The Senate’s last meeting of 2003-2004 convened at 5:00 PM on April 13, 2004. Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order and invited corrections to the March minutes, which the Senate then approved.

Reports

Committee on Academic Standards
The Speaker invited the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards to give its report first. Faculty Committee on Academic Standards Deb Vaughn (Library) provided the 2004-2005 academic calendar for the Senate’s information (now posted on Senate website). She noted that last year, her committee had suggested to the Office of Undergraduate Studies (the author of the calendar) that Spring semester classes ought to begin on a Monday, which would lessen the conflicts and double meetings that are necessary for Monday-only classes if the semester starts on another day of the week. This suggestion will be implemented, starting in 2006, she reported. Some Senators asked about whether the College would ever observe Labor Day as a holiday. “Next question,” the Speaker responded. Susan Morrison (Associate Provost) said that the only way we could observe Labor Day would be to eliminate Fall Break. Both Peter McCandless (History) and Tom Kunkle (Mathematics) said they thought the semester should end later so that the College could observe Labor Day.

Bookstore Advisory Council
Next, the Speaker recognized David Mann (Political Science), who reported on the Bookstore Advisory Council. Mr. Mann reported that at long last, the Bookstore Advisory council had met in March. There was “significant faculty participation,” he said, and the committee had written its own by-laws, because it is outside the purview and normal procedures of Senate and Faculty committees. He said he would like to hear from all faculty who have comments or concerns regarding the bookstore and textbooks.

The Speaker
The Speaker then gave his own report. He said he had been honored to work with the Senate during his past three years as Speaker, and he thanked the Senators for their hard work and cooperation. He thanked Deb Vaughn for working as the Senate Webmaster and as the projectionist during Senate meetings, a job she volunteered to do last year. Her work has made the Senate proceedings easily accessible to all via the website, and her assistance during meetings has made Senate meetings much smoother, eliminating the overhead transparencies of a bygone, fuzzier era. The Speaker also thanked George Pothering for serving as Parliamentarian, a job that might become especially important in the meeting now underway, he noted. (“But you’re doing a great job so far, George,” Mr. Wilder said.) He thanked Julia Eichelberger for serving as Faculty Secretary, and thanked Bertie Mack for her work in the Secretariat’s office, where she has become proficient at the digital storage of Senate documents. The Senate gave all these people a round of applause.
The Speaker noted that this was the last meeting of the year, and that it would be continued the following week if we had not gotten through our agenda by 6:50 (since the room was booked to someone else at 7). He also reminded Senators of upcoming forums, one the following day and another, on Auxiliary Enterprises, to be held next week. The Spring meeting of the full Faculty would be held next week as well, at 5 PM on Monday; both the President and the Provost would be addressing the faculty. Mr. Wilder noted that graduate and undergraduate commencements would be held May 15 and 16, and faculty presence is much appreciated at these occasions.

Turning to next year’s events, the Speaker reminded faculty of Fall 2004 Convocation. *Middle Passage*, a novel by Convocation speaker Charles Johnson, will be mailed to all incoming freshmen (also available to faculty upon request). He asked faculty to consider adopting the book for their Fall classes. Calling it “an extremely interesting read,” Mr. Wilder noted that the novel could be used not just in English courses, but in many others, such as History, African American Studies, and Political Science. The Speaker then reminded faculty that 2003-2004 Senate and Faculty committees would remain active until August 15, when the newly elected committees would take the reins. Most committees do not work over the summer, but “if you are about to finish something,” you should do so before August. Occasionally, too, urgent issues arise over the summer that require convening a committee. Finally, he reminded faculty, the chair of the outgoing committee is responsible for convening the newly elected committee and seeing that a chair is elected. The names of the chairs should be sent to the Faculty Secretary. Each committee is also responsible for writing a report on its work in 2003-2004, and these reports should be sent to the Speaker.

**New Business**

**Nominations and Elections**

David Gentry, chair, moved acceptance of the slates presented by the committee, reminding Senators that additional nominations are no longer in order. The slate was then accepted by acclamation, as follows:

**Academic Planning (seven faculty with at least four senators):**
- Robin Bowers, Psychology
- Julie Davis, Communications (Senator)
- Jose Gavidia, Management and Marketing
- Tom Heeney, Communications
- Elizabeth Martinez-Gibson, Hispanic Studies (Senator)
- Todd McNerny, Theatre (Senator)
- Norris Preyer, Physics and Astronomy (Senator)

**Budget (seven faculty with at least four senators):**
- Charles Beam, Chemistry and Biochemistry
- Frank Cossa, Art History
- Marion Doig, Chemistry and Biochemistry (Senator)
- Charles Kaiser, Psychology (Senator)
- Susan Kattwinkel, Theatre (Senator)
- Martin Perlmutter, Philosophy and Religious Studies
Janice Wright, Hispanic Studies (Senator)

Bylaws (three faculty with at least two senators):
Glenn Lesses, Philosophy and Religious Studies (Senator)
Herb Silverman, Mathematics
Trevor Weston, Music (Senator)

Mr. Gentry then invited additional nominations for the 2004-2005 Committee on Nominations & Elections, noting that this committee would be elected at the full Faculty meeting the following Monday. Marion Doig and Rick Heldrich were nominated, and the slate was closed.

Graduate Committee
Sarah Owens brought proposals from the committee. All of the following proposals passed:

Curricular Proposals - Existing Programs
Proposal for a change in the MS in Computer and Information Sciences program
Proposals for three new courses in the MS in Computer and Information Sciences:
1. CSIS 616 – Automata
2. CSIS 656 – Software Systems Design and Implementation
3. CSIS 658 – Software Testing and maintenance
Proposals for five new courses in the Master of Science in Accountancy program:
1. ACCT 515 – History of Accounting Thought
2. ACCT 518 – Financial Case Analysis
3. ACCT 521 – International Accounting
4. ACCT 531 – Advanced Accounting
5. ACCT 545 – Taxation of Estate/Gift Transfers and Deferred Compensation
Proposal for a course change - EDFS 632 - Educational Psychology

The next proposal, for a Graduate Certificate in Organizational and Corporate Communication, was presented to the Senate for information only. Hugh Wilder told the Senate that in 1998 the Senate had approved the practice of not requiring Senate approval for certificate programs (as opposed to programs for a bachelor’s or master’s degree). These programs do not require CHE approval either. The Senate can discuss the program, Mr. Wilder said, but we have no authority over it. Bob Mignone (Mathematics) asked if the course proposals associated with the certificate still needed to be approved. Yes, said Mr. Wilder, any new course must be approved by the Senate (which we would be asked to do shortly). Glen Lesses (Philosophy) said he though certificate programs should be vetted by the Senate. He said he had questions about the coherence of this particular proposal, and that he wondered why these five courses were enough to warrant “a certificate in something.” He also had questions about the costs of the program as a certificate, and future costs should this be turned into a master’s degree. For that reason, he thought we should not approve the courses that were being proposed for this certificate.
Doug Ferguson (Communication) said that his department has been working on this proposal for five years, and that they do not think any of Mr. Lesses’ concerns were significant problems. The department (chaired by Mr. Ferguson) now has 20 faculty, and will eventually have 25. They plan to offer only one course per semester for this program, in the evenings at the Lowcountry Graduate Center. Students will be able to complete the certificate program in 2 years. The department believes there is demand for such a certificate. Mr. Ferguson added that he was planning to teach the course without taking any release time for it in the first year. He said he hoped the Senate would support this proposal, which had already been approved by the graduate dean and council. Hugh Haynesworth (Graduate Studies) said that the Committee on Graduate Education was also satisfied with the proposal. Glen Lesses noted that the Budget committee had not reviewed the program. Frank Kinard asked Hugh Haynesworth if there was information available on how many students are now enrolled in certificate programs and how many such programs are “out there.” Mr. Haynesworth said this information could be found at the Institutional Research website, where we could see how many FTEs were generated by degree candidates and by non-degree candidates in these graduate programs. Mr. Kinard asked if enrollments were rising, and Mr. Haynesworth said that overall, graduate enrollments had increased, though that was not true of all individual programs.

Ms. Owens then brought proposals for five new courses in support of the Communication certificate:

1. COMM 501 – Communication Research Methods
2. COMM 507 – Seminar in Communication Management
3. COMM 510 – Communication Theory
4. COMM 535 – Public Relations Campaigns
5. COMM 580 – Special Topics in Organizational Communication

Mr. Lesses moved “to table these courses” because of the questions he had raised about the certificate. Parliamentarian George Pothering asked whether Mr. Lesses wanted the Graduate Committee to reconsider the proposals. Mr. Lesses said he would like to defer consideration of the courses “until we have discussed the certificate issue.” Mr. Pothering said this would require a motion to postpone the vote indefinitely, which meant it could come up next semester if the committee asked to put it back on the agenda. Sarah Owens said that the committee had looked at these courses three times, and that they were “stand-alone courses, irrespective of the certificate.” Would these courses be used for anything besides the certificate, Bob Perkins (EDFS) asked. No, said Mr. Ferguson. Reid Wiseman (Biology) asked Mr. Lesses to discuss his concerns further. Mr. Lesses said he was concerned that the certificate did not fit our liberal arts mission, that the courses did not seem coherent, and that the program had hidden costs, which we could not know of since the proposal had not been reviewed by the Budget committee. Mr. Wiseman noted that Mr. Ferguson planned to teach the first course without release time. “Or a stipend,” said Mr. Ferguson. “I’m making a considerable sacrifice so that this can go forward.” Mr. Haynesworth said that the proposal was not required to be approved by Budget. “Maybe we should change that policy,” he said. “I don’t think so,” he added, because his committee “looks at these things very carefully.” Mr. Lesses said he was still dissatisfied with the lack of Budget oversight, and said that the certificate still did not seem to him to fulfill the College’s mission. Julie Davis (Communication) said she thought it was “not
fair for the Senate to change the rules now” and begin requiring certificate proposals to be reviewed by the Budget committee. She also said that this certificate did serve the goals of a liberal arts institution, and that it was not a “vocational public relations” program. The courses had theoretical content, she added, and the course descriptions stated that they were designed to improve the critical thinking of students who take them. Mr. Lesses’ motion to table failed. The new courses were then approved.

Next Ms. Owens presented a New Program Proposal for a Master of Science in Historic Preservation. This program did receive the approval of the Budget committee and Academic Planning committees, she said, adding that the program has been in the works for a long time, in conjunction with Clemson University. Robert Russell, director of undergraduate program in Historic Preservation, said that this has been under discussion for many years. Currently the undergraduate program has 120 majors. The graduate program will be taught by both Clemson and C of C faculty, and will be located in Charleston (though not necessarily on the C of C campus). He noted that the Master of Science designation was used by the University of Pennsylvania for a similar program.

Peter McCandless said that the Budget committee was concerned about the proposal. He noted that the proposal anticipated new faculty lines coming from the Fourth-Century Initiative, yet the FCI lines are supposed to be for undergraduate teachers. He also wondered if we would be able to depend on Clemson to continue to contribute financially and to make faculty available to teach in this program. Mr. Russell responded that the new hires in Historic Preservation would teach mostly undergraduates, with no one teaching more than one graduate course per semester. CHE has already approved this program for Clemson, and this proposal will make it a joint program. Its size will be small, with a maximum of 18 students enrolled per year. Mr. Russell added that the cost of the program would be entirely covered by its tuition; the Clemson money would cover “extras” and not operating costs. Hugh Haynesworth added that if Clemson decided to drop out of the program, then it would be phased out at the College as well. Clemson provides courses in areas we cannot cover, such as architecture, he said.

Hugh Wilder noted that Academic Planning had also reviewed this proposal. Bill Olejneckiak (History), chair of that committee, said their only concern was over a faculty member who was listed as having only a master’s degree. Hugh Haynesworth said he had been told by Clemson faculty that in this case, a master’s was the terminal degree in that field. “So these salaries are for people with master’s degrees?” asked George Pothering. No, said Mr. Haynesworth; these salaries are for future faculty with PhDs. Norris Preyer (Physics) asked if there would be new courses for this program. Yes, said Mr. Haynesworth, and they will be sent through the regular course approval process. The courses now being taught by Clemson faculty will come before the Senate next fall. Jack Parsons (Political Science) said, “We’re being asked to approve a master’s degree without a curriculum. Why?” Hugh Haynesworth said that something like this had occurred before in the Computer Science program. The Senate then voted on the proposal; the motion carried.

The final items from the Graduate Committee, which were “just tightening up previous
policies that had loopholes,” all passed: the Clarification of the Academic Dismissal policy, the policy regarding grades of Incomplete, and the policy on Probation Standards.

Curriculum Committee

Turning the Senate’s attention to undergraduate curriculum, Norris Preyer brought the following proposals from his committee. Darryl Phillips noted that the courses the division of Languages was proposing to delete were Modern Greek, not Ancient Greek, courses, and that Languages also wished to delete one additional MGRK course currently on the books. This was received as information, since the Senate does not need to approve course deletions. All the other proposals for individual courses were approved.

LACS 105 Introduction to Contemporary Brazil – New Course Proposal
PHIL 450 Seminar in Philosophy – Proposal to Change a Course
MGMT 310 International Human Resources – New Course Proposal
MGRK 101, 102, 201, 202 – Proposal to Delete a Course
SLRTS 270 Studies in Russian Film – New Course Proposal
Minor in Russian Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
SPAN 445 Phonetics and Advanced Language Studies – Proposal to Change a Course
SPAN 316 Applied Spanish – Proposal to Change a Course
SPAN 317 Introduction to Spanish for Business – New Course Proposal
SPAN 318 Spanish for International Business – New Course Proposal
ENGL 359 Contemporary American Poetry – New Course Proposal
HIST 215 Native American History – New Course Proposal

Next, Mr. Preyer proposed the new major in Latin American and Carribean Studies. This interdisciplinary major will be built out of existing courses, he said, and therefore is not expected to create an increased workload in any department. Representatives from Budget and Academic Planning confirmed for the Senate that they had no objections to the new major. Doug Friedman (Political Science) explained that this major grew out of the LACS minor, which had grown over the past several years. It cannot be the student’s only major, but must be part of a double major, he explained; Mr. Preyer added that no more than 12 hours in LACS curriculum can be “double-dipped” for the student’s other major. George Pothering asked if the college had any other degrees that were only valid as a double major, and Lynn Cherry noted that students with a major in international business had to complete a minor in a foreign language to be awarded a degree in that major. Darryl Phillips asked about the compensation proposed for the director of this program (a $5,000 stipend). “I would like to see the college standardize the compensation rates because there are some that are much less,” he said. Provost Elise Jorgens said she would like to see this happen as well. The major was brought to a vote, and was approved.

Next, Mr. Preyer presented a new major in Hospitality and Tourism Management. He said that this major had been developed in response to Johnson & Wales (a culinary institute) leaving town. The proposed major requires 56 hours and is “very rigorous.” Peter McCandless stated that the Budget committee expressed concern that there was no
money requested for library additions in the proposed budget. Bill Olejnezciak said the Academic Standards committee was concerned about its cost, but that the committee was told that there was new money available for it. John Crotts (Management and Marketing) noted that this program was originally requested by Alex Sanders in 1995. It became a concentration and then a minor. The curriculum was rigorous, he said, and eventually the department hired two new faculty members. “We will not request any resources from the Fourth-Century Initiative,” he said, but only from new state money. Chip Condon (School of Business) said that this proposal has always been conditional on resources coming from legislature or private funding, so it would not take anything from existing College resources. He asserted that the degree was appropriate for the mission of the College and the School, because the College has “a clear public mission to support the state and community.” This program “responds to a state and local need. We’re educating people who will go on to a particular industry, but they are getting the same education they would get with a business major.”

