The College of Charleston Faculty Senate met Tuesday, April 19th, 2005, at 5:00 p.m. in ECTR 116. Speaker Bob Mignone called the meeting to order and received approval of the minutes.

Reports

The Speaker began his report by noting that he hoped to see as many faculty as possible at Commencement, May 15th. He also reminded faculty that chairs of Senate and Faculty committees were responsible for calling a meeting of the new committee to elect next year’s chair and for sending him or the Faculty Secretary their committee’s annual report. Next, Mr. Mignone informed the Senate regarding policies and procedures for courtesy appointments. He explained that courtesy appointments are made for people who visit the college in some professional capacity and are not paid. The purpose of a courtesy appointment is to facilitate interaction between the College and other institutions. The Speaker has a document detailing this College policy, should anyone desire further explanation, he said. Next the Speaker reminded Senators that this was our last meeting of the 2004-2005 academic year. He thanked Deb Vaughn for her services as Webmaster and projectionist during Senate meetings, noting that this would be her last meeting to act as projectionist. It is also the end of Julia Eichelberger’s three-year stint as Faculty Secretary. Mr. Mignone thanked both colleagues for their service and said he looked forward to working with Secretary-elect Susan Farrell next year.

The Speaker then invited Laura Lindroth (Health Educator from the Counseling and Substance Abuse Office) to assist him in reporting on the proposed Tobacco Control Policy that her office is helping the SGA to develop. She informed the Senate of the results of a recent campus survey, in which faculty and staff indicated a general willingness to confine smoking to more limited areas and to enforce tobacco control more stringently. This policy would be offered to the Senate sometime next year and would then be sent to the President, who would make the final decision on whether to implement it.

Last year over 700 students signed a petition supporting better enforcement of smoking policies, she noted. The new proposal will attempt to accomplish this through making residence halls 100% smoke-free, clearly marking smoking and non-smoking areas (with special concern for moving smokers away from building entrances), and developing a different system for responding to people who violate these rules. Ms. Lindroth said many respondents to her recent survey were in favor of imposing fines on those who smoked in non-smoking areas. The Office of Public Safety is reluctant to serve as the enforcer for these regulations, however, and Ms. Lindroth said that several other approaches were being considered, such as arming student volunteers with printed cards that would politely remind offenders of their transgressions or congratulate those who were caught obeying the rules. She added that the proposed policy would also ban any tobacco promotions on campus and any acceptance of money from tobacco companies.
Ms. Lindroth said she hoped that the Senate would give her its feedback on the policy and, eventually, its own endorsement when the SG presents it to them in the future. She said that when it is sent to the President, they will also point out that most other South Carolina institutions have much more stringent tobacco restrictions, banning smoking in dorms and in all indoor buildings. Ms. Lindroth detailed a number of the responses to the questions that were in her survey, and answered questions from the floor as they arose. David Gentry (Psychology) spoke against the ban on accepting direct funding from tobacco companies, even for research. He noted that these companies “fund a lot of research on smoking.” Ms. Lindroth replied that our credibility would be weakened if we tried to discourage smoking, yet accepted money that was generated by the sale of tobacco. Reid Wiseman (Biology) asked Ms. Lindroth if her office was planning to conduct a similar survey on the use of “other drugs besides nicotine,” which he believed were a more serious problem. Ms. Lindroth said such a survey was conducted annually, and Mr. Mignone added that the President takes this problem seriously enough to be forming a drug and alcohol task force.

**New Business**

**By-Laws Committee**

Glen Lesses, chair of the committee, brought two motions for the Senate’s approval, explaining that if the Senate approved these motions by a two-thirds majority, then the question would be sent by written ballot to the entire faculty. The first motion read as follows:

Revise the eligibility for Senate membership in III, Article IV, Section 2, A so as to insert the following revisions in caps:

Department Chairs, REGARDLESS OF THEIR TEACHING LOADS, are eligible to serve as Faculty Senators.

Rationale:
When the Faculty Senate by-laws were originally written, no chairs taught less than six contact hours per semester. As the College has changed, chairs have often received administrative and/or research reductions which result in their teaching less than six contact hours. From the inception of the Senate, the faculty has treated chairs as eligible for Senate membership and distinguished them from full-time administrators with limited teaching duties. This revision preserves our historical practice and eliminates possible eligibility confusion between chairs and full-time administrators who are faculty.

Mr. Lesses explained that this amendment was meant to honor the spirit of the present definition of Senate eligibility. In the course of the committee’s deliberations, someone asked whether administrators could therefore serve on the Senate, if they teach a similar amount. The By-laws committee decided that chairs with administrative duties were properly considered as faculty, and that they wanted to retain the distinction between
faculty and administrators, making chairs eligible to serve regardless of teaching load. He added that the manual notes that people with administrative appointments can be excluded from faculty deliberations. On a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously, which means that the faculty as a whole will be asked to ratify it by written ballot.

Mr Lesses then presented a second motion, as follows:

Revised the duties of the Educational Technology Committee (III, Article V, Section 3, 16, b) to include a new item (6):

To serve as regular members of the President's Information Technology Council, representing the faculty in strategic and tactical information technology policies, projects, and planning.

Rationale:
At the last Senate meeting, the Educational Technology Committee made a two-part motion to amend the By-Laws. This motion was automatically sent for review to the By-Laws Committee. The By-Laws Committee recommends against adoption of the first part of the motion concerning changes to the membership on the ETC. The Nominations Committee would have serious difficulty in implementing distributional requirements for standing committees and makes a good faith effort to staff committees with suitable faculty from throughout the College. The By-Laws Committee favors the 2nd part of the ETC motion. This change in duties will help insure adequate faculty representation on the President's Information Technology Council. Please note that although the faculty can change its by-laws, the President's Information Technology Council is not under faculty purview. The Speaker, however, has vetted this proposal with appropriate College administrators.

Bob Mignone noted that after this motion was proposed at the March 29th Senate meeting, he discussed it with the President, who is willing for the committee to be so constituted. Mr. Lesses said that his committee agreed with the new duties in the motion, but were against the stipulations about membership. “This is because it is extremely difficult for the Nominations Committee to come up with the kind of membership that is proposed here,” Mr. Lesses said. He thought it was enough to “rely on the good faith efforts of the Nominations Committee.” David Gentry (Psychology) asked if this policy could be changed when we got a new President. Mr. Mignone replied that it was unlikely that a future president would undertake to change existing by-laws, but that it still could be done.

Frank Kinard (Chemistry) suggested the motion should be amended to make this less than a hard and fast requirement. This committee “is making decisions on large amounts of money, so every school should be involved,” yet Nominations may not be able to implement this in every year if not enough people volunteer, he said. Alex Kasman suggested that the motion be amended to read as follows:
“It is stated as a goal that the committee membership should include a faculty member from each academic school, one from the graduate school, one from the library, and a student.”

After some discussion, the members of the By-laws committee agreed to accept this as a friendly amendment. Marion Doig (Chemistry) asked, “So we’re going to vote to do what we currently do?” Mr. Mignone said that such representation is already “the implicit goal” for the Nominations Committee, “but in this case it is stated explicitly.” The Senate then voted in favor of the motion.

Committee on Academic Standards

Deb Vaughn, Chair, brought the following motion for the committee, proposing that a grade of XF be added.

Memorandum

To: Academic Standards Committee
From: Jeri Cabot, Dean of Students
Patrick McShay, Honor Board Chairman
Re: Proposal to add the XF grade as a sanction option within the Honor System

Introduction

Many institutions now employ the grade of XF on a transcript to communicate the outcome of an Honor System process. The grade of XF is intended to “denote a failure to accept and exhibit the fundamental value of academic honesty” (Univ. of MD). This element of an honor system has been successfully introduced to a number of schools in recent years, including University of Maryland at College Park, University of Tennessee, University of Georgia, University of Minnesota, and Kansas State University.

Rationale

To insure consistency in sanction outcomes: Currently each Board or Panel called to set sanctions has some latitude when designing sanctions. Training insures that each Board/Panel works within a set range of sanctions, depending on the nature of the offense, relevant mitigating circumstances and other factors. Sanctions, however, can and do vary for roughly similar violations. The adoption of the XF would guarantee that similar violations would have at least one component of the sanction in common.

To increase the deterrent value of sanctions: The XF recorded on a transcript would announce to other schools that a student seeking to transfer in is leaving an institution with a mixed record. Knowing the “public” nature of the XF should make students think
hard before performing an act of academic dishonesty. Moreover, the proposal below argues for combining the XF grade with disciplinary suspension for at least one semester as the minimum sanction for our typical “serious” honor code violations.

To communicate to other institutions a more accurate reflection of a student’s academic record while at the College of Charleston: Many students currently receive Fs from faculty for academic dishonesty. The complete explanation for the failing grade rests only with the complainant-faculty and the dean of students. Students are at liberty to offer any explanation they desire for the failing grade to other institutions. The XF clearly communicates to admissions officers why the student failed the course.

To relieve faculty of any guesswork in determining the appropriate grade impact for an act of academic dishonesty: Faculty frequently ask what others do about the grade after a finding of academic dishonesty. Many turn to department chairpersons, the dean of students, and other colleagues for guidance when deciding about the grade impact.

To insure greater consistency of the grade impact for acts of dishonesty: Based on casual observation, roughly 50% of faculty assign failing grades for acts of academic dishonesty and 50% assign a zero grade for the individual assignment and re-calculate the overall course grade. Under this proposal, faculty would have to assign a XF in the course once the finding of in violation is established and offense merits a XF.

**Operation**

1. **Schedule of Sanctions for Violations of Academic Dishonesty** (significantly adapted from Millersville State University, PA)

   A. **Class 1.** The most serious breaches of academic honesty fall into this category, as well as any and all second or more offenses of any sort. Sanctions: 1) XF grade and suspension, or 2) XF grade and expulsion. Examples of violations include, but are not limited to:

      i. cheating on a test which involves premeditation and conspiracy of effort,
      ii. taking a test for someone else, or permitting someone else to take a test or course in one's place,
      iii. plagiarizing, where the majority of the submitted work was written or created by another,
      iv. obtaining, stealing, buying, or sharing all or part of an unadministered exam,
      v. selling, or giving away all or part of an unadministered test,
      vi. bribing, or attempting to bribe any other person to obtain an unadministered test or any information about the test,
      vii. buying, or otherwise acquiring, another's course paper and resubmitting it as one's own work, whether altered or not
viii. entering a building, office, or computer for the purpose of changing a grade in a grade book, on a test, or on other work for which a grade is given,

ix. changing, altering, or being an accessory to changing and/or altering a grade in a grade book, on a test, on a "Change of Grade" form, or other official academic college record which relates to grades, and

x. entering a building, office, or computer for the purpose of obtaining an unadministered test.

B. Class 2. These include other offenses for which strong sanctions are applied. Sanctions: 1) grade of XF in the course and disciplinary probation and other educational sanctions or 2) grade of XF and suspension. Examples of violations include, but are not limited to:

i. cheating on an exam which does not involve premeditation,

ii. copying from another's test or allowing another student to copy from your test, where no prior plans were made for such collaboration,

iii. plagiarizing, where a small portion of the submitted work was written or created by another,

iv. submitting work for a class that was already submitted for another, when unauthorized,

v. intentionally failing to cite information from the correct source,

vi. listing sources in a bibliography that were not used in the paper, and

vii. copying, or allowing one to copy, homework assignments that are to be submitted for credit.

viii. unauthorized collaboration on an assignment

C. Class 3. These include offenses where evidence of student confusion and/or ignorance is obvious. Sanctions: 1) probation and other educational sanctions or 2) warning. Examples include, but are not limited to:

i. record of same offense made on other similar assignments and no feedback provided by the instructor prior to allegation.

ii. submitting work for a class that was already submitted for another without permission of the professor

iii. unintentionally, failing to cite information from the correct source

2. XF Grade Policy

A. If the Honor Board sanctions a student with a course grade of XF, and this sanction is not appealed by the student, the Dean of Students and the faculty member notify the Registrar to place a grade of XF for the applicable course on the student's academic record. The grade XF shall be recorded on the student's transcript with the notation "failure due to academic dishonesty."

B. Student appeals of the XF grade follow the procedure for all other appeals of academic dishonesty sanctions, as outlined in the Student Handbook. If the Appellate Board denies the right to another hearing, or another hearing is
granted and the Honor Board decides to uphold the XF grade sanction, the Dean of Students and the faculty member notify the Registrar to assign the XF grade to the student's academic record.

C. If grades are due but an academic dishonesty hearing is still in progress, a grade of 'I' shall be applied to the course until the hearing process is complete.

D. An XF grade shall maintain a quality point value of 0.0. The grade "XF" shall be treated in the same way as an "F" for the purposes of Grade Point Average, course repeatability, and determination of academic standing.

E. The XF must stay on the transcript for at least two years from the date student is found in violation.

F. After two years, a student may petition the Honor Board to exchange the XF for an F. The petition must be in written form and provide the reason for removal of the XF. Additionally, the petitioner must appear before the Honor Board to explain the request. If the student petitions and a majority of the Honor Board agree to remove the XF, the Honor Board outlines conditions under which the XF is removed. The conditions may include giving testimony of dishonesty during freshman orientation or other organized Honor Board events, and/or performing specific tasks aimed at increasing the education of the violator and/or campus on the value of academic integrity. When these conditions are met, the XF is removed entirely from the transcript, leaving no past evidence of the XF. A grade of F is recorded in its place.

G. If a petition to change an XF grade to an F has been made and denied, another petition may not be made for another year from the date of denial. This stipulation applies after graduation as well.

H. If the student is/has been found responsible of an additional violation of academic honesty, either in the past or future, the XF remains. For cases where the XF was changed to an F and the student is later found responsible of an additional act of academic dishonesty, the XF grade is restored for the course. In these cases, the XF remains permanent. The student may not petition for an F in exchange for the XF in these cases.

