Minutes of the Faculty Senate  April 2003

The eighth regular meeting of the 2002-2003 Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 1, in Room 116 of the Education Center (ECTR). Fifty-one Senators attended.

Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order. The minutes for the March meeting were approved after Bob Mignone requested that a correction be inserted.

Reports

The Speaker
Mr. Wilder began by noting that this was the last Senate meeting in this academic year. Accordingly, he thanked those who have assisted him in running the meetings: Deb Vaughn, who has managed the Senate website, reduced the paper the Senate has had to use for its meetings, and cheerfully served as the projectionist at every Senate meeting. (Ms. Vaughn was at this moment projecting an agenda the Secretary had provided her, one whose date, 1 April, was correct but which contained several questionable items.1 The Speaker ignored this agenda and followed the one previously published.) The Speaker also thanked Trisha Folds-Bennett for serving as Parliamentarian, Julia Eichelberger for serving as Faculty Secretary, and Ms. Bertie Mack of the Faculty Secretariat for her cheerful and efficient service, which this year including learning to convert documents into suitable format for the Senate website. He also thanked all faculty for re-electing him as Speaker, and said he was looking forward to continuing the privilege of serving for the following year.

The Speaker urged faculty to attend the upcoming Commencement ceremonies, noting that our presence at these events will be important to our students and their families, as will the post-commencement receptions that each department will host. Turning to the fall, Mr. Wilder encouraged faculty to study and consider using the Convocation book Mapping Human History, which will be mailed to all incoming students this summer. The author, Steve Olson, will speak at Convocation on the 25th of August.

---

1 Questionable items in this April 1 document were as follows:
   3. Reports
   Office of Media and Technology:
      Report on Faculty Senate Reality TV Project
   4. New Business
   Graduate Committee
      Proposals for New Graduate Courses:
      AMST 501 – Pranks in American Culture
      ENGL 501 – The Poetics of Faculty Minutes
      POLS 501 – Quibbling in Faculty Governance, 1990-2000
   Committee on Nominations and Elections
      Ad Hoc Committee on Ad Hoc Committee Proliferation
   Senator Mark Lazzaro
      Motion to endorse proposal from student organization “Axis of Evil”
Mr. Wilder reminded faculty that all campus-wide committee terms begin 15 August. It is the responsibility of the outgoing committee to complete any outstanding work during the summer. The outgoing committee chair is also responsible for convening the new committee to elect its new officers.

Faculty Educational Technology Committee
The Speaker then recognized Brenton LeMesurier, who presented the following “draft in progress” to the Senate for information. He explained that a version of this document will be presented to the Senate next year for its approval. It will also be subject to approval by the College’s legal counsel.

Procedures for Investigative Contact by Law Enforcement Involving Information Technology
- Faculty and Staff

The College of Charleston embraces the concept of academic freedom and the value of the free exchange of ideas, whether expressed through electronic or non-electronic communications. Members of the College community have the same rights of privacy as other citizens and surrender none of those rights by becoming South Carolina state employees, or members of the academic community.

1. It is the policy of the College of Charleston to require a properly executed subpoena, search warrant or other court order for all computer, electronic information, or network-related information requests by law enforcement agencies.

2. A person contacted by a representative from a law enforcement organization that is conducting an investigation of an alleged violation involving computing and networking resources must immediately inform the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (953-5527) and the College Legal Counsel (953-5502). The Vice President for Academic Affairs will then contact the appropriate department chair, or director for assistance in gathering the requested information.

3. If you are the first point of contact with an investigative agent who is delivering a subpoena, search warrant, or other court order, ask the agent for permission to contact the College Counsel to assist you with reviewing the paperwork. Contact the College Counsel immediately for assistance. If an agent with a search warrant or court order refuses to wait before executing the instructions detailed therein, contact the College Counsel, but do not inhibit the progress of investigation.

New Business

Nomination of a slate for 2003-04 Committee on Nominations & Elections
The Speaker announced that nominations for next year’s committee remained open until April 11th. Nominations should be sent to the Speaker.
Election of Standing Senate Committees and Bookstore Advisory Council
David Gentry, chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, proceeded with Senate committee elections. The following committees were elected by acclamation. Mr. Gentry also moved that the slate for a new administrative committee, the Bookstore Advisory Council, be elected by acclamation.

**Academic Planning Committee** (seven faculty, at least four senators):
Cozart, Angela (EDFS)
Donato, Henry (Chemistry, SEN)
Friedman, Douglas (Political Science)
Kattwinkel, Susan (Theatre, SEN)
Morrison, Shawn (French, SEN)
Olejniczak, Bill (History)
Ward, Trish (English, SEN)

**Budget Committee** (seven faculty, at least four senators):
Beam, Charles (Chemistry, SEN)
Cossa, Frank (Art History)
Elshazly, Talaat (Accounting)
Martinez-Gibson, Elizabeth (Hispanic Studies, SEN)
McCandless, Peter (History, SEN)
Perlmutter, Martin (Philosophy/Religious Studies)
Seaman, Sheila (Library, SEN)

**Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual** (three faculty, at least two senators):
Grantham, Todd (Philosophy, SEN)
Hunt, Bishop (English, SEN)
Sarvate, Dinesh (Mathematics)

**Bookstore Advisory Council** (two faculty)
Aziz, Abdul (Management)
Mann, David (Political Science)

**Approval of Recommendations for Ad Hoc committees**
Mr. Gentry then conducted an election for the Ad Hoc Committee slates that the President had requested, since there were more nominees than there were slots on each committee. (These nominees had been previously circulated.) Paper ballots were distributed, and at the end of the meeting Mr. Gentry was able to report that the following names had been chosen by the Senate.

**Long-Range Planning Ad Hoc Committees**
**Ad Hoc on Communications across the Curriculum** (seven faculty):
Gamboa, Sylvia (English)
Heeney, Todd (Communications)
Martin, Betsy (Chemistry)
Ad Hoc Committee on Class Size (seven faculty):
Caveny, Deanna (Mathematics)  
Doig, Marion (Chemistry)  
Jones, Linda (Physics)  
Lewis, Andrew (PEHD)  
Nenno, Nancy (Classics)  
Perlmutter, Martin (Philosophy/Religious Studies)  
Carlson, Larry (English)

Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Workload (seven faculty):
Kelly, Joe (English)  
McBroom, Deanna (Music)  
Mignone, Robert (Mathematics)  
Miller, Deborah (PEHD)  
Olejniczak, Bill (History)  
Phillips, Darryl (Classics)  
Strand, Allan (Biology)

Ad Hoc Committee on IT Assessment (seven faculty):
Fowler, Robert (EDFS)  
Hunt, Caroline (English)  
Mann, David (Political Science)  
Marcell, Michael (Psychology)  
Moore, Christine (Computer Science)  
Phillips, Michael (Library)  
Runyon, Cass (Geology)

Graduate Committee
Maureen Hays presented the following proposals on behalf of the committee. All were approved.

Proposals for New Graduate Courses:
LALE 602 - Advanced Language Teaching Methodology
LALE 603 - Second Language Acquisition
LALE 690 - Special Topics in Language Education
FREN 602 - Modern Approaches to French Literature & Textual Analysis

Proposal to Change a Graduate Program:
MS in Mathematics

Proposals to Change Graduate Courses:
MATH 603 - Abstract Algebra I
MATH 611 - Real Analysis I
MATH 615 - Complex Analysis
Next, Senator Mark Lazarro presented the following proposal from the student organization “Alliance for Planet Earth.”

-----------------------------------------
A request to the Faculty Senate by members of the student organization, The Alliance for Planet Earth (APE), to declare by resolution to hold in abeyance the removal of a deodar cedar tree from the Sottile House grounds and the formation of an ad hoc committee appointed by President Higdon whose members will serve as our campus verderers.

The pending removal of a deodar cedar tree, planted on the Sottile House grounds over 100 years ago, has prompted APE to circulate copies of a petition against the removal of this tree. Nearly 850 students, faculty and staff have signed the petition thus far.

This venerable tree has weathered ice storms, droughts, and hurricanes and has been delightfully festooned with Christmas lights for years. It is an outstanding, unique member of our campus arboretum, and its history is intertwined with the history of the College of Charleston.

As members of APE, we would like to gain the support of the Faculty Senate by resolution to hold in abeyance the removal of this tree and for President Higdon to appoint an ad hoc committee comprised of three faculty members, a student representative, and the Supervisor of Grounds to serve as our campus verderers who would determine tree removals and plantings on campus.

Molly Gentle
Biology Major
Alliance for Planet Earth

-----------------------------------------
Mr. Lazarro moved that Senators endorse this proposal, and asked that Senators split their vote into two parts, first voting on the removal of the tree, then on the formation of an Ad Hoc committee. He introduced the author of the proposal, Molly Gentle, who told the Senate that this proposal had 1134 signatures as well as the support of the SGA, the Biology Club, and other campus organizations. In response to faculty questions, Ms. Gentle said that administrators had believed the Sottile tree should be replaced with one they believed to be more attractive, since they believed it looked unhealthy. One Senator noted that he understood that no one is planning to do anything to the tree anymore, and he thought the resolution was therefore unnecessary. Mr. Lazarro pointed out that the Sottile tree was “saved” after the Alliance for Planet Earth had gathered many signatures supporting its preservation. If this resolution were passed, then future decisions about trees would be made in a more responsible and informed manner. The head groundskeeper was not consulted about the Sottile tree during the original planning for its removal, he noted. Phil Dustan (Biology) added that the groundskeepers were in favor of having more input on such decisions. Ms. Gentle noted that the City of Charleston now requires that the College maintain a certain number of trees that are greater than 8 inches in breast height diameter, but that the City does not require any particular tree to be protected. The Sottile tree is 23 inches in breast height diameter, she noted. Mr. Lazzaro
added that with new construction scheduled on campus in the next few years, the College would be making decisions on more trees besides the Sottile tree. The Senate then voted on Mr. Lazarro’s two motions in support of the Alliance for Planet Earth’s proposal. The motion to support the protection of the Sottile tree passed unanimously on a voice vote. The second motion, to support the formation of a committee to decide the fate of campus trees, also passed.

Constituents’ Concerns

Bob Mignone asked if there was any progress on the Provost search. Bev Diamond, speaking for the search committee, replied that candidates would be visiting the campus during exam week. Bishop Hunt, noting this was the end of the Senate year, thanked the Speaker for his work. The Senate twiddled its collective thumbs while waiting for David Gentry and the Committee on Nominations to report the election results, which he did at 5:52. Hearing the results, the Senate adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary
March 24, 2003

Minutes of March Faculty Senate Meeting

The Faculty Senate met for an hour and a half on Tuesday, March 11. Fifty Senators attended.

Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order. The February minutes were approved with one correction.

Reports

The Provost

The Speaker welcomed Provost Andy Abrams, who had come to answer Senators’ questions about impending budget cuts from the S. C. Legislature. In response to a question by Tom Kunkle (Mathematics), Mr. Abrams told Senators that the Administration did not consider faculty furloughs to be an option. Although the legislature plans to cut funding by 9.98 %, the College will absorb this reduction without affecting new faculty lines or their salary levels. Mr. Abrams said that the College did plan to review all requests for replacements in classified (non-faculty) positions. In some cases the College will save some money by replacing these positions with temporary rather than full-time appointments. This would mean that the line would be protected, but the cost to the College would be lowered.

Glenn Lesses (Philosophy) asked whether the President planned to recommend a tuition increase to the Board. Yes, Mr. Abrams replied. The President is currently “working the scenarios” for various rates of increase, to see what income the College could gain, how it could offset the increase for needy students, etc., depending on the amount. Mr. Abrams said he expects a double-digit increase. When asked if there were plans to increase out-of-state tuition at a higher rate, Mr. Abrams conceded that “it is a bargain” for out-of-state students to attend the College at our present rates. Yet we need high-quality students from out of state in order to improve the overall quality of our student body; we don’t have enough high-achieving in-state students to draw from to accomplish this with only South Carolina residents. If we increase our out-of-state tuition too much, we may discourage some of these out-of-state students from coming here. Frank Kinard (Chemistry) asked if the school had considered increasing lab fees, since they had remained at $25 for 10-15 years. Mr. Abrams said that this and other fee increases would be considered. He also reminded Senators of the need to document their travel requests carefully so that they not be deemed “non-essential” for lack of information to justify them. “I’ll do all I can to interpret travel as being essential,” he said, but he needs full information about the purpose of a trip in order to do this.

Peter McCandless (History) asked Mr. Abrams to explain the difference between these budget cuts and the new building projects that are underway, such as the expanded gym.
The Provost said that the budget cuts would affect only our operating costs. This income is separate from monies given by the state (or anyone else) for a specific purpose. The state has already allocated $12 million for a new athletic facility. Additionally, the College has been authorized to retain the profits it realized from the sale of property at Remley’s Point, but only if we use it to build athletic facilities. Some members of the Board wanted a much larger athletic facility than what they finally approved—one that would have cost some $45 million. President Higdon convinced them to scale back their plans to a project costing $36 million, because he was opposed to weakening our debt capacity that could be used to finance academic facilities. The President is especially eager to secure about $45 million for the building of new science facilities. He has not yet obtained the full amount, and plans to finance the balance through a bond bill, the Provost told the Senate. The Speaker thanked the Provost, who replied, “See you next month.”

The Speaker

Mr. Wilder began by reminding faculty that Senior Week would take place in late March and early April. This tradition was begun last year by President Higdon in an attempt to encourage students to identify with their graduating class. He encouraged faculty to attend a reception at the President’s home, and to RSVP to the invitations we had received by email.

Next the Speaker reminded faculty of the formation of Ad Hoc Committees which would make recommendations concerning four areas: class size, communication across the curriculum, workload, and IT competency. All these recommendations would then flow through the normal Faculty and Senate committee channels. Mr. Wilder encouraged Senators to submit nominations, including self-nominations, to David Gentry. He also noted that a new Bookstore Advisory Committee would soon be formed. This would not be a standing faculty committee, but would be an advisory committee like the Parking Advisory Committee, composed of students and staff as well as faculty, who would offer input to Kristen Wing, the new Bookstore manager.

The Speaker then updated the Senate on other matters in the S. C. Legislature. A bill to eliminate the TERI retirement plan is now under consideration, and Mr. Wilder says he believes the TERI plan will probably be eliminated eventually. He also reported that an “at-will employment” bill was passed by the House with almost no debate. One effect of the bill, which was probably unintentional, could be to make tenure illegal. Senator Kay Patterson has been filibustering the Senate debate on this bill, and ceded the floor long enough to hear an amendment to the bill that would exempt faculty from this “at-will employment” condition. This amendment has passed, and as of this time the filibustering continues. Even if the bill is passed as amended in the S. C. Senate, it will return to the House for reconsideration in its amended form. Mr. Wilder noted that Senator Glenn McConnell sponsored the amendment, and said that if any faculty had contacted him asking for support, it would now be appropriate for them to thank him. Susan Kattwinkel (Theater) asked if we should be ready to contact House representatives if the bill returned to them, and Mr. Wilder said he would let faculty know if that became appropriate.
New Business

Graduate Committee

Maureen Hayes recommended the following new courses, course changes, and program changes. All were approved:

- ENGL 560 - Film Studies
- FREN 683 - Realism and Naturalism in French Literature & Art
- LALE 601 - Applied Linguistics

Course Change Proposals (3):
- EDFS 738, EDFS 748, EDFS 758

Program Change Proposals (4): Change admission criteria for:
- MAT in elementary and early childhood programs
- MED in elementary and early childhood programs
- MAT in special education program
- MED in special education program

Curriculum Committee

Norris Preyer brought the following proposals before the Senate, and all were approved:

- B.S. in Biology with Concentration in Molecular Biology – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
- Math 121 Introductory Calculus Lab – New Course
- B.A. in Biology, Dual Degree with Allied Health - Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
- ENGL 496 Undergraduate Research – New Course Proposal
- ENGL 326 Irish Literature – New Course Proposal
- CHEM 343 Introduction to Modeling in Chemistry – New Course Proposal
- PHYS 206 Planetary Astronomy – Proposal to Change a Course
- PHYS 311 Stellar Astronomy and Astrophysics – Proposal to Change a Course

Academic Standards Committee

Brian Scholtens presented the Senate with the following proposal.

---------------------------------------

Final Exam Policy

It is the general policy of the College of Charleston to require final exams in accordance with the final exam schedule in all courses for all students registered for credit. Exceptions to this policy may be made only under the following conditions:
1. The final exam in a course may be eliminated by an instructor who considers such an exam to be unnecessary if approval has been received from the department head and the dean of the school. Although the instructor may give a final exam, individual approval for eliminating the exam does not have to be obtained for certain categories of courses:
   a. Seminars, Internships, Practicums
   b. Independent studies, Bachelor’s essays, Tutorials
   c. Music performance courses; Studio Art courses
   d. Student Teaching

2. If no final exam is given, instruction shall be continued through the last week of the semester in all courses. In such cases, the classes will meet at the times shown on the final exam schedule with the exception, at the discretion of the instructor, of (a) Seminars, Internships, Practicums; (b) Independent studies, Bachelor’s essays, Tutorials; (c) Music performance courses; Studio Art courses; (d) Student Teaching

3. The presence of each student registered for credit in a course shall be mandatory at the final exam or at the last class meeting during exam week unless the student is excused by action of the Undergraduate Dean in consultation with the professor.

4. Adherence to this exam schedule is required. Only in extreme circumstances can a final exam be scheduled by a faculty member at a time not in conformity with the College schedule. If this action is necessary, it must be approved by the head of the department, Dean of the School, and Undergraduate Dean.

   Exception: Final exams for laboratories which are part of a 4-credit course and receive either zero credits or one credit may be scheduled prior to the final exam period.

5. Ordinarily, tests should not be given during the final week of classes. Exceptions are permitted if:
   a. a test is the last of three or more during the semester and there will be minimal new material on the final exam, and
   b. no major papers are due in the class during this time, or
   c. the test is in a laboratory class as described in Item 4-Exception, above.

----------------------------------------

Mr. Scholtens explained that the policy was designed to prevent conflicts for students whose professors gave exams at non-scheduled times. Senators asked whether this policy would require them to give an exam, and Mr. Scholtens said that for most courses, faculty would have to get permission from their chairs if they chose not to give an exam. In response to a question by David Mann (Political Science), Mr. Scholtens said the committee had not decided where this policy should go (in the Faculty-Administration manual or the Undergraduate Catalog, for example). In response to other questions, Mr.
Scholtens said that the present policies are not being followed, and faculty were giving what was actually an exam during the last week of class, instead of during the normal exam period when students had more time to study. Other faculty were moving their exams to a time other than their scheduled slot.

Faculty asked about the particulars of the policy. Would it prevent faculty from giving a take-home exam, asked Tim Carens (English). Mr. Scholtens said that as long as the take-home exam was due during the exam period, it would not prevent this option. George Pothering asked if students could email a take-home exam. Mr. Scholtens said the committee had imagined that students must present their exams in person, and that they had not considered the email option. More objections to this requirement were raised. Susan Morrison (Associate Provost) said she thought this document was intended for students, so they would take the exam period more seriously and not try to leave for a vacation as soon as possible by changing their exam dates. After more discussion, David Mann moved to remand the proposal to the committee, in order that they address the issue of electronic delivery of take-home exams. Some faculty thought if this document were for the benefit of students, it needed to be written more clearly. Mr. Scholtens noted that the committee had used another university’s policy as the model for the policy they proposed. Other faculty acknowledged that there was a need for some clarification of exam policy, because some professors were changing their exam dates or giving exams during the last week of the semester just so they could leave early. The question was called, and the vote to remand passed.

By-Laws Committee

Bob Mignone presented two changes to the Faculty-Administration Manual. As Mr. Mignone explained, a change appeared in the Faculty/Administration Manual when that document was revised in 1999, and his search of Senate records indicated to him that no one intended for this item to be deleted. The first motion follows:

MOTION 1 TO CORRECT THE BY-LAWS

Change: Article V, Section 2, A. (page 41):

FROM: "A. Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations at least 15 days prior to the April Senate meeting, and are elected by the Senate during the April Senate meeting."

TO: "A. Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations at least 15 days prior to the April Senate meeting, and are elected by the Senate during the April Senate meeting. The majority of members of standing Senate committees must be Senators."

RATIONALE
At the December 1, 1998 Senate meeting the By-Laws Committee forwarded, with "no adjustments", several motions that were approved by the Senate at the November 1998 Senate meeting (original motions made by the Committee on Nominations). The relevant motion is as follows:

Motion 1 Part A. Change: Article V, Section 2, A. (page 42):

From: "A. Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations and Elections by March 15 and are elected by the Senate by April 1."

To: "A. Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations at least 15 days prior to the April Senate meeting, and are elected by the Senate during the April Senate meeting."

The "From" part OMITS and the rationale does not mention the last sentence in the then existing By-Laws which stated: “The majority of members of standing Senate committees must be Senators.” It does not appear the intention of the 1998 motion was to delete this sentence, yet it was deleted upon revision of the Faculty/Administration Manual as of August 1999. Every indication is that the deletion was inadvertent. This motion would correct that omission by replacing this sentence.