Deborah Boyle (Philosophy) said she was one member of the Curriculum committee who was not in favor of the program, because she was not persuaded that there was a local need for this degree. Trident is building a new hospitality center, she said, and The Citadel is offering a focus on hospitality in their MBA program. Ms. Boyle said she did not think the degree was appropriate for a liberal arts and sciences university. The College of William and Mary, a university that also offers a business degree and is located in a tourist destination, does not have a degree like this, she said. Out of the 20 comparable institutions identified by the Strategic Plan, only 3 offer this major; one of these is a land-grant college and another is not a liberal arts college. Tim Carens (English) said that his department had just discussed this possible major and was in unanimous opposition to it; his department, too, believed that it was not a good fit for a premier liberal arts and sciences institution. Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) raised a concern about cost, saying that even if the salaries were covered by new money, office space would not be, and this campus is still very short on space for its existing faculty and classrooms. Provost Elise Jorgens said that she had spoken to “a number of people in town and in the legislature who very much want to support this program” and who do not see it as equivalent to what Trident offers. The clientele of Charleston tourism “requires people who have a liberal arts background,” she said, adding that she believed this was a rigorous program and consistent with a liberal arts institution that already offers degrees in business and in arts management.

Todd McNerny (Theatre) asked if the $400,000 in the proposal had been allocated by the Life Sciences Act. Mr. Haynesworth said that had not yet happened, but that the proposal was contingent on that money being appropriated. Glen Lesses asked if this were recurring revenue. Ms. Jorgens said it had not yet been made recurring. Mr. Lesses also asked about “this vague source of revenue from the business community.” He thought it might be wise to defer approval until we knew how much money there would be, so the total cost of the program could be calculated. “The legislature is waiting for our approval” before they will commit any money, said the Provost. She said no tenure-track faculty would be hired until the College had secured recurring money to fund the lines permanently. But to acquire such revenue, the College would have to support the
Jose Gavidia (Management and Marketing) said he had reviewed the proposal and found its requirements, while different from the existing business degree, to be “quantitatively similar” to the content students would cover in a regular business program, and equally rigorous. Tim Carens questioned the idea that College of Charleston graduates are more appealing to the clientele of local businesses because they have a liberal arts and sciences degree. “I think the liberal arts and sciences should be important in their own right,” he said, and not because they give upscale restaurants and hotels a marketing advantage. The Provost responded that “the liberal arts are wonderful to study” but that the College benefits when businesses “recognize that we prepare people to be successful.” Glen Lesses opined that the real reason this degree was being proposed was the closing of Johnson and Wales, but Norris Preyer said the proposal had actually been underway long before the announcement of Johnson and Wales’ departure. George Pothering inquired about the implementation procedure, and Mr. Crotts said they would search for faculty next year and would eventually get future courses approved. Mr. Pothering noted, “I have concerns about office space. My department has no place for some of the faculty.” Mr. Crotts said the department was not going to grow that much since it was already servicing a number of students in the existing minor. Meg Cormack said she thought “a minor is perfectly appropriate but not a major.” The Speaker then asked if faculty were ready to vote; by a voice vote, the proposal passed.

Since it was now 6:30, Bill Olejnecziak, chair, asked that the Senate adjourn until next week, since they would not be able to finish tonight. The Senate approved, and adjourned until April 20th.

Committee on Academic Planning
The Senate gathered again at 5:00 PM on April 13th, with Hugh Wilder calling the resumed meeting back to order. Mr. Olejnecziak then presented his committee’s proposal to the Senate. (Full proposal is posted on the Senate website.) He noted that the Strategic Plan had charged this committee with creating an academic component for the first-year experience. In accordance with this charge, the committee had worked for two years, during which time the committee members came from four different schools and eleven different departments. Mr. Olejnezciak asserted that the proposal fulfills goals that President Higdon articulated at the full Faculty meeting yesterday--to sharpen the distinctiveness of our institution and to be more of a student-centered learning environment.” This committee is in unanimous support of the proposal, which came about after several earlier drafts were presented to deans and chairs and to the Faculty Senate this year. In response to comments made at the December Senate meeting, the committee has made several modifications: the descriptions of the course content have been made more flexible; the use of smart classrooms is now described as “when available”; the stipends and the compensation for a director have both been reduced to lower the cost, and they recommend that whenever possible, departments should make their Freshman Seminar courses fulfill General Education requirements. Mr. Olejnezciak also noted that the committee recommends a director who is part of an academic department. He reminded the Senate that the committee had chosen this model (a 3-hour, special topics seminar) after considering others that had met with strenuous objections from chairs. They also like this proposal because of the richness of the academic content
that it will have. It is still a pilot program, one that invites participation from any
department who wishes to contribute to it. The committee hopes that all 5 schools will
participate. The existing Freshman Seminar course already has a budget, and many of its
sections are now taught by adjuncts; this proposal would not, therefore, net any
significant increase in adjunct use. Of the 2169 courses taught at the College in Fall 2002,
for example, 824 were taught by non-roster faculty. This proposal would only involve 90
sections even if it were ever implemented for all freshmen; hence its impact on total
adjunct use would be modest. Moreover, Mr. Olejnečziak said, “this should be a
spending priority.” The College should commit resources to this program because it will
help “make us a superior college.” This proposed freshman seminar will foster the
mentoring of students by roster faculty, starting with their first semester. It is also an
opportunity for faculty to develop new and exciting course offerings in areas of their own
special interest. All these factors make the proposal “an essential building block for the
Fourth-Century Initiative.”

Discussion began with Bishop Hunt (English) noting that the proposal involves a new
standing committee, which involves a change in the bylaws. We can’t approve that
change today, Mr. Hunt said, since this has to be vetted by the Bylaws Committee. High
Wilder agreed, saying we would only be voting to start the process today.
Lisa Thomson Ross (Psychology) asked if there were any data that show that
participation in these programs does enhance student retention?” Mr. Olejnečziak said
that other schools with such a model “have positive retention data.” He noted that this
course would not only stress the sort of study skills that were in the existing FRSR, but
also would give them practice in an academically ambitious course, helping students
“learn to learn” at the college level. Reid Wiseman asked what would happen if only 4
students signed up for a particular subject, and Mr. Olejnečziak said he did not anticipate
that. Mr. Wiseman asked how many sections were anticipated for this pilot, and was told
about 30, with about 1/3 of the freshmen expected to participate. Charles Kaiser said he
thought this would increase adjunct use, and that he did not know if it would have any
effect on retention. “You may want to attach an assessment procedure to this,” he said,
and Mr. Olejnečziak said this was already in the proposal. He repeated that the adjunct
use would not be much greater in the scheme of 2000 courses, and that many adjuncts
now teaching FRSR would not be replaced by roster faculty in this proposal. Alex
Kasman spoke in favor of the proposal, saying that “the details can be worked out later
after we start it. Those concerns are for down the road.” He knows faculty at the UNC-
Asheville where there is a program like this, he said, and it has grown in popularity and is
now being phased in as a requirement for all freshmen; many other institutions have such
a requirement and it seems to work very well. Marion Doig asked how many sections of
FRSR there were now, and was told there were 37. “So we’re trading 30 sections for 30
sections,” he asserted. Sue Turner asked if smart classrooms would be taken away from
other courses, and Mr. Olejnečziak said they would not. Frank Kinard said, “I hate to be a
cynic but it comes easy to me. If you gave every student three hours of A credit that
would have an effect on retention.” He said these courses were not appropriate for
freshmen, who ought to be satisfying their “basic degree requirements” as soon as
possible. Joe Kelly (English) said that he saw no problem with offering these courses to
freshmen, noting that the freshman English program undertakes similar goals for all
entering freshmen. He did note that English department courses now have relatively small numbers since they are writing-intensive, “and we get penalized for it.” In order to insure that this doesn’t happen to departments contributing to this FRSR, “we should count each student in one of these courses as 1.5 students. Otherwise the departments will be penalized for low numbers.” Bev Diamond asked about the director’s role. Would the director still teach in his/her home department? Mr. Olejncziak said yes. The director’s role is only partly fleshed out in this proposal, because this would need to be worked out with the Provost. “The spirit of this proposal is not to micromanage” the working out of these practical details, he said. Ms. Diamond suggested that the proposal would be easier to implement if the committee did not have to include a representative from every school.

Glen Lesses said that people had not had enough time to discuss the proposal and he thought there should be “open forums scheduled” to discuss it. “There hasn’t been a full discussion here,” he said. He moved to remand the motion to Academic Planning in order for them to “vet this” with departments. Darryl Phillips spoke against remanding, saying the proposal was voluntary and departments would have a chance to discuss it while it was still a pilot program. He noted that the process had been underway for two years now, “and I would like us to vote on it this evening.” Susan Kattwinkel, a member of Academic Planning, noted that next year’s committee would have no returning members on it. Jack Parson said he wished to vote on the proposal tonight. “It’s a blueprint,” he said, not a complete plan, and participation is voluntary, and we can look at it again after it has been tried as a pilot. “There is no real reason to wait,” he said.

Elise Jorgens thanked the committee for their proposal, then urged that it be remanded. She said she was “uncomfortable with some things in the proposal.” She wanted the committee to work out a number of things that she thought should be changed, she said. Jack Parson asked if she could tell the Senate what she was uncomfortable with. Ms. Jorgens said she was “not quite happy with the stipend structure,” which she said was “considerably higher than usual stipends.” She thought the adjunct use for these 30 sections needed to be charted out. “I doubt that it is going to be a wash,” she said. “I really do want this to succeed,” she added. Bev Diamond asked if the Provost thought there should be a conversation with chairs. The Provost said she thought that was necessary. She also said there needed to be more discussion of the question of what general education requirements the classes would fulfill. Darryl Phillips said that if the proposal was remanded, it should be sent to an ad hoc committee. “It’s an unfair burden on Academic Planning” to remand it to them, he said, adding that he still thought it should not be remanded. Susan Kattwinkel said that Academic Planning had discussed the proposal with deans and chairs for two years already. “Maybe a new group should take this on,” she said. Henry Donato, also a member of Academic Planning, spoke against remanding. “It won’t be possible to have a program that satisfies every constituency,” he said. “If we wait to make something perfect,” we may never have any program, he said. The Provost said, “I wish there were a way to endorse the philosophy of this program and form an ad hoc implementation committee” to work out the details.” Jack Parsons said, “I still think it would be better that we don’t remand.” He noted that the committee had worked on this for two years. “If we were to approve it as a blueprint,” then the implementation process would begin. No aspect of it is compulsory, and the
Provost would be in a position to work out the logistics. “If we send it back to the committee, we will be back here having this same debate in another 3 years,” he said, “Let’s move forward, then see what needs to be done to fine-tune it.” Todd McNerny also spoke against remanding, noting that the proposal already specifies a committee that would take charge of implementation issues.

Erin Beutel asked if she could move “to send this to an ad hoc committee that would talk to deans and chairs” and at the same time “endorse the spirit of the proposal.” Parliamentarian George Pothering said that she needed to separate the motions. More discussion ensued about what was actually on the floor, and Glenn Lesses withdrew his motion to remand and Erin Beutel withdrew her amendment of this motion, so the Senate now was facing the main motion by the Academic Standards Committee.

Bev Diamond moved that “we approve this in spirit but not in the details.” More parliamentary discussion ensued regarding what this meant and whether it could be done. Eventually Ms. Diamond said she wanted to endorse the first two paragraphs. Susan Farrell (English) asked, “Isn’t the Senate an advisory body anyway?” She noted that our proposals are always “in spirit” since we cannot compel the Administration to do anything. Alex Kasman asked if the motion would ever return to the Senate once it were remanded. Mr. Wilder said that it would only return if the committee placed it back on the agenda. Bev Diamond said she did not seek to end discussion of the proposal. Darryl Phillips urged the Senate to amend the main motion so as to address the Provost’s concerns, saying that the Senate could lower the stipends and limit the adjunct use to whatever the Provost specified, since there were only 30 sections proposed. “I would like to see us go ahead with something,” he said. Glen Lesses said, “The Provost has given us some of her concerns. There are probably more. There are probably other questions that will be raised.” Frank Kinard made a motion to divide the proposal, so that the Senate could first vote on only the first two paragraphs. The motion to divide was not debatable, and it passed on a voice vote. Alex Kasman then said that it would be pointless to endorse only the first part of the motion, since it meant nothing by itself. Jack Parson said that implementation details should be worked out by the Provost. Part I, the first two paragraphs, was then voted on, and it passed unanimously.

Next Mr. Lesses moved to remand the rest of the proposal to a new ad hoc committee “to be formed to consider implementation.” When asked by David Mann where this committee would come from, Mr. Lesses said there was a procedure in place in the by-laws for the Committee on Nominations to follow. David Mann said he thought Academic Planning should do the reconsidering of this proposal, not a new committee. Joe Kelly spoke against remanding, stating that all Senate votes are nothing more than recommendations anyway and can only be implemented by the administration. Tom Kunkle said that the Senate should not “hand over” a proposal if it weren’t finished. Senators voted by a show of hands, and the motion, to remand the rest of the proposal to an ad hoc committee, was passed by 28 to 15. Mr. Wilder said that this committee would be appointed in September, and Mr. Olejneziak asked that the committee not try to start from scratch, but use this proposal as a blueprint. Hugh Wilder thanked the members of Academic Planning, and the Senate applauded.
Post-Tenure Review Committee
Finally, the Senate considered a proposal from the Post-Tenure Review Committee and its chair, Susan Gurganus (EDFS), as follows:

Proposed Changes to the Faculty-Administration Manual

Proposal #1:
Revise section 6.a.1. of the policy (“Rating of Candidates; Rating of a candidate will take one of three forms; Superior Rating”) to read:

The superior rating is awarded to candidates who continue to perform at the level expected for promotion to the rank of Professor or Librarian IV, in accordance with the standards of the Faculty/Administration Manual. Only faculty members holding the rank of Professor or Librarian IV are eligible for a superior rating, except that tenured Assistant and Associate Professors who lack the terminal degree but who otherwise could meet the standards of promotion to the rank of Professor are also eligible for superior ratings.

Rationale: The revision would clarify the language regarding who is eligible for the superior rating. The PTR Committee has consistently held to this interpretation since the process was initiated.

Proposal #2:
Revise section 1 (Introduction):

A post-tenure review will be conducted for each tenured faculty member during the sixth year since her/his previous extra-departmental review, with the exception of the first review after tenure, which will be conducted during the seventh year unless the faculty member is seeking promotion the same year.

(Deferment reason (c) should remain in the policy but will be used only occasionally with this change.)

Rationale: Currently faculty members who plan to seek promotion to Professor in their seventh year must seek a deferment in the sixth year. The committee believes this will result in a reduction in confusion and paperwork for these automatic deferrals.

Ms. Gurganus noted that this proposal was endorsed by last year’s committee as well as this year’s. She told the Senate that the PTR committee has dealt with numerous applications for a “Superior” rating from people who were not eligible. The committee wants the eligibility requirements to be spelled out more clearly. Bob Mignone said he had been on the committee last year, and that the requirements for a professor to earn a “Superior” rating were equivalent to those required for promotion to Full Professor. The first part of the policy clarifies these requirements, he said. The second part of the proposed change policy would change the PTR calendar, making it occur in the 7th year...
rather than the 6th year after becoming an Associate. This would allow them to come up for Full first, rather than going through PTR, then going through promotion the following year. Present policy allows those faculty to write a request for such a deferral, Ms. Gurganus said, and 15-16 faculty had to do that this year. She noted that this recommendation will require approval from CHE as well as the Provost. Both these recommendations were passed by the Senate.

Constituents’ Concerns
Robert Russell (Art History) presented a concern from his department. They believe that teaching and research awards tend to go to senior faculty, and they propose the creation of teaching and research awards for junior faculty. Mr. Russell said he would make a formal motion to this effect next fall.

With no further business, the Senate adjourned at 6:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, March 16, at 5:00 p.m. in ECTR 116. Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order and received approval of the February minutes.

Reports

SC Council of Chairs
Before giving his own report, the speaker recognized Bob Mignone (Mathematics), who serves as our representative on the South Carolina Council of Chairs. Mr. Mignone reported to the Senate that he attended a retreat held by the Council of Chairs to discuss recommended changes in South Carolina’s higher education system. Present were board members of the state’s Commission on Higher Education (CHE), SC college presidents, and SC Council of Chairs members. There was much discussion about whether CHE will continue to be the ruling body for higher education in SC, or whether, as was suggested in a recent report from Columbia, some other ruling body will be created to take its place. Mr. Mignone also said that he has learned that some state officials are planning to replace “Performance Funding” [an elaborate scheme for determining how schools qualify for state monies] with smaller accountability measures. The state’s higher ed institutions are working with CHE on these proposed measures. Mr. Mignone has asked Conrad Festa (formerly our Provost, now head of CHE) that the SC Council of Chairs be allowed send representatives to these conversations.