I. A student who has received an XF in a course and needs to pass the course for a requirement may retake the course. If the student passes the course, the requirement is met, but the original course grade will remain as an XF unless the X is removed by an accepted petition for removal.
Ms. Vaughn invited Dean Jeri Cabot to explain the need for this motion. Ms. Cabot noted that the Provost and a faculty member had initiated this discussion during the past year. She told the Senate that recent surveys have noted an increase in students who, by their own admission, have plagiarized via the Internet, or have cheated in other ways. This increase is reflected at the College, Ms. Cabot said. Last year the Honor Board heard over 60 plagiarism and cheating cases, and in 100% of them the students were found responsible, since “you faculty members come prepared,” she said. Faculty have said they would like some consistent minimum sanction that the Honor Board would be compelled to use. This proposed XF will stay on a student’s record for 2 years, with students having the opportunity to petition in 2 years for it to be removed. The Registrar has told her that this will not be a problem to implement, she said. Policies like this one exist on other campuses. It was first implemented at the University of Maryland, and is an option at UVA. At Kansas State, the grade can’t be removed until student takes an ethics seminar.

Ms. Cabot said that if the Senate endorses the proposal, it will be discussed in the classroom for an full academic year before being implemented, so there would be time for it to go into syllabi and the College catalog. Alex Kasman (Mathematics) asked, “What if the professor does not want the grade to be an XF--will there be an option?” Ms. Cabot said that it would not be the professor’s decision. Reid Wiseman noted that for a senior who was found guilty, this would amount to a harsher punishment than it would for a freshman, and he thought the Honor Board should be sure to stress this to students. Elizabeth Jurisich (Mathematics) said she was concerned with items 6, 7, and 8, especially the listing of sources in a bibliography that are not in a paper. “This could have happened by accident,” she noted, if “a student takes out a portion of a draft, but then forgets to take it out of the bibliography. That’s a little scary, and so is the homework,” she said. “I allow collaboration on homework,” which means that “it’s possible for students to copy rather than collaborating. This is an issue that I as a professor want to use my judgment on, and this statement does not leave room for that.” She thought that this and item #5 should be moved into Class 3, which does not warrant an XF penalty.

George Pothering (Computer Science) asked about retaking the course students got an XF in, and Ms. Cabot said students could retake the course later. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) said she thought some faculty might choose not to report such things to the Honor Board if they didn’t want the student to receive such a strong penalty. Ms. Cabot answered that this proposal was “an opportunity for us to show how seriously we take academic integrity. If you think this is an honest mistake, you can send it back to students to redo,” but if you suspect actual cheating, then this sanction would show that we take this very seriously. Erin Beutel said her students made mistakes like this all the time because they just didn’t know how to document properly. Elizabeth Jurisich said that students might just be too lazy to look something up, and an XF was too harsh a penalty. Even unauthorized collaboration on homework should not receive an XF, she said. Frank Kinard noted that this would show up on a student’s transcript. “If they are convicted of a crime, does it show up on the transcript?” he wondered. “No, but I am working on this,” said Ms. Cabot. Alex Kasman said that he believe a grade reflected the knowledge gained in a course, and that even a student who cheats may not deserve an F; this is something
the teacher should control, he said. Julie Davis wondered whether the classification of “work already submitted for another class” should be considered plagiarism. “If the instructor hasn’t made clear that these things are not acceptable, isn’t that the professor’s responsibility to tell students?” she wondered. Ms. Cabot said that some faculty have told her that they think “this is something you should come to college knowing, that you don’t recycle work.” Aliss Whitt noted that the Honor Code already forbids the recycling of work, unless the professor has deemed this acceptable.

Joe Kelly (At-large), spoke in support of the proposal, noting that “Most people in English think this is long overdue.” Reid Wiseman asked, “Is there any way that every incoming freshmen could receive a written copy of it and sign a contract that they have read it?” Ms. Cabot said that all students read and sign the Honor Code during their orientation. Charles Kaiser (Psychology) said that in his department, “Faculty are sometimes not clear on how they define plagiarism and students come and complain.” He thought some of the items in class II “should be scrutinized more carefully. Students may get too harshly punished just because they don’t understand. I’m a little bit leery about the level of punishment.” Todd Grantham (Philosophy) spoke in support of the overall plan, noting that “last semester I had five students who copied from internet. I think this is a serious problem that we should do something about.” He suggested moving items 6 and 7 from class II into class III, which Ms. Vaughn said she would consider a friendly amendment. Bob Perkins said that his department did not support this proposal because “it takes away our rights as faculty members to give a grade. Right now I have that promise in my syllabus—you’ll get an F if convicted of plagiarism.” With this proposal, that decision is out of the faculty member’s hands, he said.

Darryl Phillips (Classics, Italian, German, and Japanese) said that in the past year his department “was responsible for at least 25% of the Honor Board convictions, even though we are one of the smallest departments. This is a faculty-friendly initiative,” he said, because it will protect faculty from “the bargaining that goes on” when a student faces a charge of plagiarism. He said that as a department chair he has often had to face “the teary student who says ‘I never meant to do this’” (i.e., to download and submit a paper from the Internet). He also said he felt that this penalty “is more than an F—it’s also an F for honor code violations. This is appropriate for serious violations of academic integrity. I think it’s wonderful to put this in the hands of the Honor Board and not faculty, so the Honor Board can take the heat.”

Allan Strand wondered if there were evidence showing that this penalty would deter cheating. Ms. Cabot replied that she did not know of such evidence, but “on other campuses [with this policy] I have heard that students understand more clearly the implications of their actions. I think the system that hasn’t worked is the single-sanction system, such as at UVA,” she added, since faculty who find that sanction too harsh may choose not to report violations. She said she thought this sanction would make it clear to anyone looking at a transcript “that something went amiss” and that for this reason, students would be less likely to cheat. Terry Bowers (English) spoke in support of the proposal, saying, “This is the institution sanctioning the student, not just the professor or the department. This is the institution saying they take cheating very seriously, and this is
important because an atmosphere can develop very quickly where students decide to cheat because they think they can get away with it.”

Myra Seaman (English) also supported the proposal, noting that students are sometimes confused by what is expected of them in different departments and this policy might help to clarify and standardize expectations. Aliss Whitt (Library) said she had been “been reading a lot about plagiarism lately” for a research project, “and one of the things that keeps coming to the forefront” in her reading was that faculty don’t define plagiarism clearly enough and don’t really understand the dimension of the problem. “So if we vote on this we need to do more to educate our colleagues,” including adjuncts, she said. Carol Toris (Psychology) said she supported the policy, but also thought that lying should be included, since she was certain students sometimes lied in offering excuses for missing tests, for example. The Speaker noted that the only matter that was actually before the Senate was adding the XF grade as an option for the Honor Board. “I’m allowing this discussion because it’s pertinent,” he said, but penalties for additional violations would have to be worked out later, he said. Oleg Smirnov (Mathematics) spoke against the proposal, saying that “the professor should be responsible for the grade, and I can envision situations where this would not be the grade I would want to assign.”

Jack Parsons asked, “If we approve the [creation of the XF] grade, when will the other parts of the proposal be worked out?” Jeri Cabot asked the Speaker if the Senate could approve the proposal “in principle and ask that the particulars be worked on further.” Mr. Mignone said that rather than amending each of the items in the proposal that had caused concern, the Senate could “trust the good faith of the honor board to work out these details. Or, we can start the process of amending, or send it to the committee.”

David Gentry said that if the Senate approved this policy, it would be more than just giving the XF as an option; we would be “voting on giving up our ability to assign a grade.” Mr. Mignone said that he believed that the vote was only on the existence of the XF grade, and not the whole document on how the grade would be assigned. “You can vote to override me on that,” he added. Jack Parsons said he wanted to challenge this interpretation, and after some discussion with the Parliamentarian, the Senate rejected the Speaker’s view of the proposal on a voice vote. Then, by a show of hands, the Senate voted in favor of referring this proposal to the Committee for review.

Next, the Senate considered the Committee’s second motion, which read as follows:

Faculty Committee on Academic Standards
Probation and Readmission for Visiting Maymester / Summer Session Students

Currently, the College of Charleston Undergraduate catalog does not address students who left the College with a GPA below 2.0 and wish to return as visiting students. The present catalog (pages 10 and 20) indicates that students who leave here with a GPA below 2.0 must reapply to the College through Admissions as well as enroll in Learning Strategies (EDLS 100). This scenario is not practical or possible for visiting students who want to be here during the summer only.
Page 10:
2. Students who have been dismissed from the College for academic deficiency or separated for disciplinary reasons and who complete the suspension period will be considered for readmission. Those whose records indicate that they can reach the graduation standards in a reasonable period of time and for those that have met the conditions required for reconsideration must meet the following conditions for readmission:
   a. They must complete a special one-day workshop that contains information on the services that the College provides for students with academic difficulties, the academic requirements they must satisfy, and their personal responsibilities in reaching good academic standing. Most students will be required to enroll in the course, Learning Strategies (EDLS 100), to attain these skills necessary to succeed at college.
   b. Each student must sign a readmission contract prepared by the Office of Undergraduate Studies. The contract specifies the grade point average (GPA) and other specific requirements that readmitted students must meet in order to remain at the College of Charleston.
3. Students who voluntarily leave the College while on probation may be readmitted conditionally in accordance with 2 (a, b) above.
4. Students who voluntarily leave the College and who are not on probation, but who have less than a 2.0 cumulative GPA, will be readmitted conditionally in accordance with 2 (a, b) above.
5. Students who previously attended the College as provisional students but failed to meet the conditions of the program must satisfactorily complete a minimum of 30 semester hours at another institution before applying for readmission. They will be considered for admission only if they meet the admission standards applied to transfer students.

Page 20:
Academic Probation Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits earned</th>
<th>GPA required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-19</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-59</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and up</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a student’s cumulative GPA at the end of any semester is less that the grade point average required as listed above, the student is placed on academic probation. A student on academic probation must do two things:

1. Make up the GPA deficiency in the next 15 credit hours attempted. (It is recommended that not all 15 credits be attempted together.)
2. Enroll in EDLS 100 Learning Strategies during the next fall or spring semester. EDLS 100 is not counted toward the 15 credits above.

Proposed Wording
Visiting students to the College of Charleston for summer sessions must adhere to the same academic standards as College of Charleston degree-seeking students. Students who have previously earned less than a 2.0 GPA while attending the College or who are not in good standing at their home institutions will normally not be permitted to enroll for summer sessions. However, instances where these students have gone on to demonstrate a proven academic track record at other universities or who have been granted permission to complete courses as part of their degree programs at other universities may petition the Office of Maymester / Summer Sessions along with the Office of Undergraduate Studies for permission to enroll. Petitions will be handled on a case-by-case basis. A student granted permission to enroll in a summer session is not guaranteed admission or readmission during a subsequent semester.

Rationale

The proposed catalog change would allow Summer School administrators flexibility in working with visiting students who have had academic problems at the College of Charleston in the past.

This motion passed on a voice vote. David Gentry, noting that it was now 6:30 and there were many items still on the agenda, moved to adjourn for the evening and continue the following Tuesday. A vote was taken and the meeting was adjourned.

On Tuesday, April 26, when the Senate reconvened, the Speaker noted that there was a slight procedural confusion because once he had declared that the motion to adjourn had passed, the meeting was over. No one who believed that perhaps the “ayes” had not carried the motion could have called for a division of the house (a show of hands) because, as the Speaker noted, “the house had left.” In the future, therefore, he will be sure to call for a division of the house if he faces a similar situation.

Curriculum Committee

Deborah Boyle, committee chair, presented the following proposals.

1. S05-14 BS in Computer Science/BA in Computer Science/BS in Computer Information Systems – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
2. S05-15 CSCI 360 Software Architecture and Design – Proposal to Change a Course
3. S05-16 CSCI 362 Software Engineering – Proposal to Change a Course
4. S05-17 CSCI 462 Software Engineering Practicum - Proposal to Change a Course
5. S05-18 ARTH 420 Preservation Law and Economics – New Course Proposal
6. S05-19 PORT 313 Advanced Portuguese Composition – New Course Proposal
7. S05-20 PORT 314 Advanced Portuguese Conversation – New Course Proposal
8. S05-21 PORT 330 Collateral Studies – New Course Proposal
10. S05-23 LTPO 270 Studies in Brazilian Film – New Course Proposal
11. S05-24 LTPO 280 Studies in Brazilian Civilization and Culture through Literature – New Course Proposal
12. S05-25 PORT 390 Special Topics in Portuguese – Proposal to Change a Course
13. S05-26 Environmental Studies Minor – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor (Add GEOL 213)
14. S05-27 Environmental Studies Minor – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor (Add SOCY 346)
15. S05-28 Women's Studies Minor – Proposal to Change Degree Requirement for a Minor
16. S05-29 EDFS 326 Technology for Teachers – Proposal to Change a Course
17. S05-30 Self-Designed Major – Proposal for a New Major
18. S05-31 COMM 414 Mass Media and Society – New Course Proposal
19. S05-32 Major in Communication (Concentration in Media Studies) – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
20. S05-33 BA in Religious Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major (add one course from new distribution group)
21. S05-34 BA in Religious Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major (increase hours required)
22. S05-35 RELS 280 Religion and Film – New Course Proposal
23. S05-36 Archaeology Minor – Proposal for a New Interdisciplinary Minor
24. S05-37 BS teaching option in Biology – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major

All these proposals were passed except a proposal for a Self-Designed Major, which would require 36 hours of multidisciplinary coursework; a new faculty committee would review and approve each proposal. Glen Lesses began the discussion of the proposal by saying “I have a number of questions.” He wondered why the proposal required 3 faculty advisors, when the major might have only 2 core areas. He wondered why there were 36 hours to the major, and why the senior thesis was defined differently from the present Bachelor’s Essay. “Even though I think there’s much to commend the major,” he said, he had many concerns about approving it. For example, “this new faculty committee strikes me as overly bureaucratic.” Mr. Lesses said he thought it would be proper for all members of the core departments to scrutinize a student’s proposal, rather than only the chair and the committee.” He concluded that the proposal still needed more work.

Kay Smith, Vice President for the Academic Experience, spoke on behalf of the committee that developed this new proposal. (Its chair, Amy McCandless, was absent due to a death in the family.) Ms. Smith invited anyone else on the committee to be recognized at this time, but no committee members were present. Jack Parson said that he shared Mr. Lesses’ “concerns and worries about the proposal as it stands.” He stated that he found it “curious” that this proposal contained “no letters of support from departments,” something that is normal protocol when a new major or minor proposal may appear to overlap with the work of an existing department. “Since all departments are affected they should all have been asked to support it,” he said. The deans had written letters of support, but without discussing this with their chairs. He suggested that some departments, if they discussed the proposal, might conclude that they did not wish to be
included as a possible component of such a major, or they might wish to include further regulations in the major. Mr. Parsons asked Ms. Boyle why departments had not been asked to discuss this major before it was brought before the Senate. She said that the committee had not discussed that issue. Provost Elise Jorgens said, “The deans did discuss this on two or three occasions.” Mr. Parsons asked, “How many departments have discussed this?”