This motion was approved by the Senate with no discussion. Mr. Mignone’s second proposal was to change the Faculty/Administration manual by repeating a criterion for tenure. His written rationale stated, “Since the exemplary performance requirements already exist as requirements for tenure and promotion and since they are used in the evaluation process, it is highly important that these requirements are not missed. The intention of this motion is to repeat this requirement in a more prominent location to increase the likelihood that this vital information is not missed.” This proposal provoked a brief discussion. Some faculty suggested it was unnecessary, since it involved only repeating information in more than one place in the manual. Bev Diamond (Mathematics) suggested a change in wording that would indicate that this was a reminder rather than a new requirement. Mr. Mignone accepted this suggestion as a friendly amendment, and moved that the faculty endorse their recommendation, as follows:

MOTION 2 TO IMPROVE THE FACULTY/ADMINISTRATION MANUAL

CHANGE: CHAPTER IV; J; 4. (Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion), first paragraph (page 79)

FROM: “What follow are minimum criteria for tenure and promotion. Each department may develop additional appropriate criteria, which must be written, available and on file in the Office of the Provost.”

TO: “What follow are minimum criteria for tenure and promotion. Each department may develop additional appropriate criteria, which must be written, available and on file
in the Office of the Provost. Candidates are reminded that evidence of exemplary performance is required in at least one of the specified professional competency areas.”

RATIONALE

In Chapter IV, Institutional Policies, Regulations and Procedures; J. Third Year Review, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional Faculty (page 73); second sentence of the second paragraph, it states: "In addition, evidence of exemplary performance is required in at least one of the specified professional competency areas."

Since the exemplary performance requirements already exist as requirements for tenure and promotion and since they are used in the evaluation process, it is highly important that these requirements are not missed. The intention of this motion is to repeat this requirement in a more prominent location to increase the likelihood that this vital information is not missed.

The Senate then approved this motion.

With no constituent concerns offered, the meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary

Last Spring 2002 Senate Meeting (5:00 PM, 116 ECTR):
Tuesday, April 1 (continued Tuesday, April 15, if necessary)
Faculty Meeting (5:00 PM, Physicians Auditorium): Monday, April 21; agenda deadline Wednesday, April 9, 3:00 PM
Minutes of the February Faculty Senate Meeting

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, 11 February for about two hours. Fifty-one Senators attended.

Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order. The January minutes were approved with no discussion.

Reports

Before giving his own report, the Speaker welcomed Andy Abrams (Provost), Marcia Moore (Administrative Computing), and Chief Donald Cronin (Public Safety), who were present in response to the Senate’s request that they answer questions about about faculty privacy in offices and in the use of computers belonging to the College. Mr. Wilder requested that Senators respect the privacy of Robin Bowers, whose situation had brought these questions to light. Instead of asking about any specific details relating to Professor Bowers’s case, the Speaker suggested, Senators should use this opportunity to ask about general College policies regarding privacy and computer use.

David Mann (Political Science) asked Chief Cronin about Public Safety’s policy for responding to requests by off-campus law enforcement agencies. Mr. Cronin explained that Public Safety and state and local law enforcement agencies had “mutual agreements” for cooperating with each other, adding that Public Safety officers were certified police officers as well. When asked if there was a written policy in effect, Mr. Cronin said that it was “very loosely written” to allow for quick action in emergencies. Mr. Mann asked what Public Safety’s protocol was when an outside agency calls and requests information. Mr. Cronin said they gave out any information that they were legally able to divulge to these agencies. Frank Kinard (Chemistry) asked if there was a search warrant in the Bowers case, when a computer was removed from a faculty member’s office. Mr. Cronin said there was no requirement for a search warrant, and that courts have held that there is no expectation of privacy in a computer that is owned by a company. Mr. Kinard pointed out that many universities require a search warrant to enter a dorm room pursuant to a crime, and Mr. Cronin said that computers were different from other personal property, like a lockable desk. At this point Mr. Wilder requested that the Committee on Technology look into this distinction. “I’m on it,” Mr. Kinard replied.

Jim Carew (Geology) noted that former president Alex Sanders believed that faculty have the same expectation of privacy in their offices that they have in their homes. Mr. Carew said he wanted a statement clarifying exactly what privacy we could expect. If we don’t have privacy, then he would buy his own computer, and would no longer “function like a normal professor.” Mr. Carew also wondered what level of evidence was required before a search was conducted. Was one accusation all that was necessary? Mr. Cronin said that
there was more than that in the most recent case. He added that President Higdon has told Public Safety that the President and Provost must be informed in the future if a search is done. Provost Andy Abrams then said that he disagreed with Chief Cronin’s interpretation of the law, and wanted the Committee on Technology to develop a new policy. He believed the law does not give the state the right to look into any part of our offices. Further, he wondered, should and institution, even if legally entitled to do so, search faculty offices while faculty members are “in class, or at a Faculty Senate meeting?” Such has not been the College’s practice in the past, Mr. Abrams said. He planned to work with the Committee on Technology to develop a policy for our community. He believed it would be possible to comply with state law while still protecting faculty rights. Susan Katwinkel asked if the Committee would develop this policy, noting that it wasn’t reasonable to expect Public Safety to formulate policy. Mr. Abrams agreed that procedures need to be clarified. In the meantime, the President has requested that if a need for a search arises, Public Safety check with him first. In response to further questions, Mr. Cronin noted that he attempted to inform his supervisor in the Bowers case, but that the message did not get delivered. Next time, he said, he would inform the President and the Provost himself.

Other faculty asked questions about how the College would respond if asked for information about faculty or students in other cases. Mr. Abrams maintained that the College would require a subpoena or a warrant for any privileged information to be released. James Carew proposed that the College establish a policy of not letting anyone search a faculty member’s office without a warrant. Terry Bowers (English) asked what the timeline would be for developing a policy. Mr. Abrams said he couldn’t speak for a faculty committee, but that he hoped it would be developed soon and be brought to the Senate for feedback.

Norris Preyer asked Marcia Moore (Academic Computing) if the college monitored e-mail and other things in transit on the Internet. “Technically, yes,” Ms. Moore replied. “Ethically, no,” unless there was a good reason. She pointed out that hackers can monitor our e-mail, though. Mr. Preyer asked if it would be possible to encrypt our e-mail. Ms. Moore said that at this point, only individuals could install encryption tools at their own computers. Mr. Preyer asked if the College limited the transfer of MPG files. Ms. Moore replied that the College did try to monitor and discourage such use of the College server, mostly because MPG files take up so much server space, but also because of music copyright issues. Mark Lazzeri asked what sort of monitoring this was, and Ms. Moore explained that Administrative Computing looked at aggregate data on bandwidth use, not at individual use. David Mann asked if our computers could be tampered with by hackers while they were on. Ms. Moore said that this was possible. “We’re working on that,” she said, adding that most hacking is intranet (people within a system) rather than internet, and firewalls do not protect us against intranet activity.

Mr. Abrams reiterated his desire that the College adopt a policy that would require a search warrant before entering faculty offices. “Whenever we can protect ourselves, we should,” he said. David Mann asked if there was a policy on faculty computer use, noting that there is a policy on student use. Mr. Abrams said that currently, this was the only
policy we had for the entire College. Brenton LeMesurier noted that the Committee on Information Technology has been asked to review this policy. Frank Morris (Classics) asked how we could filter unwanted (and sometimes unsavory) e-mail. Ms. Moore said that this was best done through filters that individuals set for themselves. Mr. Abrams said this was better than limiting academic freedom by filtering too much. (He suggested individuals could choose whom to filter; for instance, all e-mail from the Provost’s office.) Marcia Moore noted that Administrative Computing does filter any viruses they learn about, but even this is imperfect; last year, in an attempt to block the “Hi” virus, they inadvertently blocked all e-mail for “Higdon.”

The Speaker called the questioning to a close, thanking the guests for their time, and the Senators applauded. Mr. Wilder then turned to his own report. He reminded faculty of the deadline for Distinguished Faculty Awards (2/14) and of the open forums to be held that week on the Strategic Plan developed by the Long-Range Planning Coordinating Committee will take place Wednesday and Thursday, 2/12 and 2/13. The Strategic Plan is available at http://www.cofc.edu/~lrpcc/, where faculty may also comment upon it online.

The Speaker also noted that the Master Plan for the College’s facilities is well underway, The firm of Ayers-St. Gross has done extensive research on the campus through visits and interviews, and it will distribute a draft of its plan to the College community in early fall. The Board will respond to this draft at its October meeting, and is expected to approve a final plan in January of next year.

**Old Business**

The Senate then turned to old business: a proposal, submitted in December by the Committee on Tenure & Promotion, recommending that all candidates for tenure and promotion be required to submit their research to external review. The Speaker reminded Senators that they had been charged with discussing this proposal with their departments, and opened the floor for discussion.

Tim Carens (English) read a statement signed by 19 members of the English Department.

“The following members of the Department of English support excellence in research and excellence in teaching and cannot, because of present inequities in workload, support this new proposal which does not promote either. Members of the department have voiced several concerns and objections to the proposal, including the following:

--The proposed process of external review does not guarantee a more objective or more rigorous assessment of scholarship than does the present process. The proposal does not indicate what standard a candidate is expected to meet. Hence it is not clear that requiring external review will enable the T & P committee to determine whether or not a packet contains "sufficient" evidence of scholarly excellence.

--The effect of the requirement of external review will be to raise pressure on and expectations of faculty, particularly at the junior level. We consider that without a change in workload this elevated expectation would have a damaging effect on teaching, service,
and even collegiality at the College. It is not reasonable to consider raising expectations across the board until teaching loads are equal for all tenure and tenure-track faculty.”

In response to Mr. Carens, Glenn Lesses (Philosophy) said that the criteria were not changing and that institutions that we wished to emulate used external letters. “We think this will enhance the rigor of the review,” he said. Bill Olejniczak (History) proposed an amendment to the motion, stipulating that this requirement be instituted when the standard teaching load for tenure-track faculty was no more than 9 hours per semester. Mr. Lesses said that a faculty member’s teaching load was irrelevant. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) thought that attaching this amendment to the proposal was like saying we would begin requiring outside letters “when hell freezes over.” Bob Mignone (Mathematics) said that faculty workload should be addressed by the Workload committee. Susan Farrell (English) said that the College should emulate these premier institutions, many of which require outside letters, but that we must emulate them in our teaching as well as in our research (all these institutions have less than a 12-hour load), so she believed it was proper to join the issues of scholarship and workload through this amendment. Finally the question was called. The amendment failed, and discussion of the main motion resumed.