The Speaker
Mr. Wilder reminded Senators of the Forums being held on the College’s Statement of Core Values. He had attended the first one yesterday, and reported that the discussions were “very worthwhile and substantive,” so he urged Senators to attend the one being held later this week. Next, he alerted faculty to the existence of a State of SC employee database. Updated annually, most recently on March 10th, this database contains information on salaries of state employees. In years past, the Welfare committee has made this available to the faculty by placing a copy on reserve in the library. Now, however, the State newspaper is maintaining this database on its website (http://thestateonline.screads.com/salaries/index.php) with our institution identified as “University of Charleston.” Finally, the Speaker noted that there would be only one more meeting of the Faculty Senate this year. The last scheduled meeting is April 13th, agenda deadline April 1st. If we don’t get through the agenda by the 13th, we’ll continue the meeting on the 20th.

Old Business

By-Laws Committee
The By-Laws Committee presented a motion “to revise the Faculty Organization and By-Laws to Create a new standing College Committee on Faculty Compensation.” Mr. Wilder reminded Senators that this motion had been introduced at the February Senate meeting, and that the Senate had approved the idea of removing duties relating to faculty
salaries from Welfare and creating a new standing committee for these duties. As a matter of course, this was sent to the Bylaws Committee. Ultimately, in order to change our by-laws, a proposal needs a 2/3 vote by Senate, and after that it would go to all faculty as a mail ballot. Bishop Hunt (At-large), representing the committee, reported that they have endorsed this proposal. They gave consideration to a request, made during the Senate discussion in February, to include a separate reference to Librarians’ status, but decided not to do that. The other concern expressed in February had to do with the duties of Welfare, Mr. Hunt said. The committee’s amendments follow:

The By-Laws Committee recommends that the motion proposed by Senator Bev Diamond on behalf of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation on February 10, 2004 be approved with certain minor adjustments in wording, as indicated below:

**Motion to Revise the Faculty Organization and By-Laws to Create a New Standing College Committee on Faculty Compensation**

I. REVISE the Faculty-Administration Manual, Section III, V, 3, B, 3 (Faculty Welfare Committee):

1. Strike section 3.b.5 ("compensation [both direct and indirect]") and renumber accordingly;
2. Revise section 3.b concluding paragraph to read:

The Committee shall also report to the Senate annually regarding current and pending legislation, regulations and programs concerning fringe benefits. The committee shall gather statistics and report benefits for other state and peer institutions.

[replace this paragraph with: The Committee shall also report to the Senate annually on current and pending legislation, regulations, and programs related to faculty welfare, including fringe benefits. The committee shall gather statistics and report to the faculty annually regarding such benefits at other state institutions and peer institutions.]

II. ADD to the Faculty-Administration Manual, Section III, V, 17:

17. Faculty Compensation Committee

a. Composition

Seven faculty members.

b. Duties

(1) To review and recommend changes as needed to College Policies concerning faculty compensation (both direct and indirect);

[eliminate: (both direct and indirect) ]

(2) To review and recommend changes as needed to College policies concerning adjunct faculty compensation (both direct and indirect);

[eliminate: (both direct and indirect) ]

(3) To conduct or recommend faculty salary and/or compensation studies and report the results to the faculty; these studies may be internal and/or external; they may address such issues as internal equity,
appropriate entry-level salaries, salary compression, and comparisons with peer institutions;

(4) To recommend measures taken in response to findings of any faculty salary and/or compensation studies;

(5) To advise the administration concerning the development and implementation of any special compensation enhancement program (programs which go beyond any regular annual salary increases);

(6) To monitor the effects of any special compensation enhancement programs, recommend modifications as necessary in the implementation of long-term programs, and report to the faculty the results of such programs;

(7) To review and recommend adjustments as needed to College policies concerning salary [substitute “increases” for “bonuses”] for the awarding of tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review ratings of "superior."

Rationale

[add a sentence to the Rationale:]

The two-part motion creates a new standing college committee on Faculty Compensation, shifting responsibilities concerning compensation from the Faculty Welfare Committee. This recommendation is made in the report of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation. The change is warranted by the importance and complexity of faculty compensation issues, as well as by the heavy current workload of the Welfare Committee. (It is understood, however, that “fringe benefits,” which are mandated at the state level, will generally remain within the purview of the Welfare Committee.) We believe it makes sense to create a new standing faculty committee dedicated to faculty compensation matters.

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

After a brief discussion of exactly who would be responsible for what (Welfare will continue to have oversight over faculty benefits and any other matters relating to faculty welfare that it chooses to study; this committee will be solely responsible for keeping up with salary), the motion carried unanimously.

Committee on Graduate Education

Sarah Owens presented three new course proposals from the Committee on Graduate Education (LATN 620, LATN 621, LATN 624) . All were approved, as was a proposal to change the MA in History program by adding a concentration in African American studies.

Report from Daniel Dukes

At this point in the meeting, the Speaker recognized Daniel Dukes, Senior Vice-President for Government Affairs, who had just arrived. Pressing business in Columbia had twice prevented Mr. Dukes from appearing at previous Senate meetings; Mr. Wilder thanked him for coming tonight. With the General Assembly session partially completed, Mr. Dukes told the Senate about some of the legislative matters that he was monitoring on the College’s behalf. “As you know, state revenues in the past few years have been declining, Mr. Dukes reported. This year’s revenue is 800 million dollars less than last year’s, he said. The General Assembly was still 350 million short in its most recent
session, and as a result, C of C appropriations were cut by 2.3% in a recent House bill—about $600,000. Almost all State agencies have suffered deeper cuts than our institution has, Mr. Dukes added. On the positive side, the Lowcountry Graduate Center was fully funded, as were requests for technology funding to be taken from lottery profits—we’ll get about 1.3 million for our institution for this purpose, which is an increase from last year. Mr. Dukes added that our requests for scholarships were fully funded, and additional money was put into needs-based scholarships. All FTE-funded lines were approved, as was a 2% pay raise for classified employees, and an average raise of 2% for unclassified employees.

Mr. Dukes noted that the S.C. Senate would begin its business in two weeks, and they could change some of the things the House has done; he said the House’s version of the budget was one President Higdon would be happy with. Regarding facilities funding, Mr. Dukes reported that the new Science Center had received more money from both the federal government (9.4 million) and the state (4 million), but that we still need more. The estimated cost for a new science center is 45 million, and Mr. Dukes said he hoped to get more federal funding for the facility next year. The Life Sciences Bill would also help the college since it would send us money for deferred maintenance. In addition, Mr. Dukes reported that colleges and universities were still seeking to relax some of the regulations currently in place, but that no agreement had been worked out yet. In response to a question from Frank Morris, Mr. Dukes reported that the TERI retirement plan was still in place. He added, “If there is an attempt to remove the TERI plan I will email the campus immediately. If not, I’ll be crucified.” Joe Benich asked if Mr. Dukes knew if the TERI plan were revenue-neutral, and Mr. Dukes said he would try to find out the answer to that question. Mr. Wilder thanked Mr. Dukes for “doing good work for us” and for presenting this update.

**Curriculum Committee**

Norris Preyer presented a list of items for approval. The first three passed:

1. F03-25 POLS 350 Contemporary Liberalism – New Course Proposal
2. S04-01 POLS 104/GEOG 101 World Geography – Proposal to Change a Course
3. S04-02 MATH 103 Contemporary Mathematics with Applications – Proposal to Change a Course

The next group, from Mathematics, generated some discussion. Tom Kunkle (Mathematics) asked that an error in the course description for Item 6 be corrected, and Mr. Preyer accepted this as a friendly amendment. George Pothering (At-Large) asked about the stipulation that a student could not receive credit for both Math 120 (Calculus) and Hons 115 (Honors Calculus). “If a student takes both, which will count?” he asked. Mr. Kunkle explained that by default, the first one would count, but a student could ask the registrar to count the second one instead. These proposals were then approved, as well as changes to the Minor in Linguistics:

4. S04-03 MATH 105 Calculus for Business and the Social Sciences – Proposal to Change a Course
5. S04-04 MATH 120 Introductory Calculus – Proposal to Change a Course
6. S04-05 MATH 220 Calculus II – Proposal to Change a Course
7. S04-06 MATH 245 Numerical Methods and Mathematical Computing – Proposal to Change a Course
8. S04-07 MATH 311 Advanced Calculus I – Proposal to Change a Course
9. S04-08 MATH 411 Advanced Calculus II – Proposal to Change a Course
10. S04-09 HONS 115 Honors Calculus – Proposal to Change a Course
Mr. Preyer explained that item 16 had been removed at the request of Computer Science, since the department has now decided it does not wish to make this change after all. The other CSCI proposals passed, as did the change to SPAN 344.

Faculty Welfare Committee

Lisa Thomson Ross (Psychology) presented two proposals on behalf of the committee. The first was designed to make the Faculty-Administration Manual (FAM) consistent with the College’s policy on FMLA (Family Medical Leave Act) for faculty, which states that faculty who have taken FMLA leave may request an extension on tenure decisions. Ms. Ross said that this proposal is meant to spell out this new policy in the manual. Mr. Wilder noted that the Senate and Faculty do not control the FAM, but that, if passed, our proposal would be sent to the By-Laws Committee for their input on the wording, then ultimately sent as a recommendation to the Provost and the President. Provost Elise Jorgens spoke in favor of this proposal, adding that she would like to require more notice if a faculty member plans to use the extension. Ms. Ross suggested that instead of a March 15th deadline, the manual could stipulate that this extension be requested within 6 months of the faculty member’s return from a leave. Chip Voorneveld (EDFS) asked whether this policy was inconsistent with the Americans With Disability Act (ADA). Joe Kelly (At-Large) moved that the proposal be amended. He believed a faculty member should have 12 months rather than 6 months to ask for an extension, since, he said, faculty members returning from leave could be so overwhelmed with their new parenting responsibilities that it might take more than 6 months for them to be able to assess whether their research program was still on schedule for tenure and promotion. The Provost suggested that since faculty members have more advance notice of becoming a parent than they do of other family medical emergencies, they could be expected to have a shorter window in which to ask for a “stop-the-clock” on the time remaining before going up for tenure. Bev Diamond (Mathematics) thought the committee might need to reconsider whether these different leave conditions ought to be treated separately. The question (on Joe Kelly’s amendment) was called, and it was passed.

Returning to the main motion, Frank Kinard (At-Large) said he thought these changes were too specific, and that the present FMLA policy already allows varying circumstances to be taken into account. Glen Lesses (Philosophy) suggested that the FAM should add a phrase to its description of the T & P schedule: “unless exceptions have been granted in accordance with the College’s FMLA policy.” He noted as well that the same language should be used throughout the manual, in descriptions of Senior Instructors and Librarians. Ms. Ross accepted both suggestions as friendly amendments.
Another senator asked if FMLA covered disabilities, to which some senators said yes and some no. Was a motion to remand in order now, Susan Kattwinkel asked. Yes, said Mr. Wilder. Various other possible scenarios were proposed by other senators, each of whom wondered if this amendment would cover them or exclude them unfairly. Paul Buhler (Computer Science) then asked if we couldn’t trust the Provost to deal with unusual scenarios (such as getting hit by a bus one week before your T& P packet was due) when they occur. “I’m coming to that position on this, too,” the Provost said. “Given funding for CARTA, that bus may not be a problem,” Frank Kinard said. Ms. Jorgens said, “I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this with the Welfare Committee.” A motion was made, then passed, to remand the proposal to Welfare. The amended, then remanded proposal follows, with amendments underlined:

The Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the Faculty Senate recommend the following changes to the Faculty/Administration Manual.

In the current edition of the Faculty/Administrative Manual, delete the following sentence in section IV. J. 5th paragraph:

A tenure decision is made only once, no later than the sixth year.

Insert in its place:

A tenure decision is made only once, in normal circumstances no later than the sixth year unless exceptions have been granted in accordance with the College’s FMLA and ADA policies. (see section IV. U. 7. for discussion of effect of leaves of absence on tenure schedule).

Delete the following sentence in section IV. K. 3rd paragraph:

A promotion decision is made only once normally in the sixth year.

Insert in its place:

A promotion decision is made only once, in normal circumstances no later than the sixth year unless exceptions have been granted in accordance with the College’s FMLA and ADA policies. (see section IV. U. 7. for discussion on effect of leaves of absence on promotion schedule).

Also insert the following as section IV. U. 7.:

7. Extension of Probationary Period.

An instructional faculty member who uses 120 days or more of paid or unpaid disability, family, infant, or newly-adopted child care leave during any consecutive two-year period shall be entitled, at his or her election, to extend the tenure/promotional probationary period by one year. An instructional faculty member who has used less than 120 days of paid or unpaid disability, family, infant or newly-adopted child care leave during any consecutive two-year period but who has, nonetheless, taken a significant amount of such leave prior to consideration for an award of tenure or promotion, or who has experienced circumstances which, at the faculty member’s election, could have resulted in a significant period of such leave may petition the Provost for an extension of the probationary period.

The decision to grant an extension of the probationary period under such circumstances shall be made at the sole discretion of the Provost, after consulting with the faculty member’s dean and department chair. The election to extend the probationary period by one year or the petition to the Provost to extend the probationary period by one year must be made no later than twelve months after the completion of the
leave and no later than March 15 of the contract year before which the tenure/promotional review normally 
would occur. If such election is made or if the petition is granted by the Provost, the faculty member 
thereby waives the provisions of the Faculty/Administration Manual requiring that a decision regarding the 
award of tenure be made within six years. No faculty member will be granted more than one such 
extension.

**Rationale:**

It is accepted practice amongst many institutions of higher learning to grant faculty in who have used a 
large amount of leave extensions of promotional/tenure decisions. The draft above is based heavily on the 
Faculty Handbook of The College of William and Mary. This also is in line with the College’s expressed 
FMLA policy, which states:

“Faculty members who take a substantial amount of leave for personal or family reasons may request to 
defer tenure and promotion decisions in consideration of the time they have been away.”

This statement seems to clearly support the extension of promotion and tenure decisions, however the 
current wording in the Faculty and Administration manual requires that the tenure decision be made no 
later than the 6th year. We recommend revising the manual to agree with the College’s FMLA policy.

Ms. Ross then presented the Welfare Committee’s second proposal, which she described 
as “a goodwill gesture,” to ask the College to create a Staff Welfare Committee that 
would monitor the same issues for staff that the Faculty Welfare covers for faculty. The 
proposal follows:

It is hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston enthusiastically supports the 
formation of a Staff Welfare Committee. The Faculty Senate recognizes that the welfare of the staff 
members of the College is not under its charge, and therefore this committee would not be a standing 
committee under the Faculty Senate. Its purpose would be to serve the staff members of the College in 
much the same manner as the Faculty Welfare Committee serves the Faculty. Concerns of this committee 
shall be all College policies that affect the welfare of the staff at large, such as:

20. employment and working conditions;
21. promotion policies;
22. work loads;
23. compensation;
24. leaves of absence;
25. fringe benefits, including: state retirement; health insurance, to include medical and dental 
benefits, life insurance; annuities, to include state and/or privately; sponsored programs; Social 
Security benefits; all other programs of a like nature.

The College of Charleston Faculty Senate strongly urges the President and the Director of Human 
Resources to take all necessary steps to form a Staff Welfare Committee.

Susan Kattwinkel asked who would be on this committee. Ms. Ross said they had not 
planned the composition, but that it would include the director of Human Resources and 
other staff. Peter McCandless (History) asked why Welfare had made this suggestion, and 
Ms. Ross said that staff members have contacted them and asked for it. Does the staff 
have a plan for how to create this committee, Jack Parson (Political Science) asked. Other 
senators asked about whether staff would be paid for time spent on this committee 
service, what the definition of “staff” was, and whether staff concerns should be handled 
by Human Resources. Annette Godow said this was simply a “friendly encouragement”
for HR to follow. The motion was then passed on a voice vote.