Frank Kinard then asked when in a student’s career this major must be declared. Could it be used as a “roll-your-own” major that a student assembles after finding a traditional major too rigorous? Kay Smith said that it could not be declared after a student had completed 75 hours. Mr. Kinard thought 75 hours was too much, but Ms. Smith said that at Appalachian State, students were more likely to devise such a major after having done a fair amount of coursework; the 75-hour limit would also allow transfer students a little time to devise such a major, since many of them come here with 60 hours. Ms. Boyle said this 75-hour requirement was something the Curriculum committee did discuss. Reid Wiseman lauded “the polymathic intent” of the proposal, but said it amounted to “3 mini-minors.” Ms. Jorgens disagreed, saying that students were required to demonstrate that their self-designed major was “a coherent curriculum and not 3 separate curricula.” Ms. Boyle added that such a major “would let students develop things they wouldn’t be able to do otherwise with existing courses.” Joe Benich asked if this major would mean that students had to take fewer upper-level courses, since so many of those courses have prerequisites, but Ms. Smith said students had to take all prerequisites, separate and apart from their specific majors. Ms. Boyle said that the proposal did not specify a requirement of 300-level courses as such. Mr. Kinard asked about how many transfer credits could be applied toward this major. “I would think that substitutions would be subject to committee approval,” Ms. Boyle said.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked about the GPA requirement of 3.0. Ms. Boyle said that was not a graduation requirement but a requirement for enrollment. Ms. Curtis said she thought this would have to be a major for “a highly motivated student” and that its GPA requirement should be higher than a 3.0. Todd Grantham (At-large) said it appeared to him that there was considerable scrutiny and rigor built in, since a student has to submit a transcript and, as Ms. Boyle added, letters of recommendation. Norris Preyer (Physics) asked why such a course of study would not be met with a combination of an existing minor and major. Ms. Boyle said that this was what the student had to explain in the proposal. The Provost said that there were “not very many students who need or want” this option. Kay Smith said that it was helpful for interdisciplinary studies “or for very specific career goals, such as ethnographic photography.” Norris Preyer wondered if this could allow students to be exempt from the normal co-curricular requirements of one of the core disciplines. Ms. Boyle said that this would be up to the departments approving the proposal. Glen Lesses said that this was why he thought the whole department, not just the chair, should scrutinize a proposal; he was not mollified by Ms. Boyle’s comment that there would be 3 faculty advisors and at least two disciplines represented on each student’s major. Betsy Martin (At-large) added, “The idea that departments will be involved without discussion at the department level, seems to me a drastic thing. Now a person will be able to have the name of a department”
on his or her degree without their coursework being “discussed and bought into by the
department,” which “seems to be a very drastic step.” Calvin Blackwell
(Economics/Finance) asked, “Is there any obligation of a faculty member to do this?” He
also wondered about “what counts as a faculty member.” There was no obligation, Ms.
Boyle said, but the proposal does not define who is a faculty member.

Joe Kelly said, “I’m happy with the department chair signing off” on a proposal, but
suggested as a friendly amendment that the proposals needed departmental approval,
rather than department chair approval. Ms. Boyle accepted this amendment, and then Kay
Smith asked if this meant a majority of department members, so Mr. Kelly said it could
be worded as “approved at a department meeting.” Norris Preyer asked if we needed to
get the approval of the Ad Hoc Committee to accept that amendment, but the Speaker
pointed out that none of the committee were present. Mr. Parsons asked if the whole
proposal therefore “now belongs to the Curriculum Committee.” Mr. Mignone said he
ruled that it did. David Gentry asked if this new major required CHE approval, and the
Provost said that it did require such approval. Frank Kinard thought that this major was
being defined in the catalog in a way that might enable students to get a degree even if
the committee did not believe they had satisfied the requirement. “How could that
happen?” wondered Ms. Boyle. The student defines the requirements, the committee
approves them, and those are the ones the student must meet.

Jack Parson said that he agreed with Claire Curtis that “this is not a high bar.” This
major could require a lot of time from faculty just in putting a proposal together, he said,
so students should not be encouraged to do so if they are not highly motivated. He argued
that a GPA of 3.5 or “normally 3.5” should be required. He also suggested it should be
made clear that “no student is entitled to this major” and that if their proposal is turned
down, there should be no appeal. “I worry about students who are not strong,
complaining they were wrongly denied the chance to design their own major.” Ms. Boyle
noted that the current proposal specifies that a student can appeal decisions to the
Academic Standards committee, and Mr. Parsons said he thought this should not be
available to students.

Darryl Phillips then said, “As the chair of a department that has a lot of unusual
course in it, I’m concerned about resources. If a student has to project a course of study in
2 years and departments are not planning their schedules that far ahead, it could impose a
burden on departments who have to support other minors and have the pressure of
cancelling courses because of insufficient enrollment.” Kay Smith said that when a
course turns out to be unavailable, a student can apply to the committee to make a
substitution. She said that at Appalachian, the self-designed majors “never had more than
about 45 students” so that this should not be a very large number. Mr. Phillips replied, “I
would be afraid that this would mean more pressure for faculty to conduct independent
studies.” He noted that faculty are already doing such teaching that is not credited as part
of their workload, and “we don’t need to add any more” to that burden.

Erin Beutel (Geology) said she thought the discussion was too one-sided since the
original committee was not here to respond, and moved that the proposal should go back
to this Ad Hoc committee to address today’s concerns. Mr. Parsons observed, “The ad hoc committee gave this to our committee [Curriculum] that has now recommended it to us. Now, I think, the new [2005-2006] curriculum committee is the one to take it up, since this year’s committee did not do this. I urge we remand to our committee and ask them especially to look at department participation.” Ms. Beutel said she thought it should go back to the original committee. The Speaker said that in that case, the Senate would be voting to reconstitute the now-disbanded Ad Hoc committee, then remand this proposal to them. Ms. Beutel said that she would accept remanding the proposal to Curriculum instead, as a friendly amendment. Terry Bowers asked if we were now suggesting that Curriculum consult departments. Mr. Parsons said such consultation is already called for on the Curriculum proposal form—that any departments affected by this major must attach letters saying that their department has discussed it—and he thought the Curriculum committee should use this process for this self-designed major. Joe Benich called the question, and that call was passed. At long last, the Senate took a vote on the amendment to the proposal (to remand it to next year’s Curriculum Committee), and this passed unanimously.

**Committee on Graduate Education**
Sarah Owens, committee chair, proposed the following changes and additions to the Graduate curriculum. All were passed:

**MS Accountancy Programs**
- Proposal for a New Graduate Course
  - HTMT 520—Independent Study in Hospitality and Tourism
  - DSCI 520—Independent Study in Decision Sciences
  - TRAN 520—Independent Study in Logistics and Transportation
  - HTMT 560—Special Topics in Hospitality and Tourism
  - DSCI 560—Special Topics in Decision Sciences
  - TRAN 560—Special Topics in Logistics and Transportation

**Proposal for a New Graduate Course**
- ENGL 537 Contemporary British Literature
- HSPR 520 Preservation Law and Economics

**Proposal to Change a Graduate Course**
- ENGL 527 British Fiction 1900 to Present
- PUBA 777 Internship

**Proposal to Change a Graduate Program**
- Master of Public Administration (chance to degree requirements)

**Resolution on Implementation of the Labor Day Holiday**

George Hopkins (History) proposed the following as a charge for the 2005-2006 Faculty Welfare Committee.
It is hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate charge the Faculty Welfare Committee [newly elected] to explore options for the observance of Labor Day as an official holiday for College of Charleston students, staff, and faculty and to report back to the Senate at its October 2005 meeting.

Rationale: On October 5, 2004, the Faculty Senate approved a resolution urging the College to observe Labor Day as a holiday. Given the complications of adjusting the College calendar, the Speaker [with Senate approval] on November 30 charged the Faculty Welfare Committee with providing the Senate with choices on how to implement observance of Labor Day. At the March 29 meeting, the committee presented a draft motion and then agreed to present a revised motion at the next meeting. According to the committee chair, the committee could not agree on a new motion for the April 19 meeting. Therefore, I ask the Faculty Senate to charge the newly elected committee to explore options for observing Labor Day and to report back at the October Senate meeting.

Mr. Hopkins noted that earlier this year, the Senate had already approved a resolution that the College find a way to observe the Labor Day Holiday. “Given the complications of the College calendar,” this year’s Welfare committee was not able to come up with a suitable plan, he said. He wants next year’s Welfare committee to do further study on how the Labor Day holiday is implemented elsewhere (for example, at the University of South Carolina). In answer to a question, Mr. Hopkins clarified that he wished for the committee to study the problem and report to the Senate at the October 2005 meeting. His proposal was then passed by the Senate.

There were no Constituents’ Concerns offered except by the Speaker, who reminded Senators that if they were dissatisfied with any procedure during a meeting, they always had the right to raise a point of order, and that they were, of course, free to contact him personally as well.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m. Here ended the 2004-2005 Faculty Senate business, a torrent of verbiage (occasionally interrupted by important decisions) that it has been this Secretary’s privilege to record.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of College of Charleston Faculty Senate

The College of Charleston Faculty Senate met Tuesday, March 29th, 2005, at 5:00 p.m. in ECTR 116. Speaker Bob Mignone called the meeting to order, and asked for corrections to the minutes of the March 1st meeting. These minutes were approved.

Reports

The Speaker noted that the By-Laws committee was at work on the question of senate eligibility, and that a motion on this topic might be forthcoming at the April meeting. He also urged faculty to make plans to attend this year’s Commencement. Next, Mr. Mignone recognized the Provost, who wished to report to the Senate on the Retention Strategic Plan.

Office of Academic Affairs (Report on Retention Strategic Plan)

Ms. Jorgens told the Senate that increasing retention was a priority for the President, and she detailed the major efforts to that end that are now underway. Noel Levitz, a consulting firm, has been working with the College for almost a year now, and several individuals have been on campus to consult with the Provost’s office. A statistical analysis of the 2003 and 2004 incoming freshman class may help us to identify the characteristics of the students who do or don’t return after their first year, the Provost said. Our advising system has also been studied through several means, including student focus groups. Another consultant has done an analysis of all the forms of communication the College uses with students, to see how effective these media are. The retention team includes Associate Provost Amy McCandless and Kay Smith, the College’s new Vice President for the Academic Experience. The Provost noted that it is beneficial for the College “both academically and economically” to keep the students we have recruited. It’s expensive to recruit the new students to replace those we have lost, she said, and from an academic standpoint, it’s better if we have students from freshman year on. Many transfers are good students, she said, but we can teach students more effectively when we know what their prior courses were like. “We have more to build on if we have them here all four years.”

Amy McCandless reported on the goals of the retention team. The first goal is to achieve and sustain a 90% retention rate between the first and the second year. Ms. McCandless explained that within this strategic plan, the term “retention” refers only to this period. The College’s current rate is 83.4%; the goal is to reach 90% by Fall 2008. Ms. McCandless said that our current retention rate makes us “competitive” with good schools, but a rate of 90% will put us up higher, with schools like William and Mary. Other goals concern graduation rates. In September 2004, the College’s four-year graduation rate was 43% (43% of the students who had entered 4 years previously had graduated); our 5-year rate was 59% (of all students who entered in 1999, 59% had graduated in September 04). “Our graduation rates are good, but they are not competitive,” said Ms. McCandless, noting that the goal was to have a 55% 4-year rate by Spring 2012. The Strategic Plan also calls for achieving the same graduation rates for
African American and minority students that we achieve for the student body as a whole. Retention rates for our African American students are as good as or better than our rates for the whole student body, but graduation rates are not as good, she said. Finally, she said, there are goals regarding the persistence and graduation rates of our transfer students. Currently that is 77%, and the goal is to reach 85%.

Kay Smith, the new Vice President, then addressed the Senate. Having been on campus since January, she is in the process of meeting with people in many departments at the College, she said. The Retention team held a retreat in January, and attendees decided on seven areas to work on. Advising was an area students were not satisfied with, as was verified in focus groups. Another area is the early alert system, so that students could benefit from earlier intervention if they begin to slip academically. Financial aid was another area that affects retention; students need to know what other aid to apply for in the event they lose scholarships or grants because of their GPA. Support services also affect retention, Ms. Smith noted--areas like dining services, parking, etc. Jeri Cabot is heading the committee that will address this area. Other committees are now seeking to improve the quality of the on-campus and off-campus academic experience.

Undergraduate research and internships can enhance this experience, the Vice President said, and the Gen Ed committee is looking at how the general education requirements can serve our students better. There will be some Learning Communities begun this fall (a group of students taking courses in a block schedule, living in the same dorm, and sharing some enrichment experiences). Institutions that have learning communities have a 4% higher retention rate, she noted. A pilot group for women students with an interest in science and math will be launched next semester. Another idea is to help students prepare to transfer in to the College. Ms. Smith said she hoped to get Trident to offer a course that would enable students who were planning to transfer to prepare for the specific requirements of the College. Other scholarships are contemplated that are designed to improve retention of African American and minority students over four years by increasing their participation in co-curricular activities. Ms. Smith invited faculty to contact her to volunteer to serve on any of these committees.

