c. EDFS 672 – Linguistic and Cultural Diversity in Education
   d. EDFS 673 – Assessing Student Performance

3. ESOL Certificate II Proposal (Advanced) [for information]

4. ESOL Certificate II New Courses
   a. EDFS 680 – Teaching English Through the Content Areas (or Content Modification for ESOL Students K-12)
   b. EDFS 681 – Second Language Acquisition for Teachers of Elementary and Secondary Learners
   c. EDFS 682 – ESOL Curriculum Design and Materials Development for K-12 Students
   d. EDFS 704 – Practicum in the Instruction of English as a Second Language to Elementary and Secondary Learners
   e. EDFS 683 – English Grammar / Structure (for ESOL Teachers)
   f. EDFS 684 – ESOL / Talented and Gifted and Special Education Issues

In addition, it was announced that proposals for two new Master’s programs (M.Ed. in Languages and M.Ed. in Middle Level Education, just received) would be forwarded to the Senate Budget Committee and the Academic Planning Committee.

Doug Friedman introduced fifty-four measures from the Curriculum Committee, including twenty-four new courses in Elementary and Early Childhood Education, and nine in Communication. (The new Majors in education were not sent on to the Senate Budget Committee or the Academic Planning Committee, as would normally happen, because they are mandated by CHE and further review would serve no purpose.) Tom Kunkle commented that the Mathematics Department would like to take part in the discussion, design, and implementation of courses that address the teaching of mathematics, such as those under consideration here (items 1-38), and Linda Fitzharris, Chair of Elementary and Early Childhood Education, was agreeable to this general request. All motions were approved. The only change was in the proposal for EDEE 323, the title of which ("Mathematics: The Language of Logic") would be modified later,
after consultation between the Mathematics and Education Departments. Special Topics courses in Chemistry and Computer Science (CHEM 583, CSCI 199) were for information. The complete list, as approved earlier at the 22 February, 2002 Meeting of the College Curriculum Committee, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>S02-030</td>
<td>Summary of Changes in Elementary and Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>S02-031</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Middle Grades Education - <strong>New Major</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>S02-032</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education - <strong>New Major</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>S02-033</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education - <strong>Change of Major</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>S02-034</td>
<td>EDEE 326 Health and Physical Education - Change course #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>S02-035</td>
<td>EDEE 325 Language and Literacy Development - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>S02-036</td>
<td>EDEE 327 Learner Development and Context Learning - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>S02-037</td>
<td>EDEE 323 Mathematics: The Language of Logic - <strong>New Course: title provisional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>S02-038</td>
<td>EDEE 375 Reading / Learning Strategies: PreK-Grade 3 - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>S02-039</td>
<td>EDEE 371 Teaching Social Studies and Humanities: PreK - Grade 3 - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>S02-040</td>
<td>EDEE 367 Teaching Science: PreK - Grade 3 - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>S02-041</td>
<td>EDEE 365 Teaching Mathematics: PreK - Grade 3 - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>S02-042</td>
<td>EDEE 373 Teaching Social Studies and Humanities: Grades 2-8 - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>S02-043</td>
<td>EDEE 377 Reading / Learning Strategies: Grades 2-8 - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>S02-044</td>
<td>EDEE 368 Teaching Science: Grades 2-8 - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>S02-045</td>
<td>EDEE 366 Teaching Mathematics: Grades 2-8 – <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>S02-046</td>
<td>EDEE 380 Application of Curriculum and Instruction: Grades PreK-Grade 3 - <strong>New C.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>S02-047</td>
<td>EDEE 382 Application of Curriculum and Instruction: Grades 2-6 - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>S02-048</td>
<td>EDEE 384 Application of Curriculum and Instruction: Grades 5-8 - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>S02-049</td>
<td>EDEE 403 Visual and Performing Arts - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>S02-050</td>
<td>EDEE 407 Creating Learning Environments - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>S02-051</td>
<td>EDEE 401 Literacy Assessment - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>S02-052</td>
<td>EDEE 409 Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>S02-053</td>
<td>EDEE 415 Curriculum Instruction and Assessment: PreK-Grade3 - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>S02-054</td>
<td>EDEE 416 Curriculum Instruction and Assessment: Grades 2-6 - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>S02-055</td>
<td>EDEE 417 Curriculum Instruction and Assessment: Grades 5-8 - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>S02-056</td>
<td>EDEE 459 Middle Grades Student Teaching - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>S02-057</td>
<td>EDEE 457 Elementary Grades Student Teaching - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>S02-058</td>
<td>EDEE 455 Early Childhood Student Teaching - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>S02-059</td>
<td>EDEE 307 Managing Instruction for Effective Teaching - Delete Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>S02-060</td>
<td>EDEE 315 Individualizing Instruction - Delete Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>S02-061</td>
<td>EDEE 316 Creative Arts - Delete Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>S02-062</td>
<td>EDEE 385 Teaching Language Arts - Delete Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>S02-063</td>
<td>EDEE 390 Teaching Social Studies - Delete Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>S02-064</td>
<td>EDEE 432 Teaching Science in the Elementary School - Delete Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>S02-065</td>
<td>Change in degree requirements for Majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>S02-066</td>
<td>EDEE 430 Teaching Reading in the Elementary School - Delete Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>S02-067</td>
<td>EDEE 431 Teaching Mathematics in the Elementary School - Delete Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>S02-070</td>
<td>CHEM 583 - ST: Introduction to Scientific Research Project Management - <strong>for Info.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>S02-071</td>
<td>CSCI 199 Special Topics in Computing - <strong>for Information</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>S02-073</td>
<td>COMM 301 Communications Research Methods - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>S02-074</td>
<td>COMM 304 Training and Development - <strong>New Course</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Post-Tenure Review Committee introduced a “Proposal for the Rewording and Changing the PTR Policy.” This was immediately referred to the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, who will make a recommendation at the April meeting. The original document, as circulated to the Senate, is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.

For the Faculty Welfare Committee, Julia Eichelberger introduced this motion:

We move that the SGA’s proposed questions be attached to the current course evaluation form, and that the responses to these added questions be made available to the SGA for distribution to students through a searchable PDF file on the College’s website. This proposal would go into effect in Fall 2003. The attached documents explain the SGA’s proposal in more detail.
Proposal For A Student-Produced Course Information Publication (SCIP)

I. The Problem
Concurrent with the dramatic increase in the student population at the College over the last decade, there has been a strong, ongoing growth in the number of programs, courses, class sections and teaching staff. There are currently close to 500 faculty teaching over 1,800 course sections in a typical semester. While College policy holds each student ultimately responsible for making course registration decisions which meet their individual educational needs, currently very little about the methods of instruction and testing employed in any particular course or course section is available to students. SGA has been aware of widespread student concern with this shortage of information for over four years, and increased growth in programs has only worsened the problem. A survey recently conducted by SGA found over 98% of over 400 randomly selected students support making additional information about the teaching and testing methods employed in particular course sections available.