**Constituents’ Concerns**

Beatrice Frask (French) thanked faculty for their signatures to the tree-protecting petition at the February meeting, and asked the Senate for help on the matter of adjunct welfare. As an adjunct, Ms. Frask said she had heard many concerns and resentments expressed by other adjuncts who are highly educated but not well paid. Is there a voice for adjuncts, she wondered. Could they have representation on the Faculty Senate? Mr. Wilder noted, first, that all Senate meetings are open to all faculty, whether adjunct, visiting, or tenure-track. Adjuncts currently cannot serve as Senators, but could do so if we changed our By-laws. One way to proceed, he said, would be to suggest to Welfare to consider bringing such a motion. Bev Diamond suggested that Welfare could take up the special concerns of adjuncts in general, in addition to considering their representation in the Senate. Ms. Frask thanked the Senators for their suggestions, saying that it was “very difficult as an adjunct to be recognized.”

David Mann (Political Science) announced that the Bookstore Advisory Council had met. As a member of the council, “I really need your input,” he said, and asked faculty to relay their concerns to him. Darryl Phillips noted that the deadline for the reporting of mid-semester grades seemed to have been earlier this year. Since it’s all submitted electronically, couldn’t there be a later deadline so faculty could include midterm exams” Ms. Jorgens said the Registrar would open to a discussion of this. She also thought we should synchronize this midterm grade deadline with the withdrawal date. This semester there was indeed a very low submission of midterm grades, she said, but these grades should be a tool our students can use. Beatrice Frask asked about the problem of having only B+ and C+, with no other plus and minus notches, and Mr. Wilder said there was a new grading scale with more notches coming into effect in 2006. Another senator suggested that if we change to withdrawal and midterm deadlines, we should make sure students will still have the option to enroll in an Express class in the second half of the semester.

At last the meeting was adjourned, at 6:33.

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary

_Last Faculty Senate Meeting of Spring 2004:
April 13• 5:00pm • 116 Education Center
(continued April 20 if necessary, same hour and place)_

_Spring Faculty Meeting (5:00 PM, Physicians Auditorium) April 19 (agenda deadline April 7)_
The College of Charleston Faculty Senate met Tuesday, February 10, 2004, in ECTR 116. Forty-six senators attended.

Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order and invited any corrections to the minutes of the January meeting. Hearing none, the Senate approved these minutes.

Reports

SC Legislature and Higher Education

Mr. Wilder informed the Senate that Vice President Daniel Dukes sent his regrets that he had been unable to attend today’s meeting as scheduled. Mr. Dukes was in Columbia meeting with the Ways and Means committee on the College’s behalf. Mr. Wilder asked Bob Mignone to update the Senate on changes in state higher education, since Mr. Mignone had been elected by the Senate in January to represent us on the SC Council of Chairs. Mr. Mignone told the Senate that the Council was discussing current challenges to higher education in South Carolina. The Council met with Conrad Festa, our former Provost who now serves as the executive director of CHE (The Commission on Higher Education). They learned that there is a possibility that Trident Technical College could become a four-year institution. Higher education in the state could be restructured through the formation of a Board of Regents, and the elimination of CHE. Conrad Festa told the Council that they would have input on this decision, Mr. Mignone said. Another bill under consideration could change the way SC institutions teach the life sciences. Associate Provost Susan Morrison asked for the numbers of these bills. Mr. Mignone said the Life Sciences Act was Bill # 560. He added that on the SC legislative website, we could use the search function to enter relevant keywords and locate the numbers of pending bills. Mr. Mignone also reported that the TERI retirement plan and its possible demise was under considerable discussion in Columbia, but that, in his view, no one in the legislature seems willing to go on record as attacking this program.

Committee on Nominations and Elections: Replacement of At-Large Senator

Before the Speaker began his report, he requested a suspension of rules to allow this committee to conduct its election early in the meeting. David Gentry, the Committee chair, presented Karen Berg (Hispanic Studies) and Betsy Martin (Chemistry) as candidates for a replacement Senator for a vacated At-large seat. Committee members then distributed paper ballots, collected them, and went off to count. Later in the meeting, they returned to report that Betsy Martin had been elected.

The Speaker

Mr. Wilder began by reminding the Senate that the election for Speaker, Secretary, and At-large Senators would end this Friday. “I’m fast becoming a lame duck,” the Speaker
noted, and asked that Senators remind all their colleagues to vote. Next, he told the Senate that a report by the Ad Hoc Committee on Communication Across the Curriculum was now posted on the college website. Senators had received a portion of this report at the January meeting, when the committee’s chair, Sylvia Gamboa, reported on its work; now the entire report is available for our scrutiny at www.cofc.edu/CAC.

Mr. Wilder noted that at the end of the January meeting, Alex Kasman (Mathematics) had asked if the College could discontinue giving Saturday exams, since this schedule can pose a hardship for some students. The Speaker reported that he has investigated the matter and has confirmed that there would simply not be enough days to give exams if we did not use the Saturday slot. To make up those lost exam slots, the College would have to do away with Reading Day, give more exams in each day (perhaps by restricting the exam periods to two hours), or allow faculty less time to complete their grading. The Office of Undergraduate Studies also told the Speaker that since the exam schedule is published at the beginning of the semester, students do have ample time to make arrangements to be available on a Saturday.

This semester, faculty experienced significant problems with the College Bookstore, “more than the usual glitches,” the Speaker said. The bookstore apparently never placed some faculty members’ orders, and ordered an inadequate supply for many other classes. This constitutes an academic problem, so the Speaker met with the Provost as well as with Kristen Wing and the new textbook manager who arrived in December. “They were very apologetic about the problem,” the Speaker noted, saying that the bookstore officials have submitted an “action plan” to the Provost, detailing their efforts to improve. Last year, Kristen Wing initiated a Bookstore Advisory Committee, Mr. Wilder noted, but he has learned that this committee has thus far never met. Calling a meeting is now part of the bookstore’s action plan; our representatives, elected last year, are David Mann and Abdul Aziz, and Mr. Wilder said he plans to be in touch with them.

Forums on the campus Master Plan were conducted last month, the Speaker reported. One item that caught lots of attention was the area between the library and Maybank, called “Cougar Mall,” which was to be renovated significantly. This was meant to be a project that could be done quickly and relatively cheaply, to make a big impact and give a foretaste of what the whole Master Plan would accomplish. In the illustration of this plan, existing trees were absent, and other current vegetation was illustrated as being pruned back. This change was brought up at a forum, the Speaker said, and the planning firm (Ayers St Gross) and Monica Scott explained that there is no new design, actually. The slide that was shown is not the plan, just an illustration of what there might be; the master planners will take into consideration our response to the loss of trees and other vegetation. Mr. Wilder reminded the Senate that last year it had formed a committee to protect trees on campus. Monica Scott has assured Mr. Wilder that the Tree Committee will be involved in the design of Cougar Mall. The Speaker added that he had received a petition just this afternoon, protesting any removal of trees, which he will also deliver to Ms. Scott. Reid Wiseman (At-large) asked to sign the petition, as did several other Senators. Michael Leitman, attending the Senate meeting on behalf of Student Government, said that the Alliance for Planet Earth was presenting a resolution to the
SGA about the protection of campus trees. “We will work in concert,” Mr. Wilder replied.

New Business

Committee on Graduate Education

Proposals for graduate courses in Latin had been placed on the agenda. Unfortunately, because of a problem with posting supporting materials on the website a full week in advance of the Senate meeting, action on these items was deferred until the March meeting, with the agreement of the Classics faculty and the Graduate Committee chair.

Motion for New Standing Committee

Bev Diamond (At-large) moved that the Senate form a new committee. The text of her proposal follows:

Motion to Revise the Faculty Organization and By-Laws to Create a New Standing College Committee on Faculty Compensation

Proposed by the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation

Motion made by Senator Bev Diamond

I. REVISE the Faculty-Administration Manual, Section III, V, 3, B, 3 (Faculty Welfare Committee):

1. Strike section 3.b.5 (“compensation [both direct and indirect]”) and renumber accordingly;

2. Revise section 3.b concluding paragraph to read:

The Committee shall also report to the Senate annually regarding current and pending legislation, regulations and programs concerning fringe benefits. The committee shall gather statistics and report benefits for other state and peer institutions.

II. ADD to the Faculty-Administration Manual, Section III, V, 17:

17. Faculty Compensation Committee

   a. Composition
      Seven faculty members.

   b. Duties
(1) To review and recommend changes as needed to College Policies concerning faculty compensation (both direct and indirect);

(2) To review and recommend changes as needed to College policies concerning adjunct faculty compensation (both direct and indirect);

(3) To conduct or recommend faculty salary and/or compensation studies and report the results to the faculty; these studies may be internal and/or external; they may address such issues as internal equity, appropriate entry-level salaries, salary compression, and comparisons with peer institutions;

(4) To recommend measures taken in response to findings of any faculty salary and/or compensation studies;

(5) To advise the administration concerning the development and implementation of any special compensation enhancement program (programs which go beyond any regular annual salary increases);

(6) To monitor the effects of any special compensation enhancement programs, recommend modifications as necessary in the implementation of long-term programs, and report to the faculty the results of such programs;

(7) To review and recommend adjustments as needed to College policies concerning salary bonuses for the awarding of tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review ratings of “superior.”

Rationale

The two-part motion creates a new standing college committee on Faculty Compensation, shifting responsibilities concerning compensation from the Faculty Welfare Committee. This recommendation is made in the report of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation. The change is warranted by the importance and complexity of faculty compensation issues, as well as by the heavy current workload of the Welfare Committee. It makes sense to create a new standing faculty committee dedicated to faculty compensation matters.

Ms. Diamond reminded the Senate that the President had formed an ad hoc committee on compensation, charged to investigate College of Charleston salaries and to recommend ways to correct inequities. This committee, on which Ms. Diamond served, “has high hopes that some monies are going to be distributed this year,” Ms. Diamond said. It also believes that someone needs to be monitoring what happens to this money and to conduct a new assessment next year, in hopes of equitably distributing future increases. This
Ms. Diamond’s motion received a second, and the Speaker invited discussion. He reminded the Senate that any motion to revise our own by-laws is automatically referred to the By-Laws Committee, and that committee will report back to the Senate at our next meeting. By-Laws is empowered to change the language and even the sense of the motion. Further discussion will be in order at that time, after which the Senate will vote on the proposal. For today’s discussion, points that would help the By-Laws Committee are especially useful, Mr. Wilder said. Sheila Seaman (Library) said that the Compensation committee noted in its report that it had difficulty comparing librarians’ compensation levels here with those of other schools. She said there should be a librarian on this new committee, “since we got lost last time.” Ms. Diamond replied that the librarians actually occupied a considerable amount of the committee’s time, and that the problems comparing our librarians with those of other institutions would still exist, but that the Senate was free to ask for a librarian to be on the committee. Susan Kattwinkel (At-large) asked whether Welfare was displeased to have this responsibility removed. Mr. Wilder replied that the current chair was satisfied with this proposed change. Faculty salaries have always been in Welfare’s purview, but they have never been able to address this in any detail along with all their other duties. Glen Lesses (Philosophy) said he welcomed this proposal, and he urged the By-Laws Committee to make the language describing the committee’s duties as precise as possible; the proposal’s term “compensation both direct and indirect” could be taken to mean benefits as well as salaries. Ms. Diamond agreed, noting that the ad hoc committee did not have access to other institutions’ benefits for comparison. She also noted that retirement benefits were not studied, yet this component was so closely tied to salary that there was “a correlation of one” between these two forms of compensation.

Constituents’ Concerns

David Mann (Political Science) announced that he was planning “to coordinate complaints” about the bookstore. He asked that departments give him some idea of how many courses and which courses had book orders that were not filled. Then, if the committee ever meets, he would have more precise information. “As a member of this committee that hasn’t met, I will be glad to serve as a voluntary liaison,” he said, to gather up information on all the different problems that have been reported.

Frank Kinard (At-large) reported problems getting his College ID replaced after his wallet was stolen. The process of proving that he really was an employee of the College was very troublesome, he said, and it seemed to him that the process could be streamlined, particularly if so much information was digitized somewhere. The Speaker agreed that simplification would be desirable.

Sheila Seaman reminded faculty that the library will close for its move to the new Addlestone library over the summer, to reopen in August. The librarians hope that faculty
who are doing research over the summer will scour the stacks and get what they need before the move. “We don’t want you to bring books back” right now, she said, because they are out of shelf space in the old building. The librarians hope to have reference services open and access to electronic materials all through the summer, but there will not be uninterrupted access to books. “It’s not too early” to start gathering the books that you will need over the summer, if you anticipate doing a research project then, she said.

With no further business, the Senate moved to adjourn at 5:45.
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MINUTES OF COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON FACULTY SENATE

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, January 20, 2004, in ECTR 116. Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order and invited corrections to the minutes of the December 2003 meeting. The minutes were approved as written.

Reports

Mr. Wilder informed the Senate that Daniel Dukes, Sr. V. P. for Governmental Affairs, was unable to make his report to the Senate. Mr. Dukes, who works with South Carolina legislators on the College’s behalf, had been called away to Columbia today. The Speaker added that later in the semester, there would actually be more to report from Columbia, and that Mr. Dukes had said that he looked forward to updating the Senate on these matters. He plans to address the Senate in February.

Committee on Communication Across the Curriculum

Mr. Wilder then recognized Sylvia Gamboa, chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Communication Across the Curriculum. Ms. Gamboa told the Senate that this committee had been constituted as part of the Strategic Plan, and that the committee’s charge was to study the teaching of communication skills (writing, speaking, and visual and electronic communication) across campus, and to make recommendations for improving students’ instruction in this area. The committee had also been charged to report its findings by the end of 2003.

Ms. Gamboa noted that the committee did not yet have a recommendation, but that it had produced a lengthy report on the general topic of communication across the curriculum and on the ways departments across campus are teaching communication skills. (Senators received a portion of this report in their packets.) The committee surveyed department chairs to see what was already being done, Ms. Gamboa said, and their surveys revealed that a great deal is already being done to teach these communication skills within departments. She noted College publications such as Chrestomathy, which publishes undergraduate research, and the Miscellany, which publishes creative work, as two examples. The CAC committee also brought in experts, such as Art Young (whose CAC program at Clemson won an award), to advise the committee on programs it might recommend. Mr. Young’s first piece of advice to the committee was “Reward the faculty,” Ms. Gamboa reported, and the committee expects that anything it recommends will include rewards and incentives for faculty. Money will be given to promote CAC, and the committee has surveyed department chairs to find out what they want in the way of support. Some departments, for example, have asked for more assistance in improving students’ oral communication skills. The committee will have input on the First Year Experience that the Committee on Academic Planning is developing, and this semester it will finalize its own proposal. Their wish is to support faculty, Ms. Gamboa said, and not to place heavier burdens on them through their proposal. The committee’s full report will soon be posted on the College web page, Ms. Gamboa said. The College is already doing much good work that promotes students’ communication skills, and this Committee wants to be sure the President and the Provost know about it.

The Speaker

Mr. Wilder first clarified for the date of the April Senate meeting; it has been changed since the beginning of the year, and the correct date (13 April) is now posted on the Senate website. He then informed the Senate that the SC Council of Chairs, an organization that has not been active in the past couple of years, is now being revived in the face of so many challenges to higher
education in the state. Tomorrow will be the first meeting of the year, he said, and all meetings are open; anyone interested in attending should let him know. He also alerted Senators to an upcoming “State of the Student Body” address that Nicholas Glover, the SGA president, will be giving on 27 January at 5:30. Mr. Glover has told the Speaker that faculty are most welcome to attend.

The Speaker discussed the Master Plan for the College’s physical facilities. The consulting firm of Ayers Saint Gross has been working on this for quite some time, and will be presenting their final draft of the plan on the 21st and 22nd of the month from 3:15-4:30. Mr. Wilder recommended these presentations, saying that the plans are “visionary” and long-term. He also reported that the Provost plans to create a new Space Planning and Allocation Committee, whose purpose would be to publicize the availability of space on campus and create a standard form for applying for available space (such as vacated offices.) These forms will be available online. And, speaking of electronic forms, the Speaker noted that a task force will be established to consolidate all sorts of institutional forms and to allow for online filing of these forms wherever possible.