Several faculty asked questions. Elizabeth Jurisich (Mathematics) asked whether we knew what kind of students were leaving before graduation---our best students, our worst students, or some combination. Ms, Smith said more students than not were academically eligible when they left; the Provost and Associate Provost agreed that “we tend to lose students at the high end.” Ms, Smith said that she was interested in finding out retention rates for students who live off campus. “Most of the evidence [from other institutions] is that living on campus correlates with retention.” Alex Kasman (Mathematics) noted that students had told him that they were transferring “because they want to major in a subject we don’t offer.” Ms. Jorgens noted that “we can’t worry about students who have that career path,” and that this reason had not emerged as a factor in very many of the students who have left recently. “We are tracking students who ask the Registrar’s Office to get a transcript sent elsewhere,” she said, and asking them why they are transferring. “If it’s because they are going to engineering school, fair enough. But if they want to leave because they don’t feel safe in the residence hall or don’t feel challenged in their classes,” then we need to do something to change that, she said. Kay
Smith noted that nationally, about 50% of college students attend more than one institution. Another senator noted that some people transferred into the College to pursue majors we offer that are not available elsewhere. Would such transfers be restricted in the future? The Provost said that “we will always need transfers,” and that students with such defined career goals were usually the ones we would welcome most.

Reid Wiseman asked about advising. “In many cases I don’t see my advisees for years,” he said. Is it incumbent on advisers to seek out students, or is it their responsibility, he wondered. Ms. Smith replied that in the focus groups on advising, many students said they didn’t know who their advisor was. “It’s their responsibility,” she noted, but “there doesn’t seem to be a smooth pathway to get students to know their advisors.” She wonders whether students should be required to work with a trained advisor in their freshman year, in order to help their overall development, not just course selection. Ms. Smith noted that regular faculty may not know all the opportunities available to students, whereas advisors with more expertise can help steer students towards better experiences. Terry Bowers (English) asked if the retention work were “intertwined with the Gen Ed curriculum reform.” The Provost answered, “Yes, everything is intertwined.” She added that in both areas, “the real focus is on the quality of students.” The purpose of the Gen Ed reform is to develop an approach to Gen Ed that students will find satisfying and challenging. Marty Nabors (Elementary and Early Childhood) said perhaps freshman should be required to see an advisee, noting that with the advent of online registration, we all are seeing our advisees more rarely. Ms. Smith said she agreed that freshman would particularly benefit from advising, especially if they could be advised by the same person throughout the year.

New Business

Committee on Nominations and Elections
Rick Heldrich, chair, proposed a slate of nominees for Senate committees. The following committees were elected:

Academic Planning
Terence Bowers, Associate Professor, English
Carol Ann Davis, Assistant Professor, English
Jose Gavidia*, Assistant Professor, Management and Marketing
Chris Hope, Associate Professor, Sociology
Elizabeth Jurisich, Associate Professor, Mathematics
Elizabeth Martinez-Gibson*, Associate Professor, Hispanic Studies
Todd McNerney*, Associate Professor, Theatre

Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual
Frank Kinard, Professor, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Frank Morris, Associate Professor, Class. Germ., Ital., Japn Russ.
Trevor Weston*, Assistant Professor, Music

Budget
Next, Mr. Mignone invited additional nominations to the 2005-2006 Committee on Nominations and Elections. This committee will be elected by the faculty at the April 11 Spring Faculty Meeting. The following nominations had already been received:

Marion Doig, Chemistry & Biochemistry  
Susan Farrell, English  
Frank Morris, Classics, German, Italian, Japanese, and Russian  
Michael Phillips, Library  
The following additional nominations were made from the floor:  
Bev Diamond, Math  
Annette Godow PE and Health  
Karen Berg, Hispanic Studies

These seven names formed the slate that the Senate will nominate to the Faculty at the Spring meeting.

Faculty Educational Technology Committee

On behalf of the committee, Myra Seaman (English) made the following motion:

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

1. Amend the committee membership to include a faculty member from each academic school, one from the graduate school, one from the library, and a student.

2. Amend the charge to include participation as regular members of the President’s Information Technology Council, representing the faculty in strategic and tactical IT policies, projects, and planning.

Rationale

The change in membership will ensure a broader representation and should enhance the leadership of the FETC in the development of future academic IT services on campus and allow to the committee to have input on all IT services provided to and/or affecting students and faculty members.

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

Ms. Seaman explained that the motion was a change to the committee’s original charge. Tom Kunkle (Mathematics) asked what was meant by the stipulation that one faculty member be “from the graduate school.” Could this be anyone who was eligible to teach graduate courses? Ms. Seaman said that the committee had not really clarified this point.
David Gentry (Psychology) asked if this proposal was to be sent to By-laws after the Senate approved it. Yes, said the Speaker; all changes to the By-laws automatically must go through that committee, and that the proposal today “is being offered for information.” Glen Lesses (Philosophy) said that these kinds of requirements on committees made it very difficult for the Nominating Committee to find enough people to serve on them. Ms. Seaman said that the committee was seeking to make sure that the faculty representatives on the IT council represented a wide range of faculty, and not just a small range of departments.

**Faculty Welfare Committee**

Bill Danaher, chair of the Welfare Committee, displayed a proposal on how to implement the Labor Day resolution that had been passed by the Senate in October of 2004. The committee’s proposal was as follows:

The Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the Labor Day Holiday be taken on Labor Day and that the Memorial Day Holiday be moved to December 29th. Memorial Day is during Maymester and causes conflicts with classes during an already rushed semester. Labor Day is observed by many institutions in the area, often leading to family time conflicts, such as care of children. While we recognize the importance of Memorial Day, we feel as though a holiday on Labor Day would be in the best interests of the faculty.

Mr. Danaher said that Welfare had concluded that the College ought to take a holiday on Labor Day and trade that lost work day for the observance of the Memorial Day holiday. This approach, Mr. Danaher said, would have the advantage of eliminating the interruption of Maymester that is caused by the current observance of Memorial Day as a school holiday.

Mr. Mignone observed that this resolution, which was for information only, explained how to implement the holiday for staff, but that it did not address the issue of reducing the number of teaching days in Fall Semester. Mr. Danaher agreed to revisit this issue before they brought a formal motion to the Senate for a vote. David Gentry (Psychology) asked if the Senate would be able to vote on the Labor Day part of the motion separately from the question of giving up a Memorial Day observance. Mr. Mignone explained that there are a finite number of state holidays available for staff, so this needed to be accounted for in the motion.

**Curriculum Committee**

Deborah Boyle, chair of the committee, brought a series of proposals before the Senate. The first group of proposals was from the Hospitality and Tourism major.

1. **S05-07 HTMT Hospitality Management Internship—New Course Proposal**
2. **S05-08 HTMT 488 Strategic Hospitality and Tourism Management Seminar—New Course Proposal**

Darryl Phillips raised a question about the internship course. How would the grade be determined? “Maybe this needs to be addressed more broadly” in regard to all graded
internships, he said. John Crotts said that his department had decided to make its internship course “in alignment with other School of Business courses. Currently they are all non-credit.” With no further questions, the Senate then approved the Hospitality courses. They then approved the remaining proposals in Communication:

3. S05-09 Communication Major—Concentration in Communication Studies—Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
4. S05-10 Communication Major: Concentration in Media Studies—Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
5. S05-11 Communication Major: Concentration in Corporate and Organizational Communication—Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
6. S05-12 Communication Minor: Concentration in Communication Studies—Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Minor
7. S05-13 COMM 386—Proposal to Change a Course

Constituents’ Concerns
The Speaker invited faculty to raise other concerns. There were none, but Parliamentarian George Pothering (Computer Science) offered an announcement for the good of the order, congratulating his colleague Tony LeClerc on the arrival of his daughter.

The Senate adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary

Remaining Senate Meetings for Spring 2005:
April 19th (Agenda Deadline April 7th)
Spring 2005 Faculty Meeting:
April 11th (Agenda Deadline March 31st)
Curriculum Committee
8. S05-07 HTMT Hospitality Management Internship—New Course Proposal
9. S05-08 HTMT 488 Strategic Hospitality and Tourism Management Seminar—New Course Proposal
10. S05-09 Communication Major—Concentration in Communication Studies—Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
11. S05-10 Communication Major: Concentration in Media Studies—Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
12. S05-11 Communication Major: Concentration in Corporate and Organizational Communication—Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
13. 6. S05-12 Communication Minor: Concentration in Communication Studies—Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Minor
14. S05-13 COMM 386—Proposal to Change a Course
Speaker Bob Mignone called the meeting to order. He announced that the Secretary had already received two corrections for the February 1st minutes, and asked if there were any more to add. The minutes were then approved.

Reports
The Speaker
Mr. Mignone announced that that from henceforth, the Faculty Senate attendance roster would be posted on the Senate website along with the minutes of each meeting. The By-Laws stipulate that meeting attendance is public information, he noted. He encouraged Senators to sign and circulate the attendance roster.

The Speaker reported that at the next meeting, the Faculty Welfare Committee plans to bring a motion on the College’s observance of Labor Day. He then told the Senate that the ad hoc committee on General Education has been meeting regularly, and members of the committee have also been gathering for informal lunch discussions. Before long, there should be more developments to report, he said, and the informal discussions may soon be opened up to other interested faculty. The Committee on Retention is also proceeding with its work, he said. As for the Workload Committee, the Speaker said he still had no news. The committee has already delivered its report to the administration, he noted, and he hoped that the report and the administration’s response would be released by the end of this semester.

Finally, the Speaker apprised the Senate of the schedule of meetings during the rest of this semester. The Spring meeting of the full Faculty was set on April 11th, he explained, because the 11th was the latest date during the regular semester on which the President was in town and able to attend. This schedule means that the last Senate meeting, on April 19th, actually falls after the Faculty meeting. Normally, the Senate elects candidates for next year’s Nominations committee at its April meeting, and the faculty as a whole votes on those candidates at the Spring meeting. This year, however, the Committee on Nominations will elect that slate at the March 29th meeting rather than in April, so that the Faculty can vote on that slate on April 11th.

New Business
Curriculum
Deborah Boyle, chair of the committee, brought the following proposals before the Senate. All were approved.

S05-02 DSCI 314 Global Management of Technology – Proposal to Change a Course
S05-03 MGMT 325 Comparative Management – Proposal to Change a Course
S05-04 B.S. in International Business – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major (add TRAN 312)
Committee on Graduate Education
Sarah Owens, chair, proposed the following program changes, course changes, and new graduate courses. All were approved.

PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL
EVSS 646 and 647 - Graduate Core Seminars

PROPOSAL TO DELETE A GRADUATE COURSE
EVSS 647 - Graduate Core Seminar

PROPOSAL TO CHANGE A GRADUATE COURSE
EVSS 646 - Graduate Core Seminar

PROPOSALS FOR NEW GRADUATE COURSES
ENGL 529 - American Fiction Since 1945
PUBA 661 - Advanced Arts Management
SPAN 624 - Latinos/as Literatures and Cultures

Constituents’ Concerns
“This job is getting easier and easier,” said the Speaker. He invited Constituents’ Concerns, warning that future meetings would be busier since, evidently, many items for the rest of the semester would have to be dealt with at the remaining two meetings. The only concerns offered were from a few Senators who still had not had a chance to sign the attendance roster.

Concluding in record time, an astonished Senate adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary

Spring 2005 Meeting Schedule

Senate Meetings (Tuesdays at 5 PM):
March 1; agenda deadline February 17, 4 PM
March 29; agenda deadline March 17, 4 PM
April 19 (continued April 26 if necessary); agenda deadline April 7, 4 PM

Spring 2005 Full Faculty Meeting:
Monday, April 11; agenda deadline March 31, 4 PM
MINUTES OF COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON FACULTY SENATE

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, February 1st, at 5:00 p.m. in ECTR 116. 55 Senators attended. Speaker Bob Mignone called the meeting to order. He began by asking for corrections to the last meeting’s minutes, which the Senate approved as previously circulated.

Reports
The Speaker then reported on several items to the Senate. He told the Senate that the Provost has instituted a new policy on consensual relations between faculty and currently enrolled students. The policy prohibits faculty members having romantic relationships with students. Mr. Mignone read the policy and could not resist adding, “I have referred this to the Student Affairs Committee.” Next, he reported that there will be a new email distribution list from the Vice President’s office, but this will be a “read-only” list, to which the recipients cannot reply. The facultyandstaff@cofc list will be configured so that individuals now on the list may unsubscribe from it if they wish. “I don’t want that list to atrophy,” Mr. Mignone said. He intended to continue communicating through this list, he said, and he hoped faculty would choose to remain on the list and to use it as its primary means of campus-wide communication. Mr. Mignone also informed the Senate that the recently adopted new major in Discovery Informatics has received praise from the provost at Clemson, and its next stop for review will be the the SC CHE (Commission on Higher Education). Finally, Mr. Mignone thanked all faculty and staff who served as facilitators for the service projects performed for MLK Challenge on the recent holiday. He read the names of all these volunteers, who included faculty, administrators, alumni, and members of the community, and extended his thanks to them all.

Old Business

Committee on Tenure & Promotion
Jane Clary, committee chair, told Senators, “Well, we’re back!” She noted that after bringing a proposal to the Senate at its last meeting, the Committee has tried to improve its motion for a possible fourth-year review, in response to Senators’ comments. The amended proposal is as follows.

Motion to add possible Fourth-Year Review to T&P Process

At the request of the Provost, the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review is proposing the possibility of a fourth-year review in cases where the Department and/or the Dean recommend retention in the third-year review but where the Provost has serious reservations about the case. In cases such as these, the Provost might recommend for the fourth-year review instead of recommending for termination after the third year. In these circumstances, the candidate would undergo a formal fourth-year review.

J. Third Year Review, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional Faculty (page 74 in FAM), third paragraph. Insert at the end of the paragraph:

Original Motion: (Part to be changed is underlined)

In some cases, even where the recommendation is for retention, the Provost, in consultation with the Chair and the Dean, may require a fourth-year review to substantiate further whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made.

Amended Motion: (Changes are in bold italics)

In some cases, even where the recommendation is for retention, the Provost, at the request of the faculty member being reviewed, the Department Panel, the Department Chair, or the Dean, or at her discretion, in consultation with the above, may require a fourth-year review to substantiate further whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made.

M. Procedures for Third Year Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty
1. **Introduction**, final paragraph. Insert at the end of the paragraph:

**Original Motion:**

In the case where the Provost requires a fourth-year review, the procedure is the same as for the third-year evaluation.