II. Our Proposal
We propose that a short survey (Attachment 1) of questions about teaching methods, testing methods, and overall course content be distributed to students in all classes along with the current teacher evaluation survey (which remains confidential). The students’ responses, made on the reverse side of the current SCANTRON survey form, would be analyzed by Administrative Computing and Telecom Services here at the College. Because Administrative Computing is the only entity that will actually see the completed survey forms (rather than the students), the confidentiality of non-SCIP results is assured, and results for groups such as first-year teachers can be obviated upon request during processing. The results for each course, broken down by section, would be made available online through the College’s website (Cougar Trail) as a large .PDF file. The .PDF format would allow the viewer to jump directly to the desired pages by using the “Find” tool to search the document for the course title (e.g. ‘ENGL 101’). Only the most recent results, displayed as the percentage of respondents for each question-option (see sample: Attachment 2), for a particular Course/Section will be available (no archive of multiple years’ results for the same Course/Section). The cost of this project is expected to be low, primarily lying in start-up expenses, such as having a new printer-plate made for the SCANTRON survey form ($898.00, plus tax). These one-time materials costs will be covered by SGA from its budget.

III. The Benefits
The benefits of this proposal include allowing students to better match their learning styles and desires for their education to the content and teaching methods employed in the College’s courses. Better matching would result in higher student satisfaction and (hopefully) lower drop and fail rates. The availability of comprehensive, reliable course information would also reduce students’ dependence on the unregulated and often highly biased opinions of other students in making registration decisions, on the theory that good information will drive out bad in a free marketplace, and encourage students to take courses which their peers may have found difficult, but which meet their personal desires.
The fact that the College makes this information available to its students could also be used to give potential applicants a more favorable impression of the College.

**IV. Conclusion**

We believe that implementation of the SCIP proposal would produce considerable benefits for the students, faculty, and the College in general. We would like to emphasize that this proposal **does not** allow students to ‘rate’ or otherwise comment directly on an instructor’s teaching ability or the difficulty of the course. Our desire is simply to make more reliable information available to the students so they can make better decisions about what classes best suit their needs and abilities.

**Questionnaire for Student Course Information Publication (SCIP)**

1. Which of the following are major components of this course? (Mark all that apply)
   - A. Lecture
   - B. Class discussion
   - C. Visual presentations
   - D. Student presentations
   - E. Assigned reading material
   - F. Workshops/Study sessions
   - G. Study guides
   - H. Frequent quizzes and/or tests
   - I. Regular homework assignments
   - J. Major writing assignments
   - K. Out-of-class projects
   - L. Office hours and conferences
   - M. Hands-on experiments and/or activities
   - N. Kinesthetic (physical) experiences
   - O. Group projects
   - P. Online course supplements/WebCT

2. Do tests primarily reflect materials covered in: (Mark one)
   - a. class/lecture
   - b. reading/texts
   - c. both
   - d. tests are not administered

3. What are the primary methods of assessment? (Mark all that apply)
   - a. multiple choice tests
   - b. short answer tests
   - c. essay tests
   - d. labs/applications
   - e. papers
   - f. performances
   - g. attendance/participation

4. The professor is readily accessible via: (Mark all that apply)
During the discussion, Julia Eichelberger pointed out that the proposal now being presented had been developed over a long period, and had much thought and discussion behind it. She asked Brian England from the SGA to comment. Mr. England said that work had started some four years ago, and that the proposal was based on a wide-spread feeling that students would like to have more information about courses before they sign up for them. Of the four hundred students recently surveyed, more than 98% had been in favor what was being proposed. Several senators, however, objected to the sixth question (“I would give this course a positive rating”) because they thought it would provide subjective opinion rather than real information, and, in effect, turn the questionnaire into a “popularity contest.” Bob Mignone thought the data should be aggregated, in order to separate course content from the instructor. Rob Dillon moved to remand the motion for further study.

Rhodes Bailey, speaking for the students, urged the faculty not to send the motion back, since it had been worked on for so long, but to consider an amendment instead. Accordingly, Mr. Dillon retracted his motion to remand, and replaced it with a friendly amendment to approve the first five questions, leaving out the sixth. This met with general approval. Susan Morrison asked when the proposal would go into effect, and than answer was, not until the Fall of 2003. The question was called, and the amended motion passed, on a voice vote.

Finally, three recommendations from the Academic Standards Committee, about language courses, the College residency requirement, and the date of implementation of the new grading system approved by
the Senate last year, were approved as follows (the date recommended is August of 2006):
Faculty Committee on Academic Standards

Recommendation #1

Add the following statement to the Undergraduate Catalog in the Courses section of each foreign language.

Note: For foreign language courses that range from 101-202, successful completion of a higher level course prohibits a student from taking a lower level course in the same language for credit.

Rationale:

A student enrolled and completed a 202 language class without first taking 201. After passing the 202 course the student, enrolled in the 201 course for credit. The language departments support this clarification.

Recommendation #2

Change the residency requirement in the major on page 17 of the Undergraduate Catalog.

“At least 15 hours in the major at the 200 level or above must be earned at the College of Charleston.”

Rationale:

Presently the requirement is 12 hours in the major at the College. This change would be consistent with the residency requirement for the minor which is 9 hours out of a minimum of 18 hours for a minor. This recommendation had the unanimous support of departments responding to an E-mail asking for comments.

Recommendation #3
The FCAS recommends that the grading system passed by the Senate last year be instituted in August of 2006. A statement noting the adoption date of the new grading system should be included in future Undergraduate Catalogs. The committee declined to provide verbal descriptors for every grade, but recommends retention of the existing verbal descriptors for the major grade classifications (A, B, C, D, F).

Rationale:

The full range of plus/minus grades gives faculty more options in reporting student performance. A survey of Southern Conference, Colonial Conference, Atlantic Coast Conference, and COPLAC colleges indicated that the use of plus/minus grades was the predominant grading system. Adoption in August of 2006 will impact few current students. Verbal descriptors for all grades are rarely if ever used.