Mr. Wilder told Senators that at the January Board of Trustees meeting, the Faculty Compensation Committee had presented its report, is “a very significant step.” Mr. Wilder thanked Lynne Ford for her work as chair of this committee. The report does not require the Board’s approval, he explained; it was presented for information only. The President will now begin to implement its recommendations with funds he has already begun to accumulate. Joe Benich (Management/Marketing) asked if this report would be available to faculty, and was told it was already available on Cougar Trail. The Speaker also reported that the College of Charleston Foundation had employed Ayers Saint Gross to assess Dixie Plantation, a property that was donated a few years ago. The consultants were extremely impressed with the potential of this property, the Speaker said, and they offered many suggestions for educational uses of Dixie Plantation, many of them very low in cost. For example, it is a valuable archaeological site. As a waterfront property, it has much potential for marine biology classes. The firm believes it can be a “tremendous resource,” Mr. Wilder said.

Campus construction projects continue apace. The new library will be substantially completed by March, the Speaker reported, and officials expect midsummer occupancy and a formal opening ceremony in October. The new Multi-Cultural Center is now open. And College Lodge, a dorm that some had considered a problem property, has now had its destruction postponed for the next three to four years, Mr. Wilder said. Apparently, students like it and asked that it be allowed to survive yet awhile. Many parts of the Stern Student Center, on the other hand, will be closed for renovations from this summer until January 2005, and the Lightsey Center will also be closed for renovations during a similar period. And during this summer, the area between Maybank and the present library, known as “Cougar Mall,” will be significantly renovated.

The Board’s Finance Committee is discussing tuition/fee increases for 2004-2005. This increase will not be as great as recent price hikes, but there may be a “high single-digit” increase. This committee is also studying the costs and benefits of higher out-of-state tuition. In addition to bringing the College these higher fees, out-of-state students make a significant academic and cultural contribution to the student body, and the Board wants to avoid setting their fees so high that they discourage the best out-of-state students from attending. George Pothering (At Large) asked the speaker if he foresaw budget cuts for the coming year. Mr. Wilder said he would rather not address this, because he does not know enough details.

New Business
Curriculum Committee

Norris Preyer, chair, proposed the following on behalf of the Committee.

- POLS 383 Judicial Process—Proposal to Change a Course
- HIST 241 Special Topics: History of the Holocaust—Information Only
- HIST 210 Special Topics: The Historian’s Craft—Information Only
- CLAS 104 Introduction to Classical Archaeology—New Course Proposal
- B.A. Major, A. B. Major, and Minor in Classics
  —Proposal to Change Degree Requirements

The Senate voted to approve all these proposals.

Committee on Nominations and Elections

David Gentry, Chair, conducted an election of a College representative to the SC Council of Chairs. The nominee, Bob Mignone, was elected by acclamation.

Constituents' Concerns

Alex Kasman (Mathematics) raised a concern about Saturday examinations. He pointed out that some students who have children find this to be a hardship since schools and child care are not open on Saturdays, and parking can be difficult on the weekends. Couldn’t we add an extra day to the exam period and avoid scheduling exams on Saturday, he wondered. Mr. Wilder said he was fairly certain that the constraints of the calendar would not allow us to extend the exam period, but he would ask about it.

The Speaker also told the Senate that the Secretary had received an anonymous list of agenda suggestions for this meeting. The faculty member suggested that the Senate do more for adjuncts by seeking better pay and more permanent teaching positions. Also suggested were tuition remission for children of College employees, and parking that was closer than the Aquarium. Mr. Wilder said he would forward all these to the appropriate committees (Faculty Welfare, Parking Advisory Committee), and he added that he hoped that any faculty member, whether adjunct or permanent, would feel free to attend Senate meetings to voice concerns directly. He urged Senators to let adjuncts in their departments know that their Senators represent them, and that all faculty are welcome to speak at Senate meetings.

With no further business, the Senate adjourned at 5:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary

Spring Semester Faculty Senate Schedule:
- First Tuesdays • 5:00pm • 116 Education Center
- Feb. 10 (agenda deadline Jan. 29)
- March 16 (agenda deadline March 4)
- April 13 (continued April 20 if necessary; agenda deadline April 1)
Spring Faculty Meeting (5:00 PM, Physicians Auditorium)
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Minutes of December 2003 Meeting of Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, December 2 in ECTR 116. Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order. He invited corrections to the November minutes and, hearing none, suggested that they be approved. A motion to this effect was passed. Next, requesting a suspension of the rules, Mr. Wilder moved ahead on the agenda and recognized David Gentry, chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections. Mr. Gentry reminded Senators that an At-Large Senate vacancy had occurred, and that By-Laws required that the Senate elect a replacement. The nominees for the replacement were Denis Keyes, Ralph Muldrow, and Joe Kelly. Mr. Gentry distributed paper ballots, then collected them in order to tally the results. At the end of the meeting, Mr. Gentry reported that Joe Kelly had been elected to serve as a replacement At-Large Senator.

Reports

Service Learning

After the election, the Speaker returned to the agenda, beginning with reports. He recognized Lauren Collier (Service Learning Coordinator, Office of Student Affairs), who had come to the November Senate meeting requesting Senate input on a Service Learning matter. Ms. Collier’s office would like to use the letters “SL” in section numbers to identify courses that have a service-learning component, so that when students register for them, they will know that this particular section has a service-learning component. At the November meeting, Senators asked for more information and for sample syllabi for courses that had such a component. Accordingly, Ms. Collier offered a fuller explanation to the Senate at this evening’s meeting. She explained that service learning is not the same as performing community service, but is “a methodology that infuses service” into a curriculum, Rather than being an add-on, it is an essential component of the course. Students actively participate in service that has been thoughtfully designed; the faculty member helps students to reflect on these experiences and to understand them as applications of theories they have learned in the classroom. Another advantage of service learning is that it provides experience that may help students when they seek permanent employment. Ms. Collier also noted that as a pedagogical tool, service learning gives students a problem to solve as a group, an activity that facilitates cognitive growth. Some service learning courses are about this pedagogy itself, but many are courses in which service learning is infused into an existing curriculum, and/or are courses in which students work together to develop a solution to a problem (for example, developing a strategic plan for a community in transition). A capstone course can also incorporate service learning. At the College, over 30 faculty members have attended workshops that Ms. Collier has offered on the topic, and she has also worked individually with faculty who are developing service learning components for their classes. Two Freshman Seminar courses and a Human Sexuality course have incorporated service learning since Ms. Collier came to the College. Syllabi from some College courses that included service learning had been placed on the Senate website.
Ms. Collier stressed to the Senate, “Service learning is not a fad,” citing numerous institutions that offer courses with service learning components. She offered a list of resources to faculty who were interested in learning more about the topic, and noted that this pedagogy provided numerous benefits. Because they require more time to be spent performing service outside of class, service learning courses are different from traditional courses and should be identifiable during registration. This way, students seeking out service learning can find these courses, and all students will understand when they register that the courses require students to spend time on their service outside of class. Hugh Wilder then explained to the Senate that Ms. Collier wanted the Senate’s opinion on who, if anyone, should be involved in identifying service learning courses. For example, it might be appropriate for department chairs to make this designation, he said. Senators Alex Kasman (Mathematics) and Glen Lesses (Philosophy and Religious Studies) wondered why service learning courses needed a special designation, since there are other courses that require students to spend time on events that take place outside of class (for example, theater courses require students to attend performances). Ms. Collier noted that in some cases, transportation and other logistics made service learning more challenging to carry out than other courses. Meg Cormack (Philosophy and Religious Studies) spoke in favor of designating service learning courses so students could avoid scheduling conflicts, but Frank Kinard (At-large) said he thought the Curriculum committee should review the designation. He believed there should be a standard for the amount of time a student should be required to spend in service, and that this should be spelled out in the College catalog. Ms. Collier said that any such standards should be developed by each discipline.

A motion was made to charge a committee to examine service learning and report back to the faculty. David Mann (Political Science) noted that since the Senate was still in the “Reports” section of the meeting, this would need to be a resolution instead of a motion. Further discussion led to the suggestion that Academic Planning look into this subject. Bev Diamond (At-large) noted that the Curriculum Committee evaluated courses according to standards that have already been developed, while it was the job of Academic Planning to tell faculty what sort of standards were needed. Ms. Collier noted that the Provost had been in favor of assigning this matter to a committee. The Provost, Elise Jorgens, told the Senate that she agreed that Academic Planning would be an appropriate committee. Todd Grantham (At-large) suggested that since there was such a small number of service learning courses in existence or under development, perhaps the faculty should go ahead and recommend that these few courses be designated. Academic Planning could proceed with its study as well regarding future courses. Frank Kinard said, “I’d like to instruct Academic Planning to look into liability issues that might arise.” Glen Lesses continued to object to giving service learning courses a special designation when there were other courses that also required off-campus activities. The Speaker then asked the Senate what they wanted to do about the resolution. Rohn England (Mathematics) asked if the resolution meant that the Senate could still advise Ms. Collier to implement the service learning designation? Yes, but we need to vote first, the Speaker said. The resolution passed on a voice vote.

The Senate discussed the registration flag further. Deanna Caveny (Mathematics)
noted that the designation “SL” would not work because the section numbers need two of the three available digits. Bob Perkins (At-large) asked whether the information delivered in an “SL” course would be the same as in a non-SL version of that course, and Ms. Collier said it would. In that case, Mr. Perkins said, Curriculum does not need to be involved. He wondered, though, whether this designation would be sufficient to alert students as to what they were getting into. Susan Kattwinkel (At-large) noted that service learning was essentially a pedagogical technique; pedagogy already varies from section to section of traditional courses, depending on the approach of the instructor. She opposed the designation of any pedagogical technique. Lisa Thomson Ross (Psychology) asked if the College were “moving toward” designating SL courses on students’ transcripts. Ms. Collier said this was only a concept at present. Darryl Phillips (Classics) wondered if this proposed “SL” would appear on a transcript, since, he said, that would be a serious consideration. Mr. Wilder said that section numbers do not now appear on transcripts. Finally, Bev Diamond proposed that Academic Planning look at the issue of flagging SL courses first, and report back to the Senate as soon as they have done so. Noting that this suggestion met with no objection, Mr. Wilder then recognized the chair of Academic Planning, who was next on the agenda.

Academic Planning Committee

Bill Olejniczak addressed the Senate on behalf of Academic Planning’s 18 months of work on a Freshman Seminar. (“And thank you for that new charge,” he said.) The Strategic Plan had tasked this committee to develop plans for an academic component of the first-year experience and to examine the existing Freshman Seminar, and to do so by the end of 2003. The committee’s written report to the Senate has been posted on the Senate website. Mr. Olejniczak told the Senate that this report was not a recommendation, but that the committee was ready to offer their ideas for public scrutiny. In its first year of work, the Committee considered a plan that would deliver this academic component of the first-year experience through an “add-on hour model,” using existing courses and adding an hour to sections designated for freshmen. This plan, however, met with much criticism from deans and chairs this past May, and the committee sought alternatives this fall. Mr. Olejniczak reminded Senators that his committee was not an Ad Hoc committee, but a Senate body, and that in its two years of working on this plan, its members had come from 10 departments and from 4 of the College’s 5 schools. They have also met with the Provost, and at this point, invite faculty to discuss the plan in hopes of developing a consensus.

Academic Planning believes that their Freshman Seminar plan meets the following tests: small class size, no increase in faculty workload, voluntary participation, and fiscal prudence. They also believe the course’s academic integrity will be very strong, and that these classes will be stimulating both for faculty and for students, Mr. Olejniczak noted that a review process has been built in, and that the plan is for course proposals to go before a new standing committee for approval, then through Curriculum and the Faculty Senate. Students in the course will be assured of one-on-one contact with roster faculty; these faculty will serve as students’ advisors during their first year. The Committee believes this course will also help the College to attract excellent, committed students.
Such courses are being offered at our peer institutions (and more prestigious ones); a list of course titles from such schools is included in the Committee’s written report. Mr. Olejniczak then asked for responses from Senators. George Pothering (At-large) suggested that the review process might be too extensive, and thought these courses should be reviewed by the proposed Freshman Seminar Committee only, in the same way that Special Topics courses are reviewed by the home department and not by the Curriculum Committee. Mr. Wilder noted that Honors Program courses are reviewed by the Honors Committee and do not go before Curriculum and the Senate. Norris Preyer (Physics) added that the only time such courses come before Curriculum is when they are being proposed as permanent courses. David Mann asked if faculty teaching these courses would advise students during their orientation, or only afterwards. The committee had not planned for them to do summer advising, Mr. Olejniczak said. Jane Clary (Economics) suggested that students should receive descriptions of these courses before their orientation. Charles Kaiser (Psychology) asked, first, whether there was an assessment plan built in (there was, to be done by the new committee), and whether there was money available to pay for the additional adjuncts that would be needed to staff the courses that would be vacated by faculty teaching in this program. Mr. Olejniczak said he did not foresee an increase in adjunct use, but said that he hoped the administration would be able to support this program financially, since they requested it in the first place. Mr. Kaiser also observed that he was glad to see that faculty developing new courses would receive course development grants; he wished such grants were available to other faculty as well.

Senators Lesses and Kinard both said they thought this would be an expensive program. The Provost spoke in favor of the seminar concept, but she noted that it would be costly and that she had asked the committee to prepare a budget for her. She added that she thought the course should be required of all freshmen, and that she affirmed the work of the committee, her concerns about cost notwithstanding. Frank Kinard said he thought such classes as those listed in the report (from UNC-Chapel Hill) could not possibly be taught to freshmen. Godwin Uwah (French) wanted to know how many faculty would be able to participate in the program, and whether this would in fact mean that more adjuncts would be teaching regular courses. If adjuncts could teach these courses, why shouldn’t they continue to teach the existing Freshman Seminar, he wondered. Vincent Spicer (Psychology) asked whether this course was voluntary or required at other schools. Mr. Olejniczak said this varied, and that such information was available on each school’s web page. George Pothering suggested that these courses need not be taught in smart classrooms, Susan Kattwinkel, a member of the committee, said that these freshman seminars were designed to introduce students to the liberal arts and sciences, and that this included introducing students to technological tools that could be demonstrated in smart classrooms. David Mann asked if the committee considered including the Convocation book/speaker as part of the first-year experience. Yes, Mr. Olejniczak said, but they ultimately decided not to limit the classes in that way; this would be an option, but not required. He concluded by inviting faculty to forward further comments to the Committee.
The Speaker recognized Michael Leitman of the Student Government Association. He reported to the Senate that the SGA had endorsed a resolution supporting faculty oversight over curriculum, a resolution which mirrored the one passed by the Senate in October in response to the proposed and then pre-emptively nixed LGBT minor. Mr. Leitman told the Senate that they had met with the Provost and asked her if the program was struck down because of political pressure. They then passed a resolution asking the administration to explain its reasons for stopping work on the minor. Mr. Leitman said he believed there was progress being made and that there would likely be a statement forthcoming soon. He told the Senate he wanted to let them know of the SGA’s activities “since we’ve worked on this together.”

The Speaker

The Speaker gave his own report. He reminded Senators of upcoming deadlines and dates (January 8th deadline for the next Senate agenda, which is before classes start; December 21st for the mid-year Commencement, with attendance always appreciated). The College is staging a day of service in honor of Martin Luther King, Jr. Day on January 19th, he noted. Teams of students, faculty, and staff will perform one-day service projects all over the Charleston area. Faculty are warmly encouraged to participate, whether through directing a student team, forming a faculty team, or joining all teams on the Cistern at 3 PM to celebrate Dr. King’s legacy of service.

Mr. Wilder also noted that the President is reviewing the statement of institutional “Core Values” that was developed as part of the Strategic Plan. Mr. Higdon wanted input from more faculty, and formed two focus groups which met in November. Faculty were chosen if they had served on the Strategic Planning Committee earlier, Mr. Wilder said. Probably there will be a chance for wider participation in the coming months, he added.

Finally, Mr. Wilder addressed procedural topics regarding Senate meetings. Noting that this month’s agenda packet was extremely large, he explained that the scanning of these documents could be very time-consuming and the turnaround time was sometimes barely sufficient to comply with By-Laws that require Senators to receive their packets one week in advance of the meeting. Should committees who generate lots of documents (Curriculum and Graduate Education) be required to submit all their forms electronically, he wondered. And how many Senators actually visit the website and read the scanned material? He invited comments on the process. Frank Kinard said that other schools had all of their forms online already, and that we should do the same.