David Mann said that Political Science had decided to vote against the motion, noting that the process would require his colleague who’d published 3 books to provide multiple copies to outside reviewers. Mary Beth Heston (Art History) said that her department opposed the motion, having decided that these letters would make so little difference to the outcome of a decision that they were not worth the demand they placed on the reviewer, and that the process would be “unfair if not pretentious.” Andrew Sobiesu (Hispanic Studies) said that the foreign languages faculty opposed the motion. The option exists already for departments to require these letters or for candidates to request them. Mr. Sobiesu said that refereed publications already indicated that an informed editorial board had reviewed the article. Why send them out to be re-reviewed, he asked. Finally, he noted, over 50% of what we do at the College is teaching. “If we want to attain pre-eminence, why not start with that?” Terry Bowers (English) agreed with this statement, noting that outside letters duplicated what had already been done when the article was published. Presently, a candidate has the option to solicit external review, which Mr. Bowers thought was good, but not something to be required of everyone.

Mr. Lesses said that refereed publications were one mark of quality, but that the requirement for tenure was that the research meet the standard of quality that the Faculty-Staff Manual requires. He said that outside review would not necessarily inform the Tenure and Promotion Committee’s decision, but frequently it does. Bob Mignone said that the Math department had been requiring outside letters, and that he found it very valuable. The process often helps a candidate whose work may be in doubt. Mr. Mignone also noted that external letters address the whole body of a candidate’s work, rather than individual articles. Todd McNerny (Theatre) said that his department believed that outside letters could be very valuable, but in the case of its own discipline, it was not always possible for one’s entire body of work (including performances) to be reviewed by one person. Victor Puleo (Economics/Finance) noted that when he chaired Faculty
Welfare several years ago, the committee had studied the process of peer review of teaching portfolios. They had concluded that it was useful, and that it should be optional. External letters, too, should remain an option, he said. Annette Godow (PEHD) stated that her department opposed the motion. Jim Carew asked if the T & P committee could be allowed to request letters in a case where they felt they could not judge the candidate’s work adequately. Tom Kunkle (Mathematics) said that time constraints would make this option impossible. He said that we should support this proposal because the T & P committee has asked for it.

A vote was taken by a show of hands. The motion was defeated, 13 to 38.

**Constituents’ Concerns**

With no new business, the Speaker invited constituents’ concerns. Scooter Barnette (PEHD) addressed the Senate with her concern over the planned expansion of the gym. She said that this construction will cause courses to be cancelled and recreation space to be lost, and she hoped the Senate would voice its concerns about the detrimental effect this plan would have on students. Several Senators expressed concern about this plan as well, noting that it seemed to be undertaken without regard for the facilities master plan that was in progress, and that it seemed a large expense at a time that the College is cutting other programs, such as the campus in France.

Alex Kassman (Mathematics) raised a concern about professors moving the date of their final exam and causing conflicts for students. Tom Ross (Psychology) distributed a memo that his colleague, Robin Bowers, had asked him to bring to the Senate. Several other faculty raised questions about the time it took for students to travel from one class to another, and the resulting tardiness. With other concerns raised and the hour growing late, Peter McCandless (History) noted that the roof in Maybank had been leaking since the 1980’s. The Speaker promised to follow up on all matters raised.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger

Faculty Secretary

Remaining Spring 2002 Senate Meetings (5:00 PM, 116 ECTR):
Tuesday, March 11
Tuesday, April 1 (continued Tuesday, April 15, if necessary); agenda deadline Thursday, March 20, 3:00 PM.
Faculty Meeting (5:00 PM, Physicians Auditorium):
Monday, April 21; agenda deadline Wednesday, April 9, 3:00 PM
Minutes of the Faculty Senate

The fifth regular meeting of the 2002-2003 Faculty Senate took place on Tuesday, January 21st at 5:00 p.m. in ECTR 116. Forty-seven Senators attended.

Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order. The minutes of the December meeting were approved.

Speaker’s Report

Mr. Wilder reminded Senators of several events. Later the same evening, the College would be presenting its annual program in honor of Martin Luther King Day. After a candlelight vigil on the Cistern at 7:15, an 8:00 program in Sottile would feature Ronald Walters, a professor of political science at the University of Maryland, as its distinguished guest speaker. Mr. Wilder urged Senators to attend. Next, he thanked Sean Green and David Cohen for their work on the new College website that has just been launched. Mr. Wilder encouraged all faculty to note that Mr. Green solicits faculty response to the new site, welcoming our comments and suggestions. On the topic of faculty input, the Speaker continued, the draft of the College’s Strategic plan is now posted on the web. There will be two open forums at which faculty can respond to the plan: February 12th and 14th, both at 3:00 p.m. in ECTR 118. Faculty may offer comments online as well. This draft is the penultimate version, available for comments this semester; in July the Strategic Planners will submit a final version of the plan to the Board of Trustees. The Speaker also reminded faculty that nominations for Distinguished Faculty Awards were due the 14th of February to Andy Abrams.

Mr. Wilder noted that the choice of book and speaker for Convocation 2003 had recently been announced. Steve Olsen, author of Mapping Human History: Discovering The Past Through Our Genes, will address the entering freshmen. Convocation will take place on Monday, August 25th, at 4 p.m., the day before Fall classes begin. Mr. Wilder, having served on the selection committee, was enthusiastic about the book, which will be of special interest to faculty in the social sciences, natural sciences, and philosophy. Calling the book “a good read” and “a provocative work,”” the Speaker told Senators that the book will be on reserve. Later in the semester, copies will be available to faculty. He also informed Senators that the scheduling of Convocation has crowded the calendar in August, a time when the gym is heavily in use, so that it is now difficult to find a time to hold the Faculty-Staff Back-to-School Picnic. He asked faculty if they would be disturbed if the picnic were held the Wednesday before the semester opened, rather than Friday. “Let me know if you think it would make a difference” to attendance, the Speaker said.

Next, the Speaker reminded Senators of the work of the Faculty Compensation Committee, recently announced by Lynne Ford, committee chair. In Ms. Ford’s report, she explains how the committee developed a list of “comparable institutions” and provides the list of these institutions. She solicits faculty comments to this work, and the Speaker urged faculty to send their input to Lynne Ford or any member of the committee.
Finally, the Speaker noted, the next Senate meeting has an agenda deadline of January 30th, which is not far off. Since the Senate voted at the December meeting to defer until February a vote on the Tenure & Promotion Committee’s proposal to require external review of all candidates for tenure and promotion, Senators need to be sure to use the remaining time to discuss this issue with their colleagues.

Committee on Nominations and Elections

David Gentry, Chair, conducted an election to replace an At-Large Senator. The nominees were Bob Mignone (Mathematics) and David Mann (Political Science). Since the nominations had been made, however, David Mann had been elected by his department to replace a vacancy there. The ballots, therefore, gave Senators the choice of Bob Mignone or a write-in candidate. Ballots were distributed and collected, and later in the meeting Mr. Gentry announced that Bob Mignone had been elected.

Curriculum Committee

One new graduate course was approved. FREN 680: French Phonetics and Phonology, will count toward an MED in Languages. The following undergraduate proposals were approved:

1. F02-73 DSCI 306 Introduction to Electronic Commerce – New Course Proposal
2. F02-74 TRAN 431 Issues in Intermodalism – Proposal to Change a Course
3. F02-75 TRAN 312 Intermodal Logistics – Proposal to Change a Course
4. F02-76 COMM 245 Introduction to Television Production – New Course Proposal
5. F02-77 Communication/Concentration in Media Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements

Constituents’ Concerns

The Speaker then invited discussion of a topic over which several faculty had expressed great concern. The preceding week, a faculty member had sent a mass e-mail describing how his computer had been removed from his office without his prior knowledge. The e-mail said that the computer was searched to see if there was any evidence of illegal activity, that no such evidence had been found, and that his computer had been returned. Faculty were greatly disturbed by this report, wondering what degree of privacy faculty can expect for computers they use in their offices. A lengthy discussion, off the record, followed. The Senate then voted to suspend the rules and return to New Business in order to make a motion.

New Business

David Mann (Political Science) moved “That the Senate invite Chief Cronin to the next Senate meeting, to discuss the nature of the liaison between College of Charleston Public
Safety and outside law enforcement agencies.” Discussion followed in which several faculty wondered if it would be advisable to bring in an attorney or the Provost to discuss the law with regard to privacy rights for state employees. The question was called and the motion passed on a voice vote. Another Senator moved that the Senate invite Andy Abrams to come to the next meeting to discuss the legal situation of faculty with regard to use of state-owned computers and office space. This motion passed. Next, Todd McNerny said that there are other ways to examine a faculty member’s computer besides removing it from one’s office. He moved that the Senate invite Marcia Moore, head of Administrative Computing, to discuss such technical matters with the Senate at its next meeting. The motion carried.

Following the announcement of Bob Mignone’s election to At-Large Senator, the Senate adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary

Remaining Spring 2002 Senate Meetings (5:00 PM, 116 ECTR):
Tuesday, February 11; agenda deadline Thursday, Jan. 30, 3:00 PM.
Tuesday, March 11; agenda deadline Thursday, Feb. 27, 3:00 PM.
Tuesday, April 1 (continued Tuesday, April 15, if necessary); agenda deadline Thursday, March 20, 3:00 PM.

Faculty Meeting (5:00 PM, Physicians Auditorium):
Monday, April 21; agenda deadline Wednesday, April 9, 3:00 PM
MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 2002 MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fourth regular meeting of the 2002-2003 Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, December 3rd, in ECTR 116. Fifty-two Senators attended.

Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order, and thanked Trish Ward (English) for taking notes in the absence of the Faculty Secretary. He also thanked the College Bookstore for providing Senators with cookies. The minutes of the November meeting were approved with no discussion.

Reports

Provost Search Committee
Jim Deavor, chair of the Provost Search Committee, reported that the search has been extended. The College made an offer to two finalists, both of whom declined. Mr. Deavor said that the Committee will retain its search consultant, and that it hopes to bring in candidates before Spring Break and appoint a new provost to begin duties in Fall 2003. Mr. Deavor thanked the faculty for attending forums during the search, and invited us to forward the names of potential candidates to the Committee. Some Senators suggested running a new ad. Jim Carew (Geology) asked why the candidates didn’t accept. Mr. Deavor said these candidates had decided they did not wish to accept after they learned more about the College and challenges it is facing. Bev Diamond (Mathematics), who is also on the Committee, said the two candidates offered the job were very different and had different reasons for declining.

College Bookstore
Becky Currin encouraged faculty who needed to have coursepacks printed to use XanEdu course packs, arranged through the bookstore. Ms. Currin gave a Power Point presentation which stressed that XanEdu takes charge of all copyright permissions and is liable for any legal infractions. She also reminded faculty that the bookstore contributes to the College’s financial aid pool. She provided Senators with brochures about XanEdu and noted that she would be happy to meet with departments to discuss specific needs.

The Speaker
Mr. Wilder invited Senators to admire the quality of our new projector, and also encouraged faculty to participate in December graduation, December 15 at 2:30 in North Charleston Coliseum. He noted that faculty should RSVP to Lynn Cherry by noon on Friday the 13th. Faculty should arrive by 1:30 to assemble at 2:00. The December Commencement speaker is novelist Padgett Powell (C of C class of 1974).

New Business

Committee on Tenure and Promotion
Glenn Lesses (Philosophy), chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion, reported that his Committee recommends a change to the Faculty-Administration Manual:
The Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review moves that the Faculty Senate recommend the following changes to the Faculty/Administration Manual.

In the current edition of the Faculty/Administration Manual, delete the following sentence in section IV. J. 2. b. (2):
Both internal and external colleague statements on research and professional activities.
Insert in its place:
(2) Internal colleague statements on research and professional activities.
and
(3) For candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and for promotion to Professor, confidential letters of evaluation on research and professional development from appropriate professionals outside of the College of Charleston.

and renumber current items (3) and (4) as (4) and (5).

In the current edition of the Faculty/Administration Manual, renumber items in section IV. M. 6. c. through 6. h. to 6. d. to 6. i. and insert a new 6. c. to read:

For candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and for promotion to Professor, confidential letters of evaluation on research and professional development from appropriate professionals outside of the College of Charleston. By Sept. 1, candidates should submit the names of at least three professionals from outside the College. Evaluation panel chairs in consultation with departmental panel members should present additional names of external reviewers in order to obtain no fewer than two and no more than five independent reviews of the quality of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements. No more than half of the reviews should be secured from the candidate's own list. The candidate is allowed to strike one name from the panel chair's list. The external reviewers chosen should be appropriately qualified to conduct an independent review of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements.

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

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

The panel chair must include in the candidate's packet: (1) a description of the process by which the outside letters were obtained, (2) each reviewer's institutional and departmental affiliation, and rank or other institutional title, a description of the academic specialization of the reviewer, and other relevant information about the reviewer, which may be useful to those unfamiliar with the field, (3) a copy of the letter of solicitation by the panel chair, and (4) the confidential outside reviews.

**Rationale:**

Professionals from outside the College working in the same field of expertise as the candidate can offer valuable information in helping determine whether candidates meet the qualitative standards in research and professional development for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Professor. Accordingly, external review of scholarship and research will benefit the evaluation process. Moreover, independent review of scholarship and creative achievement is the mainstream practice among strong liberal arts and sciences colleges and universities.

-------------

Mr. Lesses reminded the Senate that this motion was narrowly approved by the Faculty Senate in 1999, but the Provost decided not to implement it. The Senate cannot change the Faculty-Administration manual, but can recommend that the Administration do so. Mr. Lesses reported that his Committee believes this change will “enhance” the process of tenure and promotion. He also said that President Higdon is familiar with the debate and understands that “mainstream” liberal arts and sciences universities use this practice of external review.

A lengthy discussion ensued. Terry Bowers (English) noted that his department is vehemently opposed to the proposal. Mr. Bowers reported that the English department believes, first, that the proposal is a needless duplication, since publications are already refereed. Asking others to review articles that have already been published seems to add a needless, burdensome layer to the process. The department can evaluate the quality of these published articles on its own, and a candidate may always choose to include outside letters in a packet. He also wondered whether this practice is really “mainstream” or widely used. Mr. Lesses responded that many institutions that we wish to be like—Miami, William and Mary, Mount Holyoke—solicit external reviews. Many C of C faculty are external reviewers for other institutions, he said.

Larry Carlson (English) asked whether we as an institution really wished to elevate research via these new criteria. Mr. Lesses said that President Higdon was in favor of the criteria, and that the criteria were not being changed; only the evidence of whether the criteria were satisfied was changing. Mr. Carlson pointed out that some departments still have 12-hour loads across the board. Do the schools we wish to emulate have such a
teaching load, he wondered. This point was raised as well by Tim Carens (English), who said that all faculty needed sufficient time to do this level of research, and that he believed we should find out the teaching load at institutions who have this requirement in place. Mr. Carens also said he thought departments were capable of evaluating the quality of their colleagues’ research. To this point, Jim Carew (Geology) said, “Departments lie.” He said that when he was on the T&P committee in the past, the committee had to make an independent assessment of a candidate rather than believing the department; therefore, they needed outside evidence.

Richard Nunan (Philosophy) noted that the T&P committee, in its annual letter to candidates, has continued to urge them to get external evaluations. Mr. Nunan thinks that if the motion isn’t approved, this advice should be removed from the T&P letter. He also suggested that the current language needs to be rephrased to spell out the process used in cases when external reviews are requested. He also said he thought mandating external review was a mistake. We are not a research institution. The practice may be used for institutions that require cutting-edge research, but the T&P Committee isn’t going to be able to determine if scholarship is cutting-edge, he said. However, in departments where it is hard to evaluate a colleague’s work (a split-discipline department or someone with a specialized subfield), external evaluation may be useful; therefore, it’s a good idea to have a standardized procedure without mandating. Regarding the amount of work these reviews require, Mr. Nunan said it was “a modest burden” to the department, but it is difficult to solicit these external evaluations because some people do turn down the request. Fulfiling the request, he said, was a big burden for the reviewers, and the results may not be worth the trouble. Mr. Lesses called such concerns “paternalistic” and noted that reviewers take on the task voluntarily. He added that the annual letter to candidates says that reviews are not required, but that they are extremely helpful.

Rich Bodek (History) said there were 2 separate issues here. He was in favor of requiring external letters because that is already the practice in History, and this regularizes that practice. He also noted, though, that many of his colleagues in other departments want to know where the release time is for them to get their research done. Bob Mignone (Mathematics) spoke in favor of the proposal. He noted that in the Faculty Senate in 1999, 60% of vote was in favor of it. A motion to rescind the motion failed. The Math department has used external reviews for a long time, he said, and they find it provides critical and useful information. Herb Silverman (Mathematics) said that the College now mandates extradepartmental colleague letters on service, and they don’t make much difference. Letters on research do make a difference, he said, especially if a candidate is questionable.

Liz Martinez (Hispanic Studies) said that, like Terry Bowers, she believes the proposed process is repetitive, because publications are already refereed. External evaluation questions that process, she said. Mr. Lesses said that the proposed letter is a different kind of evaluation. It explains how the work contributes to the field, so the letter benefits the candidate. The external review says why the scholarship is significant. Frank Kinard (Chemistry) said he would be concerned if a faculty member “can’t find three colleagues who would write a nice letter” about him or her.
Darryl Phillips (Classics) said he thought it was admirable for the College to bring more of its practices in line with strong liberal arts and sciences universities, but we don’t fit that model when many of us teach 4 courses and 3 preps. Let’s begin by revising the teaching standards first, Mr. Phillips suggested. Mr. Lesses said that some external reviewers have teaching loads as heavy as or heavier than ours. Mr. Phillips said that if we want to be like “mainstream” nationally recognized institutions, let’s begin with our teaching load. Miami’s is 3-3 and William and Mary’s is 2-3, he noted.

Meta Lee Van Sickle (EDFS) said she did not think external reviews were usually very helpful, since often they are written by people who know the candidate. She also said she would like to see a study of the impact of external evaluations on decisions. Tom Kunkle (Mathematics) said that some faculty were concerned that we would have to do research comparable to that done at research universities, but that reviewers of C of C faculty understand our situation. Bev Diamond (Mathematics), speaking as a member of this year’s T&P committee, noted that the proposal says the candidate only suggests some of the names of external reviewers, not all of them, and that departments can solicit letters from scholars who are not friends with the candidate. Mr. Lesses noted that at Miami, the dean and the chair alone choose the external reviewers, so the proposed C of C process is “friendlier.”

Sheila Seaman noted that when she wrote an external review, she found it instructive, but also an enormous burden. Andrew Sobiesuo (Hispanic Studies) asked how many departments already required outside letters. He said he believed the requirement constituted a major change, and that Senators should discuss this matter with their departments before voting. Mr. Lesses repeated that the change is a change of procedure and not a change of criteria. Alex Kasman said that if some people believed external review was useful, then that outweighed objections of those who thought it wasn’t useful, and that he supported it.

Trisha Folds-Bennett (Psychology) said she thought it would be useful, and that if we aspire to be nationally pre-eminent, then maybe we should use external letters. But, she said, this practice will change the criteria. It will place more pressure on faculty seeking tenure and promotion. She also noted that the departments who are most opposed to the proposal are the ones with the highest teaching loads. Faculty in Psychology routinely teach 120-160 students per semester, she said. The pressure of facing external review of one’s work after it has been published will affect the way faculty spend their time, encouraging them to spend less time in working with students or attending meetings. External review will cause a shift in the way faculty view the T&P process and will thereby ratchet up the requirements, said Ms. Folds-Bennett. Mr. Lesses said the proposal involves no change in requirements.

Mary Beth Heston (Art History) said she was uncomfortable voting on the matter at tonight’s meeting. She said she was not opposed herself, but she wanted to have a chance to converse with colleagues before the Senate makes a decision on it. Peter McCandless (History) agreed, and said that we should not pass the proposal unless it were contingent
upon an equal teaching load across campus. Terry Bowers said he would like to have more information on peer institutions who use external review.

Jim Carew asked Senators to put themselves in the position of the T&P committee member who has no idea of the quality of a candidate’s work, and may even think it is not very good. Marion Doig agreed, saying that when he served on T&P, he never recalled the letters being anything but good for the candidate. John Huddleston (Religious Studies) then asked, if people never write anything negative in T&P letters, why do we even have them? Mr. Lesses said that some letters are less than positive, and that most reviewers used sound professional judgment.

Diane Johnson (Art History) said she wished to discuss the matter with her colleagues, and moved to postpone the vote until the February 11 Senate meeting. The motion carried, by a voice vote.

**Graduate Committee:**
The following motions were presented by Maureen Hayes. Each passed on voice vote.

**TWO NEW PROPOSED GRADUATE POLICIES**

1. **GPA Policy**
Degree-seeking graduate students in the Graduate School of the College of Charleston are required to maintain a 3.0 Grade Point Average (GPA) in their graduate coursework. In addition some students may have specified GPA’s for undergraduate coursework required by their graduate programs.

The GPA is calculated on the basis of all graduate coursework identified in a student’s Program-of-Study (POS), as well as any additional coursework which is acceptable to the degree program.

College of Charleston coursework taken prior to acceptance into degree-seeking status, will not be used in the calculation of the student’s GPA unless accepted as part of the student’s POS. Such coursework must be identified at the time the student is accepted into the program.

Decisions concerning an academic action such as probation, academic dismissal and graduation will be based on the courses and GPA as described above.

**Justification:** The present student information database at the College of Charleston (SIS-Plus) provides a running GPA of a student’s work from the first course onward. In many cases, students have changed majors or have taken courses in the distant past none of which would count toward graduation in their present program. This policy would clearly inform students of the basis for the evaluation of their body of work toward graduation and would aid the Graduate Office in defining the coursework on which to base any academic action such as probation or dismissal.

2. **Newly Accepted Graduate Student Enrollment Policy**
If an applicant has been accepted for a specific term and does not enroll for that term, the applicant’s matriculation will be ended and he/she will be obligated to reapply to the program. Applicants wishing to defer initial enrollment must receive the graduate
program director’s written approval stipulating a new start date, before the first day of class of the term in which they were originally accepted.

**Justification:** This policy will enable programs to have a clear understanding of who will be attending from each new cohort, thus enabling them to plan more efficiently for faculty advising, future teaching loads and course offerings.

THREE PROPOSED PROGRAM CHANGES
1. Elimination of Master of Environmental Studies (MES) graduate program tracks
2. Adding 6 - 10 hours of observation to EDFS 710 - Introduction to Exceptional Children and Youth
3. Changing the name of EDFS 797 from Student Teaching in Special Education to Clinical Practice in Special Education

FOUR NEW GRADUATE COURSE PROPOSALS
1. EDFS 651 - Orientation to the Profession of Special Education
2. EDFS 705 - Evaluation of Developmental Field-Based Experience
3. EDFS 714 - Introduction to Curriculum and Instruction in Special Education
4. EDFS 724 - Reading and Language Arts Instruction for Students with Disabilities

**Curriculum Committee**
Norris Preyer presented the following items for approval. All were approved.

1. F02-33 RELS 210 Theories in the Study of Religions - New Course Proposal
2. F02-34 BA in Religious Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
3. F02-35 RELS 405 Advanced Studies in Religion – Proposal to Change a Course
4. F02-36 RELS 450 Theories and Methods in the Study of Religion – Proposal to Change a Course
5. F02-37 RELS 499 Bachelor’s Essay – Proposal to Change a Course
6. F02-41 CLAS 399 Tutorial – New Course Proposal
7. F02-42 CLAS 499 Bachelor’s Essay – New Course Proposal
8. F02-43 GRMN 220 Special Assignment Abroad – Proposal to Delete a Course
9. F02-44 GRMN 324 German Civilization and Culture – Proposal to Delete a Course
10. F02-45 GRMN 370 Studies in German Film and Literature – Proposal to Delete a Course
11. F02-46 GRMN 463 Nineteenth Century Literature – Proposal to Delete a Course
12. F02-47 GRMN 464 Literature From 1900-1945 – Proposal to Delete a Course
13. F02-48 GRMN 465 Literature Since 1945 – Proposal to Delete a Course
14. F02-49 GRMN 466 Age of Goethe – Proposal to Delete a Course
15. F02-50 GRMN 470 The Novelle – Proposal to Delete a Course
16. F02-51 LTGR 350 Literature in Translation: A Foreign Author – Proposal to Delete a Course
17. F02-52 LTGR 370 Studies in German Film and Literature – Proposal to Delete a Course
18. F02-53 GRMN 313 German Conversation and Composition – Proposal to Change a Course
19. F02-54 LTGR 250 Literature in Translation: A Foreign Literature – Proposal to Change a Course
20. F02-55 BA with a Major in German – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
21. F02-56 BA with a Minor in German – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
22. F02-57 BA with a Minor in German Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
23. F02-58 GRMN 320 Special Assignment Abroad – New Course Proposal
24. F02-59 GRMN 315 Advanced German Reading – New Course Proposal
25. F02-60 GRMN 326 German Media – New Course Proposal
26. F02-61 GRMN 413 Advanced German Conversation – New Course Proposal
27. F02-62 GRMN 424 German Civilization and Culture – New Course Proposal
28. F02-63 GRMN 460 German Literary Heritage – New Course Proposal
29. F02-64 GRMN 468 Studies in Modern German Literature – New Course Proposal
30. F02-65 GRMN 472 Studies in German Cinema – New Course Proposal
31. F02-66 LTGR 270 Studies in German Film – New Course Proposal
32. F02-67 Minor in Italian Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
33. F02-68 RUSS 101C, 102C (Elementary Russian Conversation) – New Course Proposal
34. F02-69 RUSS 201C, 202C (Intermediate Russian Conversation) – New Course Proposal
35. F02-70 RUSS 313C, 314C (Advanced Russian Conversation) – New Course Proposal
36. F02-71 ARTH 190 Selected Topics in Art History – New Course Proposal

Constituents’ Concerns
Frank Kinard noted the 30th anniversary of Jack’s Café, and displayed pictures of Jack being presented with a College of Charleston chair, thanks to Professor Earl Rickerson.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary
Speaker of the Faculty Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order on November 5th, 2002. Fifty-five senators attended. The October minutes were approved, with one correction.

Reports

Master Planners

The Speaker immediately called on Kevin King to address the Senate on the Master Planning process that is underway for the campus. Mr. King reported that the College has engaged his Baltimore firm, Ayers Saint Gross, to conduct a detailed study of the campus’s existing facilities and the ways in which all members of the College community make use of them. Mr. King informed the Senate that the firm has begun the first phase, consisting of data collection and interviews with the many different groups that make up the College. As the firm and its specialized consultants develop plans for the facilities, they will present them publicly and will give formal opportunities for feedback from members of the College community. Noting that the final plans should be developed during this summer, Mr. King stressed the firm’s desire for input from faculty, staff, and student groups. Plans will be posted on the web and publicized in newspaper inserts, in addition to being presented to important supporters of the College such as the S.C. Legislature and major private donors.

Mr. King offered an example of the way the firm had worked on other campuses: at Emory University, a parking lot occupied significant space next to the university chapel, and after the firm consulted with the faculty who were parking there, these faculty endorsed an alternative landscaping plan that created a much more attractive approach to this symbolically important building. (Mr. King noted that he understood that this willing sacrifice of one’s parking space might seem unbelievable to us at the College; still, the firm’s goal was to achieve this same level of endorsement for whatever plans it proposes for our campus.) The firm hopes to address a variety of space and facilities issues, such as the amount of time it takes a student to walk from one classroom building to another. One senator asked Mr. King how many of the firm’s previous client campuses contained historic buildings. Mr. King said that they had worked with many such campuses, including Notre Dame, UNC-Chapel Hill, and MUSC, but that the College and its environs were particularly historic in character. He closed by noting that he hoped faculty would respond in the coming months whenever asked for input on facilities planning.

The Speaker

Mr. Wilder announced the tentative schedule for Spring Senate meetings, inviting faculty to let him know if they foresaw any problems with these dates (1/21, 2/11, 3/11, 4/1, 4/15 if necessary; 4/21 for the full Faculty meeting). He also updated faculty on Commencement plans for Spring 2003. The ceremony at the Cistern will remain the same as in the past, but there will be more graduates, and students have agreed to forego one of their allotted tickets in order to continue the ceremony in this confined space. The Senate made no objections when the Speaker asked if they would be willing to forego their access to a faculty guest ticket the ceremony as well.
The Speaker then pointed out to the Senate that the Drop-Add period this year is longer than it has been in past years. Officially, the period has been 1 week long, but this semester the period lasted 8 days, meaning students could miss more than a week of classes before adding. The Registrar’s Office said they didn’t know how the period had grown to 8 days in length, but that in the future it will not exceed the prescribed 7 days. They are also willing to institute whatever rules the faculty would like to make regarding the drop-add period. Mr. Wilder noted that we might consider making the “Drop” period longer but the “Add” period shorter, for example. Norris Preyer wondered if such a change could be made for the Spring semester. Mr. Wilder said he would attempt to make this happen, but doubted the Registrar would be willing to change a deadline that has already been published.

Turning to the state of the College budget, the Speaker said that we could expect cuts to follow the elections being held that day. The College has planned to cut operating expenses by 5%. Although state budget cuts will probably go deeper, the College has reserve funds to offset them. These cuts will not affect personnel costs or research funding (including sabbaticals), and since budgets for academic departments are mostly personnel, faculty will not be strongly affected. Deans will cut 2.5% of their School’s total operating costs and will work with the departments in their schools to determine what cuts an individual department can sustain. One Senator asked the Speaker why the College was spending money on a planning consultant when we face these budget shortfalls, and the Speaker replied that he believed that the idea is for the money we spend on facilities to be invested as wisely as possible.

He concluded by asking Senators if they had experienced any problems viewing parts of the packet on the Senate website, and no one raised any objections to this new paperless method.

**New Business**

**Student Affairs and Athletics Committee**

On behalf of the Committee, Godwin Uwah presented a proposal governing the use of campus bulletin boards. The proposal, which follows, was accompanied by letters of support from the Office of Student Affairs, the Physical Plant, and the Student Government Association. The motion passed.

---

**College of Charleston**

**Campus Bulletin Board Policy**

The Student Affairs and Athletics Committee of the College of Charleston move that the senate approve the following recommendations on the College of Charleston bulletin board notices.

The Student Affairs and Athletics Committee has been asked to assist with our new president's goal of improving the academic climate of the campus. Specifically, we have been asked to address on-campus advertising and bulletin board notices. In keeping with
the spirit of the College of Charleston as a center of free expression and intellectual exploration, our primary goal is to focus upon the regulation of placement, rather than the content, of campus advertising.

Our proposal consists of the following points:

I. Academic and Administrative departments will control, manage, and maintain their own bulletin boards.

II. All other campus bulletin boards will be deemed for use by either (A) off-campus activities or (B) on-campus activities.

A. Off-Campus Activities

1. Advertisements for legal off-campus activities will be limited to postings on three out-of-doors bulletin boards locations: the breezeway of the Stern Student Center, outside of the West entrance of Maybank Hall, and the kiosk in front of 10 Greenway. These boards will be clearly marked as "Off-Campus Activities".

2. The College of Charleston Physical Plant will be responsible for the cleaning and maintenance of the Off-Campus Activities boards. Every Monday these boards will be cleared of all advertisements.

B. On-Campus Activities

The Office of Student Affairs will manage and maintain all non-departmental bulletin boards on campus

Curriculum Committee

Norris Preyer presented a number of Curriculum changes. All but one passed: HIST 343, which the Committee included in a list of History courses for deletion, was not deleted, at the request of Rich Bodek (History) who noted that the department now had a faculty member who wished to begin teaching this course again. Mr. Preyer then withdrew this change from Senate consideration.

The complete list of approved Curriculum changes appears below:

1. F02-01 CHNS 390 ST – Information only
2. F02-02 CSCI 220 Computer Programming I - Course Change
3. F02-03 CSCI 221 Computer Programming II – Course Change
4. F02-04 CSCI 222 Computer Programming I Lab – Course Change
5. F02-05 CSCI 410 Automata and Formal Languages – Course Change
6. F02-06 Computer Science/Computer Science - Proposal to Change Minor Requirements
7. F02-07 Computer Science/Information Systems - Proposal to Change Minor Requirements
8. F02-08 SPAN 382 Speaking Strategies – New Course
9. F02-09 ENGL 201 Major British Writers – Course Change
10. F02-10 ENGL 202 Major British Writers – Course Change
11. F02-10a ENGL 207 Survey of American Lit. to World War II – Course Change
12. F02-12 HIST 292 Disease and Medicine in World History – New Course
13. F02-13 HIST 233 ST in European History before 1715 – Course Deletion
14. F02-14 HIST 236 Minoan Civilization – Course Deletion
15. F02-15 HIST 240 ST in European History since 1715 – Course Deletion
16. F02-16 HIST 243 Germany from 1618 to 1866 – Course Deletion
17. F02-17 HIST 251 The Cosmos in History - Course Deletion
18. F02-18 HIST 260 ST in Asia, Africa or Latin America - Course Deletion
19. F02-19 HIST 313 Strategic History of the United States - Course Deletion
20. F02-20 HIST 315 American Jazz Culture - Course Deletion
21. F02-21 HIST 330 ST in European History before 1715 - Course Deletion
22. F02-22 HIST 340 ST in European History since 1715 - Course Deletion
23. F02-23 HIST 342 Europe 1870-1939 - Course Deletion
24. F02-24 HIST 343 Europe since 1939 - Course Deletion
   (N.B.: This course was NOT deleted.)
25. F02-25 HIST 351 Women in the Western World - Course Deletion
26. F02-26 HIST 360 ST in Asia, Africa and Latin America - Course Deletion
27. F02-27 HIST 363 Japan: Court Ladies and Samurai - Course Deletion
28. F02-28 HIST 430 Research Seminar in European History before 1715 - Course Deletion
29. F02-29 HIST 440 Research Seminar in European History since 1715 - Course Deletion
30. F02-30 HIST 460 Research Seminar in Modern Asia, Africa and Latin America - Course Deletion
31. F02-31 HIST 366 Comparative Slavery in the Americas – New Course

Constituents’ Concerns

Alex Kasman, Chair of the Committee on Academic Planning, announced that his committee is planning a course to replace the existing Freshman Seminar course. The Committee envisions this course being required of all first-year students. The Committee hopes to bring a course proposal to the Senate by the end of the year, and Mr. Kasman told Senators that their input would be welcome.

Susan Morrison requested that future Senate meetings not be scheduled on an Election Day.

Glenn Brown, of the College Alumni Association, noted that Parents Weekend and Alumni Weekend were coming up. Mr. Brown thanked the faculty for our past and future participation in such events.

The meeting adjourned at 5:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Final Senate Meeting of Fall 2002:
Tuesday, December 3rd, 5:00 P.M., ECTR 116

Spring 2002 Senate Meetings (5:00 PM, 116 ECTR):
Tuesday, January 21; agenda deadline Friday, Jan. 10, 12 noon.
Tuesday, February 11; agenda deadline Thursday, Jan. 30, 3:00 PM.
Tuesday, March 11; agenda deadline Thursday, Feb. 27, 3:00 PM.
Tuesday, April 1 (continued Tuesday, April 15, if necessary); agenda
deadline Thursday, March 20, 3:00 PM.

Faculty Meeting (5:00 PM, Physicians Auditorium):
Monday, April 21; agenda deadline Wednesday, April 9, 3:00 PM.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The second regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston for the academic year 2002-2003 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 1, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Hugh Wilder presiding. 47 Senators attended.

Reports

Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order. The minutes for the September Senate meeting were approved. Mr. Wilder then introduced Bill Lindstrom, Vice-President for Enrollment Management, whom the Speaker had invited to address the Senate on admissions policies and enrollment plans. Mr. Lindstrom reported on several changes that are taking place in our student body in response to President Higdon’s vision for the College. The average SAT score for entering freshmen, 1181, is up 20 points from last year’s average, and more than 100 points from the 1990 average of 1070.

Mr. Lindstrom pointed out that over the years the national average in SAT scores has remained slightly above 1000, and South Carolina’s average continues to be between 950 and 1000. The President would like next year’s entering class to average 1200 on the SAT. In all of South Carolina, there are between 1240 and 1250 students who make over 1200. “Our work is cut out for us,” Mr. Lindstrom said, to attract those high-scoring students in South Carolina. This year about 60% of applicants were accepted at the College, whereas last year about 68% were. The total pool of applicants is larger every year: last year there were 8635 applicants, while in 1990 there were 4342. Right now about 65% of our students are from South Carolina. The Admissions Office would like to keep the balance around 60% in-state, 40% out-of-state, in keeping with our mission and the wishes of the S. C. Legislature.

Mr. Lindstrom detailed the size of this year’s class compared to previous years. This Fall we enrolled 1824 regular freshmen and 179 provisional students. Last year there were 1836 freshmen and 138 provisional students. During the summer, as larger numbers of accepted freshmen informed the College that they had chosen this school, Admissions had to reduce the number of available transfer spots. 789 transfers enrolled in Fall 2001, but only 618 transfers were enrolled this semester. The total enrollment at the College this Fall is 7180, whereas last Fall the total enrollment was 6928. Mr. Lindstrom said that the figure of 7180 will drop once this semester’s “ghosts” (students still enrolled who have never attended) are identified and removed from the count. The total number of graduate students in Fall 2001 was 1709, and this semester that total is 1775. The President’s directive to Enrollment Management is to keep this year’s enrollment level with last year, and to drop by 75 next year. In four years, the College should have a drop of 300 students.

One Senator asked Mr. Lindstrom if the President’s goal for SAT scores would have the effect of reducing our minority population, and he replied that the Admissions Office would be seeking more and more ways to recruit minority applicants. Another Senator
wondered whether there were plans to increase graduate enrollment. Mr. Lindstrom and Mr. Wilder both said they had not been privy to any discussions of such plans.

The Speaker next welcomed Kristen Wing and Gloria Heyward from the College Bookstore, who presented information on textbook ordering and encouraged faculty to submit their book orders for Spring 2003 as soon as possible. Ms. Heyward stressed the importance of placing textbook orders by the deadlines. Orders may be placed via the bookstore’s website (use “efollett” as the initial password), through the old SIS interface, or through the paper copies we have already received. “I’m not choosy,” Ms. Heyward said, as long as she gets the order as early as possible. Ms. Wing explained that this advance ordering enables the bookstore to seek out used books and provide them to students at a lower cost. Also, if the bookstore knows a professor will be ordering a textbook in a future course, they will be able to pay students better prices in buybacks.

Ms. Wing noted that the bookstore’s goal was to have texts on the shelf one month before a semester starts; hence, faculty will be able to check on their orders easily. The bookstore guarantees that their prices will meet those of University Books. She also noted that the bookstore provides custom publishing (course-packets) at a lower price than the local copy shop competitors, and reminded faculty that bookstore profits are contributed to student scholarships. She invited Faculty to attend Faculty-Staff Appreciation Day on November 21st and 22nd, when they can receive larger discounts on all merchandise.

Terry Bowers asked if there were any plans to make the Bookstore more like a regular bookseller, with larger numbers of books that are of general interest and not just textbooks. Ms. Wing said that the Follett company was in the process of “profiling” the school and planning a complement of non-textbook titles. She said she welcomed Faculty suggestions on this subject or any other ways of improving the store. Trisha Folds-Bennett asked about the problem of students buying used texts and then not purchasing the supplements that sometimes come bundled with new textbooks, supplements that a professor might be relying on as a class text. Ms. Wing and Ms. Heyward suggested asking our publisher’s representative about purchasing the supplement separately, but they added that used texts frequently return to the store for resale in broken sets, and noted that students could still buy the used text, sans supplement, from another source besides the College Bookstore. Ms. Wing closed by inviting faculty to share any more ideas or suggestions with her or Ms. Heyward.

The Speaker

Mr. Wilder updated the Senate on a number of items. He reported that December graduation will be held December 15th at the North Charleston Coliseum. Despite the distance from campus, this ceremony will include the traditional faculty procession and therefore, the Speaker said, he hoped that many faculty would attend; many of our students graduate at this Commencement. In fact, we still count on December commencement to relieve the pressure on the overcrowded Spring ceremony. The Speaker announced that the President has chosen to stick with tradition for this Spring’s Commencement, which will be held May 10th for graduate programs and May 11th for
undergraduates. The location remains the same, but this year students will receive fewer tickets for guests (only 3 per student). The Speaker noted that faculty have always had access to one ticket each for bringing a guest to Spring Commencement. Mr. Wilder suggested that in November, he might ask the Senate to decide whether or not to discontinue this policy in view of the space limitations at the Cistern.

The speaker next discussed questions that had been raised regarding the academic calendar. He discussed the matter with Dean of Undergraduate Studies Sandy Powers and with Mike Gaines, who drafts the calendar, and they said they would welcome routine faculty review of the calendar. Mr. Wilder also reported that some of the constraints on the calendar date back to a Faculty decision in the past (perhaps in 1989) that each 3-hour course needed to include 2100 minutes of instruction. The Speaker suggested that the Faculty could consider reviewing this policy. In response to a Senator’s question of whether we were bound to 2100 minutes by any external standard, Sandy Powers said she was aware of none. There was also a discussion (inconclusive) of whether we ought to continue to have a Fall Break in our calendar.