**Southern Conference**

A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F 4, 3.7, 3.3, 3, 2.7, 2.3, 2, 1.7, 1, 0.7, 0

App State, Davidson, Furman, Wofford, UNCG, ETSU

A, B, C, D, F 4, 3, 2, 1, 0

Citadel, VMI, Georgia Southern, UT Chattanooga

A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F 4, 3.66, 3.33, 3, 2.66, 2.33, 2, 1.66, 1.33, 1, 0

Western Carolina

**Colonial Conference**

A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F 4, 3.7, 3.3, 3, 2.7, 2.3, 2, 1.7, 1, 0.7, 0

Hofstra, James Madison, William & Mary, Old Dominion

A, B, C, D, F 4, 3, 2, 1, 0

Drexel, Virginia Commonwealth

A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F 4, 3.66, 3.33, 3, 2.66, 2.33, 2, 1.66, 1.33, 1, 0

UNCW, George Mason, Delaware, Towson

**Atlantic Coast Conference**

A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F 4, 3.7, 3.3, 3, 2.7, 2.3, 2, 1.7, 1, 0.7, 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Grading Scale</th>
<th>GPA Range</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke, UNC, Virginia</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, F</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1, 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech, Clemson</td>
<td>A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1, 0 (two year trial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>A+, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F</td>
<td>41/3, 4, 32/3, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State</td>
<td>A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F</td>
<td>4, 3.66, 3.33, 3, 2.66, 2.33, 2, 1.66, 1.33, 1, 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
<td>A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F</td>
<td>4, 3.75, 3.25, 3, 2.75, 2.25, 2, 1.75, 1.25, 1, 0.75, 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F</td>
<td>4, 3.7, 3.3, 3, 2.7, 2.3, 2, 1.7, 1, 0.7, 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>COPLAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s College, MD, Mary Washington</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, F</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1, 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Montevallo, Henderson St. U, Truman St, UNCA</td>
<td>A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F</td>
<td>4, 3.66, 3.33, 3, 2.66, 2.33, 2, 1.66, 1.33, 1, 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW-Superior, UM-Morris,</td>
<td>A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F</td>
<td>4, 3.75, 3.25, 3, 2.75, 2.25, 2, 1.75, 1.25, 1, 0.75, 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Lewis College</td>
<td>A, AB, B, BC, C, CD, D, F</td>
<td>4, 3.5, 3, 2.5, 2, 1.5, 1, 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constituents’ Concerns**

Further concerns were raised about parking, one senator commenting that where a faculty member parks does have an influence on classroom instruction, especially if you have to carry heavy or bulky teaching materials a long way to the campus. One senator suggested that
temporary “close-in” parking permits should be available for circumstance like this.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned a little after six-thirty.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary
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MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The sixth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston for the academic year 2001-2002 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 12, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Hugh Wilder presiding. Forty senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (January 22) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Vice-President for Enrollment Management

William Lindstrom presented a detailed report on the problems and prospects of student retention at the College, with statistics about our performance over the past decade. He divided the subject into several categories, including freshmen retention in general, African-American freshmen, transfer students, and four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates, and then added comparable statistics from other institutions such as Clemson, USC-Columbia, UGA-Athens, UNC-Chapel Hill, William & Mary, Duke, Notre Dame, UT-Knoxville, and Wake Forest. Several senators questioned the value of comparing our retention rates with those at large, “Category 1" research institutions. William Olejniczak asked for information about students placed on probation; about half of these do not return, Mr. Lindstrom said. While it seems that we are not doing too badly overall, there is clearly room for improvement, and President Higdon intends to make student retention a high priority. Accordingly, four “Action Retention Teams” have been formed to study various groups and make recommendations. One team is concerned with Freshmen (chaired by Mindy Miley) and others with Special Populations (Skip Godow), Transfer Students (Lynne Cherry), and Upperclassmen (Denny Ciganovic). Retention, Mr. Lindstrom concluded, is a general problem, affected by many different factors, that seem to vary with different student “populations.”

The Speaker

The Speaker reported that the response to the President’s “Fourth Century Initiative” has been overwhelmingly positive. He expects and will welcome comments and questions, and plans to address the Senate again at the April meeting. The key-note speaker for the first Convocation, set for August 19, will be Professor Kathleen Hall Jamieson, well-known author, political commentator, Dean of the Annenberg School of Communication, and Director of the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania. All faculty will be invited, and all students entering the College for the first time. Quite soon faculty will be asked for suggestions about possibly integrating her writings, or the topics raised in them, with courses aimed at entering students. This might provide a valuable follow-up to the Convocation in the days after the ceremony itself. Laura Hines asked if there would be a chance for graduate students to participate. Mr. Wilder said that this issue had not been formally raised yet, as far as he was
aware, but since the Convocation speaker would be on campus for three days there should be a
good chance of interaction with graduate students.

**New Business**

"For the Graduate Education Committee, Renee Tursi moved the passage of a new graduate
course, which was approved without change, on a voice vote:

**New Course:** EDFS 686, Special Topics in Education.

Doug Friedman introduced thirteen items of business from the Curriculum Committee,
approved at their meeting of January 25, 2002. These were approved without change, including
three new courses (PEHD 252, EDFS 425, PSYC 350). A Special Topics course on the Cuban
Revolution (LACS/POLS 339) was presented for information.

**Passed:**

1. S02-01 PEHD 252 Outdoor Education - **New Course**
2. S02-02 EDFS - Program Changes summary
3. S02-03 EDFS - Changes in degree requirements
4. S02-04 EDFS 345 - course change
5. S02-05 EDFS 411 - course change
6. S02-06 EDFS 412 - course change
7. S02-07 EDFS 413 - course change
8. S02-08 EDFS 422 - course change
9. S02-09 EDFS 427 - course change
10. S02-10 EDFS 425 Teaching Reading and Language Arts to Students with Disabilities - **New Course**
11. S02-11 PSYC 350 Psychology of Gender - **New Course**
12. S02-12 POLS - Changes to the requirements for a minor in Political Science
13. S02-13 SPAN - Changes in the requirements for a minor in Hispanic Studies

**For Information:**

14. S02-14 LACS 300/POLS 339 ST: Cuban Revolution
15. An additional item, involving guidelines for Special Topics courses, which had been
returned to committee at the previous meeting, passed unanimously in its revised form:

NEW GUIDELINES for the Use of Special Topics Courses:

Major and Minor Departments should utilize Special Topics courses with discretion. Before the
third offering of a particular topic within a period of five years, it must be submitted as a new
course for the approval of the Faculty Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate and, when
approved, be published in the Bulletin under its own title and number. When Special Topics
courses are interdepartmental in character or subject, formal consultation with “interested”
Departments is expected. [Secretary’s note: The foregoing language is derived, in slightly modified form, from the Minutes of the Faculty Senate, November 29, 1994, p. 2. The additional guidelines follow in bold.] The Registrar’s Office will monitor the frequency of Special Topics courses. Special Topics courses having been taught two times within four years will be reported by the Registrar as such to Department chairs. Special Topics courses offered three times within five years will be reported by the Registrar to Department chairs and the Speaker of the Faculty Senate.

In the brief discussion, Scott Peeples asked if there would be another level of enforcement, after the departmental Chairs and the Speaker of the Faculty. Frank Kinard suggested that we need another category of “Not-So-Special Topics Courses.” Robert Mignone wanted to know if this policy had been approved by the Administration; the answer was no, because it was only a guideline approved by the Senate, but not part of the Manual or Bulletin.