New Business

Committee on Academic Standards

Deb Vaughn presented a proposal for the Academic Standards committee. This is a correction of an inconsistency they discovered in the College catalog, Ms. Vaughn said.
On page 58, the catalog says students can’t get placement credit for language proficiency if they are native speakers in that language. But on page 10, the catalog lists French, German, and Spanish as languages for which students receive credit and placement from CLEP (College Level Examination Program) exams. So students who are native speakers of these languages are now using CLEP to get placement credit for them. The Committee proposed the following change to the catalog:

Proposed addition to the CLEP section, 2003-2004 Undergraduate Catalog, p.10, under the line “Languages (French, German, and Spanish)”:

Note: No native speaker of a language other than English will be awarded foreign language placement credit for proficiency in his or her first language.

Godwin Uwah asked whether this proposed change was presented by the Division of Languages. Ms. Vaughn said it came from Professor Rickerson. Liz Martinez-Gibson (Hispanic Studies) said there had been no discussion of the proposal within the Division of Languages, and that it should be remanded to the committee so that they might consult with the Division. This motion was passed. Jane Clary then moved that Academic Standards reconsider whether we ought to give students credit hours for their language proficiency, and this motion was passed.

Committee on Graduate Education

Sarah Owens presented the following proposals for the Committee on Graduate Education. All were passed:

SPAN 630: Seminar in Hispanic Studies-- New Graduate Course Proposal
FREN 682 French Mass Media-- New Graduate Course Proposal
EDEE 699: Course Name Change to Clinical Practice in Elementary Education
EDEE 681: Course Name Change to Field Experience in Reading
EDEE 636: Course Name Change to Field Experience in Early Childhood Education
EDEE 698: Course Name Change to Clinical Practice in Early Childhood Education

Curriculum Committee

Norris Preyer presented the following proposals for this committee. All passed:

1. GEOL 213 Natural Hazards – New Course Proposal
2. GEOL 385 Internship – New Course Proposal
3. GEOL 338 Hydrogeology – Proposal to Change a Course
4. PSYC 389 Child Psychopathology – New Course Proposal
5. EDFS 350 Field Experience I in the Instruction of Students with Disabilities – New Course Proposal
6. EDFS 413 Field Experience II in the Instruction of Students with Disabilities – Proposal to Change a Course
7. EDFS 426 Language Development and Communication – New Course Proposal
8. B.S. in Special Education – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
9. PEHD 320 Special Topics: Sports and Exercise Nutrition – Information only
10. B.S. in Athletic Training – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
11. PEHD 245 Beginning Athletic Training – Proposal to Change a Course
12. PEHD 245-L Beginning Athletic Training Laboratory – Proposal to Change a Course
13. PEHD 345 Advanced Athletic Training – Proposal to Change a Course
14. PEHD 345L Advanced Athletic Training Laboratory – Proposal to Change a Course
15. PEHD 365 Identification and Treatment of Activity Related Injury and Illness – Proposal to Change a Course
16. PEHD 375 Clinical Education Experience in Athletic Training – Proposal to Change a Course
17. HEAL 333 Sports and Exercise Nutrition – New Course Proposal
18. PEHD 346 Athletic Injury Evaluation II – New Course Proposal
19. PEHD 346L Athletic Injury Evaluation II Laboratory – New Course Proposal
20. PEHD 433 Research Methods and Design in Health and Exercise Science – New Course Proposal
21. B.A. in Classics – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
22. Minor in Classics – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
23. SOCY 346 Environmental Sociology – New Course Proposal
24. ANTH 303 Paleolithic Archaeology – New Course Proposal
25. ANTH 304 Rise of Complex Civilization – New Course Proposal
26. ANTH 305 Prehistoric Ritual and Art – New Course Proposal
27. SOCY 348 Substance Abuse and Society – Proposal to Change a Course
28. SOCY 353 Sociology of Occupations and Professions – Proposal to Delete a Course

The final Curriculum proposal, for ISHP 101 (a zero-credit internship), generated considerable discussion. Glen Lesses objected to listing non-academic experiences on a transcript. Lydia Keadle (Career Services) addressed the Senate, explaining that some internships already show up on students’ transcripts under the designation TNIP, and that the current proposal would formalize this practice. Todd McNerny said that the current internships are not noted on transcripts by a course number. Susan Kattwinkel said she objected to using transcripts as resumes for students, and that this practice did not seem to allow the College accountability for these internships. Ms. Keadle said that several institutions are already noting such experiences on transcripts, and that this practice would also enable IRP to track data on rates of student participation in internships. Glen Lesses asked if there were any other way for such activity to be tallied besides giving the experience a course name and putting it on an academic transcript. Ms. Keadle replied that this made it much easier for IRP to report such data to CHE. Todd McNerney (Theater) said that by putting something on a transcript, we give it academic value, and that he had questions about this. He also said he had concerns about the College’s liability for these internships, and Ms. Keadle explained that in the case of internships, it is the employer and not the College that assumes all liability. A division of the house was called for, and the vote taken was 15 in favor and 19 against; thus, the ISHP 101 proposal
was rejected.

Constituent Concerns

Bishop Hunt (At Large) spoke in protest of the recent “Smoke-Out” event in which motorcycles created deafening noise levels on Glebe and George Streets. Meg Cormack said that the Welfare Committee had dealt with this issue 6 years ago. Mr. Hunt said that during this semester there were a total of 9 amplified events which prevented work in offices and classrooms along George Street. The Speaker responded that he had forwarded complaints about noise to Jeri Cabot, who discussed them with Student Affairs. This office has apologized for the noise of the motorcycles, and promises to provide “advance notice” of future noisy events.

Marion Doig (At Large) said he did not recall the faculty ever agreeing to have non-academic activities noted on transcripts. Could the Committee on Academic Standards look into this, he asked? The Speaker said he would direct the Committee to do so.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary
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The Senate met Tuesday, November 4, 2003 in ECTR 116 at 5:00 p.m. Sixty-four Senators attended. Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order and began by noting several corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting. The October minutes were then approved as corrected.

Reports

The Speaker

Mr. Wilder informed the Senate that he had attended the October Board of Trustees meeting, where the Master Planners presented their final draft to the Board. This report, which has also been released to the public, is a comprehensive, long-range plan for the physical facilities of the College, including some items that would be implemented ten or more years later. The Speaker added that at the Board meeting, the President gave a report which included two items of special interest to faculty. The President reported that the plans to decrease enrollment, as part of the Fourth-Century Initiative, continue, and that he is now particularly interested in being able to predict and manage enrollment more precisely, by being able to project acceptance and retention rates more accurately. The President wishes to keep statistics on in-state versus out-of-state students, and to grow the College’s applicant pool. He also is concerned about students’ own retention of their scholarships, since this affects the College’s retention of these students. Second, the President reported that given the current budget shortfalls in the state, there is no funding yet in place for the new Science Center; thus he is interested in studying the feasibility of a phased approach to funding. Through such an approach, the College could construct portions of the Center in stages, as money became available, rather than waiting until the whole amount was accumulated.

The Speaker also told Senators that he had received a letter from Pamela Isacco Niesslein regarding Freshman Seminar (FRSR 101). This course was discussed at the September Senate meeting, and in response to the issues raised at this meeting, Ms. Niesslein had written a letter to the Speaker and sent copies to the chair of the Academic Planning Committee and the Provost. This letter will be placed on the Senate website, Mr. Wilder told the Senate; it addresses the questions of who teaches FRSR 101, how those teachers are trained and supervised, and what the content of the course includes.

The Speaker also announced that the following weekend (November 7-9) was both Family Weekend and Alumni Fall Festival. All events are open to faculty, he noted. Mr. Wilder also announced the receptions the President was hosting in November for students, organized by class. All events (which will also be announced by email) will be at 4 p.m. in Alumni Hall, and faculty are invited. Another upcoming event, the Speaker noted for Senators’ information, will be a day of student service performed on the Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday in January. Lauren Collier, coordinator of Service Learning, is organizing this event, and Mr. Wilder encouraged faculty to contact her if we know of any possible one-day service projects that students could undertake for this event.

Next, the Speaker addressed a few housekeeping issues. He reminded Senators and
departments that Senators were elected to serve out a fixed term. If someone who has been elected must resign (due to sabbatical, schedule conflicts, etc.), a new Senator must be elected to serve the remainder of that term. There are no provisions in the by-laws for proxy, temporary, or substitute Senators; the Speaker reminded everyone that they could not vote unless they were the elected Senator from their department or from the faculty at-large. He also reminded everyone of rules for Senate discussion (in which all faculty have floor privileges). He thanked everyone for continuing the practice of identifying themselves and their department as they began speaking. Mr. Wilder also noted that in order to allow everyone to participate, he would be imposing a 5-minute time limit on any person’s comments, and would restrict each person to 2 chances to speak during a meeting, unless someone were asked a question and needed a chance to respond. Only Senators could cast votes, and these were normally done on a voice vote. Senators may call for a division of the house (show of hands), or for a secret ballot, and such requests require a motion and a second, and are amendable, but not debatable.

**Old Business**

Resolution on Diversity
The Speaker recognized Chris Hope (At-large), sponsor of a resolution that was being discussed in the October meeting. The resolution had been amended at the October meeting. Mr. Wilder reminded Senators that in October, the Senate voted to consider the two paragraphs of the resolution separately, so the discussion would focus on one paragraph at a time. Ms. Hope first announced that she was offering an amended version of the resolution she had presented in October. The resolution as the Senate amended it in October read as follows.

A Resolution Concerning Diversity And The Hiring of the College’s New Senior Vice President for Student Affairs

**Whereas**, The College of Charleston is committed to developing a learning environment that celebrates the potential of all the members of the college community as that potential relates to the institution’s mission to achieve excellence in teaching, research, and community service; and,

**Whereas**, The College of Charleston has embarked on the "The Fourth Century Initiative: A Quest for Excellence," which seeks to make the school "a nationally preeminent public liberal arts and sciences university";

**Whereas**, Diversity is a requisite hallmark of any public institution concerned with modeling responsible hiring practices that reflect excellence and equity; and,

**Whereas**, The student body of the College of Charleston reflects a rich mix of multicultural, multiracial and multiethnic groups;

**Whereas**, The College of Charleston has used diversity as a tool to break the gender barrier in the past few years, by hiring and promoting women to key positions; and
Whereas, There are no minority members of the Board of Trustees, nor at the Senior Vice President level, nor among the Deans of the Schools;

Whereas, The aforementioned bodies are making key decisions for a multi-racial, multiethnic and multicultural student body, and

Whereas, Expanding educational opportunities for minorities in higher education sets a good example for students and publicly demonstrates the College’s commitment to a diverse workforce; therefore be it

Resolved, The College of Charleston Faculty Senate strongly urges the President and the search committee for the Senior Vice President of Student Affairs to take all necessary steps to make the applicant pool as diverse as possible, actively recruiting historically underrepresented populations and, be it further

Resolved, That the College of Charleston Faculty Senate encourages the President and the Board of Trustees to use this opportunity to make an appointment that best serves the interests of a diverse student body in order to help foster a sense of equality and balance at the Senior Vice President level; we believe this action will ultimately be in the best interests of our students and of the College.

Dave Marshall, Department of Communication
Resolution sponsored by At-large Senator Chris Hope

The new version of the resolution that Ms. Hope was now presenting read as follows.

College of Charleston Faculty Senate
A Resolution Concerning Diversity: Recruiting and Hiring

Whereas, The College of Charleston is committed to developing a learning environment that celebrates the potential of all the members of the college community as that potential relates to the institution’s mission to achieve excellence in teaching, research, and community service; and,

Whereas, The College of Charleston has embarked on the "The Fourth Century Initiative: A Quest for Excellence," which seeks to make the school "a nationally preeminent public liberal arts and sciences university."

Whereas, Diversity is a requisite hallmark of any public institution concerned with modeling responsible hiring practices that reflect excellence and equity; and,

Whereas, The student body of the College of Charleston reflects a rich mix of multicultural, multiracial and multiethnic groups,

Whereas, The College of Charleston has used diversity as a tool to break the gender barrier in the past few years, by hiring and promoting women to key positions,
Whereas, The College has adopted in its strategic plan the goals of increased diversity for its students, faculty, and staff,

Whereas, Expanding educational opportunities for minorities in higher education, sets a good example for students and publicly demonstrates the College’s commitment to a diverse workforce, therefore be it

Resolved, The College of Charleston Faculty Senate strongly urges the President and all institutional search committees to take all necessary steps to make the applicant pool as diverse as possible, actively recruiting historically underrepresented populations and, be it further

Resolved, That the College of Charleston Faculty Senate encourages the President and the Board of Trustees to make appointments that best serve the interests of a diverse institution.

After presenting the new version of the resolution, Ms. Hope then recognized Dave Marshall, the author of the resolution, and Mr. Marshall thanked her for her support of his effort. He noted that he was also appreciative of support from the President’s office, where he had discussed his resolution in detail. He said he wished to amend this resolution in order to take the focus off the hiring for a particular position, and refocus it on the College’s mission as a whole. This resolution reflects the College’s strategic plan and the core values the institution should have, Mr. Marshall said. “We as a faculty need to say publicly that we support the President” in his efforts to create a more diverse institution. Mr. Marshall added that he hoped the faculty could help dispel the myth that a minority hire might be less than excellent; this is “something we haven’t publicly done,” he said. Finally, he added, it is good for our students to see diverse people in these important positions at the College.

Mr. Wilder then invited discussion of the first paragraph of the resolution. Tom Kunkle (At-large) said, “I love it. I call the question.” Mr. Kunkle’s motion was seconded and passed, and then the faculty voted on the first resolution, which also passed. Next, Ms. Hope introduced the second paragraph, noting the wording that had been broadened from a focus on the Senior Vice President search, and now applied to the institution as a whole. Mr. Wilder asked if there were any objections to the Senate considering this modified paragraph; there were none. Discussion followed. Frank Kinard (At-large) wondered if anyone could give him an example of an appointment that did not serve the best interests of the institution. Frank Morris (Classics) said that earlier this fall, there were students here at the College whose interests were not represented or served by the administration when the LGBT minor was discussed and rejected before being formally proposed. Marion Doig (At-large) said he thought the resolution was pointless but did no harm. Alex Kasman (Mathematics) objected to some of the language in the new resolution, which he thought too vague. Tom Kunkle called the question. This motion was seconded and passed, and then the second paragraph of the resolution was passed on a voice vote.

Next the Senate considered the preamble to Mr. Marshall’s resolution. Chris Hope noted
that there were also modifications to these “Whereas” paragraphs, removing one paragraph that had been in the original and changing the wording in others. Glen Lesses (Philosophy) asked why the Senate was debating the preamble after the resolutions had been approved, and the Parliamentarian, George Pothering, explained that this was procedurally correct, since there was no point in tinkering with preambles for resolutions that were not passed. Regarding the preamble itself, Mr. Marshall noted that he had wanted to change the title of the resolution so that it would not refer to a specific search, and that he had also included a reference to the College’s Strategic Plan. Darryl Phillips (Classics, German, and Japanese) said he was sorry to see the removal of the “Whereas” paragraph that noted that the College had no members of minorities on the Board of Trustees or in senior administrative positions. He asked why that language had been removed. Mr. Marshall replied that he had originally wanted to address a time-sensitive hire, but that now he wanted to present the issue more broadly, in hopes that it would be supported over a longer period of time. Elise Jorgens, Provost, spoke in favor of Mr. Marshall’s resolution, noting that its current wording reflected the commitment of the College. The President had asked her to tell the Faculty that he supports this resolution. Alex Kasman asked to remove the prefix “multi” from the words in the fourth paragraph. Ms. Hope accepted this as a friendly amendment, as well as Rich Bodek (History)’s suggestion to remove a comma from the seventh paragraph. Frank Kinard then commented that people who had “been on this campus for awhile” know that “we’ve been doing this [seeking diversity in hiring] for a long time.” Andrew Sobiesuo (At-large) said he had been at the College for 13 years and he had seen some very positive changes, thanks to the Administration’s commitment to diversity. The resolution doesn’t deny this, he said, but it’s important that the faculty go on record in endorsement of this effort. Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) said he thought the paragraph stating that the College was a “rich mix” of ethnic and cultural groups was a little more optimistic than accurate, and he asked for a Senator to amend this with the adverb “increasingly.” Bev Diamond (Mathematics) made this suggestion, which the sponsor accepted as friendly. The Senate then voted to accept the preamble, and the motion passed on a unanimous voice vote. The full text of the resolution, in its final form, follows.