**Amended Motion:** (Changes are in bold italics)

*For those faculty members required to undergo a fourth-year review, the Provost, in consultation with the Chair and the Dean, will determine the area(s) of professional competency for which additional material must be submitted for the fourth-year review. Otherwise, the faculty member's packet will remain the same as the packet submitted in the third-year review. The procedure for the fourth-year review in the areas of professional competency under review will be the same as for the third-year review.*

(Note) Section I explains the policy governing termination. This section will not change:

*After two or more years of service at the College in a tenure track position written notice that a probationary appointment is not to be renewed will be given to a faculty member at least twelve months before the expiration of any appointment.*

A person whose contract is not renewed after the third-year evaluation would have a one-year contract for a fourth year. A person whose contract is not renewed after the (new) fourth-year evaluation would have a one-year contract for a fifth year.

---

The Speaker invited discussion of this proposal. The first suggestion offered was that the language in the amendment should be changed so that it did not refer to the Provost using “her discretion.” Ms. Clary offered to amend this phrase to “at the discretion of the Provost.” Next, Joe Kelly (English) asked if the T & P committee had discussed this proposal with any faculty who had been at the College less than 3 years. They had not, Ms. Clary replied. Norris Preyer (Physics) noted that in the previous discussion of the proposal, Senators had raised questions about short time between the third and fourth year review, and whether a faculty member might have time to demonstrate improvement. Why has that not been changed in the amended proposal, he wondered. Ms. Clary replied that the candidate would have a year---two semesters---between reviews. Mr. Preyer persisted, “But you learn of this decision in the spring, when half the spring semester is over.” The new packet is turned in during the fall semester, he said, and if a candidate is “told they had lousy teaching, they would have half a semester to improve.” Ms. Clary replied, “Hopefully, they would have had some indication beforehand.” She added, “I’m not sure the purpose of the review is to improve the teaching. It’s just to see how the evidence looks” a year later.

Tony Leclerc (Computer Science) disputed the assertion that a candidate would already know if he or she had problems. “It’s possible that the person would know nothing,” he said, because this is signed for cases in which “the provost is disagreeing with what the deans and chairs think. So the way it’s set up, it could be that the candidate has no time to make any of the changes. They could be unaware that there was a problem.” Ms. Clary noted that candidates would be terminated at the end of the third year if there were serious questions about their teaching. Michelle Van Parys (Studio Art) said that a candidate who did not know that he/she had problems in teaching by the third year would indeed have “a serious problem.” Mr. Leclerc said that this seemed to suggest that the fourth-year review was not necessary for deficiencies in teaching, but that there was not enough time for a candidate to address other problems, either, if the candidate does not get feedback on them “until March.”

Alex Kasman (Mathematics) asked, “Is there an informal way to do this, without a formal packet being submitted? Couldn’t the provost get the information at the fourth year without this process?” Tom Baginski (German) noted that, as the highest academic officer, “The provost can make this decision any
time. . . . The nice thing that I see here is that the provost relies on the department for input.” Susan Farrell (English), acknowledged that the proposal was being “presented as candidate-friendly, but my fear is that in practice it would be a way of terminating people who haven’t done enough at their fourth year.” In effect, the proposal would be a way of not allowing people the full six years they now have to meet their research requirement, Ms. Farrell said.

Betsy Martin (Chemistry) asked about the wording of the proposal. The first paragraph refers to the fourth-year review being used “in cases where the Department and/or Dean recommend retention.” Elsewhere, the motion says it may be used “even where the recommendation is for retention.” She wondered what the phrase “even where” meant. Ms. Clary responded that “if the recommendation is for termination, this [fourth-year review] would not come into effect.” Joe Kelly asked if a candidate had the right to ask for a fourth-year review if the department or dean did vote for termination. Ms. Clary said no, and confirmed Mr. Kelly’s understanding that the review would be an option “only if the candidate is not fired.” Tom Kunkle (Mathematics) suggested that the wording be changed, removing the word “even” so that it would read “in some cases, when the recommendation is for retention.” George Pothering (Computer Science) wondered if the proposal was actually intended to take care of cases in which a department had voted for retention, but only by a slim majority. Wouldn’t this be a case in which the Provost would want a fourth-year review, “even when” the vote had been for retention, he asked. Other senators said that if this had been the intention, the proposal should have spelled it out the scenario it was designed to address. Marion Doig (Chemistry) then spoke in favor of the proposal, saying that it would be an extra opportunity for a faculty member who would otherwise be fired. This proposal allows a person to add “two semesters’ worth of evidence” of improved teaching, or two more semesters to publish. Therefore, “I don’t think any faculty member is going to complain” about receiving this opportunity, he said.

The Speaker asked if faculty were ready to vote. After a voice vote, the Speaker requested a division of the house. By a show of hands, the motion failed.

New Business

Committee on Graduate Education

Sarah Owens, chair of the Committee on Graduate Education, brought several items to the Senate. The first item was for information only: newly developed guidelines for writing a Master’s thesis. These guidelines can be accessed at the following link (disabled at the moment, but it will be fixed soon, she said.)

http://www.cofc.edu/gradschool/current/index.php

This page gives a suggested timeline for completing the thesis as well as specific information on practical matters such as formatting the document. This will enable both students and faculty to have a clearer idea of how to submit a thesis, Ms. Owens said.

She then presented the following items proposals to the Senate. All were approved:

COURSE CHANGE PROPOSALS

ENGL 512 - Southern Literature (change course description)
ENGL 523 - 19th Century American Literature I (change course description)
ENGL 524 - 19th Century American Literature II (change course description)
ENGL 528 - American Fiction 1900 to Present (change course title)
ENGL 532 - American Poetry 1900 to Present (change course title)
ENGL 534 - American Drama 1900 to Present (change course title)

NEW COURSE PROPOSALS

EVSS 639 - Wetlands Hydrology and Biogeochemistry
LATN 622 - Vergil
LATN 623 - Roman Historiography
LATN 673 - Roman Biography
PUBA 660 - Contemporary Perspectives on Arts Education
PUBA 662 - The Avery, The Community and Applied Research
(N. B.: Ms. Owens said that this title had been incorrectly submitted, and should read as follows:
PUBA 662 Cultural Administration and Applied Research at the Avery)
PUBA 663 - Arts and Technology
PUBA 664 - Arts Education

Curriculum Committee
Deborah Boyle, chair, presented the following proposals, all of which received approval from the Senate.

1. F04-32 PHYS 312 Galactic and Extragalactic Astronomy – New Course Proposal
2. F04-43 PHIL 160 Ethics and Sports – New Course Proposal
3. F04-44 RELS 315 Cults and Charisma – Proposal to Change a Course
4. F04-45 RELS 348 Asian Religions in America – New Course Proposal
5. F04-46 RELS 340 Advanced Topics in Asian Religions – New Course Proposal
6. F04-47 RELS 270 African-American Religions – New Course Proposal
7. F04-48 HONS 175 Approaches to Religion – New Course Proposal
8. F04-49 CHEM 441 Physical Chemistry I – Proposal to Change a Course
   CHEM 441L Physical Chemistry I Lab – Proposal to Change a Course
   CHEM 442 Physical Chemistry II – Proposal to Change a Course
   CHEM 442L Physical Chemistry II Lab – Proposal to Change a Course
10. F04-51 B.A. in Latin American and Caribbean Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
11. F04-52 Minor in Latin American and Caribbean Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Minor (add SPAN 447)
12. F04-53 Minor in Latin American and Caribbean Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Minor (add ENGL 233, ENGL 234, ENGL 358)
13. F04-54 Minor in Latin American and Caribbean Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Minor (add PORT 328)
14. F04-55 Minor in Latin American and Caribbean Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Minor (add LTPO 250, LTPO 350, LTPO 450)
F04-56 B.A. in Latin American and Caribbean Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major (add LTPO 250, LTPO 350, LTPO 450)

Faculty Welfare Committee
Bill Danaher, chair, brought a resolution that his committee hoped the Senate would endorse. This was a proposal “to support the formation of an adjunct welfare committee, and to direct President Higdon and Human Resources director Tom Casey to form this committee. The point is to give adjuncts representation here on campus,” Mr. Danaher said. The text of the proposal is as follows:

To: The College of Charleston Faculty Senate
From: The Faculty Welfare Committee
RE: A Resolution Concerning the Formation of an Adjunct Faculty Welfare Committee

It is hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports the formation of an Adjunct Faculty Welfare Committee. The Faculty Senate recognizes that the welfare of the adjunct instructors 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 adjunct instructional faculty of the College in much the same manner as the Faculty Welfare Committee serves the Faculty. While the Fourth Century Initiative of the College states as one of its primary goals the conversion of adjunct faculty to full-time faculty positions, this is a work in progress. Currently the College has a significant number of adjunct personnel whose welfare needs cannot be addressed by the Faculty Welfare Committee. Concerns of this committee shall be all College policies that affect the welfare of the adjunct faculty at large, such as:
15. employment and working conditions;
16. promotion policies;
17. work loads;
18. compensation;
19. leaves of absence;
20. 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 an Adjunct Faculty Welfare Committee.

Faculty Welfare Committee
Karen Berg, Hispanic Studies
Bill Danaher (Chair), Sociology and Anthropology
James Deavor, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Sara Frankel, Studio Art
Sheridan Hough, Philosophy and Religious Studies
Steve Jaume, Geology and Environmental Geosciences
Celeste Lacroix, Communication
Lisa Thomson Ross, Psychology

Discussion of the proposal ensued. Glen Lesses said that according to the current committee charges in the
Manual, the duties of the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Faculty Compensation Committee overlap
with this proposed committee. The Compensation Committee was recently formed to address salaries,
while Welfare is still charged with all other aspects of faculty welfare, including the welfare of adjuncts.
Mr. Danaher replied that an adjunct faculty member had met with Welfare and told the committee that
adjuncts “need more representation on things that are of concern to them, like salary and seniority.” He said
the adjuncts also desired a means of discussing these issues among themselves. The formation of this
committee would fulfill that request and free up time for Welfare to do other things, Mr. Danaher said.
Annette Godow (Physical Education and Health) spoke in favor of the proposal, saying that adjuncts “need
representation and aren’t getting it.” Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) said that he believed that adjuncts should
remain part of the purview of the Faculty Welfare Committee. “This committee is a good idea,” he noted,
“but we as a Senate are responsible for the welfare of all faculty, including adjuncts.” Julia Eichelberger
(English) said that Welfare has worked on behalf of adjuncts in the past, such as during the period from
2000 to 2002, when the committee made a sustained effort to get the administration to provide health
insurance to adjuncts. The Speaker then called for a vote, and the resolution passed on a show of hands.

With no further concerns offered, the meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary

Spring 2005 Meeting Schedule
Senate Meetings (Tuesdays at 5 PM):
February 1; agenda deadline January 20, 4 PM
March 1; agenda deadline February 17, 4 PM
March 29; agenda deadline March 17, 4 PM
April 19 (continued April 26 if necessary); agenda deadline April 7, 4 PM
Spring 2005 Full Faculty Meeting:
Monday, April 11; agenda deadline March 31, 4 PM
The College of Charleston Faculty Senate met Tuesday, November 30, 2004, at 5:00 p.m. in Room 116 of the Education Center. After calling the meeting to order, Speaker Bob Mignone invited and received approval of the October minutes.

Reports

**The Speaker**
Noting the very full agenda, the Speaker said his report was brief. Since the last Senate meeting, he has been exploring the implementation of the Senate’s October resolution recommending observance of Labor Day as a holiday by the College. He has decided to recommend that the Faculty Welfare Committee seek input from staff and students and then draft a motion offering possible choices for implementing observance of this holiday. Mr. Mignone read from a letter he had received from one faculty member, Mick Norton, urging that the College not do away with the Memorial Day holiday in order to find room for a Labor Day holiday, since he believed this would solve one problem by creating another. “None of the choices are painless,” Mr. Mignone observed, and he thinks, therefore, that the Senate should compare the available options and then recommend the best ones to the administration. Would the Senate object, Mr. Mignone wondered, if he were to charge the Welfare Committee with coming up with a list of choices? The Senate offered no objections to this plan, so the Speaker said he would proceed with it.

**Ad Hoc Committee on First-Year Experience**
Mr. Mignone then recognized Jack Parson (Political Science). Mr. Parson reported that Trish Ward, chair of the committee charged with exploring implementation of a first-year seminar for all freshmen, had asked him, as a member of the committee, to report on her behalf. After the Committee was formed, the Provost announced that she was initiating a re-examination of the General Education requirements. The Ad Hoc committee has since met with the Provost, and now believes it will be impossible to consider implementation of the proposed freshman seminar until the new Vice President for the Academic Experience is in place and until possible new directions in General Education are a little clearer. Thus the committee has decided it must wait until January, in hopes that it may have more information by then. Mr. Parson said the committee would report to the Senate as soon as it had made substantial progress.

**Diversity Committee**
Virginia Friedman, Vice President for Strategic Communication, reported to the Senate in her capacity as chair of the President’s appointed Committee on Diversity. She recalled to the Senate that last year there had been faculty concern about a senior vice-president search and the need for a diverse pool of applicants. She reminded the Senate that this search had culminated in Victor Wilson, an “excellent choice.” Last fall the President formed this Diversity Committee and asked it to investigate how other colleges achieve this desirable goal, to hold forums on the topic, and to give the President a recommendation of best practices for the College in this regard. Ms. Friedman said that
the committee has made a number of recommendations to Mr. Higdon, and that he is still considering many of them, but has already acted on others. He has directed the College “to recruit an individual with expertise in institutional diversity issues” who would report directly to him, a position that Mr. Higdon wants to be at the senior level. Recognizing that a search of this kind requires extra resources, Mr. Higdon has engaged an agency that specializes in diversity hires, and has asked Joy Vandervort-Cobb (Theatre) to co-chair the search committee; other faculty also serve on it. Provost Elise Jorgens added that she and the President have discussed recruiting visiting faculty, and that the author Charles Johnson, who was the past Fall’s Convocation speaker, has been contacted and has expressed interest in coming here, year after next. At least three other people are being considered to visit for a year or a semester here. These are exciting candidates, Ms. Jorgens said, who would also add to the diversity of our faculty during their visit. In regard to regular faculty hires, she noted that the School of Business has already successfully recruited a new African American professor, and that another African American candidate was considering an offer for another position. Ms. Friedman, continuing with her report, noted that her committee and the President had sent faculty members to two national conferences on diversity, and these faculty will be reporting on what they learned to department chairs. Perhaps a campus forum will be offered on this as well, she said. Once the new Diversity Officer has been hired, the College will conduct a Campus Climate Survey, which measures campus attitudes on gender and race.