Constituents’ Concerns

Mary Beth Heston asked if even small curricular changes, like a change in the prerequisites for a course, had to be formally approved by the Faculty Curriculum Committee and then the Senate, and the answer was yes.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned shortly after six o’clock.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary

Spring 2002 Senate Meetings
(Tuesdays at 5:00 o’clock in ECTR 116):
January 22, February 12, March 12, April 2 (cont. April 16 if needed)

Spring Faculty Meeting:
(Monday at 5:00 o’clock in Physicians’ Memorial Auditorium)
April 22, 2002
The fifth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston for the academic year 2001-2002 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 22, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Hugh Wilder presiding. Forty-four senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (November 27) were approved after two amendments suggested by Mary Beth Heston and Diane Johnson, in the next-to-last sentence of the third paragraph on p. 1, which should read: “This will allow students to take six hours from any of the three departments – Art History, Music, Theatre.” (“This” refers to changes in the General Education Humanities Requirement passed at the November 6 meeting.)

Reports

The Speaker

The Speaker reported that President Higdon was very pleased by the faculty’s response to his Quality Enhancement Initiative, which he had outlined during an informal meeting with the Senate on January 14. The President had subsequently received unanimous support from the Board of Trustees. Mr. Wilder also discussed spring-semester enrollment. As of January 8, total enrollment for the first day of classes was up slightly, by about 3%, to 9,859 students, from 9,570 at the same point a year ago. The FTE figure has also risen a little, about 4.6%, to 8,854, from 8,460 a year ago. On the other hand, projected new admissions for the Spring semester have gone down a little, from 686 last year to 661. A table with full statistics is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.

We are now, Mr. Wilder continued, in the implementation phase of the long-range planning process. There are now eleven working groups, each one dealing with a separate long-range goal of the institution. Their reports will be forwarded to the Co-ordinating Committee, who will assemble a composite draft of their suggestions in March, with the aim of having a final plan ready for the President by the end of the Fall semester. The Provost search also proceeds apace under the guidance of James Deavor. The search criteria have been published and include this central paragraph:

The new Provost will be a skilled academic leader with the ability to work with all constituencies of the College to forge an academic vision. Successful candidates will have a demonstrated record of distinction in scholarship, teaching, and administration. Candidates are expected to possess a personal commitment to the values and aspirations of a liberal arts and sciences college. An appropriate earned terminal degree is expected.

The full document is also attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.
Mr. Wilder expected four topics to be on the agenda of the Trustees’ meeting on January 17-18. There, Gary McCombs would present the latest budget developments: a second round of cuts is now widely anticipated for February, perhaps as much as 1%, in addition to those imposed already. William Lindstrom would discuss the problem of student retention, to which President Higdon wants to give special attention: it seems that our peer institutions, that is, the colleges we would like to be like, do much better than we do in this regard, especially since we lose many of our very best students. The Campus Master Plan would also be discussed, as well as the acquisition of several new sites for faculty offices.

Finally, Mr. Wilder brought up a concern raised by several constituents at the end of the previous meeting: the problem of unauthorized rescheduling of final examinations, apparently to suit the convenience of faculty. According to the current undergraduate Bulletin (p. 19), “Examinations must be taken at the time scheduled” except when more than one has been scheduled for the same time, or when a student has three or more in twenty-four hours. “Permission to reschedule one exam may be obtained [that is, may only be obtained] from the Office of Undergraduate Studies with written permission of the instructor.” This, he said, seems clear enough. Apparently, however, there is no specific requirement, either in the Bulletin or in the Faculty/Administration Manual, that every course has to include a final examination.

**Old Business**

Since six courses, PUBA/EVSS 635, 636, and 637, had accidentally been approved at the previous meeting for cross-listing with each other, without actually having been approved as new courses in the first place, the Speaker called for a motion to reconsider. Annette Godow so moved, and the motion passed unanimously, on a voice vote.

**New Business**

For the Graduate Education Committee, Maureen Hays then moved the passage of these six new courses, and their cross-listing. All were approved without change, on a voice vote:

**New Courses:**

- PUBA 635 Land Use Law
- PUBA 636 Coastal Management
- PUBA 637 Wetlands Protection
- EVSS 635 Land Use Law
- EVSS 636 Coastal Management
- EVSS 637 Wetlands Protection

Courses to be Cross-Listed:

- PUBA 635 with EVSS 635 Land Use Law
- PUBA 636 with EVSS 636 Coastal Management
- PUBA 637 with EVSS 637 Wetlands Protection
Four additional motions from the Graduate Committee were also approved, and may be summarized as follows:

1. Program Change: Bilingual Legal Interpreting

[Existing Requirements:
   a. GPA of 3.0
   b. Oral exit exam administered by three external examiners, or professional exam administered by court system]

Change to:

   a. Minimum GPA 3.0 and either

   b1. Professional exam administered by state or federal court or recognized professional organization

   or b2. Written and oral exam administered by the graduate program. Students with prior certification, as stated in option 1, must fulfill the requirements of option 2.

_Justification:_

_Professional exams might not coincide with student’s completion of program and would delay graduation._

2. Graduate Policy Proposal:

   All programs for the Master’s Degree at The College of Charleston will require a minimum of 30 hours, which must be directly related to the discipline; and which may not include Continuous Research Enrollment hours.

3. Course Change: EDEE 604 Teacher as Researcher in Early Childhood Education

   Reduce course hours from 6 to 3.

4. Program Change: M.Ed. Early Childhood Education

   [present requirement: EDEE 604 – 6 credit hrs.]


Doug Friedman introduced several motions from the Curriculum Committee, as approved at their meeting of November 15, 2001. The first fourteen motions were passed without change, and six further items entered as information. The final item of business, a motion involving the monitoring of Special Topics courses by the Registrar’s Office, was remanded to committee, after some discussion. The Registrar said that there would be no technical problem in identifying and cancelling Special Topics courses which violated the Senate’s “three time rule.” Several
senators, however, thought this would not be a good idea because it would give the Registrar’s office direct control over faculty matters.