Responding to further questions he had been asked, the Speaker noted that the Public Safety office has told him that their policy is to have a crossing guard at the intersection of Calhoun and St. Philip at peak hours, but the department is short-handed now, so there isn’t always an officer in place. Chief Cronin has also promised to step up enforcement of the ban of riding bikes on campus sidewalks. The Speaker then reminded faculty that anyone retiring on the TERI plan was, indeed, still obligated to fulfill all regular duties (serve on committees, write colleague letters, go through post-tenure review) as long as he or she is still working. On a separate matter, he also announced that the administration anticipates a budget cut from the state following November elections, but that the College is not expecting to have to cut its programs; instead, an “Expense Reduction Task Force,” consisting of faculty as well as administrators, is planning ways to slow down expenditures. Coincidentally, there will also be an ad hoc committee formed to look into faculty salaries, with the purpose of gathering data about salaries internally and at peer institutions. Finally, Mr. Wilder reported that future packets will contain the texts of motions in printed form. The “back-up documents,” which usually consist of extensive paperwork for Curriculum course proposals, will be placed on the Senate webpage.

With no constituents’ concerns, the meeting adjourned at 6:03 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary

Remaining Fall 2002 Senate Meetings
Tuesdays at 5:00 o’clock in ECTR 116    November 5, December 3
Deadline for submitting items for Dec. 3rd agenda:  3 PM Thursday, 21 November
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The first regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston for the academic year 2002-2003 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 3, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Hugh Wilder presiding. Fifty-two senators attended.

The Speaker welcomed the faculty and announced that he had appointed Trisha Folds-Bennett (At-Large) as this year’s Parliamentarian. He thanked Ms. Folds-Bennett for her willingness to serve. The Minutes of the last meeting of the 2001-2002 academic year were approved. Displaying these minutes electronically was Debbie Vaughn (Library), whom the Speaker also thanked for having volunteered to maintain the Senate website and to provide technical support during Senate meetings. The Speaker asked for nominations for Speaker pro tem, and Glen Lesses (Philosophy) nominated Bev Diamond (Mathematics). The Senate elected Ms. Diamond by acclamation.

The Speaker also welcomed to the meeting Glenn Brown, president-elect of the College of Charleston Alumni Association, and SGA representatives Alicia Scherini (SGA President) and Michael Leitman (SGA Vice President for Academic Affairs). Mr. Wilder thanked Ms. Scherini for her speech at Convocation and added that he looked forward to SGA representation on faculty committees.

Reports

Gary McCombs

The Speaker recognized Mr. McCombs, Senior Vice President for Business Affairs, who addressed the Senate regarding the 2002-2003 College Budget. Mr. McCombs told us this year’s budget was “the easiest and the most difficult” he had worked on since 1993: easy b/c the Fourth Century initiative identified clear institutional goals, but difficult because the College was appropriated some 2.7 million dollars less in state funds than it had received the previous year. The 2002-2003 budget has increased by some $13 million, and these increases (together with the offset of reduced state appropriations) will be paid for by increased student fees.

What will this new money pay for? Mr. McCombs explained that some of the money will go to the goals of the Fourth-Century Initiative, which include 50 new staff lines, 50 new faculty lines, and increased money for research and development items such as sabbatical funding and student-faculty research. Not all of these hires will be made this year, but will be phased in over several years; there are 32 staff lines and 49 faculty lines still to be filled.

Another cost of the Fourth-Century Initiative is increased money allocated to financial aid for students who qualify. Mr. McCombs explained that the goal was to “hold students harmless” for the increased tuition, so that the amount a student would actually pay would not increase if that student had qualified for financial aid; the new allocations
would make up the difference. The College also provided a rebate on its newly increased fees for the first year, to ease students and their families through the transition. Some senators asked why the College bothered with a fee increase, then a rebate. Why not just begin with a smaller increase, one senator asked. Mr. McCombs explained that the rebate gives the college greater flexibility in future tuition and fee increases. He added that President Higdon has done a good job explaining the tuition increase to parents.

The total cost of the Fourth-Century Initiative will be up to 7.5 million per year. The College plans to issue bonds to fund new construction costs for buildings for Fine Arts and Business, among other things. Mr. McCombs reported that a Fourth-Century Initiative goal was to reduce the size of the student body by 75 per year, but that this year we actually have 100 more students than we did last year. Associate Provost Susan Morrison pointed out that these numbers reflected increased retention of returning students; we admitted fewer new students, but retained more than in previous years.

The College has not yet given any faculty raises this year, but Mr. McCombs said that increases may be forthcoming once administrators have a clearer picture of our financial condition (determined by the number of students we actually have) for this semester. Mr. McCombs solicited comment on the new parking and shuttle system from the Aquarium, and two senators admitted to using the shuttle and to being reasonably satisfied with its timeliness. Mr. McCombs says the College hopes to find vans to use rather than the yellow school busses it is currently using. He concluded his visit by inviting faculty to visit him in Randolph Hall if they have further questions.

The Speaker

Mr. Wilder thanked all the parties who were involved in our first Convocation, an event the Speaker thought had turned out very well. Many faculty, administrators, staff, and students put forth much effort in planning and executing the event. Mr. Wilder was pleased by the presentation delivered by Kathleen Jamieson and by the strong attendance: almost all the seats allocated for students were occupied. Convocation has three components: the summer reading (books were mailed to all entering students), the ceremony itself, and the discussion of the book in classes and in two campus forums this semester. The planners of this Convocation are now evaluating their efforts, so anyone who has comments, or who would like to suggest speakers for next year’s Convocation, should direct them to Hugh Wilder or Susan Morrison.

Commencement is another ceremony currently under review. The President has decided that this December’s Commencement will take place at the North Charleston Coliseum. The May ceremony is still under discussion, but the main options being considered are to streamline the current ceremony or to hold two separate ceremonies on a Saturday, with faculty and students only attending the one to which their School had been assigned. There would be two different speakers, and considerably more room in the Cistern for graduates and their families. The Speaker told the Senate that Bill Lindstrom is currently meeting with student focus groups on this subject and will be making a recommendation soon. Bishop Hunt asked if any thought had been given to eliminating December
graduation ceremonies, and the Speaker answered that for this year, that ceremony would remain. The December ceremony does reduce the number of students who march in May.

The Speaker next reported on the current parking situation. From the 550 spaces available at the Aquarium parking garage, 193 faculty and staff and 335 students have purchased a pass, which includes access to the shuttle bus, a feature the Speaker described as “a work in progress.” Auxiliary Services plans to institute 3 categories of parking: “core” lots on campus, “mid” parking facilities not so close by, and “perimeter” lots such as the Aquarium garage. Starting next semester, “core” lots will go up in price, although the amount has not yet been set. Auxiliary Services will hold four town meetings for faculty and staff on September 18th (9, 11, and 4) and 19th (4:30) where pricing will be discussed. There is still an active Parking Advisory Committee, on which Hugh Wilder and Rob Dillon both serve, so faculty may communicate their parking concerns and suggestions to them. Frank Kinard (Chemistry) spoke against the tiered pricing and noted that faculty ought to be able to count on having a spot in a lot they have paid for, which isn’t always the case.

Mr. Wilder reported on the academic calendar, noting that after Thanksgiving this semester there will be only 1 day of class for MWF classes and none for TTh classes. He says that Bill Lindstrom has promised him to try not to let this recur in future years. Alex Kasman (Mathematics) asked if there was a chance for faculty to review and respond to a calendar before it had been set. The Speaker said he would request this. When asked why we need to finish the semester so early in December, the Speaker replied that he understood that Undergraduate Studies planned the calendar to accommodate our December commencement. Paul Marino (Biology) noted that when classes do not begin on a Monday, some sections of co-requisite labs, which meet only once a week, are immediately put off sync with the class they are supposed to complement.

The Speaker noted that the changes in the Post-Tenure Review Process that the Senate approved last year have been accepted by the Provost and the President. Now the Board of Trustees must decide whether to accept changes to the Faculty-Administration Manual. The Board meets in October, but the PTR process for this year has already begun. The proposed changes have been included in this year’s process, but identified as pending final approval by the Board.

The draft of the Long-Range Plan is still in progress, the Speaker reported. Last year 11 working groups sent reports to the steering committee, which is still attempting to incorporate these reports and the President’s ideas into a draft. The Speaker predicted it would be three months before a report emerges.

Finally, the Speaker turned to the process of sending and receiving information for Senate packets. The Speaker explained that, thanks to Debbie Vaughn’s efforts, the Senate website will become an archive of old Senate business. The minutes of all meetings since 1993 are in electronic format, thanks to the former Faculty Secretary, Bishop Hunt. (Mr. Hunt offered to make copies of old minutes on a CD-ROM for anyone who requests one.) These archives will shortly be made available through the website.
The Senate website will also be used to distribute Senate packets electronically. Since this is the new plan, it is more important than ever for materials to be submitted by email to the Secretary (eichelberger@cofc.edu). The Speaker invited comments on his plan to eliminate paper packets and to project materials from the website during Senate meetings. He apologized for the dimness of the current projector in ECTR 116, but noted that it was no dimmer than the overhead projectors that had been used in the past. Some Senators expressed concern that it would be difficult to read a motion being debated if we could only look at one screen-page at a time. The Speaker said that the plan was to bring a few paper copies of the packets to the meetings, and possibly to provide laptops with Web access so Senators could study materials during a meeting. He also pointed out that Senators could print their own copies of packets. Mark Lazarro (Biology) said he thought electronic distribution of the minutes would be good for all faculty, since many faculty in his own departmental mailroom seem to discard their paper copies immediately. He thought all faculty should be aware of the Senate website and know that they have access to present and past Senate records. Another senator suggested that some faculty never read their email and would not like this new system. The Speaker told Senators he welcomes their suggestions and comments, because he wants to make this system work for everyone.

After reminding Senators of the coming full faculty meeting on September 9th at 5:00 p.m., the Speaker asked for any constituents’ concerns. Reid Wiseman noted that holding classes on Labor Day posed a hardship to faculty with children in school. Alex Kasman asked whether the change in the distribution requirements for Humanities courses, a policy passed by the Senate last year, was already in effect. The Speaker replied that this change was already printed in the new catalog and was being updated on Cougar Trail as well. Sue Turner (Hispanic Studies) reported that bulletin boards in the Bell Building were once again filled with advertisements by local bars rather than being restricted to announcements of campus activities, as had been the policy instated last year. The Speaker offered to look into this situation, and to ask about the presence of a traffic officer at Calhoun and Coming Street (Sheila Seaman, Library, reported seeing a student almost hit by a car there) and about the recurring need to discourage bicyclists from riding on pedestrian walkways on campus (Bishop Hunt offered a plea for “the halt and the slow” endangered by heedless cyclists).

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger, Faculty Secretary

Remaining Fall 2002 Senate Meetings (Tuesdays at 5:00 in ECTR 116):
October 1, November 5, December 3