College of Charleston Faculty Senate
A Resolution Concerning Diversity: Recruiting and Hiring

Whereas, The College of Charleston is committed to developing a learning environment that celebrates the potential of all the members of the college community as that potential relates to the institution’s mission to achieve excellence in teaching, research, and community service; and,

Whereas, The College of Charleston has embarked on the "The Fourth Century Initiative: A Quest for Excellence," which seeks to make the school "a nationally preeminent public liberal arts and sciences university."

Whereas, Diversity is a requisite hallmark of any public institution concerned with modeling responsible hiring practices that reflect excellence and equity; and,
Whereas, The student body of the College of Charleston reflects an increasingly rich mix of cultural, racial and ethnic groups,

Whereas, The College of Charleston has used diversity as a tool to break the gender barrier in the past few years, by hiring and promoting women to key positions,

Whereas, The College has adopted in its strategic plan the goals of increased diversity for its students, faculty, and staff,

Whereas, Expanding educational opportunities for minorities in higher education sets a good example for students and publicly demonstrates the College’s commitment to a diverse workforce, therefore be it

Resolved, The College of Charleston Faculty Senate strongly urges the President and all institutional search committees to take all necessary steps to make the applicant pool as diverse as possible, actively recruiting historically underrepresented populations and, be it further

Resolved, That the College of Charleston Faculty Senate encourages the President and the Board of Trustees to make appointments that best serve the interests of a diverse institution.  

New Business

Sarah Owen, for the Committee on Graduate Education, presented the following proposals.

1. EVSS 638 - Introduction to Hydrogeology (New course)  
2. Option of a new African American concentration in the M.A. English program (proposal to change a graduate program.)  
3. ENGL 570 - Topics in African American Literary Genres (New Course)  
4. ENGL 571 - Topics in African American Literary Periods (New Course)  
5. ENGL 572 - Topics in Major African American Writers (New Course)  
6. ENGL 573 - Special Topics in African American Literature (New Course)  
7. ENGL 702 - Internship

Rohn England (Mathematics) asked why the proposal for EVSS 638 included a proposal to cross-list the course with an undergraduate 400-level course, when that 400-level course did not yet exist. Discussion confirmed that the course had not yet been approved by the Curriculum Committee, so the Senate agreed to vote only on the course itself, not on the accompanying proposal to cross-list it. EVSS 638 was then approved. Discussion turned to the new African American concentration in the M.A. in English program. Bev Diamond asked if the optional course in another discipline had to be at the graduate level. Joe Kelly, director of the M.A. program, said that it did. Bill Moore (Political Science) asked if this would also have to be approved by the Citadel faculty, since this M.A. comes from both institutions, and Mr. Kelly confirmed that it would. This proposal
Norris Preyer, chair of the Curriculum Committee, offered the following proposals. Following some clarification of the reason for the name changes for courses in the Criminal Justice minor, all these proposals passed.

1. F03-06 JPNS 343 Advanced Japanese Conversation and Composition – New Course Proposal
2. F03-07 Minor in Creative Writing – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
3. F03-08 ENGL 402 Advanced Workshop in Poetry Writing – New Course Proposal
4. F03-09 ENGL 403 Advanced Workshop in Fiction Writing – New Course Proposal
5. F03-10 Interdisciplinary Minor in Criminal Justice – Proposal to Change Requirements
6. F03-11 CRLS 300 Special Topics in Crime, Law, and Society – New Course Proposal
7. F03-12 CRLS 400 Internship – New Course Proposal
8. F03-13 LIBR 101 Introduction to Bibliography and Research Methods – Proposal to Delete a Course

Mr. Preyer also presented the Senate with a topic that had come from Lauren Collier, Service Learning Coordinator, Office of Student Affairs. This office would like a way to designate existing courses that contain a service-learning component, so that when students register for them on Cougar Trail, they will be aware of this aspect of the course. Hugh Wilder recognized Ms. Collier, who explained that a number of faculty had told her that since courses with a service-learning component require different things of students than a traditional course, students need to be aware of this requirement when they register for the class. She asked the Senate whether it would be permissible for the Registrar to go ahead and make this designation (perhaps through an SL attached to the course number), or whether such a designation would need to be requested by a faculty committee. Frank Kinard wondered if there were any guidelines on what sort of work was permissible for a student to do in such a course. Glen Lesses said, “I’d like to reflect on this and see whether I have any objections to it.” He moved to table discussion of this topic until the next meeting. The motion passed. Bev Diamond then asked if Ms. Collier might provide the Senate with examples of service-learning courses, since some faculty are unfamiliar with the concept.

The Speaker called for constituent concerns. Hearing none, he entertained a motion to adjourn, which was passed at 6:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, October 7, 2003, for over 2 hours. 59 Senators attended. Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order and invited the Senate to make corrections to the September Senate minutes. No corrections were offered, and the minutes were approved.

Reports

Fall 2003 Enrollment

Bill Lindstrom, Vice President for Enrollment Management, provided the faculty with many statistics about the College’s current enrollment. He noted that there are a total of 180 fewer undergraduate students at the College than there were last fall (10105 F02, 9925 F03), and that the College’s goal was to go down to 9700 students. Another goal that is part of the Fourth-Century Initiative is a rise in the freshman retention rate, which for years has stayed around 80%. Last year it was over 81% and the hope is that this fall over 84% of current freshmen will remain. He noted that the minority student retention rate is higher than that of the overall population at over 88%. Another goal of the Fourth-Century Initiative is to raise the number of students who have graduated within six years of beginning at the College; currently this is 55.7 percent. Good news is that the SAT average for this freshman class is 1205 (up from 1185 for last year’s freshman class), the highest average of any public institution in SC. The College is now in a position to accept fewer of the students who apply (65% in F01, 59% in F02), and more of these accepted students are choosing to come here (36% in F01, 41% in F02).

Mr. Lindstrom informed the Senate that of the 1088 freshmen from South Carolina in this fall’s class, 1077 are receiving a scholarship funded by the state lottery. “We want them to keep those scholarships,” Mr. Lindstrom said, adding that it will help students to have midterm grades posted by faculty. Responding to questions by Senators, Mr. Lindstrom noted that provisional students receive extra support from the College, but that their retention rate is not as high as the general population. He also affirmed that these students are not included in computing our average SAT score, but said that if they were, the total average would only go down 8-10 points, and that every institution keeps those numbers separate in their statistics. When asked what students have to do to retain a lottery scholarship, Mr. Lindstrom said they needed to maintain a 3.0 grade point average and complete 30 semester hours in the academic year.

The Speaker, acknowledging the large number of items on the agenda, dispensed with his own report, but briefly announced the Ice Cream Socials being held this week, to which all faculty were invited, and reminded Senators that a consultant for the search for a Senior Vice-President for Student Affairs would be on campus soon. This has been announced in a recent email to all faculty. The Speaker urged faculty to RSVP to this message if they are interested in meeting with this consultant.

Old Business

Mr. Wilder recognized Deb Vaughn for the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards, explaining that this committee had brought a final exam policy to the Senate
last spring, and the Senate sent the policy back to the committee for further work. Ms. Vaughan presented the revised proposal, as follows:

Modified Final Exam Policy:

A. Undergraduate Catalog – Include this policy under section for Final Examinations.

B. Faculty-Administration Manual, Section IV, T, 11: -- Include this policy under this section.

1. A final evaluation will be given in each section of each course each semester. This final evaluation will take a form appropriate to the course, but should be an assignment, exam or performance completed by the student.

2. For courses that choose a final exam (in class written, take home, or electronically submitted) as their final evaluation, this exam will be given or due during the scheduled final exam period. For this policy, any exam that counts for more than 15% of the final grade and is the last exam given during the term (including a comprehensive final) is considered a final exam and will be given during the scheduled final exam period. Exceptions to this rule will include (if final exam is chosen):
   - Internships
   - Independent Studies, Bachelor’s Essays, Tutorials
   - Performance Courses
   - Student Teaching
   - Laboratory sections that are part of a 4 credit course

3. The Syllabus for a course according to the CHE guidelines will serve as a contract between the student and the instructor. This syllabus should be distributed in the first week of the term. Any assignment that counts for more than 15% of the final grade and is a last assignment of the term (excluding exams) due during the final two weeks of class is considered a final evaluation. For any course that has a final evaluation other than a final exam (as defined above), the schedule of due dates for this assignment on the syllabus is considered a contract.

4. Any change in dates for a final examination or due dates for a final evaluation, as defined above, will require permission of the chair of the department or program director and notification at least 2 weeks prior to the final class day for students.

5. Students have the right to grieve violations of these policies, according to the procedure described in the current Student Handbook and Faculty-Administration Manual. Such grievances should be filed with the chair of the Department as soon as the student finds out about the violation, but not after the day prior to the first day of final exams.
Ms. Vaughn then presented the committee’s rationale for the revisions it made to the policy. Its purpose was to “prevent conflicts for students whose professors give exams outside of scheduled exam times, to emphasize the importance of the scheduled exam period so that students might take it more seriously,” and to “enhance current exam policy.” At the March 2003 Senate meeting, Senators had said the policy needed to take into account take-home exams, the electronic delivery of exams, and other ambiguous phrases. They also suggested that a student grievance procedure could be included, that the Committee should specify where the policy would be placed (Faculty Manual, website, etc), and that the Committee should be wary of added more bureaucracy via this policy. All these things, Ms. Vaughn said, led to the present revised policy.

Senators asked for clarification of the policy. Is a final exam required, Sue Turner (Hispanic Studies) wondered. Vince Spicer (Psychology), who also serves on the Academic Standards committee, said that if the paper is the last evaluation of the class, it should be due during the exam period. Glen Lesses (Philosophy/Religious Studies) said this policy was a better one than the one that had been presented last Spring, but that he was still going to vote against it because it seemed to him to do nothing that was not already covered in the present exam policy. Vince Spicer pointed out that the proposed policy includes a clear process by which students may file a grievance if a professor changes the exam policy. Jane Clary (Economics/Finance) said she believed students needed to be protected from such an event, but that this proposed policy was too bureaucratic. Charles Kaiser (Psychology) wondered if this policy would prevent a professor from putting off the due date of a final paper, even if this were done to help the students, and he said he thought faculty needed more flexibility than this policy would allow. Mark Lazzaro (Biology) said that this proposed policy would be ignored anyway. “If you have tenure and ignore this policy, nothing will happen to you.” The only way to enforce this policy, he said, would be through the attention of a department chair. Meg Cormack (Philosophy/Religious Studies) asked that the word “grieve” be changed to “report,” which Ms. Vaughn accepted as a friendly amendment. Norris Preyer (Physics/Astronomy) asked if labs would be required to give an exam under this policy. Ms. Vaughn said that they would. Finally, Senators questioned current policy regarding changing an exam time. Frank Morris (Classics) noted that the manual says that a Dean must approve a change. Lynn Cherry, speaking for Undergraduate Studies, said that the section in the manual on changing exam times applied only to students, not faculty, but other Senators said the language in the manual permitted faculty to change their exam times if they had permission from the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Mr. Wilder asked if there were any more comments, then called for a vote. The policy was rejected on a voice vote.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

Norris Preyer, chair of the Curriculum Committee, presented the following items for the Senate’s consideration. All were approved.

1. S03-07 RELS 225 The Jewish Tradition – Proposal to Change a Course
2. S03-08 JWST 200 Introduction to Jewish Studies – Proposal to Change a Course
3. S03-09 B.A. in Religious Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
4. S03-10 EDEE 323 Mathematics: The Language of Logic – Proposal to Change a Course
5. S03-11 B.A. in Psychology – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
6. S03-12 HIST 254 History of England to the 18th Century – Proposal to Delete a Course
7. S03-13 HIST 257 Naval History – Proposal to Delete a Course
8. S03-16 GEOL 207 Marine Geology – Proposal to Change a Course
9. S03-17 GEOL 210 Stratigraphy and Sedimentation – Proposal to Change a Course
10. S03-18 GEOL 212 Mineralogy – Proposal to Change a Course
11. S03-19 GEOL 225 Geomorphology – Proposal to Change a Course
12. S03-20 GEOL 232 Introduction to Petrology – Proposal to Change a Course
13. S03-21 B.S. in Geology and Environmental Geosciences – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
14. S03-22 B.A. in Geology and Environmental Geosciences – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
15. S03-24 ARTM 360 Building Participation in the Arts – New Course Proposal
16. S03-25 COMM 210 Introduction to Communication Studies – Proposal to Change a Course
17. S03-26 Media Studies Minor in Communications – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
18. F03-01 PSYC 387 Clinical Neuropsychology – New Course Proposal
19. F03-02 B.A. in Psychology – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
20. F03-03 PSYC 307 Abnormal Psychology - Proposal to Change a Course
21. F03-04 PSYC 386 Drugs, Brain, and Behavior – Proposal to Change a Course
22. F03-05 PSYC 382 Visual Perception – Proposal to Delete a Course

Committee On Graduate Education
Sarah Owens, chair, presented the following items. The Senate approved all.
New Course Proposal – CSIS 654 - Software Requirements Analysis and Specifications
New Course Proposal – SPAN 615 - Topics in Latin American Culture and Civilization
Program Change Proposal – Degree Requirements for the Master of Arts in Teaching – Special Education program.

Resolution on Faculty and Curriculum
At-large Senator Todd Grantham presented the following motion on behalf of faculty member Larry Krasnoff.

It is hereby resolved that the faculty Senate affirms the principle that the content of our curriculum is primarily an academic matter. Decisions about the content of the curriculum, including decisions about what majors and minors to offer, are to be made after full, free and open deliberation of the academic merits of any proposals submitted to the appropriate faculty committees and to the faculty Senate. Such decisions are not to be determined by external political pressure, and especially not when that pressure is based on intolerance or bigotry.
Mr. Grantham’s motion was seconded and the floor opened for discussion. Mr. Krasnoff read a statement on why he worded the resolution as he did. He stated that while, in a sense, the principle of allowing faculty to judge academic programs on academic grounds seemed so obvious as to be unnecessary, the faculty had not been allowed to do so in the case of the minor that the LGBT steering committee had been exploring. Mr. Krasnoff noted that the resolution does not prevent the administration from making a decision not to approve a program of study, for whatever reason it chooses. The resolution simply asks that the administration not prevent faculty from debating any proposed course and offering its opinion to the administration before the administration makes the final decision. He also asserted that the political concerns that the administration had in this instance were in a different category than other political considerations. This minor was rejected before it could be offered “because of intolerance of homosexuality.” He asked faculty to stand up against this threat to academic freedom.

A lengthy discussion ensued. SGA representative Michael Leitman said the SGA was preparing a resolution that would mirror the language in this one, and that he hoped the Senate would support this one today Susan Farrell (English) read a statement from faculty in Women’s Studies, the minor she directs.

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

The Women's Studies Program at the College of Charleston affirms the principle that a liberal arts education is not simply a matter of acquiring skills, but is also (and most importantly) about deepening one's understanding of oneself and one's relation to the world. Accordingly, we believe that a sustained program of study concerning sexual minorities could indeed be in the best interests of the college.

Just as Women's Studies raises uncomfortable questions about gender roles, the status of women, the rights of women (and men) in different cultural settings, the role (seen and unseen) of women in history, and in general the construction of feminine and masculine identities, so too might an LGBT minor raise uncomfortable questions (about the role that sexuality plays in our self-understanding, about the rights accorded and denied to people on the basis of their sexuality, about the construction of gender around the issue of sexuality). We affirm that such a minor could well ask questions that are currently not being asked of our students and expose them to a vibrant and growing field of scholarship that they would not otherwise see.

We firmly believe that the issues surrounding an LGBT minor are worthy of academic debate, and we believe the faculty deserves the right to make the case for such a minor.

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

Darryl Phillips (Classics) spoke in favor of the motion, noting that the Senate was “like the Roman Senate under the emperors” in that nothing we did could control the actions of the administration. Provost Elise Jorgens said she wanted to “affirm my deep conviction” that curriculum has to come from the faculty. Mr. Phillips was correct, she added, in saying that the faculty may propose a course, and the administration may then decide it’s not in the school’s best interest to approve it. “I don’t have anything to quibble with” on this resolution, she said.
Frank Kinard (At-large) stated that the resolution was unnecessary. He said that during his years at the College, there has never been any political pressure put on any faculty member for proposing any course. Rich Bodek (History), speaking in favor of the resolution, said that he did not know whether he would support a minor in LGBT studies, but that he believed it was the faculty’s right to consider such a question. David Mann (Political Science) said the resolution was unnecessary. We don’t need to reaffirm what already exists, he said. Faculty do not debate curriculum when it is presented to the Senate anyway. Also, “we have to remember where we are and we have to remember who feeds us.”