Passed:

1. F01-46, 47, 49, 50  British Studies Program and Minor Proposal  
2. F01-48  BRST 300 - Special Topics in British Studies - New Course  
3. F01-51  Minor in Finance Proposal  
4. F01-52  FINC 386 Risk Management - New Course  
5. F01-53  FINC 310 Seminar in Finance - Change Course  
6. F01-54  PHYS 119 Celestial Navigation - Change Course  
7. F01-58  BS in Biology with Concentration in Molecular Biology - Change degree req.  
8. F01-99 ARTS 118 Issues and Images of Contemporary Art - Change course  
9. F01-100 Physical Education and Health - Change degree requirement  
10. F01-101 PEHD 222 Analysis and Conduct of Lifetime Activities - New Course  
11. F01-102 PEHD 223 Analysis and Conduct of Team Sports - New Course  
12. F01-103 PEHD 352 Physical Education for Elementary Schools - New Course  
13. F01-104 PEHD 452 Physical Education for Middle/Secondary Schools - New Course  
14. F01-106 PEHD 456 Teaching Physical Education K-12 - delete course  

Received as Information:

16. F01-56  POLS 359 ST: The Constitutional Rights of the Accused  
17. F01-57  POLS 319 ST: Wetlands Protection Policy  
18. F01-59  BIOL 453 ST: Diversity, Ecology, and Conservation of Turtles  
19. F01-60  CHEM 583 ST: Organic High Polymers  
20. F01-61  CHEM 583 ST: Modeling with CACHe and Stella  

Remanded to committee:

21. Curriculum Committee Proposal on Special Topics courses

Constituents’ Concerns and Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned shortly after six o’clock.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Spring 2002 Senate Meetings
(Tuesdays at 5:00 o’clock in ECTR 116):
January 22, February 12, March 12, April 2 (cont. April 16 if needed)

Spring Faculty Meeting:
(Monday at 5:00 o’clock in Physicians’ Memorial Auditorium)
April 22, 2002
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.*}

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
November 6, 2001

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The third regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston for the academic year 2001-2002 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 6, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Hugh Wilder presiding. Forty-five senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (October 2) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Provost

Andy Abrams reported that he had had numerous consultations and conversations with President Higdon, and that the transition to the new administration was now well in hand. There would shortly be an announcement of a national search to fill the office of Provost on a long term-basis. Mr. Abrams said that he himself would not be a candidate. He added that he had had many wonderful experiences in his lifetime, but that the opportunity of serving the faculty at the College of Charleston had been the most rewarding of all.

The President

President Higdon thanked the Provost for his outstanding contributions. Rarely, he said, had he seen an individual with as much dedication and passion for service. Mr. Abrams was a tireless worker on behalf of the institution and had provided tremendous assistance to him during the period of transition. They had become friends in a short period of time, and so he was very pleased that Andy wished to stay at the College. We are indeed fortunate that he will continue as Provost until a new one is appointed and will continue to serve after that as a key member of the senior administrative staff.

Because of our growing aspirations to become “a nationally preeminent public liberal arts and sciences university,” the appointment of the chief academic officer would be of crucial importance. The President looked forward to putting together a broadly representative search committee. He had not yet selected its members, but he had asked James Deavor, Professor of Chemistry and acting Dean of the School of Sciences and Mathematics, to serve as chair.

The Speaker
Mr. Wilder first introduced Judy Lindner, the new president-elect of the College of Charleston Alumni Association, who greeted the faculty warmly and said that one of her first priorities would be to increase the number of recent graduates joining the Association.

Several announcements followed. The senate would meet next semester on January 22, February 12, March 12, and April 2, with a continuation on April 16 if needed. The Spring faculty meeting would take place on Monday, April 22. There would be an important discussion of the Family Medical Leave Act at a question-and-answer session scheduled for 5:00 p.m. in ECTR 116.

These faculty will serve on the Convocation Committee:

- Jane Clary (Economics)
- Kathy DeHaan (Communication)
- Tom Gilson (Library)
- Enrique Graf (Music)
- Candy Jaruszewicz (Elementary & Early Childhood)
- Susan Kattwinkel (Theater)
- Scott Peeples (English)
- Vincent Spicer (Psychology)
- Hugh Wilder (Philosophy)
- Jim Young (Mathematics)

There will, of course, be other members of the committee who are not faculty, such as Judy Lindner, the new head of the Alumni Association.

These faculty will serve on the Recycling & Environmental Responsibility Committee:

- Erin Beutel (Geology)
- Tracy Burkett (Sociology)
- John Creed (Political Science)
- Martin Jones (Mathematics) - on leave 2001-2002
- Susan Morrison (Biology)
- Reid Wiseman (Biology)

On the Budget: Mr. Wilder reported that a 4% cut had gone into effect statewide. The College would probably be able to absorb this without a hiring freeze like the one just imposed at USC. A second round of cuts may be put in place in early January, 2002, however, and if this takes place, President Higdon has said that we might have to rethink our position and impose a freeze at that time.

As to the proposed changes in the grading system, approved by the senate last spring: Andy Abrams has not yet decided on his response, because he is still concerned with the fairness issue associated with the “numbers” attached to B+ and C+ in the new system. There seemed to be two
possibilities, as set out in the following table. The scale on the right, which is what the senate approved, would have to be implemented somewhat later, perhaps not until 2006; the scale on the left, with different values assigned to B+, C+, and D+, could be implemented sooner:

GRADING SYSTEM: Two Possibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sooner (e.g., August 2003)</th>
<th>Later (e.g., August 2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>B+</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>C+</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>D+</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Business

Doug Friedman introduced a series of twenty-six motions on behalf of the Curriculum Committee, as approved at their meeting on September 20, 2001. These passed without change:

1. F01-18 Hispanic Studies - Medieval Literature of the Iberian Peninsula - New Course
2. F01-17 Marketing and Management - Change Degree Requirements
3. F01-18 Computer Science - Summary of Changes
4. F01-19 Change Degree Req. - Bachelor of Science in Computer Science
5. F01-20 Change Degree Req. - Bachelor of Science in Computer Information Systems
6. F01-21 Change Degree Req. - Bachelor of Arts in Computer Science
7. F01-22 CSCI 332 Database Concepts - New Course
8. F01-23 CSCI 360 Software Architecture and Design - New Course
10. F01-25 CSCI 380 User Interface Development - New Course
11. F01-26 CSCI 432 Concepts of Database Implementation - New Course
12. F01-27 CSCI 462 Software Engineering Practicum - New Course
13. F02-28 CSCI 320 Imperative Programming Languages - Change Course
14. F01-29 CSCI 325 Declarative Programming Languages - Change Course
15. F01-30 CSCI 330 Data Structures and Algorithms - Change Course
16. F01-31 CSCI 340 Operating Systems - Change Course
17. F01-32 CSCI 410 Automata and Formal Languages - Change Course
18. F01-33 CSCI 420 Principles of Compiler Design - Change Course
19. F01-34 CSCI 440 Computer Networks - Change Course
20. F01-35 CSCI 450 Architecture of Advanced Computer Systems - Change Course
21. F01-36 CSCI 470 Principles of Artificial Intelligence - Change Course
22. F01-37 CSCI 480 Principles of Computer Graphics - Change Course
23. F01-38 CSCI 335 Computer File Organization - Delete Course
24. F01-39 CSCI 430 Database Management Systems - Delete Course
25. F01-40 CSCI 460 Software Engineering I - Delete Course
26. F01-41 CSCI 461 Software Engineering II - Delete Course

For the Graduate Education Committee, Maureen Hays proposed a change in the Graduate Program in Marine Biology, requiring completion of the program in four rather than five years. This, too, passed as circulated.