New Business

Curriculum Committee
On behalf of committee chair Deborah Boyle, Susan Morrison brought a number of motions to the Senate. The first item was quickly approved, and then the proposal for a Concentration in Creative Writing drew some discussion. Susan Kattwinkel (At-Large) said she supported the proposed track, but did question the need for a director who would receive a $5000 stipend. “We have five concentrations [in Theater] and no one gets a stipend,” she said. Larry Carlson, chair of English, responded that the director would oversee the visiting writers’ series and would have to work during the summer as well as during the academic year. “Should this be approved, Susan, you might use that as an argument in your department,” Mr. Carlson suggested. The new concentration was then approved by the Senate.

1. F04-12 ARTH 410: Internship – Proposal to Change a Course
2. F04-13 B.A. in English, Creative Writing – Proposal for a New Concentration
3. F04-14 B.A. in English, Creative Writing Concentration – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
4. F04-15 ENGL 221 Poetry Writing II – Proposal to Change a Course
5. F04-16 ENGL 224 Advanced Fiction Writing – Proposal to Change a Course
6. F04-17 ENLG 406 Crazyhorse Literary Publishing Practicum – New Course Proposal

A Geology course was then approved as proposed. Regarding the next two proposed courses, Darryl Phillips (Classics/German/Italian/Japanese/Russian) asked why they were
not part of his department. Any course designated “LING” belonged to his department for purposes of workload, the receipt of course evaluations, etc. “I will happily approve it,” he said, but he thought that his approval should have been part of the process. Susan Morrison said that the curriculum committee had not been aware of this, and said they would address the problem for future proposals. Regarding the proposal for Spanish 400, Service Learning, George Pothering (Computer Science) wondered if someone would get humanities credit for taking it. Jose Escobar (Hispanic Studies) said that the credit would either be social science or humanities, depending on the nature of the project. The Senate then approved these proposals as well as changes to English 101 and 102.

7. F04-11 GEOL 412 Crustal Geophysics – New Course Proposal
8. F04-18 LING 498 Independent Study – New Course Proposal
10. F04-20 HISP 498 Independent Study – New Course Proposal
11. F04-21 HISP 499 Bachelor's Essay – New Course Proposal
12. F04-22 SPAN 400 Service Learning – New Course Proposal
13. F04-23 ENGL 101 Composition and Literature and ENGL 102 Composition and Literature – Proposals to Change a Course

Next, a discussion ensued for the proposals from the Biology department. Norris Preyer (Physics) said he believed that some of program descriptions “may have unintended consequences.” He offered a friendly amendment that specified that the Physics requirement for both proposed Biology majors included the Physics lab, and that only courses in Physics, not in Astronomy, would satisfy this requirement. Both these amendments were accepted as friendly, and the Biology proposals were then approved.

14. F04-24 BS in Biology, BS with Concentration in Molecular Biology, BS in Marine Biology, BA in Biology, BS teaching option – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
15. F04-25 BIOL 211 Biodiversity, Ecology & Conservation Biology – New Course Proposal
16. F04-26 BIOL 212 Genetics and BIOL 212L Genetic Laboratory – New Course Proposal
18. F04-28 BIOL 310 General Microbiology – Proposal to Change a Course
19. F04-29 BIOL 312 Molecular Biology – Proposal to Change a Course
20. F04-30 BIOL 313 Cell Biology – Proposal to Change a Course
21. F04-31 BIOL 321 General and Comparative Physiology – Proposal to Change a Course

Finally, the Senate considered courses proposals for the newly approved major and minor in Discovery Informatics. Frank Kinard (Chemistry) had questions about the sequencing of some of the courses, and George Pothering (Computer Science) explained that students completing the minor had a different course (DISC 201) that was not intended for majors; the majors would take CSCI 334, a course that was “much more deeply database-oriented.” These proposals were then approved.
Committee on Tenure & Promotion

Jane Clary (Economics), chair of the committee, explained that they were bringing a proposal that had evolved because the Provost, having completed her first year of the T & P review process, saw some things she wanted to add. Ms. Clary said the Provost “thought that it might be good in some cases to have a fourth-year review” if in the course of the normal third-year review “there were some questions about whether the candidate would be successful in the tenure process.” This proposed 4th-year review would be done at the recommendation of the provost in consultation with the dean and the chair, “for some candidates,” she said. The motion is as follows:

Motion to add possible Fourth-Year Review to T&P Process

At the request of the Provost, the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review is proposing the possibility of a fourth-year review in cases where the Department and/or the Dean recommend retention in the third-year review but where the Provost has serious reservations about the case. In cases such as these, the Provost might recommend for the fourth-year review instead of recommending for termination after the third year. In these circumstances, the candidate would undergo a formal fourth-year review.

Motion:

J. Third Year Review, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional Faculty (page 74 in FAM), third paragraph. Insert at the end of the paragraph:

IN SOME CASES, EVEN WHERE THE RECOMMENDATION IS FOR RETENTION, THE PROVOST, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CHAIR AND THE DEAN, MAY REQUIRE A FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW TO SUBSTANTIATE FURTHER WHETHER SATISFACTORY PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE HAS BEEN MADE.
M. Procedures for Third Year Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty

1. Introduction, final paragraph. Insert at the end of the paragraph:

IN THE CASE WHERE THE PROVOST REQUIRES A FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW, THE PROCEDURE IS THE SAME AS FOR THE THIRD-YEAR EVALUATION.

(Note) Section I explains the policy governing termination. This section will not change:

After two or more years of service at the College in a tenure track position written notice that a probationary appointment is not to be renewed will be given to a faculty member at least twelve months before the expiration of any appointment.

A person whose contract is not renewed after the third-year evaluation would have a one-year contract for a fourth year. A person whose contract is not renewed after the (new) fourth-year evaluation would have a one-year contract for a fifth year.

The Speaker invited discussion of the proposal. Norris Preyer (Physics) commented that this process seemed to be too short, because the candidate would only learn in the spring that he or she would have to present a new packet the following fall. The Provost answered, “You may be right,” adding that she would have been agreeable to making this a fifth-year review rather than a fourth-year one, as long as there was this additional review in place. “But on other hand,” she said, “the candidate is very likely to know by December if there are problems.” There were candidates last year who did not seem strong enough to earn tenure, and she had not favored their retention but “was persuaded otherwise.” Such candidates need to be reviewed again, she said. Mr. Preyer noted that we already have annual evaluations, and Ms. Jorgens said that these evaluations do not “have the same force as a process like this.” She also noted that if a poor candidate is ultimately denied tenure, they will be searching for a job after having been here for 6 years, and it will be clear to future employers that they were denied tenure, which is not in their best interest. Tony Leclerc (Computer Science) asked if the Provost believed that the third-year review process was not working. At the third year, people are informed of any deficiencies, and Mr. Leclerc wondered how someone “could not know” that they needed to address them. The Provost said that she “was not very happy with” the process she participated in last year. In some cases, this extra review is needed.

Marion Doig (Chemistry) said he thought this was “actually a faculty friendly proposal.” He said that with this process, “if there is someone who the Provost is thinking of not retaining, they will have an additional year to improve in an area that they probably already know about.” Mike Moore, (Economics) agreed, saying this was a way of “giving a marginal candidate a second chance.” Frank Kinard (Chemistry) spoke against the
proposal. “To me, this is a department chair’s problem,” he said. “When someone has been flagged [at the third-year review], the annual review should address the area that is deficient.” The Provost said she did not think the department chair had the right to terminate a marginal faculty member, and that this proposal “give us a stronger mechanism to address a problem” more quickly.

Paul Marino (Biology) said, “The only part that I find questionable is the second part. Why go through the process of preparing a whole packet again?” He said he thought the fourth-year review should only address “the issue that is deficient,” since “If someone is having problems the last thing you want to do is give them more work to do.” The Provost said she would not mind if the process were amended to have the candidate only address the problem areas. Glen Lesses (Philosophy) spoke in support of the proposal, saying he thought such candidates needed more than an annual evaluation by one person. George Pothering (Computer Science) said he agreed that the review should focus only on the deficient area. Departments send out graduate surveys for the third year; would they need to send them out again only a year later, and then once again in the 6th year? He said he thought the response rate would decline significantly if this happened. Mark Lazarro (Biology) said, “I don’t know if this procedure is the best way to go. If you haven’t published or gotten enough grants, you obviously know that. If you have the added stress and burden of turning in a packet, that takes a huge amount of time.” The Provost suggested that the candidate might be asked to resubmit the packet, changing only the problem areas. “It’s difficult to review just one area,” she said; “I want to see the whole package.”

Joe Kelly (English) asked who would initiate this recommendation. Jane Clary said the Provost would initiate it. Mr. Kelly asked if this meant the Provost is expecting she would terminate more candidates in the future. He also noted that some departments might consider a candidate somewhat marginal, but they could still have confidence that this person would improve enough to earn tenure, and they might not want that person to go through this process. Susan Farrell asked if the process was being proposed so that this sort of candidate “won’t have to be fired.” The Provost said, “Yes, that could be what would happen without this.” George Pothering said he believed departments should be able to ask for a fourth year review. Jack Parsons (Political Science) commented that this process would change “the whole dynamic of the tenure process. If we are going to do this, departments will want to be able to ask for it.” He said he thought that the fourth-year review would become “a fairly routine option that will be exercised more often.” He was also “concerned about the consultations that will take place with the chair and the dean” that might lead to the fourth-year review being required for someone. “The heart of the review process now is the collegial review, the departmental panel. The chair is the instrument of the department, and I would be concerned if the provost only consulted with the chair and not the department panel.” The Provost said she assumed that chairs did speak for their departments. (Snickering was heard from unidentified locations.) Jane Clary told Mr. Parsons that she thought that “if the department were to ask for a fourth year review, then I believe the packet would go to the T& P committee for review.” “So we are introducing a routine 4th-year review,” Mr. Pasons said. Ms. Jorgens noted that the
Provost could still overturn the department’s suggestion that a fourth-year review was needed. Ms. Clary said, “Those cases would go to the T & P committee.”

Susan Kattwinkel asked how many semesters a candidate would have time to teach, if the problem was in teaching. Between the request for a review and the following October, there is not even a full semester. Glen Lesses (Philosophy) noted that between the fall of the 3rd-year review and the following 4th year, there are 2 semesters of teaching. He also noted that currently, “anyone involved in the 3rd year review of a candidate may request that T & P look at the case.” He added, “As a matter of practice there are very few negative recommendations” because Departments are usually unwilling to terminate a candidate. Maureen Hays (Sociology) said of the proposal, “This becomes less faculty friendly depending on when the candidate is notified of when they will get a fourth year review.” She asked that the proposal be sent back to the committee. Ms. Clary said that the calendar would be the same as the present 3rd-year review calendar, which meant that the candidates would have to be notified by March 15th. Ms. Hays said that if the review were called for as late as March 15th, then candidates would have very little time “to address really anything by October” when the new packet was due. Reid Wiseman (Biology) noted that in his department there had been more than one case where candidates had not done enough research, and they were “admonished and encouraged to publish. But they didn’t do it and they did not receive tenure. You should have confidence in the process,” he said to Ms. Jorgens. She said she was concerned that “we wait three years for that to happen.” “What would you have told the candidates that we didn’t tell them?” Mr. Wiseman asked. The Provost said that her advice would have been the same as the department’s, but that without this process, “I would not have had the opportunity to say this isn’t working, it’s time to send you on your way.” Tom Baginski (German) questioned whether a candidate were better served by being terminated at the fourth year rather than after being denied tenure. Tony Leclerc questioned the need to “protect” candidates in this way. “These aren’t children,” he said.

Paul Marino said that it was quite possible for someone to produce “two significant publications by the sixth year, and you wouldn’t know at the fourth year” whether or not that would happen. The Provost said that “you would know if they were in the offing.” Claire Curtis asked for clarification of the proposal: is there not automatic review of the 4th-year packets by T & P? Mr. Lesses said this would be “at the Provost’s discretion.” Liz Martinez (Hispanic Studies) asked, “Could someone who was told they’d be fired by department, legally say that they want a fourth year review, that they are legally entitled?” Ms. Jorgens answered that she was “not clear when a candidate would do that,” but that she would not object to it. Frank Kinard asked if this would be initiated only in cases where both the dean and the department had recommended retention. The Provost said that the language states “even if” the recommendation was for retention. So it could be done if the recommendation were for termination. Charles Kaiser said that this seemed to be interpreting the third-year as a summative evaluation, when in many cases in the past it has served as a formative evaluation that helps candidates to improve. Jack Parsons said he still was “not very comfortable with this, not because I oppose 4th year review,” but because there were not enough conditions accounted for in the proposal: should a candidate be able to request such a review? Should a department?
Ms. Clary said she did not think such a review would be asked for. Ms. Jorgens said that her “supposition” was that “the department or the dean can make a recommendation for 4th year review” if either party had concerns but wasn’t ready to vote to terminate a candidate. Glen Lesses observed that the Provost can stipulate what she likes in the Faculty/Administration Manual, since it is not the Senate’s purview; we only advise on changes. Tom Kunkle (Mathematics), noting that it was now 6:20 p.m., moved to remand the proposal to the committee. This motion was seconded and then passed.

Committee on Academic Standards

Debbie Vaughn, chair, proposed the following.

On October 12, 2004, the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards approved Sylvia Gamboa’s request to change the Summer School Course Overload Policy.

Currently, printed and electronic information from the Office of Summer Sessions refers to “Maximum Course Loads Allowed.” The committee agrees that all wording should refer to “Recommended Maximum Course Loads.” We also feel that two caveats should be given:

- Students with a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or less are advised against taking an overload
- Students with a cumulative or major GPA of 2.0 or less are strongly advised against taking an overload.

Deb Vaughn notes that Sylvia Gamboa has told the committee that the current policy is not actually enforceable. Furthermore, the Summer School has compared students who take an overload to students as a whole, and finds that the overloads’ grades are actually better, so it is hard to claim that the new policy would be harmful to students. Therefore, she has requested that the prohibition be removed and the “strongly advised against” caveats inserted. The Senate then approved the Committee’s proposal.

Ms. Vaughn then turned to a second proposal, below.