Kyle Morris, student and president of the Gay-Straight Alliance, urged faculty to support the resolution. She noted that the Alliance has over 70 student members, and that it has heard from other organizations that are planning to offer their support to the College if such a minor were proposed and then our state funding was threatened. People are ready to offer both financial and legal support to the College, she said, if the state tries to prevent such a program from being offered.

Richard Nunan, a member of the LGBT Steering Committee, responded to Frank Kinard’s earlier comment about faculty never having had academic freedom threatened before, saying, “I guess this is a first,” and that this was why the resolution had become necessary. Rohn England (Mathematics) asked Mr. Nunan why the Committee didn’t go ahead and submit its proposal to Curriculum. Mr. Nunan replied that there was little point in pursuing a proposal when they knew in advance that it would not be approved by the administration. Tom Kunkle (Mathematics) then asked the Provost if the administration would veto such a program if it did get approved by the Senate. Ms. Jorgens replied that the position expressed in the letter that she and the President had sent to the newspaper remained correct.

Further discussion questioned the words “external political pressure” and “intolerance and bigotry,” with some Senators wondering if this needed a special mention. Mr. Krasnoff said that since intolerance had been what brought pressure on the administration, the statement should be included. “I don’t know what reasons the administration had” for nixing this proposed minor, he said; he knew only that “people who don’t like homosexuality, and people who were concerned about people who don’t like homosexuality, complained, and those complaints won the day.” Frank Kinard said that the faculty had already failed in this case by not sending the proposal to the Curriculum Committee. David Mann stated that the entire resolution was “hypothetical.” Bev Diamond (At-large) said, “The situation is not.” Glenn Lesses said he thought the resolution was important because the “kind of political pressure” that closed off discussion of this minor now “seems to me to have an entrée.” An amendment to change the wording to “internal and external political pressure” failed on a voice vote. Michael Leitman noted that since the Senate was only an advisory body, the wording was not terribly important since the resolution was not going to create any policy. He also said he did not think faculty had failed, but that the administration had taken away their right to bring the proposal before the Senate.

Sheila Seaman asked for a secret ballot. Her motion was seconded and passed on a voice vote. Ballots for the main motion were then distributed, and the votes were tabulated immediately: 35 votes for the resolution, 16 against, and one abstention.
Resolution on Diversity and the New Senior Vice President for Student Affairs

Chris Hope (At-large) moved that the Senate adopt the following resolution, written by Dave Marshall.

A Resolution Concerning Diversity And The Hiring of the College’s New Senior Vice President for Student Affairs

Whereas, The College of Charleston is committed to developing a learning environment that celebrates the potential of all the members of the college community as that potential relates to the institution’s mission to achieve excellence in teaching, research, and community service; and,

Whereas, The College of Charleston has embarked on the "The Fourth Century Initiative: A Quest for Excellence," which seeks to make the school "a nationally preeminent public liberal arts and sciences university";

Whereas, Diversity is a requisite hallmark of any public institution concerned with modeling responsible hiring practices that reflect excellence and equity; and,

Whereas, The student body of the College of Charleston reflects a rich mix of multicultural, multiracial and multiethnic groups;

Whereas, The College of Charleston has used diversity as a tool to break the gender barrier in the past few years, by hiring and promoting women to key positions; and

Whereas, There are no minority members of the Board of Trustees, nor at the Senior Vice President level, nor among the Deans of the Schools;

Whereas, The aforementioned bodies are making key decisions for a multi-racial, multiethnic and multicultural student body, and

Whereas, Expanding educational opportunities for minorities in higher education sets a good example for students and publicly demonstrates the College’s commitment to a diverse workforce; therefore be it

Resolved, The College of Charleston Faculty Senate strongly urges the President and the search committee for the Senior Vice President of Student Affairs to take all necessary steps to make the applicant pool as diverse as possible, actively recruiting historically underrepresented populations and, be it further

Resolved, That the College of Charleston Faculty Senate encourages the President and the Board of Trustees to use this opportunity to make an appointment that best reflects the interests of a diverse student body in order to help foster a sense equality and balance at the Senior Vice President level; we believe this action will ultimately be in the best interests of our students and of the College.
The motion was seconded, and the discussion began with Mr. Marshall explaining the circumstances that led him to draft this resolution. At the beginning of the semester he had spoken to an African American student who had mentioned that at Convocation, the Board of Trustees and senior administrators were seated on the stage, and she had noticed that every person was white. Mr. Marshall said that “frankly, I was horrified” to realize that the student was correct. The leaders implementing the Fourth-Century Initiative looked very much like the leadership of centuries long past, he said. His resolution asks that the search committee for this senior administrative position recruit a diverse pool of candidates, spending as much time as they need to do so. We need to show our students, who are future leaders, a diverse administration as a positive example for them to emulate, he said.

Jane Clary noted that when she served on the Provost search committee, the President charged them with leaving no stone unturned in building a diverse pool of applicants. Mr. Marshall said he believes the President is sincerely committed to diversity, and that he thinks the Senate should endorse this resolution as a way of “publicly, loudly” affirming this. Bishop Hunt (At-large) offered a friendly amendment to the resolution, adding the word “of” between “sense” and “equality,” a suggestion which was accepted as friendly. Chris Lamb (Communication) spoke in favor of the amendment, calling it “an opportunity for us to go beyond what we’ve done” at the College.

Reid Wiseman spoke against the amendment, saying that no “so-called minority” applying for a position at the College would ever be excluded on the basis of race. The resolution, he said, “is terribly biased and racist in itself.” Marion Doig (At-large) wondered why there was a need for the resolution, if the College is already seeking to recruit diverse applicants? Mr. Marshall said he believed that the problem at the College was not one of racism, but of lack of representation. “Look at the room!” he said. Sometimes committees need to search longer in order to get a desirable pool of applicants. This resolution, he said, would affirm that process.

Virginia Friedman said that she is chairing the search committee for this position, and that the President has specifically charged the committee to recruit the most diverse pool of candidates possible. “You’re all invited to be part of that process,” she added. Tom Kunkle asked if the resolution were instructing the committee to hire a minority candidate. Mr. Marshall said this was not what it said, because we don’t know in advance who will be the best candidate. A friendly amendment that changed the word “reflects” in the second part of the two-part resolution to “serves” was accepted. (The phrase became “an appointment that best serves the interests of a diverse student body.”) Sue Turner said that most people in the room seemed to be in favor of what the President was already doing, so she believed they should support this resolution. Christine Moore (Computer Science) asked whether there was more the College could be doing to “open up” the applicant pool. Mr. Marshall said that he believed search committees in the past haven’t known where to look for qualified candidates, and that the College has not made a statement like this that would encourage a qualified candidate to accept an offer. Tom Kunkle repeated his question about whether the resolution specified that the new Senior Vice-President would be a minority, something he did not endorse. Glen Lesses said we should not commit ourselves to extending the search indefinitely. Susan Rozzi (Physical
Education and Health) said that the policy of seeking diverse applicants had been strongly communicated to her department in their recent search for a chair. Craig Plante (Biology) said the wording of the resolution meant that we were saying this position would be filled by a minority candidate. Mr. Marshall said he felt the resolution would affirm the President. Michael Leitman suggested that the Senate might wish to change the phrase “strongly resolve” to “strongly support,” so the resolution would sound more affirmative and less adversarial towards the President.

A motion was made to consider the two resolutions separately, and this passed on a voice vote. David Mann moved to adjourn, and the motion was seconded. The Parliamentarian reminded Senators that a motion to adjourn was not debatable. Mr. Mann’s motion passed on a voice vote. The Senate adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary

**Fall Semester Faculty Senate Schedule:**
First Tuesdays • 5:00pm • 116 Education Center
November 4 (agenda deadline 3:00 pm, Thursday, October 23)
December 2 (agenda deadline 3:00 pm, Thursday, November 20)
Minutes of the Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate met for over an hour on Tuesday, September 2, 2003 in ECTR 116. 58 Senators attended.

Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order. He welcomed Senators to the academic year’s first meeting, and announced that George Pothering (Computer Science) had graciously agreed to serve this year as Parliamentarian. Mr. Wilder also acknowledged Debbie Vaughn, who will continue to serve this year as the Senate Webmaster and to provide technical assistance in displaying agenda items and other documents during Senate meetings. He thanked both faculty members for their generous assistance to the Senate.

The minutes from the April 2003 Senate meeting were approved, and the Speaker then invited nominations for Speaker Pro Tem (a Senator who will preside over Senate meetings if the Speaker is unable to do so). Glenn Lesses (Philosophy and Religious Studies) nominated Bev Diamond (Mathematics). No other nominations were forthcoming, and Ms. Diamond was elected by acclamation. (“Stay healthy,” she admonished the Speaker.)

The Faculty Secretary circulated the roster for Senators to sign, and asked that they update any information that needed correcting. She reminded Senators that they are always elected to serve a specific term of two years, and that if a Senator could not complete that term (because of going on sabbatical, for example), then a replacement Senator would be elected who would complete only the remainder of that term.

Reports

Provost
The Speaker welcomed Dr. Elise Jorgens, the new Provost, who has come to the College from Western Michigan University. There she was a member of the English Department, a Dean, and, most recently, Interim Provost. Ms. Jorgens greeted Senators, explaining that she simply wanted to let them know that she looked forward to working with them. She added that she is delighted to be joining in the “exciting work going on at the College.”

Business Affairs
Mr. Gary McCombs, Senior Vice-President for Business Affairs, along with Sam Jones, Director of the College Budget, made a presentation on the College’s current budget. “I told Sam to be as positive as possible,” Mr. McCombs began, and Mr. Jones explained that, therefore, the presentation would be brief. Mr. McCombs explained that in the near future, there is “no relief in sight” from the state budget shortfalls that result in decreases in allocations to the College. More and more states are coming to view higher education as a discretionary rather than an essential state service, and South Carolina is part of this trend. Since 2001-02, the College lost 8.8 million in state appropriations. This meant that the percent of our total budget that came from state revenues went from 31% to 21%.
Cuts of this nature could obviously diminish or eliminate the improvements planned in the Fourth-Century Initiative, so the College needs to find some way to make up the shortfall (from 34 million in appropriations in FY 2001-02 to 26.4 million in this fiscal year). Unfortunately, the College has already exhausted its reserve funds and cut its operating budget (by 5% in FY 2002-3, with another 1.5% cut planned for 04). Other economies include restrictions on purchases and travel and the elimination of non-essential programs such as the Lightsey Center and the Annot program. There is not much left to cut. Hence, the best source of funding available for the College is increased tuition. The College has raised tuition and fees by 18%, and must use 65% of this new money to offset state funding reductions. However, the Fourth-Century Initiative continues. There were two new faculty lines and 18 staff lines added in 01-02, along with more money for advising. This year, there are 23 more new faculty lines, increased funding for financial aid, and a 2% salary increase. In this economic climate, such additions are remarkable.

Mr. McCombs then responded to questions from the floor. He reported that the college was ahead of its goal to lower enrollment by 300 this year, and that he did not foresee increasing the percentage of out-of-state students as a way of increasing the total tuition we collect. He also noted that a half-million dollars in this year’s budget had been set aside to use for merit and equity increases that have yet to be assigned. Mr. McCombs also confirmed that the Master Planning effort was still underway, state budget cuts notwithstanding.

Academic Planning Committee

Bill Olejniczak reported to the Senate on the progress of the committee he had chaired last year. He noted that the committee had been working for over a year on this project, and as yet had no proposal to bring to the Senate. Mr. Olejniczak told the Senate that his Committee had been asked to evaluate the effectiveness of the existing course called Freshman Seminar, and at the same time was charged with developing a proposal for an academic component of the first-year experience of our students. The committee did extensive research on the way such courses are organized and delivered at many other institutions. It has also sought feedback from deans and chairs, in hopes of devising a program that will have the support of all faculty. Certain principles emerged last year: the class would be required of all first year students, the class size would be small, and the classes would be taught by regular faculty. The director of the program would be a faculty member and would report to the Provost and to the new vice-president in charge of the first-year experience.

The Committee had initially come to the conclusion that these goals could be accomplished through an “add one hour” model—an existing course with a smaller class size and one more contact hour. The faculty member would spend more time with these freshmen than is usually possible in a regular version of these classes. After receiving feedback from deans and chairs, however, the Committee is now considering another model, that of the “special seminar.” Tom Kunkle (Mathematics) asked what the content of a special seminar would be. Other faculty addressed the distinction between this
proposed course and the existing Freshman Seminar, which focuses on study skills, understanding the nature of a liberal arts and sciences education, and interpersonal issues that college students face. Trisha Folds-Bennett (At-large), also a member of the Committee, noted that other universities teach the type of course the Committee wishes to introduce, which is not like our existing Freshman Seminar. This is a “Special Topics” genre of class, but one that is especially designed for freshmen. The College could offer sections of this class in a variety of individual topics taught by faculty according to their own interest, just as they now teach upper-level seminars on specialized topics. Ms. Folds-Bennett noted that often students don’t get the opportunity to take an “interesting and jazzy” course of this kind until they are juniors or seniors, and that freshmen would be likely to become much more engaged in intellectual pursuits and much more connected to the College if they could take a small class like this very early in their college careers.

A discussion ensued regarding the current state of Freshman Seminar. Godwin Uwah asked, “What is broken about Freshman Seminar?” – i.e., why is this course seen as its replacement. The Provost noted that many who now teach Freshman Seminar are not roster faculty. Alex Kasman said that he thought this existing class did not do enough to stir students’ intellectual curiosity or to give them an idea of the sort of courses they would be taking throughout their time at the College. Rich Bodek wondered why there were so many more sections offered in FRSR than there had been in the past. Trisha Folds-Bennett noted that there is currently no systematic oversight of FRSR since it has no “home” academic department to review it, and that last year only 2 roster faculty were among the instructors. Godwin Uwah noted that adjunct faculty are also our colleagues. After further questions and discussion, Mr. Olejniczak retired, promising to report to the Senate when the Committee had a proposal for it to consider.

The Speaker

Mr. Wilder noted that there are 56 new faculty, half of them occupying new lines. He also told faculty that several committees working on behalf of the Fourth-Century Initiative, such as the Committee on Workload, would be concluding their work this year. In short, it promises to be an exciting academic year. He reminded faculty of the fall meeting of the full faculty, to take place September 22nd.

The Speaker then thanked all who worked on this year’s Convocation, an event he believed was highly successful. He appreciated the high faculty participation at the event itself, and noted that Steve Olsen, the speaker, met with many students while he was on campus. There are several classes this semester that will continue to study the book and some of the issues it addresses. (Susan Morrison noted that a few copies of the book are still available in the Academic Affairs office.) Thus, Mr. Wilder said, Convocation provides our students with an important intellectual experience. Faculty who have ideas or comments about this year or about future Convocation should share them with him or Susan Morrison, and should be on the lookout for an open invitation to serve on the Convocation Committee for Fall 2004.
Mr. Wilder announced a few more upcoming events in which faculty could participate: Family Weekend (11/7-11/9), an event where faculty are especially welcome, and the Ice Cream Socials on October 6-9 that the President is sponsoring for each class of students. These occasions are part of a larger effort to strengthen students’ identification with their own classes, both now and after they graduate.

In a final update, the Speaker noted the success of a resolution the Senate approved in April 2003, to save the Sottile Tree. We also approved the formation of an advisory committee (the Tree Committee, it came to be called) to have input when the College considered removing or planting trees. This summer, that committee was called upon, the Speaker told the Senate. In this case, it participated in a decision to remove a diseased tree rather than to save a healthy one, but even so, the mechanism the Senate proposed is now in use.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary

**Fall Semester Faculty Senate Schedule:**
First Tuesdays • 5:00pm • 116 Education Center
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November 4 (agenda deadline 3:00 pm, Thursday, October 23)
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