On behalf of the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics, Jeffrey Yost introduced a motion to regulate bulletin boards at the College of Charleston. After considerable discussion, many senators seemed to think that the regulations were too complicated to work. Deanna Caveny volunteered a friendly amendment calling for a separate category of bulletin boards that would be reserved for faculty and departmental use. Several representatives from the SGA were also present and opposed the motion because it seemed to restrict students but not persons from outside the campus. In the event, the proposal was remanded to committee for further study. (The motion to remand was made simultaneously by several senators, and passed unanimously, on a voice vote.)

Todd McNerney introduced a recommendation from the Academic Planning Committee to modify the General Education Humanities requirement by treating the separate departments in the School of the Arts as separate areas. This proposal was based on a letter sent to the faculty senate on March 15, 2001 by Dean Valerie B. Morris [see Minutes of the April 3, 2001 meeting, p. 4] containing this paragraph:

> It is proposed that these three distinct disciplines of humanities courses ... under acronyms ARTH, MUSC, and THTR, which are presently lumped under the no longer appropriate term Fine Arts, be listed as three distinct areas, and that students be allowed 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.

Mr. McNerney added that the Academic Planning Committee had supported this proposal by a vote of five to one, and he urged the senate’s approval.

Rationale:

The current General Education Humanities Requirements view the entire School of the Arts as being equivalent to the departments (or sometimes smaller divisions) in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. This does not appear to have been the result of a reasoned argument about the goals of the requirements, but rather an accidental consequence of the fact that the School of the Arts was once a single department and has since grown large enough to be divided into separate departments.
Our committee took the unusual step of voting separately on the motivation of the proposal. That is, prior to voting on the proposal itself, we unanimously supported the statement that the problem which the proposal seeks to address, the inequitable treatment of humanities courses based upon which school at the College offers them, is a real problem which needs to be addressed. Thus, if the School of the Arts Proposal is not passed, we would argue that another solution to the problem would have to be found.

We then voted to support the original proposal because it remedies the current inequity within the bounds of our current General Education system. In particular, it requires no changes to the requirements themselves apart from the division of the departments of the School of the Arts into separate areas. Moreover, it conforms with the precedent set by the division of the Department of Communications and the Department of English into separate humanities areas when the former split from the latter.

It should be noted that this proposal does not solve other existing problems with the present requirements, such as the fact that a student can meet the requirements with a selection of humanities courses that might not seem sufficiently broad. However, the proposal does create an equitable foundation on which to build further modifications that can correct these other problems.

During the discussion that followed, Phil Dustan opined that the real issue was a “turf war”: if passed, the proposal would allow the Humanities requirement, which was intended to broaden a student’s intellectual perspective, to be satisfied just by taking Fine Arts courses. Rick Heldrich noted that, as a member of the Committee, he had voted against the proposal. Faye Steuer wondered if the Curriculum Committee had studied its implications. Diane Johnson and Mark Landis both supported it, Mr. Landis pointing out that all the chairs had “signed off” on the basic idea. It was not, he insisted, a turf war at all, but a question of making valid distinctions between the various Arts themselves, which are at least as different one from another as Philosophy is from Religious Studies.

In the event, the motion passed, on a voice vote.

**Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment**

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The second regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston for the academic year 2001-2002 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 2, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Hugh Wilder presiding. Forty-eight senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (September 4) were approved, with one correction suggested by Mr. Wilder: the last sentence of the third paragraph on p. 2 should end with the words, “benefits for adjuncts, and support for sabbatical leaves” [eliminating the reference to sabbaticals for “professional administrators”].

Reports

The Provost

Andy Abrams spoke briefly on two issues: the academic “culture” of the College, and prospects for the budget. He announced that President Higdon, as part of an ongoing effort to improve the academic climate of the campus, has decided to begin fall semesters with a Convocation, to be held immediately before classes start. All new students will be invited, and the ceremony will feature a major outside speaker, and the faculty in academic regalia. Mr. Higdon had asked the Speaker to work together with interested faculty on the details of this event; the administration would of course provide the funding. Mr. Abrams also reported that no less than forty-seven new faculty lines would be requested for next year, together with a substantial number of additional “support” lines. Because it appeared highly doubtful, at least at the moment, that the College would receive additional money from the State of South Carolina next year, this would probably mean that a significant increase in tuition would be needed to fund the requested lines.

The Vice-President for Enrollment Management

William Lindstrom reported that in most categories, enrollment is up slightly compared with last year. The total headcount has gone up by 3%, from 11,203 in 2000, to 11,540 this fall. The FTE figure has increased by 2.2%, from 9566.5 to 9783.3. Graduate enrollment is up 4.7% (headcount) and 10.7% (FTE). The average SAT score of entering freshmen has increased from 1159 to 1163, while the number of new freshmen has gone down very slightly, from 1858 to 1843, or about 0.8%. The goal of adding 300 Black students has been met, with 342 new students enrolled, raising the percentage of Black students on campus to 9%.

As for next year: “marching orders” have already been received from President Higdon. First, there is to be absolutely no increase in total undergraduate enrollment. (Some increase in the size of graduate programs, however, is desirable, especially since graduate classes meet after 4:00 p.m. or in the North area, and the students do not, for the most part, affect the local neighborhoods, or the housing or parking situations.) Second, we should aim at a further increase in the SAT scores of our entering students. Third, we must continue to build on the momentum
established this year in increasing diversity in the student body, in particular by increasing the percentage of African American students.

It may become steadily more difficult, Mr. Lindstrom said, to raise our SAT scores, which are already well above the figures for most other institutions in our state. In fact, we are now competing for the most able students with Clemson, Chapel Hill, and the University of Georgia. These are all classified as research institutions, and thus able to pay much higher salaries to obtain the desirable faculty that able students are seeking out. To succeed here will require extra effort from the academic departments themselves in emphasizing our academic strengths and the desirability of our programs.

[Note: The complete enrollment statistics shown by Mr. Lindstrom on the overhead projector are attached to the Secretary’s copy of the Minutes.]

The Speaker

Mr. Wilder reported that the President Higdon would like to see a Convocation Committee established as soon as possible, with substantial faculty input. The quickest way to do this, the Speaker said, would be to by-pass the usual senate procedure of directing the Committee on Nominations and Elections to produce a slate of nominees. Instead, we should ask the President simply to appoint an *ad hoc* committee, drawing informally on the advice of the faculty about its membership. After a short discussion, this seemed acceptable, and the Speaker said he would see to it.