On November 16, 2004, the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards approved Jeri Cabot’s proposal to amend the withdrawal policy (page 19, 2004-2005 Undergraduate Catalog).

Currently, the catalog reads:

Students may voluntarily withdraw from a course before the official withdrawal date of the semester (see "academic calendar") providing they do so through a
formal process. Students may withdraw from individual classes or labs through Cougar Trail on the Web. A grade of W will be entered on their record.

Proposed language that begins in last line of the current statement:

Students may voluntarily withdraw from a course before the official withdrawal date of the semester (see "academic calendar") providing they do so through a formal process. Students may withdraw from individual classes or labs through Cougar Trail on the Web. A grade of W will be entered on their record unless the student has been found responsible for an Honor Code violation. In that case, the professor determines the grade entered on their record for that class.

Rationale:

Many professors' syllabi indicate that if a student is caught cheating, then s/he will automatically receive an “F” for the course. However, two plagiarism cases have come before the Honor Board this semester prior to the official withdrawal date. These students were found in violation of plagiarism and were able to withdraw from their classes without getting the penalty of an “F” in their GPAs. There needs to be a policy in place that closes this loophole.

Ms. Vaughn explained to the Senate that as it stands now, if a student is charged with cheating in a course before the withdrawal date, then the student can just withdraw and there is no recourse for the professor. Therefore the committee wishes to prevent this possibility by adding the sentence at the end of the paragraph. Sue Turner (Hispanic Studies) asked who have to find the student responsible for an Honor Code violation. Ms. Vaughn said this would be the Honor Board. Ms. Turner said that the proposed language suggested that the faculty member could decide on a grade based on the faculty member’s belief that the student was guilty. Jeri Cabot (Student Affairs) said that this was not the intention of the amendment, and she offered alternative wording as a friendly amendment: “A grade of W will be entered on their record unless the Honor Board has found the student responsible for an Honor Code violation.” Once this amendment was accepted, the proposal was passed by the Senate.

Committee on Graduate Education
Sarah Owens, chair, proposed the following new courses and course changes. The Biology courses that were cross-listed with undergraduate course were being proposed jointly by the undergraduate Curriculum committee and the Graduate committee, as Susan Morrison confirmed on behalf of Curriculum. All the following proposals were then approved:

COURSE CHANGE PROPOSALS
EDFS 725 - Classroom Management (change title to Classroom and Behavior Management)
EDFS 726 - Advanced Classroom Management (change title to Advanced Classroom and Behavior Management)
PROPOSALS FOR NEW GRADUATE COURSES
FREN 603 - Stylistics
FREN 681 - Oral Proficiency in French
SPAN 682 - Spanish Oral Proficiency

PROPOSAL TO CHANGE THE MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH PROGRAM
Requirement changes for British Literature

NEW COURSE
BIOL 627 / EVSS 627  Marine Tetrapod Biology
BIOL 614/414  Environmental Immunology

Constituents’ Concerns
Incredibly, the Senate had now worked through its entire agenda. The Speaker asked if there were any Constituents’ Concerns, but all that could be mustered was Reid Wiseman’s anxiety that Senators might be missing that night’s broadcast of Jeopardy in which, as Internet rumor had it, the record winning streak would be broken. Given this concern and the triumphant completion of the night’s long agenda, the Senate moved to adjourn at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary
MINUTES OF COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON FACULTY SENATE MEETING

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, 5 October at 5:00 PM in the Addlestone Library, following a tour of the new building. Speaker Bob Mignone called the meeting to order and invited corrections to the September minutes. Hearing none, the Senate agreed to their approval.

Speaker’s Report
Mr. Mignone thanked Susan Morrison for serving as Parliamentarian for this afternoon’s meeting, since regular Parliamentarian George Pothering was unable to be present. He began his own report by noting that the next Senate meeting was scheduled for November 2nd. Mr. Mignone told Senators that this meeting date was chosen as part of a Fall meeting schedule designed to avoid conflicts with religious holidays or College breaks. However, Mr. Mignone said, this date happens to be Election Day. Mr. Mignone alerted Senators that he was considering whether it would be possible to postpone this November 2nd meeting, in order to ensure that all Senators had ample opportunity to vote that afternoon. “We’ll keep the deadline for the agenda” for this meeting, Mr. Mignone said, but will make the decision about postponing the actual meeting after all agenda items have been received. He told Senators that they would be informed of any changes.

He next gave the Senate some information about the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education, for which an election would be held at today’s meeting. He detailed for the Senate the information the Provost had given to the Committee on Nominations and Elections regarding the composition of this new committee and its charge. The charge is in three parts, he said. The Committee will first determine the learning goals of the College’s general education curriculum, then seek out and identify 6-8 innovative and effective programs at other institutions that fulfill these goals. Third, the Committee will develop a general education program for the College of Charleston, and this proposal should include an assessment of its costs. The first two parts should be completed by May 2005, and the last part by May 2006, Mr. Mignone said. As to the composition of the committee, the Provost has specified the following: 5 faculty elected by the Senate, 2 other faculty appointed by the Provost, 2 department chairs, one dean, one other faculty member, and one or two students. In addition, the Provost will be on this committee, and the Speaker will serve “as an observer,” he said. Committee members will total 13-15 members.

Mr. Mignone next informed Senators that an Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience is expected to be hired shortly. Two candidates were on campus recently for interviews, an appointment should be announced “in the next couple of weeks.” On the state legislative, there is little to report, the Speaker noted. The Council of Chairs sent in its recommendations (on how to replace Performance Funding with a different formula) in June, but no action has been taken yet.

Glen Lesses (Philosophy and Religious Studies) noted that he found the new Gen Ed committee’s charge “slightly worrisome.” Although the Provost has said she believes that curriculum should originate with faculty, her charge seems to presume that we need to
replace our current program. “Maybe we do,” said Mr. Lesses, but it seems premature to conclude this. Mr. Mignone said that the charge was to develop a proposal for faculty to vote on. “I expect a full discussion, first of the learning objectives and then of the proposal itself.” Tom Kunkle (Mathematics) asked how the actual proposal would be voted on. Would anything more that a simple majority be required, he wondered. Mr. Mignone said that we would follow our own bylaws on this matter. Program changes do not require a super-majority. “So we could have a situation where it’s 51-49 again,” Mr. Kunkle said (referring to the Gen Ed proposal of 1999 which ultimately failed by 4 votes). Mr. Mignone noted that this close vote occurred when the proposal was brought before the full faculty after it had been approved by the Senate. Bylaws allow the faculty as a whole to petition for such a vote in response to any vote the Senate takes.

**New Business**

**Committee on Nominations and Elections**

Rick Heldrich, Chair, and other members of the Committee passed out printed ballots for the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education. The following faculty were elected:

- Deborah Boyle; Philosophy & Religious Studies; School of Humanities and Social Sciences
- Julia Eichelberger; English; School of Humanities and Social Sciences
- Alex Kasman; Mathematics; School of Sciences and Mathematics
- Susan Kattwinkel; Theater; School of the Arts
- Allan Strand; Biology; School of Sciences and Mathematics

**Curriculum Committee**

Deborah Boyle, Chair, presented several proposals for new or changed courses. The following were approved immediately.
- F04-01 BIOL 339 Dinosaur Biology – New Course Proposal
- F04-06 EDFS 460 Student Teaching in the Content Area – Proposal to Change a Course
- F04-07 EDFS 440 Student Teaching in Special Education – Proposal to Change a Course
- F04-08 EDFS 330 Classroom Management – Proposal to Change a Course

Next, Ms. Boyle offered a proposal for a new major, a Bachelor of Science in Discovery Informatics, along with a minor in the same area.— New Minor Proposal. She noted that this is an interdisciplinary program designed to teach students “to use advanced statistical methods to mine data sets.” In the major, students also choose “a cognate area,” a specific discipline to which they apply their skill, but the minor does not require a cognate area, she said.

Mr. Mignone invited discussion of this proposal, starting with the major, and a very long exchange ensued. Sam Hines (Dean, School of Humanities and Social Sciences) spoke against the proposal. While he appreciated the hard work the committee had done to put this proposal together, he said, he was still concerned about the number of hours the major required: 67-72 hours, depending on the cognate discipline selected. “My objection
is not to the concept of the informatics program,” Mr. Hines said, but to “a continuing withering away of the fundamental concept of the liberal arts and sciences.” The major “is but a part” of this education, and the general education requirements and the elective components are extremely important. Mr. Hines suggested that the graduate-level expertise being required by this proposal was what concerned him. The College “needs to focus its attention on whether or not we really want to be a traditional liberal arts and sciences” institution, he said. Norine Noonan (Dean, School of Science and Mathematics) said that this proposal “was viewed as a way to broaden and not narrow students’ education.” The need for numerical and computational expertise is increasing, she said, “and without it our students will be at an increasing disadvantage.” She spoke of the variety of cognate disciplines that a student could choose, including Sociology, PEHD, and Business. “We didn’t ask for any waivers,” she said, “so all students will be able to take the general education requirements.” Even now, Biochemistry requires 76 hours, Computer Science requires 71, Geology 66, she noted.

Susan Farrell (English) noted that this major proposal includes 7 new courses, some with titles very similar to existing courses. “I have a hard time voting on this without seeing what these courses contain,” she said, especially if this is the first undergraduate major in the country in this subject area. Hugh Wilder (Philosophy and Religious Studies) said that the College has “long had an understanding about the maximum number of hours for a major.” Exceptions had been made if the major also satisfied accreditation requirements, or if students had the option to take a comparable major with fewer hours. He said he was not sure that this program conformed to any of these guidelines. Ms. Noonan responded that students did still have options and that many existing majors had “hidden prerequisites.” Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked why the major and the minor were being proposed simultaneously, since other new majors often began by proving themselves as minors. Chris Starr (Computer Science) said that the task force “never considered a minor until later on in our discussion,” when they decided that the minor “would be something that could help other majors. We think it is a reasonable package because we have to create so few new courses,” he said.

Reid Wiseman (Biology) asked how the major’s name was chosen. Jim Young (Mathematics) explained that “Informatics” in some countries means computer science; elsewhere it means library cataloguing, so they needed to make sure their term meant something different. As to the new course proposals, “we apologize for not having them today,” he said. The new courses have very little overlap with existing courses, he said. “For example, there is no exposure to Bayesian statistics in our existing courses.”

Joe Kelly (English) asked if this course was really similar to existing majors in the hours required. “When I look at the catalog, Computer Science is 40 hours. Where are you getting 70 hours?” he asked. Mr. Starr replied that students in computer science also had to take math courses, so those courses were part of the total. Julia Eichelberger (English) asked whether the new proposal had other hidden prerequisites, since its first math requirement was Math 220. Mr. Starr said that for this major, “we’ll be recruiting students who already are ready to take Math 220” because of taking calculus in high school.
Glen Lesses asked what students would be taking this major and why they would not be interested in any of the other majors now at the College. “Our evidence is indirect,” Mr. Starr replied. “We see a trend in students who want to engage in a major that not only is challenging but will provide them with concepts and skills for future employment. We already have hundreds of jobs ready for students with these skill sets. Monster.com has many jobs listed for students with these skill sets,” he noted. Deanna Caveny (Mathematics) addressed the issue of hidden prerequisites. She noted that the committee checked this carefully, and that there were no other hidden prerequisites besides Math 220. In response to Mr. Lesses, she noted that her own department did not believe it was appropriate to offer a statistics major at the undergraduate level, but that there were many students with an interest in this. Her department believes that this new major “is most appropriate for the undergraduate with an interest in statistics.”

Many other faculty asked questions and made comments. Lisa Thomson Ross (Psychology) asked if there was to be a new line for a program director of this proposed major; she was told that there was a one-course reduction in this proposal for a program director. Jim Young spoke about the appropriateness of an undergraduate major in the field. He said that when Dean Noonan approached him about proposing this major, they discovered there were none in the country on the undergraduate level, so he consulted with Carnegie Mellon, which offers a graduate program in this field. The director there “said he didn’t know why they didn’t have an undergrad program” in this area yet. “Maybe they will do it,” he added, since people with this training can get jobs so easily. Terry Bowers (English) noted that when a major requires as many hours as this one does, its students have “very little opportunity to pursue different interests and encounter different bodies of knowledge, which is a crucial component of the liberal education.” Alex Kasman (Mathematics) said that this new major “allows a very wide range of choices in its cognates” and is “very interdisciplinary. It would be very difficult to make it smaller. If you did, it would end up being in computer science. This is more interdisciplinary.” Deanna Caveny added, “Liberal arts is not about student choice, it’s about them bringing together lots of different disciplines.” Since no one is forcing students to take this major, they have choice, she suggested.

At this point, Susan Kattwinkel (Theater) asked that the Senate table the proposal pending further information. The motion to table failed by a show of hands.

More faculty voiced other opinions on the proposed major. Joe Kelly said he was not opposed to the major as an area of study, but said he was concerned about this proposal’s impact on the general education reform that would soon be presented. In the College’s last attempt at gen ed reform, he said, there was a split between the humanities and the sciences, with many science faculty objecting to the proposed gen ed curriculum because it was more complex and would make it more difficult for students to fulfill those requirements while completing their major. If we add this major, Mr. Kelly said, “then we have one more group of people who will be invested in defeating any changes to our Gen Ed curriculum.” Chris Starr asserted, “Just because the courses are predetermined, that doesn’t mean we are limiting their choices. This is allowing professionals to guide
the choices” that students make, he argued. “The way the courses are put together is at the heart of the liberal arts education.” Todd Grantham (Philosophy and Religious Studies) said, “My objection is that this does not fit with the mission of the college. It’s very specialized.” After looking up other places that offer this program of study, he has found that they all “are large research institutions. I think that’s where this program fits, not here at the College of Charleston.” Charles Kaiser (Psychology) asked why cognitive psychology was not included as a cognate discipline. Chris Starr said that over the past year and a half, he had invited departments to propose cognates and had not yet received a proposal to this effect, “but this program could evolve into your disciplines as you see datasets being accumulated.” Erin Beutel (Geology) spoke in favor of the proposal, saying, “I love the liberal arts, but we live in a changing world. This [Discovery Informatics] is a tool that is to be spread throughout the disciplines. It’s not enough to read and write” anymore; people need to be able “to use datasets.” Claire Curtis asked why, if this discipline were so important, it couldn’t be available to all students, not just the mathematically inclined who have studied calculus in high school. Glen Lesses asked if the program could be configured with fewer courses. Chris Starr said that the minor allowed students to do this.

A vote on the major was taken by a show of hands, and the major was passed by a vote of 33 to 23. The minor was then approved unanimously.

Resolution For a Labor Day Holiday

George Hopkins (History) proposed the following resolution to the Senate.

Resolution on Labor Day

It is hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate strongly recommend to President Higdon that the College of Charleston observe Labor Day as an official holiday for College students, staff, and faculty.

Rationale: Labor Day is a national holiday to honor the contributions of working women and men to this country. To be required to work on Labor Day contradicts the intent of this holiday. In addition, working on Labor Day causes major problems for many students, staff, and faculty because K-12 schools are closed and child care/supervision must be arranged and often paid for. Observing Labor Day as an official holiday at the College would send a strong message to staff and faculty that their work is valued. It would also send an important message to students about the value of work and the dignity of labor.

Mr. Hopkins used the projector to display a list of many institutions that observe Labor Day, including most public colleges in South Carolina, as well as some of our peer institutions such as UNC-Asheville. He noted that he recognized that there were a limited number of holidays the college could observe, but that he believed the calendar could be
adjusted without damage to the lab schedule. If the Senate endorsed the proposal, they would be “recommending that the holiday be observed” and asking the President to make the appropriate adjustments. Norris Preyer (Physics) said that his department was “strongly against” the proposal, which would “play havoc with the lab schedule” because it would eliminate a Monday class; Monday labs would lose a week. Mr. Hopkins noted that the College had been able to make such an adjustment to the Spring calendar in order to observe the MLK holiday, which is always on a Monday. Norine Noonan said that her staff did not want to have Labor Day as one of their holidays, and that the holiday would be bad for labs. Mr. Hopkins said, “The point is, do we want to observe Labor Day?” If we do, he stated, a plan could be worked out. Paul Marino (Biology) said, “If we were able to start on a Monday it would be fine.” Jason Overby (Chemistry) agreed that the semester would need to start on a Monday. Maureen Hays (Sociology) said that the faculty does not put the calendar together. “This motion is to honor the spirit of Labor Day,” she said, then ask the administration to make a calendar that does this. Glen Lesses said, “I would prefer that we first find out what the options are. The Speaker should go to the administration and find out exactly what our options are.” He moved to table the proposal; this motion was defeated. At long last the proposal itself came to a vote, and it was approved.

With no Constituents’ Concerns offered, the meeting adjourned at 6:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary

Fall 2004 Meeting Schedule

Senate Meetings (Tuesdays at 5 PM)

November 2; agenda deadline October 21, 4 PM
November 30; agenda deadline November 18, 4 PM
MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, 7 September in Room 116 of the Education Center. Speaker Bob Mignone gavelled the meeting to order at 5 p.m. The April 2004 minutes were approved, and the Speaker then took nominations for the 2004-2005 Speaker Pro Tem. Tom Kunkle nominated Susan Kattwinkel, who was then elected.

Reports

The Provost

The Speaker immediately recognized Elise Jorgens, who addressed the Senate as she began her second year as Provost. “It’s been a very exciting and eventful year,” Ms. Jorgens noted. She told faculty about three important goals that her office is busy addressing. One is the Tenure and Promotion process. After observing the process last year and after meeting with deans, chairs, and the T & P committee, the Provost has implemented some changes to the way material in T & P packets is presented (as detailed in a memo this August). Starting this year, T & P candidates will place their most important material in an executive binder, and this will be the first thing the T & P committee examines. Normally, this binder will be all that travels up the line from the committee to the Provost to the President. Any of these parties may request to see a candidate’s full portfolio if they need to, but often this is not necessary, “especially when the decision is positive.” The Provost said this is an effort to streamline the T & P process. This is the first year of the new process and the Provost expects that further refinements of the procedure may emerge next year. She believes that candidates will benefit from limiting their materials and narratives to a smaller space, because it will help them to decide how “to put their best foot forward” and make the strongest case for their promotion.

The Provost has also been concerned with improving the College’s retention rates. Currently 83-84 % of our freshmen return after their first year, Ms. Jorgens noted. While this is a respectable rate, we would prefer to be retaining students at the same level as the top-ranked colleges in the country, she said, “more like 90%.” A consulting firm, Noel-Levitz, will be serving on a retention coordinating team, and they will be “taking the broadest possible view of what it means to improve our retention rate,” exploring all aspects of student life that affect a student’s decision to continue at the College. Faculty, however, are the most important factor in these decisions, and the Provost will be seeking more input from faculty in the coming year. She noted that the College is “in the process of hiring” an Associate Vice-President for the Academic Experience. At first the College envisioned a V-P to focus on the first-year experience, then on retention, but now they realize the position “needs to focus on the overall academic experience our students have, not just retention numbers,” she said, adding that candidates for the position are visiting campus this month.

Finally, the Provost announced, she is interested in examining the College’s General Education Curriculum. “I am very cognizant that curriculum needs to originate with you,” she told faculty, “but I will have some things to say about where we need to put our
attention.” She has already been looking, at the president’s directive, for ways to emphasize our institutional distinctiveness, and has held a retreat with Deans about this topic in June. All the deans agree that in order to “put ourselves on the map” as a distinctively liberal arts institution, we must reexamine the General Education requirements. “It’s been awhile since you looked at that,” the Provost told the Senate, and it is a laborious process, but worthwhile. There will be a faculty committee, but she will serve on it as well, because she wants the recommendations to be supported by both faculty and administration. Anyone who is interested in serving should contact the Provost or the Speaker.

The Provost then invited questions. Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked when the Associate VP would start. The Provost said she hoped for a January start date, so that the VP could work alongside the Noel-Levitz firm, who will be working for us all this year. Andrew Smeltzer, speaking for the SGA, asked if there would be student representation on the Gen Ed committee. Yes, said the Provost. Mr. Smeltzer then asked for a description of the President’s vision of Gen Ed. What changes were being contemplated? Ms. Jorgens said she wanted these answers to come out of a discussion with the committee. “The President thinks that what we have now lacks the spark that we want it to have,” she said. Our current “basic distribution model... does expose students to a broad array of liberal arts, but I would like us to look at something that has a more distinctive character.” This could be “more broadly interdisciplinary” or it could be “much smaller core curriculum.”

Several faculty asked about retention, wondering if the reasons students chose not to return might be beyond our control. Reid Wiseman (Biology) thought online registration might be to blame, and Norris Preyer (Physics) wondered if many students came here with the intention of transferring after a year or two. Frank Kinard (Chemistry) noted that students who transfer in from tech schools are sometimes not prepared to step into our upper-level classes, and Liz Martinez (Hispanic Studies) asked if some students left in order to study programs that the C of C did not offer. The Provost acknowledged all these factors and thanked faculty for their suggestions, saying she looked forward to working with all faculty on these projects.

College Bookstore

The Speaker recognized two staff members from the College Bookstore, Kristen Wing and Whitney Stall. Ms. Wing said that they felt their fall “rush” had been fairly successful, and that they were here to confirm their commitment to serving the faculty. She announced that the Bookstore will be sending out a survey, developed by the Bookstore Advisory Council, next week, which will allow faculty to express any concerns they may have. “How many of you read the newsletter we sent out?” Ms. Wing asked. She said this fully explained their policies and demonstrated their concern for students. Spring textbook adoptions are due on October 15th, she said, and this will enable the bookstore to save students more money through buybacks. A few faculty do use other bookstores for textbooks, and she hopes to discourage this in the future, she said.
Sue Turner (Hispanic Studies) said, “I would like a pledge that books will be in on time and there will be enough ordered. I am sure everyone in this room knows of a horror story” of books not being in stock at the beginning of the semester. “The other unnamed bookstore always does come through,” Ms. Turner said. “In return for getting the orders in on time we would like a pledge that these will be on time.”

“That is our commitment,” Ms. Wing said. She then said that the bookstore does not “order the books right away so we don’t always know publishers are out of stock until the last minute.” She said it took the staff a long time to enter in the orders by hand. Norris Preyer asked if the bookstore wished to eliminate this hand-entry by using the “e-options” method of ordering that is on the Bookstore’s webpage. “All those I sent [via e-option] were lost,” he said. Whitney Stall answered, “I would prefer you to use an email directly to me.” Mr. Preyer noted that there was no follow-up to let him know that no books had been ordered for his course. “We made phone calls,” said Ms. Stall. Mr. Preyer said he only learned of the problem a week before classes began.

Andrew Smeltzer, the SGA representative, read out a number of prices of textbooks for sale at the College Bookstore, and compared these to prices charged by the bookstore that could not be named. In many cases the College Bookstore charged two or three dollars more per book. Even though this is not much for one student, it adds up to quite a lot of extra profit for Follett, he said, if one considers that there are ten thousand students at the College. Ms. Wing said that although Follett did operate the bookstore, the company was constrained by many obligations that stores in the private sector did not have to face. The College Bookstore is obligated to supply every textbook that is requested by faculty, she said, and other bookstores are not, nor do these stores have any financial responsibility to the College.

Lowcountry Graduate Center

The Speaker then recognized Skip Godow, who updated the faculty on the Lowcountry Graduate Center. This is a partnership between the College, MUSC, and the Citadel, formed in 2001 in response to community demand for more graduate programs. Mr. Godow said that the Lowcountry is one of only six areas of its size in the whole country that doesn’t offer a full range of doctoral programs. More high-tech graduate opportunities are needed, according to local and state officials who have studied the needs of the area.

Mr. Godow explained that all 3 institutions contributed a little for the startup of the LGC in 2001. Currently there are Computer Science courses being offered online, and there are two new certificate programs, one in Organizational Communication and one in Statistics. And the state has now come up with $465,000 which will enable the LGC to offer a program in electrical engineering. This money will mean a savings of $66,000 for the college. No longer will we contribute $18,000 for the LGC, nor will we pay $30,000 for rent on the North Campus. The LGC will now cover $4,000 that the College was paying in fringe benefits, and it will begin paying the College $14,000 for being the fiscal agent of the LGC. Also, two new staff positions will be added—new lines, not old ones.
already dedicated to the College—and there will be three new classrooms and four new faculty offices. All this is at no cost to us, said Mr. Godow, and the total benefit to college is worth $150,000. Another $100,000 has been set aside for program support, and faculty are eligible to apply for grants from this fund. Another intangible benefit is that S. C. legislators see this effort as being driven by the C of C, even though the LGC is a partnership with the other 3 institutions. Mr. Godow said that this positively affects our standing with the Legislature.

Faculty asked what programs would be added in the future. Mr. Godow said there has been talk of a doctoral program in policy or in education. Frank Kinard asked how the high-tech offerings could be justified, since they would require laboratory and research facilities that we lack. Mr. Godow said that there were labs available in the community, and there were many courses that would not require labs, according to MUSC. There are also other programs besides high-tech ones under consideration. He added, “If we really need more money for these labs from the legislature, we will be able to get it.”

The Speaker

Mr. Mignone then turned to his own report, which he promised to deliver very briefly, given the lateness of the hour. He noted that the Senate would be meeting in the new library for its October 5th meeting, and that faculty could come early for a tour, at 4:30. He also said that the Ad Hoc Committees on Workload and on Class size should be delivering their reports soon. He reported that the South Carolina Council of Chairs has submitted to the state, at CHE’s request, a draft of a new form of accountability that is intended to replace the “performance funding formula” that is currently in use. Finally, he urged all faculty to come to the full Faculty meeting on Monday, 13 September, since both the Provost and the President will be addressing faculty with important information. Mr. Mignone also noted that, since this is the first Senate meeting of the year, he wished to thank Julia Eichelberger (Secretary), George Pothering (Parliamentarian), and Deb Vaughn (volunteer webmaster and projectionist), and Susan Kattwinkel (just elected Speaker Pro Tem) for their willingness to serve.

New Business

Committee on Nominations and Elections

Rick Heldrich, this year’s committee chair, passed out paper ballots to elect an Ad Hoc Committee on the First Year Experience and to elect a replacement member for the Committee on Graduate & Continuing Education. After the meeting was over, the full count was completed, with these results.

Ad Hoc Committee on the First Year Experience:

Susan Kattwinkel, Theatre
Chris Korey, Biology
Melanie Kyer, German
Jack Parson, Political Science
Phillip Powell, Library
RoxAnn Stalvey, Computer Science
Trish Ward, English
Replacement member, Committee on Graduate and Continuing Education:
Rohn England, Mathematics.

Curriculum Committee
Deborah Boyle, this year’s chair, presented the following items. All were approved.

1. B.S. in Mathematics, Secondary Education Track – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
2. PEHD 438 Advanced Topics in Resistance Training and Conditioning – New Course Proposal
3. PEHD 439 Advanced Topics in Exercise Physiology – New Course Proposal
4. PEHD 498 Capstone Experience in Exercise Science – New Course Proposal
5. B.S. in Physical Education and Health, Exercise Science Concentration – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
6. Bachelor Degrees in PEHD, EDFS and Secondary Minors in BIOL, ENGL, GEOL, HIST, MATH, PHYS, POLS, SOCY, and Foreign Languages – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for Fall 2004

The last item presented was a proposal for a new course that was cross-listed as both a graduate and undergraduate course, BIOL 414/614 Environmental Immunology. After discussing the different assignments that determined whether a student would receive graduate or undergraduate credit for this course, senators asked whether this course had been approved by the Graduate Committee. Sarah Owens (Hispanic Studies), chair, said that it had not, and that such courses should be approved simultaneously by Curriculum and by her committee. After some consultations with the Senate parliamentarian, the proposal for BIOL 414/614 was remanded to the Graduate Committee. Without its approval, the Senate cannot vote on the proposal.

Constituents’ Concerns

Susan Farrell (English) reported that her department had asked her to raise their concern about the very loud noise that recent street concerts have caused on George Street. This amplified music is very disruptive, preventing English Department faculty from meeting with students or conducting other business in their offices, she said.

George Hopkins (History) announced that he was considering introducing a resolution that the College observe Labor Day, and that he would be interested in other faculty’s suggestions on this topic.

The Senate adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger, Secretary