Mr. Wilder then brought up several matters of concern, including the widely-hailed cancellation of the managed travel contract. This, he said, had come about partly because the faculty had clearly voiced their objections – and it was nice to know that our voices were being heard! He understood that Marie Fitzwilliam and the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics was looking at the general academic climate of the campus, and in particular, into the question of the many crammed and unsightly bulletin boards scattered around the campus; they were receiving help from Jeri Cabot in the Office of Student Affairs.

He mentioned some of the safety concerns at the Bell Building, including emergency access and the signs near elevators and in the stairwells. All the safety codes relating to the capacity of the building had in fact been met, but some signs would be replace, and better door-handles put in. The asbestos problem, he thought, had been taken care of during a previous renovation of the building some years ago, and it should be safe in this regard. Better access to the building for students with handicaps was being worked on by Bobbi Lindstrom, with help from Richard Krantz at the Office of Public Safety. Someone mentioned that the signs at the main entrances to the Bell Building were not very satisfactory either, and Mr. Wilder said he would pass this on.

After a period of relative dormancy, The South Carolina Council of Chairs will again spring into action this year. Jack Parson and Robert Mignone, who had represented the College in the past, would accompany Mr. Wilder and Trisha Folds-Bennett to this year’s meeting.
Discussion was continuing on the new grading system, with several questions still unanswered. What was its scope? Do the changes apply to undergraduates only, or will they involve the graduate grading system, too? It was fairly clear, Mr. Wilder said, that the changes endorsed by the senate were intended to apply just to the undergraduate curriculum, since the graduate programs had their own, different grading scheme already. Beverly Diamond suggested, however, that we should send the new policy to the Graduate Council and see if they want to think about this question. In addition, there were still concerns about the “fairness” issue, connected with the new grade-point equivalencies. A number of questions obviously remained about implementation. Gary Asleson, chair of the Academic Standards Committee, had recently had a productive meeting with members of the administration, and would be surveying other schools who had changed grading policies to see what their experience had been.

It now looked as though gradual implementation was probably not the best way to go about such a change, and if this is the case, what date should be set for an all-at-once implementation? August, 2006 had been mentioned. The fairness issue, Mr. Wilder said, is clearly related to the problem of implementation, and senators should think about this over the next few weeks. Susan Kattwinkel asked where the full text of the recommendation passed by the senate could be found, and the answer was, in the Minutes of the March, 2001 meeting. Caroline Hunt asked if an earlier date for full implementation had been considered? The answer was, yes; it could be accomplished in two or three years. The new grading system could be in place by August, 2004. Tom Kunkle added that he still thought there were problems with the “numbers” being proposed, and he wondered whether faculty would really be free not to use the new system, if they had objections; he doubted, in fact, that this would be possible.

Finally, Mr. Wilder said that he had received two weighty documents, one a detailed report on Fall 2001 Admissions, and the other an Interim Report on the September 2001 NCAA Division I Athletics Certification. These could be examined at leisure in the Faculty Secretariat in Maybank Hall, if any senator should so desire.

**New Business**

Doug Friedman introduced a series of motions on behalf of the Curriculum Committee, which they had approved at a meeting on August 23. These were voted on as a single item, and passed without change, as follows:

1. F01-02 Hispanic Studies Department - Change in requirements and New Curriculum
2. F01-03 SPAN 324 Spanish Civilization and Culture - Delete
3. F01-04 SPAN 325 Spanish American Civilization and Culture - Delete
4. F01-05 SPAN 312 Spanish as a Heritage Language **New Course**
5. F01-06 SPAN 322 Civilization and Culture of Spain I - **New Course**
6. F01-07 SPAN 323 Civilization and Culture of Spain II - **New Course**
7. F01-08a SPAN 326 Latin American Civilization and Culture I - **New Course**
8. F01-08 SPAN 327 Latin American Civilization and Culture II - **New Course**
9. F01-09 SPAN 344 Advanced Grammar and Lexicon - **New Course**
10. F01-10 SPAN 443 Morphology and Syntax - New Course
11. F01-11 SPAN 448 Spanish Sociolinguistic - New Course
12. F01-12 SPAN 453 Don Quixote de la Mancha - New Course
14. F01-14 SPAN 458 Contemporary Hispanic-Caribbean Theater - New Course
15. F01-15 SPAN 474 Contemporary Spanish Theater - New Course

Susan Kattwinkel asked if the reading the upper level Spanish courses was in Spanish, and the answer was, yes.

Reid Wiseman then introduced a motion to establish a recycling committee, as formulated by Jim Bastian, Acting Chair of the ad hoc Recycling Committee. The motion was seconded, and Mr. Bastian gave a brief history of recycling at the College:

C of C became interested in recycling in 1991, at which time a recycling coordinator was hired. However, this program was not adequately supported and the director left to start a program at MUSC. No one was hired to fill this position on our campus. Vestiges of that early effort are still in place to a small degree, and include campus recycling of paper and aluminum. No other materials are currently being recycled on campus.

Given what we know about environmental issues, it is difficult to sustain a rationale against recycling as this campus has done for ten years. Over the past ten years the amounts of materials we recycle have actually been steadily declining, rather than increasing as most modern institutions would want. This decline began to be reversed when the recycling committee was formed a year ago to address this problem. Since then the recycling committee has taken some beginning steps to bring the campus more in line with more modern thinking about recycling, as a necessary means to reduce landfill space, slow global warming, and reduce our consumption of many materials. This campus - with over 15,000 people - generates huge amounts of waste, most of which we pay to have hauled off. The cost of hauling off this waste amounts to several hundred thousand dollars per year. The committee estimates that up to 60% of this waste - and its corresponding haul off fees - could be eliminated if we were to become more environmentally responsible by having a professional recycling program on campus.

Given that our current campus thinking about recycling is woefully ineffective and out of date, this committee hopes to continue to work towards having a professional recycling program on campus, and thereby reduce our waste, better educate our students about responsible environmental interaction, and become a better neighbor in Charleston.
The first order of business for this committee is recycling. Naming the committee as a committee on environmental responsibility will allow the role of the committee to expand into other related areas such as campus sustainability, green building, responsible use of resources on campus, and a host of other environmental concerns that we are currently faced with.

After a brief discussion, the motion was passed, with one amendment suggested by Faye Steuer, as follows:

**To establish as a permanent standing committee, the "Committee on Recycling and Environmental Responsibility" which will be designated as a college committee, at the level of the President's Committee on Diversity and Multicultural Issues, as found on page 25, section II, H - 1, the Faculty Administration Manual.**

**Purpose:**

To foster awareness of campus environmental issues.

To advocate for and encourage an effective and responsible recycling program.

To educate the campus community regarding environmental issues which directly impact our community.

To create a network wherein the campus community is kept abreast of campus policies on recycling.

To research current environmental trends and programs - especially with regard to recycling - from which our campus may benefit.

To assess plans, policies, and programs with regard to campus environmental and recycling issues and to make recommendations to appropriate college offices and officers.

**Membership:**

This is an advisory committee with members to be appointed by the President, after consultation with the Recycling Coordinator, the Director of the MES Program, and the Director of the Undergraduate Environmental Studies Minor. Members will include at least 1 student selected by SGA, 1 student selected by Alliance for Planet Earth, 1 graduate student, 2 staff
members, 5 faculty members [as amended by Faye Steuer; the original motion called for four, not five, faculty] and representatives from Residence Life, Physical Plant, and the campus food services.

[Secretary’s note: this amendment was not reported correctly in the “Highlights” sent out the day after the meeting.]

Jeremy Browning then introduced a motion calling on the Trustees to give financial support to the “Worker’s Rights Consortium.” This was devised by two students, Matthew Brown and Anthony Panarese, and a third student, Kate Reuter, was also present to lend support. Considerable discussion ensued. A number of senators felt that not enough was known about the Worker’s Rights Consortium for the senate to endorse the proposal. Tom Kunkle introduced a friendly amendment, which was eventually accepted, limiting financial support to “a trial period of one year.” After further discussion, Frank Kinard called for a division of the house, and the amended motion passed by a vote of 32 to 4, on a show of hands. Here is the full text of the letter circulated to the senate:

Motion for October 2 meeting:

Dear Faculty Senate:

As members of the College of Charleston, we believe the administration should take a proactive stance of awareness pertaining to the conditions in which clothing, bearing our school's insignia, are made under. In order to facilitate this desire, we have proposed to the Board of Trustees at the College of Charleston to adopt the following policy: at a fee of $1000.00 per year, (depending on the growth of the College) the College sign on [amendment: for a trial period of one year] to the Worker's Rights Consortium. The WRC is an independent watchdog organization that monitors the conditions of the factories in which our school apparel is made, and reports its findings to the institution.

We are asking for the support of the Faculty Senate on this matter both collectively and individually. As representatives of the College and its mission statement, it is imperative that we, the student body and faculty alike, strive to improve the rights of working people, by fighting to insure that they are treated as individuals and not commodities. In hopes of proving the legitimacy of the WRC we have, listed below, the website in which each member of the faculty, if so desired, can read and understand what exactly this organization represents.

Sincerely,

Matt Brown and Anthony Panarese
www.workersrights.org

This matter will be officially decided upon on the 15th of October.

Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary
September 4, 2001

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The first regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston for the academic year 2001-2002 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 4, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Hugh Wilder presiding. Fifty-four senators attended. The Minutes of the previous meeting (April 3 and 17, 2001) were approved as circulated.

The Speaker welcomed the Senate for the start of the new academic year, and appointed George Pothering as Parliamentarian for the Fall semester. Beverly Diamond was nominated from the floor by Shaun Nichols and elected as Speaker of the Faculty pro tempore.

Reports

Gary McCombs, Senior Vice-President for Business Affairs, with the assistance of Samuel B. Jones from Budgeting and Payroll Services, reported on prospects for the 2001-0002 College Budget. He said that if current economic trends continue, we are not likely to be as fortunate this year as last, when the impact of state-mandated cuts turned out to be a good deal less severe than had originally been projected. This year, the “magic figure” appears to be $1,000,000; if the budget is not cut by more than this, we should be all right.

He then reviewed the way the College budget is divided into four categories: unrestricted funds, designated funds, restricted funds, and auxiliary enterprises. Last year, unrestricted funds accounted for 72% of the total operating budget of about $88,000,000. It costs $303,460 per day to operate the College, and no less than 81% of the money goes for instructional purposes. We have 456 roster faculty, and 554 non faculty employees; “benefits” average $9,316 per person. No new faculty lines are anticipated, vs. the twenty-to-twenty five new lines of last year. Our fees, however, have increased only 4.1%, the lowest in the State. Funds allocated for what can be called “technology” account for between $300,000 and $500,000 a year, but there is a great deal of uncertainty in this figure. Mr. McCombs asked if there were questions he could answer.

Phil Dustan asked what happens to funds designated as indirect costs associated with graduate study, now calculated at 50%? The answer: these are pooled with the general funds of the College, and not identified separately. Are there any plans to raise fees charged students? Mr. McCombs mentioned something that President Higdon had been heard to say: if we want quality, we will have to pay for it. In business terms, the alternative to charging more is to hold down costs, by becoming more “productive” – but it is hard, Mr. McCombs said, to see just how much more productive we could become, since our operations are already substantially more efficient than other comparable institutions. Essentially, more funding is needed, from whatever source.
On another matter: he said that he was painfully aware of parking problems on and near the campus, but expected to have some good news about this in a few weeks’ time. Caroline Hunt asked about the costs of providing security at remote parking lots, saying that some faculty were simply afraid to walk to them after dark. Mr. McCombs said that he was definitely aware of this, and Hugh Wilder added that that Public Safety has extended their bicycle patrols to these remote lots.

Tom Baginski asked if there were any other areas that could be looked at for possible new sources of revenue, apart from outright tuition increases? A plan is in place for long-term capital investment, Mr. McCombs answered, and this could be “raided” in an emergency – but everyone hopes that this will not have to happen.

The Speaker

Hugh Wilder noted that his term as Speaker had begun on May 15, and that he had been very busy over the summer months. First of all, the members of the Presidential Search Committee, including Trisha Folds-Bennett, Deana Caveny, and himself, together with George Pothering and some other senators, had already met with President Higdon in August and were impressed with his qualities of leadership – including the fact that he had wanted to meet with a group of senators right away. They had discussed several matters of concern, including infrastructure problems at the College; leadership issues (a number of important administrative positions were about to fall vacant, through retirements, at the same time); the absence of a campus “Master Plan”; long-range plans for the College in general; faculty morale and professional development, including salaries, workload, and the problem of sheer overwork; and benefits for adjuncts, along with the possibility of sabbatical leaves for professional administrators.

Mr. Wilder noted that he had also met separately with President Higdon and had given him a copy of the Senate’s resolution, passed at the September, 2000 meeting, favoring an eventual national search to select Dr. Festa’s successor in the office of Provost. Mr. Higdon had been interested in the President’s Advisory Committee and what its role is or has been, and he had read the Faculty Newsletter, with the result that he had wanted to know, for example, about the Faculty Welfare Committee and various other committee initiatives now under way. In addition, the College has in place a “transition team,” made up mostly of Trustees, but with some administrators and faculty participating, including the Speaker. This team was looking forward to suggestions from the faculty. All of this, Mr. Wilder thought, spoke well of the new administration.
With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary