The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, April 25, 2006, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115 to continue business that we didn’t finish at the April 11 Senate meeting.

**New Business**

**Curriculum Committee**

Faculty Speaker Bob Mignone recognized Agnes Southgate, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, who moved several curriculum proposals (see Appendix I).

**A) Marketing & Supply Chain Management**

The first item the Senate discussed was a new major in Supply Chain Management. Chris Hope, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, reported that her committee was split in its vote on the proposal. They understood the desire to design special majors to stay in line with other business schools in the nation and to be on the cutting edge, but committee members had the following objections to the proposal:

1) That it was too specialized for an undergraduate major and would be more appropriate as a concentration.
2) That it required a very high number of hours to complete (although it is not out of line with other business majors).
3) That two required courses in the major are not yet fully developed.

The Speaker then recognized Erin Beutel, Chair of the Budget Committee, who said her committee had been concerned about the costs of the two new courses, but had been reassured there would be an amendment put forward in the Senate that would address costs.

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) reminded Senators that the College requires every department to offer a major with 36 hours. She argued that it is unclear where the 36 hour major, which would serve as an alternative to the Supply Chain Management major, is. Jose Gavidia (Management and Entrepreneurship) replied that, in the School of Business, there is no clear correspondence between majors and departments. Departments are groups of faculty, but majors don’t necessarily correspond to department groupings. Chris Hope added that there are exceptions to the 36-hour rule for the Schools of Business and Education. Mr. Gavidia also pointed out that the proposal for the major reduces hours from the concentration as it currently exists.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) spoke next. She wondered why there was no answer to question #8 on the new major proposal form. Thus, there was no academic discussion of why the particular courses for the major were chosen or how they fit into the beginning, middle, and end of the major. Ms. Curtis also worried that prerequisites for required courses would add to the high number of hours for the major. Finally she pointed out that
48 hours in the major are specific, required courses, and only 3 hours offer any type of elective. She would like to see a fuller explanation and justification for the major in pedagogical terms.

Terry Bowers (English) added that some members of the Academic Planning Committee simply felt the proposal was incomplete. For instance, no syllabi for the two new courses were offered. Mr. Bowers suggested the proposal was too incomplete to vote on. Ms. Southgate, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, spoke to this issue, pointing out that her committee had struggled with the issue of whether or not all new courses should have to be included with proposals for new majors. She believes they should, but argued that past precedents had been set for approving majors without all new courses fleshed out. Next year’s Curriculum Committee, she added, might have to deal more fully with this issue.

Glenn Lesses (Philosophy) voiced objections that he said were along the same lines as those originally presented by Chris Hope. He wanted to hear more about the review of the proposal by the Academic Planning Committee. He also wondered how the new major fit into the liberal arts and sciences curriculum. Some preliminary research he did shows that, around the country, places with majors like this were large, research universities with good programs in these areas. Wharton, MIT’s Sloan School, and some of the other best business schools in the country, as well as the COPLAC schools (Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges) did not have similar programs. In light of this, Mr. Lesses asked whether the major represented a legitimate undergraduate program.

Joe Kelly (At-Large, English) then raised two questions. First, he wondered if any of the schools mentioned by Mr. Lesses had specialized, niche programs based on their location. He suggested that the new major in Supply Chain Management might make sense here because of our location. Mr. Lesses replied that Sonoma State University has a wine management program, but most of the schools he researched did not have the kind of specialized, niche programs Mr. Kelly was asking about.

Second, Mr. Kelly asked why the proposal did not include a catalog description of the major. Ms. Southgate replied, saying that there had been many different versions of the proposal. Apparently, the proposal came to the Curriculum Committee and was sent back for revision several different times. Julia Eichelberger (At-Large, English) then asked for clarification about whether it is customary to vote on a major without a list of the major requirements. Ms. Southgate replied that it is not. She believes that there was a catalog description in an earlier version of the proposal, and that the description should have been included in the proposal, but wasn’t. Both Jose Gavidia and Gerry Gonsalves (Management and Entrepreneurship) confirmed that this was the case.

Daryl Phillips (Classics/German/Italian/Japanese/Russian) moved that we table the proposal and reconsider it next year. After a brief conference with Parliamentarian George Pothering, Mr. Phillips changed his motion. Instead of tabling the proposal, he moved that we refer it back to the Curriculum Committee.
The floor was then opened to discussion of Mr. Phillips’ motion. Jack Parson (Political Science) wondered if it were clear what the Senate is asking the Curriculum Committee to do with the proposal. It was generally acknowledged that the questions asked by Senators in the discussion of the proposal (and now contained in these minutes) would need to be answered. Julia Eichelberger said she’d like to see the proposal explain more clearly to the non-specialist what constituted the beginning, middle, and end of the major. Right now, the only rationale offered by the proposal is that students taking the major will be well paid upon graduation.

David Gleeson (History) argued that the Curriculum Committee had already passed the proposal and that he didn’t think it was fair to hold this proposal to a higher standard than other items which had been approved by the committee.

Daryl Phillips pointed out that only four pages of the proposal were available on the Senate website. Obviously, somewhere in the process, pages have dropped out of the proposal. The Senate needs a complete document.

The Senate voted to send the new major proposal in Supply Chain Management back to the Curriculum Committee for further consideration.

The Senate approved all of the other curriculum items, after brief discussion of the following items:

C) School of Sciences and Mathematics
Ms. Southgate pointed out that the new courses proposed by the School of Sciences and Mathematics, all research experiences carrying no credit, were created mostly so that students could receive stipends. State rules stipulate that students can’t receive stipends and credit hours for the same course. Paul Young (Mathematics) asked whether these courses would have any effect on students’ GPA’s. Ms. Southgate replied “no.” Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) asked if a grade of “unsatisfactory” in the research experience would appear on student transcripts. Ms. Southgate replied that it would.

G) Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education
Ms. Southgate pointed out that the new B.S. in Cognate Secondary Education would replace the current minor in Secondary Education. Students would still have to major in another academic discipline as well. Terry Bowers (English) announced that the English Department was split in their vote on this proposal. Those who were against it thought that the current hierarchy (major in a discipline, minor in secondary education) is good because it emphasizes a content area. He wondered if there is any evidence that this proposal will attract more teachers, suggesting it might have the opposite effect of scaring potential teachers away because it sounds like more work. Fran Welch, Dean of the School of Education, replied that this proposal is on the floor because students have asked for it. And further, students asking for it are good students—teaching fellows quite often. They believe they are already doing the work of a double major and they want credit for that. In addition, Ms. Welch argued that Secondary Education is currently
buried in the catalog and at the college; it’s difficult to find. Her School wants students to have strong content areas, but strong training in pedagogy as well.

Betsy Martin (Chemistry) spoke next, pointing out that her department was split on the proposal as well, for many of the same reasons cited by Mr. Bowers. She urged, though, that we make the path to teaching for students as smooth and accessible as possible. Bob Perkins (EDFS) argued that one reason for the new major is to reward students, but other reasons are to recruit new students and to help with advising. Students often come to teaching late and many advising problems arise because they are not getting to Secondary Education until it is too late. Andy Lewis, Chair of the Teacher Education Council, which has members from various academic departments, added that the council voted overwhelmingly in favor of this proposal. Students are currently putting in much, much more than the typical 18 hours required of a minor, but receiving credit for only a minor.

**Addendum to Curriculum Proposals**

Ms. Southgate moved to suspend Senate rules to allow us to consider an addendum to the curriculum items under consideration, since these new items had not appeared on the original April 11 agenda and the Senate had not seen them a week in advance. (See Appendix 2 for Addendum items).

The Senate approved suspending the rules by the required 2/3 vote.

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) asked for clarification about the following sentence describing the proposed change for ARTH 338: “This falls into same category as ARTH 335 and should read the same way.” Ms. Southgate explained that this sentence means the prerequisites for both courses will be the same.

The Senate approved all items proposed in the Addendum.

**Graduate Education Committee**

The Speaker then recognized Betsy Martin, Chair of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs, who first introduced a proposal for a Certificate Program in Medical and Health Care Interpreting, noting that the program received positive recommendations from both the Academic Planning and Budget Committees. The Certificate Program itself, Ms. Martin added, does not need a vote, but the new courses that accompany the program must be approved by the Senate.

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone asked for clarification about whether the Senate was being asked to vote. Hugh Haynsworth (Dean of Graduate Studies) replied that the Senate was welcome to vote on the proposal even though such a vote is not required. If the courses are voted down, he added, the proposal will be dead anyway.

Glenn Lesses (Philosophy) opened the discussion by referring to an article he’d seen in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* six weeks ago. This article stated that the college’s Program in Legal Interpreting, which has been in existence for ten years, has graduated
only 25 students. Mr. Lesses said that these figures made him question whether enough demand for the new program is really there. He wondered if instituting such a program would be a good use of the College’s resources. Liz Martinez (Hispanic Studies) spoke to Mr. Lesses’ question, noting that she is the one who put the certificate program together. She has volunteered at MUSC and sees a great need for such a program. The needs are so great, in fact, that Hispanic patients sometimes wait 4-5 hours for an interpreter to arrive to help them. The low number of students graduating from the Legal Interpreting Program, she added, is probably because all courses are offered during a six-week period in the summer. The program is currently being moved into the regular academic year so working people can take evening courses over a more spread-out time period.

George Hopkins (History) added that, in his view, Legal Interpreting is highly specialized, but that the Medical Interpreting Program would appeal to a wider range of people.

Hugh Haynsworth added that the *Chronicle* article Mr. Lesses referred to was extraordinarily positive about the Legal Interpreting Program. He added that new students have not been accepted into that program every year, and that it was funded out of summer school tuition. The current program being proposed is separate from Legal Interpreting with no intersecting courses. If the Medical Interpreting Program becomes successful, it might be possible, down the road, to incorporate the two into a single program in interpreting.

The Senate then voted to approve the new Certificate Program in Medical and Health Care Interpreting.

Ms. Martin next introduced the four new courses that will accompany the certificate program:

a. INTR 514 - Fundamental in Medical Interpreting  
b. INTR 601 - Written and Sight Translation in Health Care  
c. INTR 607 - Languages and Cultures in Health Care  
d. INTR 613 - Consecutive Interpreting in Health Care

Susan Kattwinkel pointed out a typo in the title of the first course. It should actually read “Fundamentals in Medical Interpreting.”

There was no further discussion. The Senate voted to approve all four new courses.

**Graduate Education Committee—Honor Code and the Grade of XF**

Betsy Martin, Chair of the Graduate Education Committee, then moved to suspend the Senate rules to consider a motion from the committee concerning the Honor Code and the Grade of XF. The motion to suspend was necessary because this item did not appear on the original April 11 Senate agenda and because Senators did not see the motion a full
week in advance. The motion to suspend the rules was approved by the required 2/3 vote.

Ms. Martin introduced the motion, which reads as follows:

“We move that the Graduate School adopt the Honor Code as approved. When an XF is awarded to a student in a graduate program, the grade will carry a GPA of 0.0. However, dismissal is not automatic. Rather, the student’s status in the program (e.g., continuation with sanctions and probation, suspension or expulsion) will be determined pursuant to the College of Charleston Honor Code. The form used by the professor to report a suspected Class 1 or Class 2 violation to the Honor Board will have a place for the professor to check whether, based on the offense, he/she recommends Class 1 (sanction 1 or sanction 2) or Class 2 (sanction 1 or sanction 2).”

Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked what the committee’s rationale for this proposal was. She pointed out that academic expectations of graduate students are higher than for undergraduate students—they get kicked out of the program after receiving an “F” in a course. She asked why we shouldn’t have higher ethical expectations of graduate students as well. Ms. Martin replied that the Academic Standards Committee had not sent the original XF proposal passed by the Senate to either the Graduation Education Committee or the Graduate Council. Thus, those two bodies had no input into the institution of the XF grade. The Graduate Council, in particular, did not want to turn this issue over to another body since it has such serious consequences for graduate students. Yet, some people argue that we’re one institution and the Honor Code should apply to all, equally. This proposal represents a compromise view.

Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) then asked what we call adjuncts without doctorates who teach in graduate programs—professors or instructors? He pointed out that the wording in the motion might be a bit misleading and made a friendly amendment to change the word “professor” when used in the motion to “instructor.” The amendment was accepted.

Paul Young (Mathematics) asked who would determine the student’s status in the program, pointing out that this point is unclear in the motion. Ms. Martin replied that the Honor Board makes this determination. Mr. Young then moved a friendly amendment to add the phrase “by the Honor Board” after the words “will be determined” in the motion. The amendment was accepted.

David Gleeson (History) asked for clarification about the word “dismissal” used in the motion. He wondered whether “dismissal” meant suspension or expulsion. Ms. Martin said that it depended what class of violation the student was convicted of and what the sanction was determined to be. Hugh Haynsworth added that the works “expulsion” and “suspension” are used in the Honor Code, but the term “dismissal” has been used for years in the Graduate Catalogue. Dismissal is not equivalent to either suspension or expulsion. With a dismissal, a student is not eligible to re-apply for a program for one year. Then, the student may re-apply, and may or may not be re-admitted.
Mr. Wiseman then asked whether there were two separate Honor Boards, one for undergraduates and one for graduate students, or just one. Mr. Haynsworth replied that there is a single Honor Board, but that graduate students sit on cases involving other graduate students.

Discussion ended, and the Senate voted to approve the Graduate Committee’s motion concerning the Honor Code and the Grade of XF. The amended motion reads as follows (changes to the original motion are in red):

“We move that the Graduate School adopt the Honor Code as approved. When an XF is awarded to a student in a graduate program, the grade will carry a GPA of 0.0. However, dismissal is not automatic. Rather, the student’s status in the program (e.g., continuation with sanctions and probation, suspension or expulsion) will be determined by the Honor Board pursuant to the College of Charleston Honor Code. The form used by the instructor to report a suspected Class 1 or Class 2 violation to the Honor Board will have a place for the instructor to check whether, based on the offense, he/she recommends Class 1 (sanction 1 or sanction 2) or Class 2 (sanction 1 or sanction 2).”

Constituents’ Concerns

The Speaker recognized George Hopkins (History), who pointed out that, when we discussed the Coca-Cola Corporation at the previous Senate meeting, issues of human rights violations at other companies the College does business with were raised. Some faculty members argued it was unfair to single out Coca-Cola. Mr. Hopkins asked whether the College has a corporate responsibility clause in any of our vending contracts. Some other universities do have such clauses, and Mr. Hopkins feels the College should have a uniform policy about these issues as well. Mr. Mignone promised to check more fully into this matter and get back to the Senate about it. Scott Peeples (English) pointed out that a resolution about Coca-Cola passed by the SGA does include language about a corporate code of conduct. This was the one difference between the SGA resolution and the resolution passed by the Senate.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:25.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix 1: Curriculum Proposals

A) Marketing & Supply Chain Management
-Proposal for a new major: Supply Chain Management

B) English
-Proposals to change a course:
  1. ENGL 101: change course title and description
  2. ENGL 102: change in course description

C) School of Sciences and Math
-New course proposals
  1. BIOL 397: Research Experience in Biology
  2. CHEM 397: Research Experience in Chemistry
  3. CSCI 397: Research Experience in Computer Science
  4. DISC 397: Research Experience in Discovery Informatics
  5. GEOL 397: Research Experience in Geology
  6. MATH 397: Research Experience in Mathematics
  7. PHYS 397: Research Experience in Physics

D) Theater
-New course proposals
  1. THTR 365: Musical Theater performance workshop
  2. THTR 323: Creating scene and song

E) Latin American and Caribbean Studies
-New course proposal
  1. LACS 499: Bachelor’s Essay

F) Arts Management
-Proposals to change a course
  1. ARTM 340: Add ARTM 310: Advanced Arts Management as a pre-requisite
  2. ARTM 370: Building Participation in the Arts: Add ARTM 200: Introduction to Arts Management as a pre-requisite.
  3. ARTM 400: Internship. Remove ARTM 340: Arts Financial Management or ARTM 420: Policy in the Arts as pre-requisites

G) Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education
-Proposal for a new major: B.S. in Cognate Secondary Education (to replace existing minor)

H) Communication
-New course proposals
  1. COMM 378: Persuasion
  2. COMM 389: Public Opinion in American Politics
  3. COMM 395: American Politics and Mass Media
4. COMM 475: Electronic Magazine Production

- Course Change Proposals
  • Add prerequisites to COMM 380

- Delete a Course
  • Delete COMM 231: Journalism Practicum

- Proposal to Change electives for the Communication Studies Concentration
  • Add COMM 378 to Theory

- Proposal to Change electives for the Media Studies Concentration
  • Strike Theory/Research and insert Advanced Theory
  • Add COMM 378 to Media Electives
  • Add COMM 475 to Advanced writing
  • Strike POLS 389 and insert COMM 389
  • Add COMM 395 to Advanced Theory

- Proposal to Change electives for the Corporate and Organizational Communication Concentration
  • Add COMM 378 to Applications/Electives

- Proposal to Change electives for the Communication Studies Minor
  • Add COMM 378

- Proposal to Change electives for the Media Studies Minor
  • Add COMM 378, COMM 389, and COMM 395

I) Sociology:
- New course proposals:
  1. SOCY 272: Statistics for Sociology
  2. SOCY 372: Qualitative Research practicum
  3. SOCY 379; Special Topics in Social Research

- Proposal to delete a course:
SOCY 363: African American Society and Culture

- Proposal to change a course:
  1. SOCY 343,350 and 354: change course number to respectively SOCY 366, 365, 364
  2. SOCY 347: change course number to SOCY 361 and catalog description
  3. SOCY 360: change course title, course prerequisites, and catalog description.
  4. SOCY 369: change course title and catalog description.
  5. SOCY 371: change course title, course prerequisites and catalog description.
  6. SOCY 362 change in course description
- Proposal to change degree requirements: B.S. Sociology
Appendix 2: Addendum to Curriculum Proposals

Art History program

ARTH 265: The city as a Work of Art. Remove all prerequisites

ARTH 299: Research and Methods in Art History (our "gateway" course)
Prereq currently reads: ARTH 101 or 102 or permission
Due to changes in the overall program, this should say:
6 hours of Art History or Permission of instructor

ARTH 335: History of American Architecture
Prereq currently reads: Permission ...or 6 hours of Art History or ARTH 299
Because of changes in HPCP program (for which these is an elective), this should say:
Permission of instructor OR six (6) hours of Art History OR ARTH 299 OR HPCP 199.

ARTH 338: American Vernacular Architecture and Material Culture
This falls into same category as ARTH 335 and should read the same way.

ARTH 340: Selected Topics in Art History
Prereq currently reads ARTH 101 or 102 or 103 or permission (This was the old listing).
It should read like all 300-level courses, that is:
Permission of instructor or 6 hours of Art History or ARTH 299.

Historic Preservation and Community Planning

HPCP 339 History of American Interiors add prerequisites HPCP 199 or permission of instructor

HPCP 420 Preservation Law and Economics. Remove ARTH230 as prerequisite, add
HPCP 199

HPCP 490 Independent study. Add prerequisite Junior or Senior standing in HPCP with
3.0 GPA (overall and HPCP)
The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, April 11, 2006, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115. Because we didn’t finish all business on the agenda, we will meet again on Tuesday, April 25 at 5:00 in Beatty Center 115.

The minutes from the March 28 Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens reported she has asked Julia Eichelberger to take over as Chair of the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education. She is quite pleased with the direction the Committee has taken and is ready for her participation to diminish a bit.

In addition, Ms. Jorgens announced a re-organization of the Office of Undergraduate Studies. Various people and responsibilities are being shuffled to form a new Office of Undergraduate Academic Services, which will be headed by Lynn Cherry. Current Dean of Undergraduate Studies Sandy Powers will become an Associate Vice President and academic liaison to CHE. The Provost will provide faculty a fuller report on these changes soon.

Speaker

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone publicly recognized President Lee Higdon for the job he's done while at the College of Charleston. Mr. Mignone said that President Higdon has had a transforming effect on this campus, especially in relation to facilities, faculty salaries, new hires, and student-focused initiatives. He added that President Higdon will be missed when he leaves, and that his effects on campus will be felt long after he's gone.

Mr. Mignone also announced that he will be a member of the search committee charged with finding a new president. Terry Bowers (English) asked if a national search for the new President would take place. Mr. Mignone replied that he doesn’t know for sure. According to an article in The Post and Courier, the search will involve either a “target shoot” or a “fishing expedition.”

Julia Eichelberger, Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education

Julia Eichelberger, of the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education, announced that her committee has been working to provide defining characteristics for the general education goals the Senate approved in January. The next step in the process will be to identify what kinds of curriculum and other activities the College currently has in place to meet these goals, and where there are holes. She hopes that her committee will have at least
one stage of a concrete proposal ready to bring to the Senate in the fall. For a full copy of the report Ms. Eichelberger delivered, see Appendix 1.

Susan Kattwinkel, Melanie Kyer, and Kay Smith, Committee on the First-Year Experience

Susan Kattwinkel, Melanie Kyer, and Kay Smith, of the Committee on the First Year Experience, reported that the new SACS evaluation process requires the College to submit a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that outlines future steps to improve the College. A proposal concerning the First Year Experience will be that QEP for us. Right now, committees are being put together to examine curricular, student support, and assessment elements of the First Year Experience. Curricular elements will involve both first year seminars and learning communities. For a full report of the committee’s work to date and the tentative framework for the first year experience, see Appendix 2.

The floor was then opened to questions. Agnes Southgate (Biology) asked how the proposed first year seminars differ from the freshman seminar course currently being offered. Ms. Smith replied that the current course is success-focused and that it counts for only two hours of credit. In addition, it’s more focused on skills than content. The proposed seminars would be taught by departmental faculty rather than a separate staff and would have a specific content focus.

Brian McGee (Communication) asked if the committee had projected whether the proposed first year seminars would increase adjunct use. Ms. Kattwinkel replied that projections have been made several times, all resulting in different numbers. Questions such as these are why the committee is working very closely with the administration at this point, she added. Until we know the number of students who actually sign up for the courses, it will be difficult to project adjunct use. Melanie Kyer added that we already have an adjunct pool teaching the current freshman seminar, so it might be a matter of shifting this money to other adjuncts.

Ad-Hoc Committee on the College Identity

Bob Mignone, acting on behalf of the Ad-Hoc Committee on the College Identity, read a resolution supporting the identity of the College of Charleston as a public liberal arts and sciences institution. See Appendix 3 for a full copy of the resolution.

The committee asked the Senate to vote to endorse the resolution, but because Senators had not seen a copy of it a week in advance, Mr. Mignone announced that we would have to suspend the rules for a vote to take place. Claire Curtis (Political Science) moved that the Senate suspend the rules. Her motion was seconded and the vote to suspend the rules passed.

The Senate then voted in favor of endorsing the resolution.
Old Business

Scott Peeples (on behalf of the Amnesty International student group)—
Resolution Regarding the Contract with Coca Cola

The Speaker recognized Scott Peeples (English) who re-introduced a resolution written by the student group Amnesty International that had originally been put forward at the March 28 Senate meeting. However, because of time constraints, the March 28 Senate meeting adjourned before the issue could be discussed. The resolution urges the College of Charleston not to renew its exclusive vending contract with the Coca-Cola Corporation. For the full resolution, see Appendix 4.

Discussion began with two short presentations. First, representatives of the Coca-Cola Corporation gave a power point slide show defending Coke’s practices in Columbia, South America. Next, three students from the College of Charleston chapter of Amnesty International, Kristen Neumann-Martiensen, Jess Berens, and chapter president Taylor Livingston, presented arguments refuting Coca-Cola’s claims.

After the presentations, the Speaker opened the floor to discussion. He announced that only Senators would have floor privileges, though Coca-Cola representatives and students could be called on to answer questions. George Hopkins (History) spoke first. Mr. Hopkins said he supported the motion and thought it was a good example of students “thinking globally and acting locally.” He doesn’t believe that Coca-Cola has no control over their bottlers and added that movies such as the recent Fast Food Nation show that companies like McDonald’s can make suppliers change their practices.

Next, Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) asked what CofC’s contract with Coca-Cola actually says. Jan Brewton, of Auxiliary Services, replied to Mr. Blackwell. She reported that Coca-Cola has an exclusive five-year contract to provide vending services at the College. The contract expires in June of 2009. Mr. Blackwell then asked what the College receives from this contract. Ms. Brewton replied that the Coca-Cola Corporation pays a minimum $100,000 annual commission to the College. If we sell more Coke products, we make more. She also pointed out that Coca-Cola has helped buy scorer tables for the basketball arena and supported the College’s athletics programs in other ways as well.

Joe Kelly (At-Large, English) then spoke in favor of the resolution, pointing out that the Amnesty International students have done a tremendous amount of research and that he is willing to support their decision. Bob Dukes (Physics/Astronomy) spoke next, confirming that the Associated Press was reporting that the University of Michigan had just agreed to resume purchase of Coca-Cola products. (This was a point made by the Coca-Cola representatives in their presentation). Yet, it looked to him that the decision was made by the administration without student input.

Betsy Martin (Chemistry) asked about contracts the College has with other companies. She pointed out that the College should have well-thought-out policies in place to deal
with issues such as the ones facing us today. Peter Calcagno (Economics/Finance) then asked whether the College had thought about alternatives to Coca-Cola. He asked who we would bring in instead, pointing out that it would be difficult to be sure that other major companies wouldn’t have similar problems to the alleged human rights abuses in Columbia.

Scott Peeples (English) then pointed out that the Amnesty students had discussed whether they believed the College should actually break its contract with Coca-Cola. Instead, they decided to suggest not renewing the contract after the five-year period ends in order to have bargaining power with the company. Mr. Peeples added that progress in the University of Michigan case was made only because students at that university brought pressure on the company. The Amnesty students, he said, want the College to work with Coca-Cola over the next few years to resolve some of the issues they raise in their resolution. Otherwise, Mr. Peeples argued, we have no say in Coca-Cola’s policies.

Gerry Gonsalves (Management and Entrepreneurship), pointing out that he had grown up in India and witnessed the effects of large corporations first hand, argued that large foreign companies bring both good and bad to impoverished nations. It is not a black and white matter. Mr. Gonsalves worried that if we picked out one company, such as Coca-Cola, to condemn, we’d have to pick out others as well. It is not fair to single out only one company.

Myra Seaman (English) spoke next, arguing that the student resolution does not prohibit Coca-Cola from doing business with the College, but that it provides we not renew our exclusive contract with the company.

Bob Perkins (EDFS) said that, when he came to the meeting, he was worried it would turn into a “he said, they said” affair, in which the faculty wouldn’t have enough information to make an educated decision. But because the resolution doesn’t involve actually breaking the contract with Coca-Cola, he supports it. The period before the contract expires will give us time to discuss the matter in more detail.

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) asked what the administration’s position on the resolution is. Mr. Peeples replied that President Higdon is aware of the resolution, but that he doesn’t know what Mr. Higdon’s actual position on it is.

Paul Young (Mathematics) then asked for a clarification. He pointed out that he didn’t see anything in the resolution that suggested the College would gather information before not renewing the contract. Mr. Peeples replied that Mr. Young was correct. The resolution currently contains no language making the non-renewal of the contract conditional on more information being gathered.

The matter was then put to a vote. The resolution passed on a show of hands.

Committee on Nominations and Elections—Honor Board Proposal

4
The Speaker recognized Michael Phillips, of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, who presented a motion to increase membership on the College’s Honor Board by 11 to a total of 16 (8 board members, 8 advisors). The committee supplied the following justification for such an increase:

**Justification**
Honor Board membership needs to be increased for the following reasons:

1) There has been a great increase in case load due in large part to expansion of jurisdiction to include incidents involving removal from residence halls.
2) The peak times for Honor Board work, midterm and semester's end, overlap with peak periods of faculty workload, hence more faculty assigned to the Honor Board will alleviate the burden placed on a few.
3) Because of the increased case load, some adjuncts are currently being used as advisors. (With over 500 faculty eligible for committee service this seems needless.)

**Benefits**
1) Honor advisors will receive recognition for their time and labor.
2) More faculty will be able to assist in the annual review of the honor system.
3) Prompt processing of cases.

The floor was opened to discussion. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) asked where the pool of advisors would come from. Mr. Phillips replied that the advisors would come from the pool of faculty who volunteer for committee service. Michelle Mac Brooks (Biochemistry/Chemistry) added that she has been on the Honor Board and been an Honor Board advisor as well. She confirmed that Honor Board duties take hours and hours of faculty time, and thus, she supports the motion.

A vote was taken, and the motion passed.

**Committee on Nominations and Elections—Nominations for Standing Committees; Election of Senate Committees**

The Speaker then opened the Senate floor to nominations for next year's Committee on Nominations and Elections. Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) nominated Tom Kunkle (Mathematics), and Julie Davis (Communication) nominated Kathy DeHaan (Communication). Mr. Kunkle and Ms. DeHaan will join the slate of candidates already put forward by the Nominations Committee: Marion Doig (Chemistry), Lynne Ford (Political Science), Annette Godow (Physical Education & Health), Frank Morris (Classics/German/Italian/Japanese/Russian), and Michael Phillips (Library).

The Senate next approved the slates for Faculty Senate Committees (Academic Planning, Budget, and By-Laws) put forth by the Nominations Committee. These committees will be comprised of the following members:

**Academic Planning**-7 (at least 4 senators)
Because of time and room constraints, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 without finishing all items of business on the agenda. The meeting will continue on Tuesday, April 25, 2006 at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix I: Report from the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education

Progress Report, April 2006
To: College of Charleston Faculty
From: Ad Hoc Committee on General Education

The Committee’s work in 2004-2005

The Ad Hoc Committee on General Education was formed at the request of Provost Elise Jorgens. After learning of her request at the end of Spring 2004, the Senate elected representatives to serve on this committee. Additional members of the committee, both faculty and administrators, were appointed by the Provost. Students were also appointed, and they attended meetings in Spring 2005.

During Spring 05, the committee met regularly to discuss and consider the holistic purposes of general education and college curriculum requirements—in other words, what a student should gain as a result of completing graduation requirements, besides the degree itself. The committee sought to build on work that had already been done at the College by several current committees (Academic Planning, First-Year Experience, Communication Across the Curriculum, and others) and by the Ad Hoc Committee that had led the campus effort to examine and reform our general education curriculum in the 1990s. The important work of these committees has informed our thinking, enabling us to identify shared goals and possible curricular enhancements that already have broad support at the College.

We also have explored the work of many other institutions, some with very different models for their general education programs. Some schools have a set of common course requirements that are much more tightly defined and smaller in number than ours; other schools have a much larger menu of courses that can be used to fulfill their requirements, to the point that students in different disciplines within the same institution may receive very different educations. The Committee did not find that either of these models would fulfill our goals for general education as well as they could be fulfilled here with a “distribution model” similar to what we have in place now. This conclusion was not exactly a vote for the status quo. We believe our goals can be met by a distribution model, provided that we

• examine our current course requirements closely and retain all requirements that effectively advance the goals we have agreed upon,

• add components that could bring our students closer to meeting these goals, and

• develop a system of faculty oversight that would allow all faculty to take responsibility for the ongoing quality of this curriculum.

Our work in 2005-2006

To this end, we sought input from faculty during Fall 2005, writing a letter in September requesting input from departments and then, in October, inviting faculty to an open Forum on General Education. We then used this faculty input to articulate six holistic goals of a College of Charleston education. We agreed that all students should develop the following intellectual skills and areas of knowledge over the course of their College of Charleston career:

Research and Communication in Multiple Media and Languages
Analytical and Critical Reasoning
Historical, Cultural, and Intellectual Perspectives
Interdisciplinary and Intercultural Perspectives
Personal and Ethical Perspectives

Advanced Knowledge and Skills in Major Area of Study

In January 2006, we presented a more detailed articulation of these goals to the Faculty Senate. The Senate amended our proposal and voted to endorse the following statement.

Statement of Purpose for the Common Requirements of the College of Charleston’s Undergraduate Curriculum

All graduates of the College of Charleston complete a challenging sequence of coursework and experiences that will prepare them to function intelligently, responsibly, creatively, and compassionately in a multifaceted, interconnected world. While their work in the major of their choice will give students specialized knowledge and skills in that discipline or profession, the College’s core curriculum will ensure that each student, regardless of major, develops crucial intellectual skills in analysis, research, and communication. Their coursework in the liberal arts and sciences will offer students a broad perspective on the natural world and the human condition, and will encourage them to examine their own lives and make useful contributions to their own time and place. Over the course of their undergraduate careers, all College of Charleston students will develop the following intellectual skills, areas of knowledge, and dispositions:

I. Research and Communication in Multiple Media and Languages, including proficiency in
   - Gathering and using information
   - Effective writing and critical reading
   - Oral and visual communication
   - Foreign language

II. Analytical and Critical Reasoning, including the ability to perform
   - Mathematical and scientific reasoning and analysis
   - Social and cultural analysis

III. Historical, Cultural, and Intellectual Perspectives, including knowledge of
   - Human history and the natural world
   - Artistic, cultural, and intellectual achievements
   - The mind and the way humans interact in groups and societies
   - International perspectives
   - Perspectives and contributions of academic disciplines

IV. Interdisciplinary and Intercultural Perspectives, gained by
   - Using multiple approaches to interpret complex phenomena
   - Experiencing and understanding multiple cultural perspectives

V. Personal and Ethical Perspectives, including experiences that promote
   - Self-understanding
   - Curiosity and creativity
   - Personal, academic, and professional integrity
   - Moral and ethical responsibility
   - Communal and global responsibility

VI. Advanced Knowledge and Skills in Major Area of Study, consisting of
   - Skills and knowledge of the discipline
   - Sequence of coursework that fosters intellectual growth
   - Coursework that extends and builds upon knowledge and skills gained from the core curriculum
   - The ability to transfer the skills and knowledge of the major into another setting

What’s Next?

The committee now is in the process of analyzing our existing requirements to see how close they bring our students to achieving all of the components of these six goals. The first step in doing this has been to identify defining characteristics of each of the six goals and their sub-goals. We arrived at these defining characteristics through our synthesis of suggestions and comments that came from the previous Gen Ed reform effort, the department memos we collected in September, the Forum, and from statements we found in other institutions’ general education goals. After much effort and deliberation, we have completed a draft version of this document, which will serve as a guideline for whatever proposals the Committee will make about modifying or retaining any aspect of our curriculum. Our next step is to discuss this document with chairs. We need department chairs’ views on how far the present curriculum takes our students in meeting these goals, and we welcome their ideas on enhancements to the curriculum that would help us meet these goals more effectively. Based on the input we get from chairs, we will continue our work this summer, in hopes of bringing a proposal to the faculty in the fall. Such
proposals would begin in the appropriate academic committees (Curriculum, Academic Planning) and then come before the Senate for discussion. Faculty are welcome to contact the Committee directly with their comments on our work thus far, or to convey any comments or concerns to their department chairs, who will be meeting with us in early May.

Statement of Purpose for the Common Requirements of College of Charleston’s Undergraduate Curriculum

All graduates of the College of Charleston complete a challenging sequence of coursework and experiences that will prepare them to function intelligently, responsibly, creatively, and compassionately in a multifaceted, interconnected world. While their work in the major of their choice will give students specialized knowledge and skills in that discipline or profession, the College’s core curriculum will ensure that each student, regardless of major, develops crucial intellectual skills in analysis, research, and communication. Their coursework in the liberal arts and sciences will offer students a broad perspective on the natural world and the human condition, and will encourage them to examine their own lives and make useful contributions to their own time and place. Over the course of their undergraduate careers, all College of Charleston students will develop the following intellectual skills, dispositions, and areas of knowledge:

I. Research and Communication in Multiple Media and Languages, including proficiency in
   Gathering and using information
   Students should be able to
   --Determine the nature and extent of information needed
   --Access the needed information effectively and efficiently
   --Evaluate information and its sources critically
   --Understand the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information, and access and use information ethically and legally
   --Acknowledge the use of information sources using an appropriate documentation style
   [From Association of College and Research Libraries’ Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education]

   Effective writing and critical reading
   Students should be able to
   --Understand, analyze, and interpret intellectually challenging texts
   --Use writing to increase their own understanding of a topic and to communicate their point of view persuasively
   --Strengthen written work through the process of drafting, revising, and editing
   --Produce well-organized papers that convey substantive information and that conform to the conventions of edited American English
   Students should complete rigorous writing assignments and receive significant feedback on their written work, both in their first-year writing courses and in other courses taken throughout their college career.

   Oral and visual communication
   Students should be able to
   --Create oral presentations that are well-developed, well-organized, and
appropriate for the situation and audience
   --Deliver oral presentations clearly and persuasively
   --Interpret visual images and employ images to communicate ideas and concepts

**Foreign language**
Students should be able to
   - Communicate in writing, construct simple sentences, and apply the rules of the basic grammar of the target language
   -- As readers, understand the meaning of simple sentences on familiar topics and, with the aid of a dictionary, to discern the meaning of an unfamiliar passage written for adults (i.e., an article in a newspaper, a speech by a public official, a passage from a work of imaginative literature)
   -- Communicate orally on straightforward topics, construct intelligible sentences, respond to simple questions
   *For languages whose alphabet, root words, or other linguistic features have very little in common with the English language, a more rudimentary level of competency may be required.*

**II. Analytical and Critical Reasoning, including the ability to perform**

**Mathematical and scientific reasoning and analysis; social and cultural analysis**
Students should be able to
   -- Understand, interpret, develop and apply abstract models of varied phenomena
   -- Engage in inductive and deductive thinking and quantitative reasoning
   -- Use appropriate methodology to evaluate evidence and to make clearly reasoned interpretive judgments
   -- Use appropriate methodology to effectively formulate questions and solve problems
   -- Exercise the skill and precision necessary for successful laboratory experimentation

**III. Historical, Cultural, and Intellectual Perspectives, including knowledge of**

**Human history and the natural world**
Students should
   -- Develop knowledge of the history of human civilizations and an awareness of the diversity of historical experience
   -- Understand the historical process
   -- Understand fundamental concepts and theories about the natural world, as well as knowledge of the evidence, ideas and models used to describe natural phenomena
   -- Appreciate the historical and contemporary impact of science and mathematics on daily life
   -- Distinguish between science and pseudo-science and appreciate the capabilities and limitations of science in order to effectively evaluate and contribute to science based policies and issues of contemporary significance.
**Artistic, cultural, and intellectual achievements**

Students should

--Know the achievements in the fine arts of our own and other civilizations and the cultural, social and historical context in which they were created
--Understand aesthetic criteria that may be used to interpret works of art
--Understand the creative process, gained through analysis and/or creation of art
--Have knowledge of mathematical and scientific achievements
--Have knowledge of literary, philosophical, and religious traditions

**The mind and the way humans interact in groups and societies**

Students should

--Know the evidence, ideas, and models used to understand how people relate to one another in groups, institutions, and communities
--Understand concepts, patterns, and issues that affect the organization and governance of societies and the relationship between the individual and the group or society
--Understand the values and ethical issues that underlie social, political, and economic organizations.

**International perspectives**

Students should

--Know the literature, culture and intellectual achievements of countries other than the United States
--Have linguistic and/or cultural knowledge that could enable them to function more effectively within a foreign country
--Understand some of the local and global conditions that historically cause countries to become distinct and different, as well as the conditions that cause the destiny and interests of countries to be interconnected

**Perspectives and contributions of academic disciplines**

Students should

--Employ the methods of inquiry appropriate to multiple academic disciplines and be familiar with the ways these disciplines organize and create knowledge
--Develop in-depth knowledge in at least one academic discipline, [including the ability to relate knowledge in that discipline to other disciplines ]

**IV. Interdisciplinary and Intercultural Perspectives**, gained by

**Using multiple approaches to interpret complex phenomena**

Students should be able to

--Understand the interconnectedness of knowledge that comes from separate disciplines
--Solve problems using knowledge and perspectives learned in more than one discipline
Experiencing and understanding multiple cultural perspectives
Students should
--Demonstrate understanding of perspectives and conditions that distinguish cultures and social identities from one another
--Demonstrate critical understanding of the local and global processes that historically influence and help to define human difference
--Demonstrate awareness of beliefs and values of a culture or social identity other than their own
--Experience a culture different from their own

V. Personal and Ethical Perspectives, including experiences that promote Self-understanding
Students should undergo
--Experiences that increase their understanding of their own personal temperament, ways of learning that are successful for them, and beneficial ways of relating to others

Curiosity and creativity
Students should undergo
--Experiences that increase their desire to learn more about a subject or problem
--Experiences that require creative and original approaches to problems

Personal, academic, and professional integrity
Students should undergo
--Experiences that require personal honesty and accountability
--Experiences that promote understanding of the Honor Code and the responsible use of knowledge in academic settings
--Experiences that define integrity in a professional setting or an academic discipline

Moral and ethical responsibility
Students should undergo
--Experiences that invite them to reflect on their own values and commitments and to understand why they hold them

Communal and global responsibility
Students should undergo
--Experiences in which they use their talents and/or education to serve others and learn to behave as responsible citizens

Experiences in this category will be self-assessed; students will be required to identify experiences satisfying each criterion that have occurred during their careers at C of C (both in and out of class).

VI. Advanced Knowledge and Skills in Major Area of Study, consisting of
Skills and knowledge of the discipline
Sequence of coursework that fosters intellectual growth
Coursework that extends and builds upon knowledge and skills gained from the core curriculum
The ability to transfer the skills and knowledge of the major into another setting
Home departments will define these sub-goals more precisely for their own majors.
Appendix II: Report from the Committee on the First-Year Experience

To: The Members of the Faculty Senate
From: The ad hoc committee on the First Year Experience (Melanie Kyer, Susan Kattwinkel, Chris Korey, Jack Parsons, Philip Powell, RoxAnn Stalvey, Trish Ward) and Kay Smith, ex-officio member of the committee
Re: Our report to the Senate on April 11, 2006

The committee was charged with examining issues of implementation regarding plans for a new First Year Seminar program. We have addressed issues raised by the provost and the committee. What follows is our new report, preceded by a summary of the questions we have attempted to answer in our work:

1. Will the courses give general education credit?
Yes, based on the discipline/department offering the course. Part of implementation will concern making decisions about how each course will be approved to be offered as a FYS.

2. What will the stipend be for developing this course?
$1000 for a week-long planning/training experience. Again, part of implementation will be working out appropriate training.

3. Will departments be penalized for offering these courses because of small enrollment (20 students per class)?
The Provost will negotiate with departments and deans based on workload standards. The Provost has noted that there will be enough workload flexibility for each department to offer courses of this size; no department should be penalized for participating in FYS offerings.

4. Will the FYS increase the number of adjuncts?
There will be approximately a 40% replacement rate for FYS courses that offer Gen Ed credit (the average class size at CofC is 35; the average class size for the FYS will be 20, leaving approximately 15 students to be covered). Implementation will be incremental, so that staffing costs can be analyzed and managed at each stage, but it is clear that some adjunct hires will be necessary.

The First Year Seminar
At the meeting of April 13, 2004, the faculty senate approved the following principles and goals of the First Year Seminar program:

“The entering first-year students enrolling at the College of Charleston in Fall 2003 come from many places and bring varied backgrounds, experiences, talents and expectations with them. President Higdon, in order to introduce these freshmen to the learning community at the College of Charleston, is developing a First-year Experience. It is envisioned that an important component of that First Year Experience will be a course, taken by freshmen in their first semester, for academic
credit. The many sections of this course, while designed and taught by faculty members from different departments, will share the following characteristics. The students will understand the material as relevant to their understanding of the world in which they live and the education they are pursuing. Analysis of these issues will require input from many disciplines. The small class size and intense discussions occurring in class will encourage students to develop a personal relationship with their professor. It is expected that, as a result of this academic experience, the students will become familiar with the various resources available at the College. More importantly, this course should demonstrate not only the necessity of detailed disciplinary knowledge in attacking real world problems, but also the usefulness of a broad-based understanding of the scope of human intellectual activity that a liberal arts education can provide.

First-Year Seminars fit directly into the Strategic Plan of the College of Charleston. This initiative will contribute to the goals of lowering average class size, demonstrating to students the complexity of the intellectual experience, helping them to develop higher order thinking skills, and raising the freshman to sophomore retention rate by improving student ability to succeed in college-level work.” We propose that a new First-Year Seminar program, to replace the current FRSR 101 course, be implemented as soon as possible. It will be a voluntary program for roster faculty and first-year students, beginning with fifteen sections and increasing by fifteen sections per year for the first two years. It is planned that, eventually, all freshmen will either take the first-year seminar or have their freshman experience enhanced through participating in a linked course or learning community.

First-Year seminar courses will, when appropriate, count for General Education requirements. In some departments, these seminars may function as alternative introductory courses so as to reduce the need to replace roster faculty with adjunct faculty. Informal discussions with department chairs across the college community have shown that there is significant interest in the program and that enough faculty members should be available to cover the program.

Each semester the Registrar clearly designates the courses which count as First-Year Seminars.

Program Structure

I. Administration

The Director of the First-Year Seminar Program is a roster faculty member directly responsible to the Vice-President for the Academic Experience. The Director works with the Deans of the Schools, the Department Chairs, the Advising Center, the Admissions Office and the Registrar. The Director should teach at least one First-Year Seminar each year. The Director organizes training workshops and meetings as needed to orient faculty members who teach in the program and to ensure that curriculum meets the course goals. The Director recruits faculty to participate, serves as a resource to faculty, and oversees any common course components. In conjunction with other administrative bodies, the
Director insures that incoming students are fully informed in advance about course offerings. The Director should be appropriately compensated.

A Standing College Committee, called the First-Year Experience Committee, is composed of 6 roster faculty (and must have at least one faculty member from each school), 3 of whom shall be teaching in the program, and a student representative and alternate. The Director of the First-Year Seminar, and the Vice-President of the Academic Experience are *ex officio* non-voting members of the Committee. The Committee, in conjunction with the Director, reviews and approves all First-Year Seminar proposals. It participates in the assessment of the program. It reviews information from the Director, reviews and makes policy decisions concerning curriculum, course selection procedures, and training, and works with the Director in program development. The Committee is responsible for forwarding a course that is taught more than three times to the Faculty Curriculum Committee for approval as a permanent course. The First-Year Experience Committee may also be charged with oversight for other First-Year programs such as learning communities.

First-Year Seminars shall:
- enroll no more than 20 students
- be taught by roster faculty
- be taught in “smart rooms” when available.
- not be offered as express courses

II. Faculty
Faculty who wish to teach First-Year Seminars will take part in a training workshop for which they will receive a stipend of $1,000. Faculty teach First-Year Seminars as part of their normal course load. Enrollment in First-Year Seminars will be counted as double for purposes of workload calculation so that neither faculty nor departments are penalized for low enrollment as a result of their participation in this program.

Part of the faculty member’s advising and instructional duties is to develop in students the necessary skills for academic success in college, whether through in-class activities or through the utilization of existing campus services.

In addition to a required workshop for faculty participating in the First-Year Seminar, funding will be available for interested faculty to attend special conferences and external workshops specific to the First-Year Experience.

We recommend that the Faculty Senate modify the tenure and promotion guidelines to acknowledge the participation of the faculty teaching in this program.

III. Students
Students who pass the First-year Seminar receive credit for an elective course which counts towards the 122 hours for the degree. In most instances, this course will also count towards General Education distribution requirements pending approval by the First-Year Experience Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and the Faculty Senate.
IV. Course Content
First-Year Seminars are designed to develop the necessary skills for academic and professional success in a discipline-specific environment.

Seminars will include components of
• writing
• reading
• class discussion
• collaborative learning
• an oral presentation
• a research component
• a technology component
• an interdisciplinary component

The topics of First-Year Seminars will vary. They will provide roster faculty with an opportunity to develop courses not regularly offered in the College of Charleston curriculum.

V. Implementation Details
Implementation will occur in conjunction with the new General Education Requirements. Upon approval of this proposal:
• A director will be chosen to lead the program.
• The First-Year Experience committee will be established according to faculty senate rules.
• A call will go out to faculty providing information about the program and soliciting course proposals for consideration and approval.
• The Registrar will clearly designate First-Year Seminars in the course schedule.

Upon creation of the committee and appointment of a Director:
• An assessment procedure will be developed to ensure that curriculum goals are met by each course, to monitor any difficulties which may arise in the implementation of the program, as well as to anticipate problems regarding staffing and adjunct considerations.
• A procedure of validation will be developed for current Freshman Seminar courses which may be adapted to meet the new requirements. In particular, this would affect summer programs such as the SPECTRA program.

VI. Examples of First-year Seminar Courses taught at other schools
A Quest for the Ultimate: From Quanta to Quarks
Picturing Nature: Visual Images and Scientific Knowledge, 1600-1850
Ethics and Children’s Literature
One Billion Years of Change: The Geological Story of North Carolina
Defining Blackness: National and International Approaches to African-American Identity
Making the Right Connections: computers and Microprocessors
Where Did All the Fish Go?
Unlocking the Genetic Code
A TENTATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR THE FIRST YEAR EXPERIENCE QEP

CURRICULAR ELEMENTS:
Chair: Hugh Wilder

FIRST YEAR SEMINAR: INQUIRY IN THE LIBERAL ARTS
• TOPIC FOCUS/ SMALL CLASS

LEARNING COMMUNITIES: EXPLORATION IN THE LIBERAL ARTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PKG</th>
<th>DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• SIZE</td>
<td>• TWO/THREE CLASSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TAUGHT BY FACULTY</td>
<td>• STUDENTS COULD TAKE A TOTAL OF 9 HOURS TOGETHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GENERAL EDUCATION CREDIT WHEN POSSIBLE</td>
<td>• SOME RESIDENTIAL LCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LINKED TO SUPPORT SERVICES LIKE ADVISING</td>
<td>• LINKED TO SUPPORT SERVICES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POSSIBLE COMMON ELEMENTS FOR ALL FIRST YEAR SEMINARS:
• FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING
• INFORMATION LITERACY
• TRANSITIONAL ISSUES
• RESEARCH AND CRITICAL THINKING
• ACTIVE LEARNING
• WRITING/SPEAKING INTENSIVE
• DEMONSTRABLE LINK TO GEN ED LEARNING GOALS

POSSIBLE COMMON ELEMENTS:
• FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING
• INFORMATION LITERACY
• TRANSITIONAL ISSUES
• RESEARCH AND CRITICAL THINKING
• ACTIVE LEARNING
• WRITING/SPEAKING INTENSIVE
• DEMONSTRABLE LINK TO GEN ED LEARNING GOALS

STUDENT SUPPORT ELEMENTS:
*Co-Chairs: Victor Wilson* and Lynn Cherry

| ADVISING ORIENTATION SUMMER READING/CONVOCATION WELCOME WEEK RESIDENCE LIFE EARLY ALERT (RES. LIFE FOCUS) CENTER FOR STUDENT LEARNING SERVICE LEARNING |
| COMMON ELEMENTS: LINKED CLEARLY TO STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND GENERAL EDUCATION GOALS |

ASSESSMENT:
*Chair: Jeri Cabot*

| ASSESS CURRENT FIRST YEAR TO ESTABLISH BASELINE | DESIGN ASSESSMENT TO SUPPORT CURRICULAR AND STUDENT SERVICE |
Appendix 3: Resolution on the College Identity

This We Believe . . .
During the past two months, 372 faculty have engaged one another in a conversation about the identity of the College of Charleston as a liberal arts and sciences institution. The conversation was framed around three questions and the detailed responses from each of the 87 groups involved in the first round were made available, unedited and in their entirety, on a website. Likewise, the results of the second round of discussions, designed to serve a synthesizing role, are available in their entirety and unedited on a website. Rather than try to summarize the variety of insights and viewpoints, we have elected to draw on what we have learned from this experience to frame the obvious fourth question, “What happens next?”

There is a strong consensus among the faculty (85 percent) that we should continue to use “liberal arts and sciences” to describe the College of Charleston and that the advantages to doing so far outweigh the disadvantages. As expected, we do not agree on every detail of what it means to be a liberal arts and sciences institution. However, this conversation was never meant to settle the question of institutional identity; that will require a more integrated discussion among faculty, the administration, and other stakeholders. What this conversation has demonstrated is the depth of commitment the faculty has, individually and collectively, to maintaining our institutional culture devoted to liberal education. As a faculty we reaffirm our commitment to our identity as a public liberal arts and sciences university. In our context, this means:

- a primary focus on providing high quality undergraduate education, grounded in an extensive and common general education curriculum reflecting the value of intellectual inquiry across disciplines, and designed to support a diverse array of major programs ranging from Classics to Discovery Informatics.

- a faculty focus on teaching that at its core is defined by a close relationship with students whether nurtured in small classes, or through academic advising, research collaborations, supervised undergraduate research, and/or experiential learning opportunities. In this regard, scale is more important than size.

- a faculty that understands and embraces the teacher-scholar model of professional development and an administration that has supported high quality teaching and high quality scholarship through the Fourth Century Initiative by expanding the size of the faculty relative to the size of the student body, by enhancing support for sabbaticals, and by providing resources to support faculty research, undergraduate research, and innovation in teaching.

- an entrepreneurial faculty that remains intellectually vital by developing interdisciplinary teaching, research, and programmatic connections with colleagues from across the university and a faculty committed to translating the value of a liberal arts core
to students in professional programs in business and education.

• a public university that develops and provides high quality graduate programs in service to community needs and that prepare graduates for responsible leadership grounded in the core values of the liberal arts.

• a firm commitment to shared decision-making and a belief that process is at the core of collegiality.
Appendix 4: Resolution Regarding the Contract with Coca-Cola

College of Charleston Faculty Senate Resolution regarding the Contract with Coca-Cola

WHEREAS paramilitary groups have threatened, kidnapped, tortured, and murdered union workers at Coca-Cola bottling plants in Colombia; and

WHEREAS a fact-finding delegation of labor, educator and student representatives led by New York City Council member Hiram Monserrate concluded that the Coca-Cola corporation’s “complicity in the situation is deepened by its repeated pattern of bringing criminal charges against union activists who have spoken out about the company’s collusion with paramilitaries” (Final Report dated April 2004, p. 1); and

WHEREAS credible reports have also charged Coca-Cola with irresponsible business practices elsewhere, including: using sugar harvested through hazardous child labor in El Salvador; illegal salary reductions and unsafe working conditions in Guatemala; and the theft of common water resources and consequent depredations to subsistence agriculture in the Indian province of Kerala; and

WHEREAS the Coca-Cola Corporation currently holds an exclusive vending rights contract with the College of Charleston that eliminates competition from other soft drink manufacturers while encouraging members of our campus community to subsidize human rights violations and environmental degradation by purchasing Coca-Cola products; and

WHEREAS, as educators at a liberal arts and sciences institution, College of Charleston faculty are deeply committed to protecting human rights and promoting environmental responsibility;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Faculty call upon the Administration not to renew the College of Charleston’s exclusive vending contract with the Coca-Cola Corporation; and

That the Faculty request that President Higdon send a letter to Edward E. Potter, Director of Global Labor Relations and Workplace Accountability, and E. Neville Isdell, Chairman of the Board of Directors and C. E. O. of the Coca-Cola Corporation, stating the College of Charleston’s intention not to renew its contract and urging the Coca-Cola Corporation to

- Denounce the violence that has occurred in the name of Coca-Cola in Colombia;
- Reinforce Coca-Cola’s public stance against violence by directing all bottling plants in Colombia to stop dealing with any armed groups that are participating in violence against trade unionists;

- Respect the fundamental rights to free association and to organize trade unions, as reflected in Colombian law, Article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as well as Conventions 87 and 88 of the International Labor Organization;

- Provide compensation to known victims of violence at Coca-Cola bottling plants.
MINUTES OF THE MARCH 28, 2006 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, March 28, 2006, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

The minutes from the February 28 Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens reported that a new round of strategic planning is set to begin at the College. This round of planning will explore where the College hopes to be in the next 5-10 years. Faculty members will soon be asked to participate in this process. The administration wants to be sure to put together a process that doesn’t ignore other types of planning that go on at the College. All voices should be heard, and there is plenty of room for new ideas.

Ms. Jorgens also informed faculty that Academic Affairs had written up an institutional profile that is available at both the website of the Chronicle of Higher Education and the College of Charleston website (http://www.cofc.edu/academicaffairs/). This document highlights the College’s location in the Lowcountry and the distinct programs the College is able to offer because of this location. The new round of planning will continue to identify programs of distinction at the College.

The Provost then invited questions from faculty members. Terry Bowers (English) brought up a brief discussion the Senate had at its last meeting about a new course proposal for MGMT 250: Business, Leadership and Society. The syllabus for this course states that all company analyses performed by students become the property of the professor. Mr. Bowers said that he’d asked around and discovered that such a practice may be illegal. He wondered if the College has a policy on this issue. Ms. Jorgens replied that she didn’t know, but would look into it. The College certainly needs to have some kind of stated policy concerning intellectual property, she said, adding that the College is in the process of searching for a new legal counsel. This person, when hired, might draft such a policy.

Carolyn Morales, Associate Vice President for Diversity

Carolyn Morales, the College’s new Associate Vice President for Diversity, introduced herself to the Senate and explained that her position is connected to the Office of the President. She has been charged with piecing together a comprehensive diversity plan at the College. She is currently working with the Diversity Council to set up subcommittees on specific issues concerning diversity. She also announced that the College is soon to receive a gift directed toward increasing diversity; she is working to establish an advisory council which will review proposals about how the gift should be used.
David Katz, Assistant Treasurer

College of Charleston Assistant Treasurer David Katz reported that, in the fall semester, a new policy to enforce student payment of tuition will be instituted. Students who do not pay by the August 11 deadline will be dropped from their courses for non-payment. Although they may re-register immediately, these students will have no guarantee of getting back into the classes they’d originally registered for. Mr. Katz asked faculty members to remind students to check their Edisto e-mail accounts regularly. He also asked for suggestions about what kind of post-drop process his office should institute.

Mark Lazzaro (Biology) asked some procedural questions about dropping students. As a department chair, he wants to know when students have paid so that he can let them get back into courses they might have been shut out of. He also wondered if there would be one time when the Treasurer’s Office drops lots of people. If so, he asked if a list of dropped students in particular majors could be forwarded to department chairs. Mr. Katz replied that his office can do both of these things and is, in fact, working right now on these issues.

Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) asked if there would be big signs on campus to apprise students of the new policy. Mr. Katz assured him that his office plans to notify students and parents repeatedly by e-mail before dropping students from classes, and that there will indeed be signs on campus as well.

The Provost spoke next, urging faculty members to take this matter seriously. She believes we are giving students a terrible lesson if we continue to allow them to take classes without paying. She is very supportive of this new policy, though she recognizes that the first time students are dropped, it might be an administrative nightmare. The problem should die down, however, in subsequent semesters.

Mr. Lazzaro then suggested that it might make more sense if students aren’t allowed to re-enroll in courses until they pay. Mr. Katz replied that the administration doesn’t want to make students leave school; rather, they want students to get into financial compliance. Kay Smith, Associate Vice-President of the Academic Experience, added that once a student is dropped from his or her schedule, that student’s bill disappears. The student has to re-enroll to generate a new bill. Mr. Lazzaro then asked whether students or parents were financially at fault. Mr. Katz replied that it was a combination. Some students can’t pay, others won’t. Some simply bank the money to try to earn interest.

Calvin Blackwell (Economics and Finance) asked whether the Treasurer’s Office anticipated that students would sit out the fall semester. Mr. Katz replied that they might, but that his office will work with anyone who calls and tries to work out a payment plan. Mr. Blackwell pointed out that once a student is dropped from courses in the School of Business, the chance of getting back in goes to zero. Mr. Katz acknowledged this possibility, pointing out that students will be warned in e-mails that they might not be able to graduate on time if they miss payment deadlines. He then ended the discussion by
saying that he’d send an e-mail to faculty members, letting them know where they can post suggestions for making the drop process run as smoothly as possible.

Speaker

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone thanked the organizing committee of the College Identity discussion for its successful forum Friday afternoon, March 24. He also thanked Claire Curtis for making the original motion that instigated this discussion. In addition, Mr. Mignone announced that, in his role as Speaker, he will help organize the process by which faculty will participate in the next stage of strategic planning. Finally, he reminded faculty members to think about how to handle the transition to the new grading policy. In his spring newsletter, he will outline several specific models that might be used.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

The Speaker then recognized Agnes Southgate, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, who moved several curriculum proposals (see Appendix I):

During discussion of the new course proposals for the Interdisciplinary Comparative Literature Minor, Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology), ever vigilant about language use, suggested we stop referring to “capstone” courses, which he said reminded him of what you put over people when you bury them. He suggested “keystone” as a more elegant metaphor to describe these culminating courses.

Next, Glenn Lesses (Philosophy) proposed the following friendly amendments to the proposal for a new Interdisciplinary Comparative Literature Minor:

IV. Administration of the Minor, p. 6

Insert first sentence:

The minor will be co-sponsored by the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs and the School of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Change next sentence to:

It will be administered through two . . .

p. 7, replace sentence:

The Program Director will be appointed by the Steering Committee. . .

with

The Program Director will be recommended by the Steering Committee and appointed by the deans for a term . . .

Administration of the Minor, p. 11
Insert first sentence:  
The minor will be co-sponsored by the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs and the School of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Change next sentence to: 
It will be administered through two . . .

p. 12, replace sentence:

The Program Director will be recommended by the Steering Committee and appointed by the Dean . . .

with

The Program Director will be recommended by the Steering Committee and appointed by the deans for a term . . .

Terry Bowers (English), who brought the proposal, said that while he supported Mr. Lesses’ amendments, he would like to have a vote on them, so that anyone who disagreed could voice their objections. Mick Norton (Mathematics) asked whether the amendments really got at administrative issues. Mr. Lesses replied that they did because the program director will come from one of the two schools and the dean of one of the schools will have to appoint this person. Mr. Lesses’ proposed amendments passed on a voice vote.

Discussion then turned back to the main proposal (for a new Interdisciplinary Minor in Comparative Literature). Joe Kelly (English) said that he supported the minor but was concerned about the list of ten duties for the program director, many of which would have to be performed during the regular semester, and the $1500 summer stipend, which he felt was inadequate. A general problem with interdisciplinary minors, he added, is a lack of support. The Provost replied to Mr. Kelly’s concerns, pointing out that her office is in the process of reviewing the duties and compensation of all program directors, a task they hope to accomplish as soon as possible. Discussion ended, and the proposal passed.

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone announced that the new major in Supply Chain Management is currently being reviewed by the Planning and Budget Committees. An oversight on the forms rather than negligence by those proposing the new major had caused this step to be omitted previously. The proposal will come back to the Senate at the April 11 meeting. Mr. Mignone also announced that he is currently looking into the possibility of streamlining the curriculum process.

None of the other curriculum proposals elicited discussion. All of the motions brought by the Curriculum Committee passed.

Committee on Graduate Education

The Senate approved the new course proposal for FREN 630: Seminar in French Language Study.

Faculty Welfare Committee—Motion to Make SCIP Evaluation Results Available to Faculty Members
The Speaker recognized Claire Curtis of the Faculty Welfare Committee who made the following motion:

The motion:
The faculty welfare committee moves that results for SCIP evaluations be made available to each faculty member for their classes.

Rationale:
We feel that if the faculty are going to be evaluated they should have access to the results, the same as the students.

The motion passed with no discussion.

Faculty Educational Technology Committee—Recommendation on Online Student Evaluation of Classes

The Speaker recognized Myra Seaman and Christophe Boucher of the Faculty Educational Technology Committee who made the following recommendation (see Appendix II for a full rational of this recommendation):

Recommendation
The FETC recommends that the Senate support the implementation of online student evaluation of classes.

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) began the discussion by asking how and when students would fill out online course evaluations. Ms. Seaman replied that students would complete evaluations on Cougar Trail, during the same two week period that currently exists to complete paper evaluations.

George Hopkins (History) then asked what concerns have been raised about online evaluations and what the committee’s response to these concerns is. Ms. Seaman said that the biggest concern involved response rates. The goal of online evaluations is to eventually get a better response rate than paper evaluations since a student’s absence from a course on a particular day won’t negate their ability to evaluate. Yet, Ms. Seaman acknowledged that, initially, response rates using online evaluations would be lower than with paper evaluations. At other institutions that use online methods of evaluation, the best way to increase response rates seems to be encouragement from faculty across campus rather than some kind of punitive measure for not responding. Ms. Seaman then added that another large concern has been how electronic evaluations will affect faculty members coming up for tenure, promotion, and third year review. Mr. Boucher pointed out that we can pilot a small online evaluation project first, in order to work out some of the concerns before instituting online evaluations college-wide.

The Speaker then recognized David Gleeson (History), who said that the Citadel has recently adopted online evaluations and that the response rate has been “disastrous.”
Though they are talking about moving to a compulsory method of evaluation at the Citadel, Mr. Gleeson opposes this because he believes students should be free not to respond if they wish. He also expressed concern that it seemed to him a pilot program was not simply a possibility, but had already been decided on at the College. Ms. Seaman responded by pointing out that, in the research she’s seen, 3-5 years is often cited as the amount of time needed to get the response rate for online evaluations back up to the rate for paper evaluations.

Todd Grantham (Philosophy) spoke in favor of what he called a “mindful” pilot program. He fears the strongly bi-modal responses that might result from online evaluations (that only students with extreme reactions, whether positive or negative would bother to evaluate a course). He pointed out that these are the troubling type of responses one sees at websites such as RateMyProfessor.com. Ms. Seaman responded that her committee wants people to realize that the type of information collected in online evaluations might be different in the beginning than that collected by paper evaluations.

Michael Skinner (EDFS) pointed out that the experience of evaluating a course online would be qualitatively different for students than evaluating a course in a classroom setting. Students might get together, talk about evaluations, etc. The results could be very different. Although he commended the committee’s work, Mr. Skinner said that he’s not very supportive of the recommendation because of these reasons. He also asked whether research exists that studies evaluations done of the same course using different methods. Evaluation is a very important issue for people coming up for review. Mr. Boucher responded that, even in the classroom, students could get together and talk about evaluations. He suggested that maybe students would feel less pressure to conform with online evaluations than with evaluations conducted in the classroom. Mr. Skinner re-emphasized that the experiences are different and would generate different responses.

Daryl Phillips (Classics, German, Italian, Japanese, Russian) then pointed out that the committee had done a good job in identifying the benefits of online evaluation. Yet, his department was in unusual agreement in opposing the recommendation for the following reasons:
--Currently, there are no time or space limits set on online evaluations. This invites students who feel passionately to write a lot. Skewed results would arise from these very passionate responses.
--It’s dangerous to do a pilot program that involves a small number of faculty. Under such a program, what would happen to the cross-department and cross-school comparisons we receive? Comparing courses evaluated on-line to courses evaluated on paper is troubling and unfair.
--While the 3-5 year adjustment period may seem short to some, to others those years are crucial and may mean tenure.
Finally, while Mr. Phillips said he would like to save trees, he does not think the recommendation is faculty-friendly at this point.

Melissa Hughes (Biology) argued that she studies behavior and doesn’t think that the data obtained from online evaluations will be meaningful if the only motivation for students to
evaluate courses is a desire to participate. She suggested that all students be required to
go to Cougar Trail to either evaluate or to specifically opt out of evaluating. We could
withhold grades until they do so. Otherwise, the data will be about as meaningful as that
obtained by RateMyProfessor.com.

Mick Norton (Mathematics) added that, in online evaluations, the middle responses
(students who don’t feel strongly either way about a course) would not be represented.
Charles Kaiser (At-Large, Psychology) asked whether the committee had examined any
well-controlled research studies that compare online evaluations with paper evaluations.
Elizabeth Jurisich (Mathematics) responded that we haven’t examined any well-
controlled studies for the type of evaluation we do now.

Sarah Owens (Hispanic Studies) then called the question, arguing that points were
starting to be repeated. The Senate voted down calling the question, so discussion
continued.

Mark Lazzaro (Biology) asked whether anyone had asked students their opinions about
online evaluations. At this point, the Speaker recognized student James Eby, a member
of the Faculty Educational Technology Committee. Mr. Eby said students are strongly in
favor of the recommendation. The SGA passed an almost unanimous resolution
endorsing online evaluations. Students have a stake in the process—they don’t want to
see “lousy” teachers get tenure. Mr. Eby also pointed out that he has witnessed many
points of failure in the current system of evaluation. Melissa Hughes asked Mr. Eby what
he thought the odds were that students would actually participate in online evaluations.
He replied that he thought participation would be low at first, but would return to normal
rates after the 3-5 year adjustment period. Students, he added, want the evaluation
process to be voluntary and anonymous.

Julia Eichelberger (At-Large, English) then asked if anyone had considered a paper
evaluation system that used only bubble-in responses. Comments could be added later
online. Then, the paper forms would not have to be retained after the results were
calculated. Ms. Seaman replied that the burden lies in producing and distributing paper
forms, not only in maintaining them. She added that her committee is recommending that
online evaluations be debated, discussed, and considered, that the door not be shut against
them.

Gerry Gonsalves (Management and Entrepreneurship) expressed concerns about the two-
week window during which students could complete online evaluations. He thought
evaluations should be done only after a course if fully completed. Ms. Seaman responded
that a similar two-week window currently exists in the system we use now.

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) commented that part of her problem with the
recommendation is its generality. While she’s willing to hear more about the issue, she
doesn’t want to support online evaluations at this point. She would be more comfortable
with a more specific proposal. Ms. Seaman pointed out that the actual process for how
online evaluations would work is being pursued by a different committee. The Faculty
Educational Technology Committee was brought in to determine whether further investigations into online evaluations should continue. She hopes that faculty members do become involved in further discussions of this issue.

George Pothering (At-Large, Computer Science) said that he would hate to see the possibility of online evaluations die without being tested. He volunteered to serve as a guinea pig in a pilot program, pointing out that if we don’t give online evaluations a chance, we’ll never know if they could have worked.

Glenn Lesses (Philosophy) argued that the way the motion had been described by Ms. Seaman (as something that should be debated and considered further) sounds more like a report than an actual motion or recommendation. He moved to table the recommendation until the committee comes up with a more specific process. Then the Senate could vote on a specific document. Ms. Seaman asked for clarification about what the FETC was specifically being asked to do, reminding the Senate that her committee (the FETC) is not the committee that is actually developing the process for online evaluations. Melissa Hughes spoke next; she said she was also uncomfortable voting for the recommendation as it’s currently worded, suggesting the FETC come back with a proposal that says faculty would be willing to support online course evaluations if our concerns are met. Erin Beutel (Geology) pointed out that the current document recommends that the Senate support the implementation of online student evaluation of classes. The language of implementation is the problem, and that’s why we’re asking for a new proposal.

A vote on the recommendation was taken, and Mr. Lesses’ motion to refer the recommendation back to the Faculty Educational Technology Committee passed.

**Post-Tenure Review Committee—Proposed Additions to Procedures for Post-Tenure Review**

The Speaker then recognized Mick Norton of the Post-Tenure Review Committee, who proposed the following additions to procedures for post-tenure review:

Add item

O. 2. a. (8): A late packet will not be considered for a superior rating except in extraordinary circumstances. A letter must accompany the packet to explain these circumstances.

Add item

O. 6. f.: **Appealing a Satisfactory Rating**
A candidate who receives a satisfactory rating when having sought a superior rating and who alleges that the rating was based upon discrimination, violation of academic freedom or violation of due process may follow the appeals procedure outlined in item O. 6. c. (1).
If the candidate feels that the satisfactory rating received is incorrect due to reasons other than those outlined in section O. 6. c. (1), a formal appeal is not allowed. However, upon the candidate’s request, the candidate will be allowed to undergo one “successive” post-tenure review the following year and to modify the packet so as to better document the case for a superior rating. The candidate is allowed to modify statements on teaching, research and service, to include additional or different peer letters, and, generally, to strengthen the packet with the kinds of evidence outlined in section O. 2. a. However, other than the fact that the vita included in the packet shall be current, the evidence in the packet shall cover the same six-year period that was covered in the prior year’s review. A candidate’s post-tenure review cycle does not change as the result of undergoing a successive post-tenure review, and no further reviews covering the same six-year period are allowed.

After the Senate decided to handle the two items separately, the floor was opened to discussion on the issue of late packets. Joe Kelly (At-Large, English) asked whose job it was to decide if a late packet met the criteria for “extraordinary circumstances.” Mr. Norton replied that the Post-Tenure Review Committee would decide. Mr. Kelly then proposed a friendly amendment be added to the proposal which would make this point explicit. Mr. Norton accepted the friendly amendment.

The Senate voted on the issue of late packets, and the change in procedure passed.

The floor was then opened for discussion on the issue of the appeals process. Bob Perkins (EDFS) asked why the Hearings Committee was not chosen to hear appeals. Mr. Norton replied that the Hearings Committee does hear cases that involve discrimination, violation of academic freedom, or violation of due process. No process currently exists, however, for people who simply disagree with decisions made by the Post-Tenure Review Committee.

Glenn Lesses (Philosophy) spoke next, arguing that he was uncomfortable with the appeal proposal because it bureaucratizes the process. Mr. Lesses does not believe that a candidate’s failure to get a desired outcome in the post-tenure review process is a good reason for an appeal. No such process exists during the tenure and promotion review. Mr. Lesses would prefer to see appeals allowed only on the basis of discrimination, violation of academic freedom, or violation of due process. Mr. Norton replied that tenure is an “up or out” review process. But when undergoing review for promotion to full professor, candidates have the option to come up again the very next year if they disagree with a decision, or if they add to their record. Mr. Lesses pointed out that candidates can also choose to come up again in six years under the current post-tenure review process. The $2500 reward is a one-time benefit.
The issue was then brought to a vote. The Senate approved the change in the appeals process.

**Scott Peeples (on behalf of the Amnesty International student group)— Resolution Regarding the Contract with Coca Cola**

The Speaker recognized Scott Peeples (English) who introduced a resolution written by the student group Amnesty International that urges the College of Charleston not to renew its exclusive vending contract with the Coca-Cola Corporation. (For the full resolution, see Appendix III). Mr. Peeples pointed out that the students who brought this resolution have worked on the project since August. Among other things, they collected 600 signatures on a petition, screened a documentary three times, brought in speakers, and held a tele-conference. Mr. Peeples then introduced students Kristen Neumann-Martiensen and Jess Berens who gave a power point presentation pointing out what they believe to be human rights violations the Coca-Cola Company has committed in Columbia, South America.

Because of time constraints (it was 7:00 and the room was needed by another group), the Speaker ended the meeting before discussion of the resolution or the usual Constituents’ Concerns portion of the meeting could take place. Mr. Mignone directed that the Amnesty International resolution would be the first order of old business taken up at the next Senate meeting, on April 11.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix I: Curriculum Proposals

A) School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs
- New Interdisciplinary Comparative Literature Minor

- New course proposals:
  1. CPLT 200 Introduction to Comparative Literature
  2. CPLT 400 Comparative Literature Capstone

- Change a course: LTFR 250. Change title and description to better define content

B) Latin American Studies:
- Changes in degree requirements to the major: add LTPO 150, LTPO 270 and LTPO 280 to CORE II list
- Changes in degree requirements to the minor: add LTPO 150, LTPO 270 and LTPO 280 to CORE II list

C) Anthropology:
- New course proposals:
  1. ANTH 342: Human Behavior and Evolution
  2. ANTH 352: Folklore of Ireland and the British Isles

D) Economics and Finance:
- Change a course: FINC 380. Change title, description and prerequisites

- New course proposal: FINC 381

E) Hispanic Studies:
- Change a course:
  1. SPAN 315, 316, 317, 318, 320, 322, 323, 326, 327, 344, 381 and 382. Change in prerequisites to include SPAN 312 or 328 as alternatives
  2. SPAN 400. Change in prerequisites

F) English:
- New course proposal: ENGL 2XX: Writing Song Lyrics

G) Women's and Gender Studies Program:
- New course proposal: WMST 381: Women’s and Gender Studies Internship

H) Biology:
- Change a course: For Biol 310 Microbiology, Biol 312 Molecular Biology, Biol 313 Cell Biology and Biol 321 General and Comparative Physiology: Change prerequisite to add 1 year of chemistry. This was part of the original prerequisites before last year’s curriculum changes, and was an omission.

- Changes in degree requirements to the major:
Degree: Bachelor of Science with concentration in Molecular Biology. The total number of hours in the major should be changed from 35 to 34. This was a miscalculation

I) Marketing & Supply Chain Management:
- New major proposal: Supply Chain Management
Appendix II: Full Recommendation on Online Student Evaluation of Classes

To: College of Charleston Faculty Senate  
From: Faculty Educational Technology Committee  
Re: Recommendation on Online Student Evaluation of Classes  
Date: 15 March 2006

Recommendation

The FETC recommends that the Senate support the implementation of online student evaluation of classes.

Rationale

We value the intent and purpose of the College’s evaluation system.

The current paper-and-pencil delivery mechanism has weaknesses that can be addressed by an online delivery system.

The financial, physical and technical resources are available to implement online evaluations.

An online delivery system can provide additional formative and summative features that will benefit faculty, students and the institution.

Presented by the FETC members:

Christophe Boucher, History  
Sara Davis, Education  
James Eby, Student  
Allen Lyndrup, Theatre  
James Neff, Physics  
Myra Seaman, English (Chair)  
Jared Seay, Library  
Chris Starr, Computer Science
Purpose of Student Evaluation of Classes

The College has been evaluating courses and instructors under the current system since the early 1990s.

Pedagogically, many faculty members find the student evaluations of classes to be an important source of information for measuring the success of classroom strategies and student satisfaction.

Institutionally, these evaluations are an important part of annual reviews and of the tenure and promotion process.

More recently, one purpose of student evaluation of classes is to meet external requirements placed on the College by the SC Commission on Higher Education (CHE), which mandates that each institution conduct evaluations of all sections of every course every semester (except those with a single student enrolled or those courses coded “independent study”).

Limitations of the paper-and-pencil delivery system

- The current procedure rests on a manual multi-step delivery system for dissemination. By the time the final copies of the evaluations reach the faculty, the original form has transited back and forth between no less than 3 offices on campus (ACTS, AAPA, Departments) and various other intermediaries including faculty, staff, and students. At this point, there are too many gaps in the system and too many places where evaluation forms can be lost, momentarily misplaced, misused, or incorrectly administered. In such conditions, confidentiality and privacy can also both be compromised given how many junctures there are for information failure.

- The process for preparing, delivering and tabulating the paper evaluations is slow, spanning over 15 weeks, prohibiting professors from obtaining results in a timely manner.

- The current process involves a great deal of labor in each of the various offices involved and represents therefore an excessive burden on the College.

- Each semester too many classes remain unevaluated, placing the College in jeopardy of a CHE fine (which could be as high as $500,000) for non-compliance with the CHE mandate cited above.

- The process is inflexible and changes are expensive (e.g., new print plates).

- Open-ended (comment) questions are hand written and compromise the student’s privacy and anonymity.

- Results are presented in a paper format that is difficult for both faculty and chairs to use.
• If the forms are lost, numerical results can be duplicated, but comments cannot be retrieved.

• Issues such as reprints, “double bubbling,” incorrect forms being distributed, use of old or “doctored” forms, etc., render results invalid and are of no benefit to the professor or the institution.

• In-class evaluations use valuable class time.

• The process is expensive, necessitating the use of up to 70,000 evaluation forms per semester not including paper copies issued later to faculty. Since the current printer is 22 years old and will go out of service in May 2006, the College will have to spend tens of thousands of dollars to replace it, placing an additional financial burden on our institution.

Development of Online Student Evaluation of Classes at the College

In response to faculty expression of interest in transitioning to online delivery of student evaluations, a committee of faculty and administrators was formed in January 2001 to investigate the topic. For the following five years, the committee researched and analyzed existing systems as well as the results those systems generated. This information was considered in terms of the history of student evaluations of classes at the College, local uses of the evaluations and the data they generate, and needs of the main audiences – faculty, staff, and students – involved.

Upon discovering that only a former Faculty Educational Technology Committee, but not the Faculty Senate itself, had expressed support of the online student evaluation system being proposed, the committee suspended its work. At that point, a trial run that had been scheduled for Spring 2006 was postponed. Instead, the committee pursued faculty support for the system. Faculty Senate President Bob Mignone in Fall 2005 charged the FETC with investigating online student evaluation of classes generally, and the particular version of them being prepared at the College, to return in Spring 2006 with its recommendation.

Proposed Online Delivery of Student Evaluation of Classes

The culmination of five years of extensive research and implementation has replicated the current system utilizing an online delivery mechanism with the following characteristics:

• Via Cougar Trail, students will be able to view and evaluate only their own classes.

• Students will be able to evaluate each class only one time.

• Students will not be able to view course evaluation results.

• Students will be able to evaluate classes only during the last two weeks of the semester; this schedule closely corresponds with the current time frame for student evaluation of classes.
• Online evaluation would be available only to those classes consisting of more than two students and those not coded as independent study.

The proposed online student evaluation system addresses several issues elicited from the five-year study and faculty response.

• The Cougar Trail system will ensure anonymity between student and professor, privacy of response, and confidentiality even in open-ended response formats.

• Student participation will be optional, as it is now, but student absence from class will no longer prohibit individual participation.

• Research indicates that response rates will decrease initially. However, research also indicates that rates increase in response to coordinated efforts among student groups and instructors.

Implementation Options

Full Implementation

The Online Evaluation System would be fully implemented and completely replace the current paper-and-pencil system. The system could be operational and accessible through Cougar Trail as early as Fall 2006. The evaluation process would be open only during the last two weeks of classes, mirroring as closely as possible the current evaluation system. Current Cougar Trail hours are 8 a.m. until 11:45 p.m. Monday through Thursday, 8 a.m. through midnight on Friday, all day Saturday, and 12 a.m.-11:45 p.m. Sunday. Hours for evaluation access can be further restricted.

Pilot Project: Partial implementation of Online Evaluation System

A subset of the faculty would use the online student evaluation system during the evaluation process (instead of the paper system), while the rest of the faculty uses the current paper-and-pencil system. This could be implemented as early as the fall semester 2006.

Benefits of Online Evaluation

The first version of the online student evaluation system would be intended to replicate the paper-based evaluation system with no changes in questions or format. Some changes will result directly from the electronic means of delivery. These include the following:

Immediate benefits

For Instructors:

• Student comments are returned immediately after the semester ends for formative use before the next semester starts.

• All student comments are legible even if they remain unintelligible.
• Student comments are typed to better preserve anonymity.
• Results are returned electronically in a form ready for printing.
• Results are returned electronically in a form for analysis and graphing.
• System integrity is increased (encryption of data, no hand-manipulation of forms).
• Faculty will not miss access to student feedback due to student absences.
• Business processes are simplified (do not have to remember to take the evaluations to class).
• Security is increased (faculty do not have to depend on one student to execute the process in class and return the forms on behalf of the instructor).
• Class time is recovered.

For Students:
• Student anonymity will increase because comments will be typed.
• SCIP responses will be available before registration for the next semester.
• A student will not miss an opportunity to complete an evaluation due to a class absence.
• Every student will have access to the evaluation forms for their classes.
• Students will not be able to bubble in more than one response to each question.

For the Institution:
• System integrity is increased (via data security and student anonymity).
• System reliability increases (with simplified business process).
• Data validity is increased (by eliminating opportunities for cheating).

Future Benefits
Once the first version is in place, the faculty could consider adding features to the online system. Examples of features enabled by the online delivery mechanism include the following:

Options to consider for future versions of the online student evaluation system:
• The number of days and the hours per day, during which the evaluations are available, can be adapted to improve the system.
• Comment boxes can have a spell checker to improve anonymity of student comments.
• Each faculty member could add questions to the evaluation specific to a course or section.
• Each department and school could add questions to the evaluation.
• Program assessment questions can be included for learning/accreditation standards.
• Data is stored electronically allowing instructors and administrators to analyze trends over time.
• The system can remind and encourage students to complete their evaluations.
• A report of the response rate can be sent to instructors during the evaluation period to allow instructors to encourage student participation.
• The evaluation system can automatically generate the T&P section on course evaluations at any time.
• Instructors can insert comments into evaluations and evaluation summaries (perhaps explaining how they plan to respond to or improve the course).
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Appendix III: Resolution Regarding the Contract with Coca-Cola

College of Charleston Faculty Senate Resolution regarding the Contract with Coca-Cola

WHEREAS paramilitary groups have threatened, kidnapped, tortured, and murdered union workers at Coca-Cola bottling plants in Colombia; and

WHEREAS a fact-finding delegation of labor, educator and student representatives led by New York City Council member Hiram Monserrate concluded that the Coca-Cola corporation’s “complicity in the situation is deepened by its repeated pattern of bringing criminal charges against union activists who have spoken out about the company’s collusion with paramilitaries” (Final Report dated April 2004, p. 1); and

WHEREAS credible reports have also charged Coca-Cola with irresponsible business practices elsewhere, including: using sugar harvested through hazardous child labor in El Salvador; illegal salary reductions and unsafe working conditions in Guatemala; and the theft of common water resources and consequent depredations to subsistence agriculture in the Indian province of Kerala; and

WHEREAS the Coca-Cola Corporation currently holds an exclusive vending rights contract with the College of Charleston that eliminates competition from other soft drink manufacturers while encouraging members of our campus community to subsidize human rights violations and environmental degradation by purchasing Coca-Cola products; and

WHEREAS, as educators at a liberal arts and sciences institution, College of Charleston faculty are deeply committed to protecting human rights and promoting environmental responsibility;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Faculty call upon the Administration not to renew the College of Charleston’s exclusive vending contract with the Coca-Cola Corporation; and

That the Faculty request that President Higdon send a letter to Edward E. Potter, Director of Global Labor Relations and Workplace Accountability, and E. Neville Isdell, Chairman of the Board of Directors and C.E.O. of the Coca-Cola Corporation, stating the College of Charleston’s intention not to renew its contract and urging the Coca-Cola Corporation to

- Denounce the violence that has occurred in the name of Coca-Cola in Colombia;
- Reinforce Coca-Cola’s public stance against violence by directing all bottling plants in Colombia to stop dealing with any armed groups that are participating in violence against trade unionists;

- Respect the fundamental rights to free association and to organize trade unions, as reflected in Colombian law, Article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as well as Conventions 87 and 88 of the International Labor Organization;

- Provide compensation to known victims of violence at Coca-Cola bottling plants.
The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, February 28, 2006, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

The minutes from the January 31 Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens began her report by informing faculty that she and several Deans had just returned from two admission events, one in Greenville and one in Columbia. These were both productive experiences, and she hopes the college participates in similar events in the future.

Next, Ms. Jorgens shared with faculty some statistics from the huge number of surveys conducted by the offices of assessment and planning and institutional research as well as by private consultants. The following are some interesting pieces of information collected in these surveys:

• Students asked about their decisions to enroll at CofC rated (among numerous other items) the following factors:

  --Opportunity to study overseas: 22% said “essential”
  28% said “very important”
  25% said “somewhat important”
  25% said “not important”

  --Opportunity for undergraduate research:

  11% said “essential”
  25% said “very important”
  31% said “somewhat important”
  33% said “not important”

• 47% rated the college’s involvement in NCAA I Athletics as “not important” in their decision to enroll; 61% rated CofC’s reputation as a party school as “not important.”

• 71% of students reported having either a mother or father who has attained a Bachelor’s Degree from a 4-year institution of higher learning.

• Student religious affiliated broke down as follows:
  47%--Christian Protestant
  20%--Catholic
  20%--none
8%--other  
3%--Jewish  
1%--Buddhist  
1%--Baptist  

• Data from national student opinion surveys conducted in 2003 and 2004 show that students perceive CofC’s strengths to be:  
  -- quality of undergraduate instruction, both in introductory courses and in the major  
  -- academic support from faculty  
  -- accessibility of faculty outside the classroom  
  -- variety of courses offered  

• Data from the same survey show that students perceive CofC’s weaknesses to be:  
  -- accessibility of advisors in the major  
  -- quality of advising  
  -- availability of offered courses  

• Data from a national survey of college freshmen, conducted in 2004, show that CofC’s freshmen have the following characteristics:  
  -- 91% are white  
  -- 75% live over 100 miles away from the College  
  -- 20% are Catholic  
  -- 19% claim no religion  
  -- 40% have fathers who are in the field of business  
  -- 20% have mothers who are in the field of business  
  -- 77% plan to attain a graduate degree of some kind  
  -- 79% used the internet for research and/or homework  
  -- 74% said CofC was their first choice for college  

• Another national student survey, which attempts to get at actual student experience, not just their opinions, shows that:  
  -- CofC is successful in providing knowledge, but less successful in providing techniques or venues for students to showcase their knowledge.  
  -- Faculty are good at interacting with students in the area of grades and academics, but could engage students better in other ways.  
  -- CofC students excel at interacting with students from different backgrounds, but the college doesn’t encourage such interaction as much as it could.  
  -- CofC does well in the areas of study abroad and internships.  

• Finally, a nation-wide survey conducted of faculty showed the following characteristics of CofC faculty:  
  -- 31% are between the ages of 30-39  
  -- 16% are 60+  
  -- 68% are married  
  -- 67% have a spouse working in the same city
--27% have a spouse working in academia
--30% joined CofC since 2002
--50% joined CofC since 1997
--12% will retire in the next 3 years
--67% developed a new course in the past two years

After the Provost had presented these statistics, she asked for questions from the Senate. Joe Kelly (At-Large, English) asked about the status of the faculty workload report. Ms. Jorgens replied that the administration had learned a great deal from the report. She has been working with Deans and Chairs to see if the College can accomplish the goals of the report without a full-scale change in the faculty manual. There are two areas she is particularly focusing on: 1) trying for increased flexibility for release time for research work, and 2) paying more attention to the way that independent studies are credited. In their workload efforts, the administration is using national benchmarks through the Delaware Study. Ms. Jorgens added that it is her goal to make any decisions about workload as open and transparent as possible. She expects that any decisions made by the administration will be supportive of faculty work.

When asked if new workload policies would be in effect next year, Ms. Jorgens responded that she hopes so, and that any new policy will be data-driven. Scott Peeples (English) then asked whether the workload report is available on-line. Ms. Jorgens replied that it is not. She apologized for not making the report more open, but the administration is worried about generating negative feedback from outside campus.

Speaker

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone began his report by announcing that there will be a student/faculty forum to discuss the new plus/minus grading system on March 16, from 5:00-6:00 in the Stern Center Ballroom. All faculty are welcome to attend.

In addition, he announced that the third stage of the college identity discussion will consist of faculty forums to be held in March. We will be hearing more about these forums soon.

Old Business

Academic Planning Committee—Transcript Notation of Non-Credit Experiences

The speaker then recognized Chris Hope, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, who made the following recommendation to the Senate on behalf of her committee:

The Academic Planning Committee recommends that the Senate require department or program driven course approval by the Curriculum Committee and the Senate prior to transcript notation for non-credit experiences. The current
practice of manually entering non-credit experiences in a field separate from courses on the academic transcript should be discontinued. Departments/programs that feel the need for a transcript notation for non-credit experiences should develop a department or program specific course proposal for such and submit it for consideration to the Curriculum Committee. In the absence of the passage of such a department/program course, students may place such non-credit experiences on their co-curricular record (as proposed by Student Affairs) or on a resumé.

**Rationale:**

- Historically, departments, the Curriculum Committee, and the Senate determine academic value of a course of study. That “flow chart” makes considerable sense.

- The academic transcript of an institution, if it is to retain its authority, credibility, and value, must be a document that reports academic work and not other types of life experiences.

- As currently configured, some non-credit internships have no departmental faculty supervision and award no grade, therefore it is inappropriate to place them on an official academic transcript

In the discussion that followed, Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) asked if we could encourage students to include non-credit experiences on their resumés. Ms. Hope responded that the co-curricular records proposed by Student Affairs is intended to do just this—build resumés.

Brian McGee (visitor, Communication) asked if this proposal would be only a recommendation made by the Senate, not binding. Ms. Hope replied that it would, adding that all Senate proposals are merely recommendations. Mr. McGee then asked if there would be a period of time before this recommendation was implemented, since there are students in the pipeline right now who currently receive transcript notation for non-credit experiences. Ms. Hope replied that she thought there would be. There would be no removing of items already on the transcript.

Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) moved to amend the motion by adding that the new policy be put in place only after some kind of instrument is developed to recognize co-curricular activities. Peter Calcagno (Economics/Finance) seconded the motion to amend. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) agreed that there should be a co-curricular transcript, but spoke against Mr. Blackwell’s amendment, arguing that the people who create the new co-curricular transcript might delay because they are the same people who supported putting non-credit experiences on the academic transcript in the first place.

Discussion ended, and the amendment failed. A vote was then taken on the original recommendation as brought by the committee. The motion passed.
Academic Standards Committee—Proposal to Modify Admission Standards for the School of Business and Economics

The speaker next recognized Lynn Cherry of the Academic Standards Committee, who made the following motion to implement new admission standards for the School of Business and Economics:

The School of Business and Economics has admission standards to attract and retain students with the ability and commitment necessary for success in business and economics. The standards include the following requirements:

Completion of the following courses with no grade less than a “C-“
- MATH 104 or 250
- MATH 105 or 120
- ECON 201 or HONS 211
- ECON 202 or HONS 212
- ACCT 203*
- ACCT 204*
- DSCI 232

*Economics majors are not required to take ACCT 203 or ACCT 204.

Students should apply for admission to the School during the semester they expect to complete the requirements described above. Non-admitted students may take up to 9 hours of upper-division business courses (300 level or above). Exceptions to this 9 hour limit will be made to allow completion of degree requirements for other College of Charleston students with majors outside of the School of Business and Economics.

In the discussion that followed, Julie Davis (Communication) asked whether the last sentence of the proposal applied to minors. Rhonda Mack (Marketing and Supply Chain Management) replied that it did. The exceptions will apply mostly to minors and transfer students.

Next, Glen Lesses (Philosophy) asked whether the committee had considered the impact of these new admission standards on other parts of the College. He particularly wondered if there would be a flight of students to other programs. Ms. Cherry replied that the committee didn’t discuss this issue in detail. Her opinion is that, typically, many students who struggle in business classes currently do change their majors. Mr. Lesses responded that, when a new admissions policy for the School of Business and Economics failed in the Senate last semester, one of the concerns was how admissions standards for particular schools would impact other parts of the college. He still has the same concerns. Ms. Mack replied that the new standards require a GPA less than that needed to graduate from the College. She argued that the new standards don’t set as high a bar as the previous proposal did.
The Speaker then recognized Bob Perkins (At-Large, EDFS), who asked how grades would be calculated for students who retake a course after receiving a ‘D’ initially. Ms. Mack replied that all the proposal asks is that students eventually get at least a ‘C-’ in the listed courses. So, if a student initially took MATH 104, received a ‘D,’ then retook the class and received a ‘C-,’ they would not be denied admission to the school.

Darryl Phillips (Classics/German/Italian/Japanese/Russian) spoke next, pointing out that he believed the School of Business and Economics could accomplish their goals without calling for a special admissions process. He suggested making these grade requirements pre-requisites rather than admission standards. Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) pointed out that, currently, all the SIS computer system checks is whether a student is enrolled in necessary pre-requisite courses; it doesn’t check grades.

Joe Kelly (At-Large, English) then asked whether any student meeting these requirements would be guaranteed admission to the School of Business and Economics. Ms. Mack replied that the school can’t guarantee graduation because that depends on seats being available. But, she added that students meeting the admission requirements would be allowed to declare a major. Mr. Kelly asked if this could be made more explicit in the proposal. He suggested a friendly amendment which would make it clear that any student who meets the proposal’s requirements couldn’t be rejected from admission to the school. The amendment would read, “All students completing these courses with a grade of C- or better may declare a major in the School of Business and Economics.” The amendment was accepted as a friendly one.

Next, Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) said that she was concerned about the precedent of one school setting higher admission standards than others. She would love to have all her students be required to have passed English 101 with a ‘B.’ Claire Curtis (Political Science) responded that she was less concerned about precedent with this proposal than with the previous one because of the low bar required for admission. Julia Eichelberger (At-Large, English) agreed with Ms. Curtis, adding that she believes the proposal will help the School of Business and Economics mentor students and alert them early on of the need to do well in courses and take them seriously. Bob Perkins agreed, saying that he believes the intent of the proposal is not to get rid of students and send them to other schools, but to save students from failure.

Sue Balinsky (Physical Education and Health) then asked if there would be any opportunity for a student who received a ‘D’ in one of courses on the list, perhaps because of unusual circumstances, but who had a good overall GPA, to be admitted to the school.

Kay Smith, Associate Vice-President of the Academic Experience, asked how many hours a student would normally have when he or she declared a major under the new proposal, pointing out that the college requires students to declare majors by the time they have accumulated 60 hours. Ms. Mack replied that the latest students would declare a major in the school would be the second semester of their sophomore year. Students who come with AP credit would declare earlier.
Next, Joe Kelly wondered whether, if the Senate approves this proposal, future changes would have to come through the Senate again, or if, once passed, changes could be made by the administrators in the School of Business and Economics. Ms. Cherry replied that any future changes to the proposal would have to go through the appropriate faculty committees.

Returning to Ms. Balinsky’s previous question, Claire Curtis proposed a friendly amendment which would allow a student to petition to be admitted to the school despite one grade of ‘D’ in a course from the list. Ms. Mack replied that the proposal as is doesn’t preclude petitions. Elizabeth Jurisich (Mathematics) then spoke against the proposed amendment, arguing that it’s not a matter of sympathy—if students have missed a chunk of a math class, they’re simply not prepared to succeed in a later course. Jason Overby (Chemistry) agreed with Ms. Jurisich, pointing out that a ‘D’ grade stands for “deficiency.” Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) then argued that this issue is taken care of in the policy itself, since students can still take three upper-division classes before they declare a major. Ms. Mack added that the proposal is based on data, and that students making below a ‘C-’ on the listed courses aren’t going to succeed in the program. The friendly amendment was not accepted.

Discussion then came to an end, and after a voice vote, the proposal passed.

**Academic Standards Committee—Report on SGA Resolution and Proposal to Form an Ad-Hoc Committee**

Mr. Mignone then recognized Lynn Cherry again, who reported on the Academic Standards Committee’s examination of the SGA resolution concerning the plus/minus grading policy. Ms. Cherry said that the committee considered seven items from the resolution, which they considered to be in their purview. Of these items, the committee decided that several were worthy of further study.

Therefore, the committee proposed forming an Ad-Hoc committee to study the following issues:

--the course withdrawal deadline
--the maximum number of withdrawal credit-hours allowed
--a possible academic redemption policy
--the GPA required for various levels of graduation and semester honors.

In the discussion that followed, George Pothering (At-Large, Computer Science) asked what an academic redemption policy is. Ms. Cherry replied that such policies are in effect at many schools; they often allow students to retake courses in which they earned a ‘D’ or ‘F,’ but not have the old grade count in the GPA. Kay Smith then added that most schools with such policies strictly limit the number of courses a student can retake. Jason Overby then asked how an academic redemption policy fit with concerns about the new plus/minus grading system raised by the SGA resolution. He argued that this seemed like a “pork policy.” Ms. Cherry replied that the students also raised a number of additional
questions and concerns they would like to see addressed. These additional concerns are not necessarily related to the original resolution.

Susan Kattwinkel then asked why an Ad-Hoc committee was needed. She wondered why the Academic Standards Committee didn’t investigate these issues further. Ms. Cherry replied that the Standards Committee is extremely busy at this point and that the student concerns will be addressed in a more timely manner if an Ad-Hoc committee is formed. Jose Gavidia (Management and Entrepreneurship) then asked whether this was an emergency situation that we need to look at before the implementation of the plus/minus grading policy. Ms. Cherry replied that it was not an emergency, but that she doesn’t believe it should be dragged out unnecessarily.

Calvin Blackwell then asked whether the Ad-Hoc committee proposed could only consider relaxing standards or if it could also consider tightening standards as well. Ms. Cherry replied that such considerations would be up to the committee itself.

Discussion ended, and the proposal to form an Ad-Hoc committee passed.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

The Speaker then recognized Agnes Southgate, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, who moved the following proposals:

1) Astronomy packet:
   a. New course proposal: PHYS-377 Experimental Astronomy
   b. New Major: B. S. in Astrophysics. This will *de facto* replace the current B.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration. It will be more visible and attractive to potential students.
   c. New Major: B. A. in Astronomy.

2) Communication packet:

New course proposals:
1. COMM 223: Interviewing *(offered once/year)*
2. COMM 360: Communication and Technology *(no overlap with Computer Sciences)*
3. COMM 436: Crisis communication *(offered every other year)*
4. COMM 476: Capstone in Corporate and Organizational Communication *(offered once/year)*

Course changes:
   a. added prerequisite
   COMM 407: Seminar in Communication Management
   COMM 370: Gender and communication
b. New course description and prerequisites:
COMM 285: Basic Photojournalism *(change in emphasis to digital photography)*

c. New course title, description and prerequisites:
COMM 385: Advanced Photojournalism and Documentary Photography *(change in emphasis to digital photography)*

**Change in degree requirements for the major**

a. For all concentrations: Eliminate all references to ENGL 382 *(now replaced by COMM 382)*

b. Under Major requirements remove parenthetical text after “36 hours” and replace with “(except 39 hours for the Media Studies Concentration and 42 hours for the Corporate and Organizational Communication Concentration)” *This represents an increase of 3 credit hours in both cases*

c. For Communication Studies Concentration:
Add COMM 223 to “Fundamentals” section
Add COMM 360 to “Electives” section
Add COMM 394 to “Applications” section

d. For Media Studies Concentration:
Add COMM 375 (editing) to the “Required Courses” section
Add COMM 245, 285, 360, 394 and 436 to the “Media Electives” section
Add CSCI 112 and 114 to the “Media Electives” section
Delete the “Visual Communication” section and the “Trident Technical College” section
Create “Media Studies Capstone” section with choice from: COMM 499, 407, 435 or 495, with a minimum of 3 credits to fulfill capstone requirement.
Remove COMM 407, 435, 495 and 499 from “Media Electives” section

Under “Media Electives” drop from 3 additional courses to 2 additional courses.
Increase from 15 to 21 the number of credit hours needed at the 300-400 level with COMM-prefix.
Cap at 3 credit hours the number permitted in non-COMM courses to fulfill the Media Studies requirements.

e. For Corporate and Organizational Communication Concentration:
Add COMM 223 to “Fundamentals” section
Add COMM 360 and 436 to “Applications/Electives” section
Create “Corporate and Organizational Communication Capstone” section with choice from: COMM 435, 476, 495 or 499, with a minimum of 3 credits to fulfill capstone requirement.
Remove COMM 435, 495 and 499 from “Applications/Electives” section

**Change in degree requirements for the minor**

a. For Communication Studies
Add COMM 223 to the 200-level electives list
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Add COMM 394 to the 300-400-level courses list

b. For Media Studies
Add COMM 335 and 394 to “choose 3 courses” section

3) Political Science packet

New course proposals:
1. POLS 221: Law and Society (from special topics)
2. POLS 308: Education Policy “
3. POLS 309: Health Policy “
4. POLS 310: Political Ecology “
5. POLS 334: Geographies and politics of the European Union (from special topics)
6. POLS 335: Cuban Revolution (study abroad in Cuba)
7. POLS 351: Utopia/Dystopia (from special topics)
8. POLS 352: Gender, Theory and Law; Sexual Harassment (from special topics)
9. POLS 353: Beginning Mock Trial once/year
10. POLS 354: Advanced Mock Trial once/year
11. POLS 368: Political Geography once/year
12. POLS 369: Politics of Globalization every 2 years
13. POLS 394/COMM 394: Political Campaign Communication from special topics in Comm
14. POLS 395: American Federalism (from special topics)

Change a course proposal:
POLS 301: Change in Title and description: Bureaucratic Politics and Policy

Delete a course proposals:
1. POLS 300: Budgetary Process
2. POLS 303: Advanced Policy Studies
3. POLS 320: Politics of Western Europe
4. POLS 325: Politics of Eastern/Central Europe
5. POLS 348: Methods in Political Science
6. POLS 349: Contemporary Constitutional Issues
7. POLS 385: The American Bureaucracy
8. POLS 393: Religion and Politics
9. POLS 403: Seminar in Public Policy
10. POLS 404: Seminar in Political Sciences

4) Art History packet

New course proposals:
1. ARTH 104 Themes in the History of Art
2. ARTH 225 Medieval Art
3. ARTH 277 Renaissance Art
4. ARTH 285 Modern Art
5. ARTH 301 Studies in Ancient and Medieval Art
6. ARTH 303 Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art
7. ARTH 306 Studies in Modern, Contemporary and Film Arts
8. ARTH 308 Studies in Asian Art
9. ARTH 321 Hindu Myth and Image
10. ARTH 322 Indian Painting

Course changes:
   a. New course title and description:
ARTH 101 History of Art: Prehistoric through Medieval (changed from: History of Art: Prehistory through Renaissance) better reflects content

ARTH 255 Latin American Colonial Art (changed from: Latin American Art: Colonial to Modern) content stops at the time of 19th century independence

   b. New course number;
ARTH 105 from ARTH 245 this course is a basic introductory course

   c. Deletion of prerequisites:
ARTH 250 American Art
ARTH 255 Latin American Art: Colonial to Modern
ARTH 265 The City as a Work of Art
These are broad survey courses

   d. Deletion of prerequisites and new course number:
Renumber ARTH 305 Pre-Colombian Art and Culture to ARTH 205
Renumber ARTH 310 African Art to ARTH 210
Renumber ARTH 345 Greek and Roman Art to ARTH 220
Renumber ARTH 341 History of the Art of India to ARTH 241
Renumber ARTH 342 History of the Art of China to ARTH 242
Renumber ARTH 343 History of the Art of Japan to ARTH 243
Renumber ARTH 380 History of Baroque Art to ARTH 280
Renumber ARTH 393 Introduction to Film Art to ARTH 293
These are broad survey courses

   e. New course title, description and prerequisites:
ARTH 415 Advanced Seminar in Art and Architectural History (changed from Senior Paper in Art History); prerequisite: “Permission of instructor or 6 hours of Art History or ARTH 299”

   f. Change prerequisites
for all 300-level courses change prerequisites to: “Permission of instructor or 6 hours of Art History or ARTH 299”

Change in Degree Requirements for the Major:
   1. Remove ARTH 101, ARTH 102, and ARTH 103 from list of required courses.
   2. Create 3 category of courses. Students need to choose at least one from each.
3. Additional requirements stay the same

5) Historic preservation and Community Planning packet

Course changes:

a. Create parallel courses with HPCP acronym for ARTH 290 (Special Topics); ARTH 340 (Special Topics); ARTH 410 Internship; ARTH 490 (Independent Study); ARTH 499 (Bachelor’s Essay) without removing the ARTH courses

b. Create parallel course HPCP 415 “Senior Seminar.” Leave ARTH 415 “Senior Paper in Art History” in place.

c. Change acronym:
ARTH 315 to HPCP 315 Urban Design Studio
ARTH 319 to HPCP 319 Architectural Design Studio
ARTH 420 to HPCP 420 Preservation Law and Economics

d. Change acronym & number:
ARTH 230 to HPCP 199 Introduction to Historic Preservation
ARTH 318 to HPCP 299 Preservation Planning Studio

e. Add HPCP acronym and Cross List with ARTH
ARTH 275 and HPCP 275 History of Land Design
ARTH 339 and HPCP 399 History of American Interiors

Change in Degree Requirements for the major:
ARTH 265 (The City as a Work of Art) becomes an alternative to HIST 211 (American Urban History) in the core requirements, and is removed from “column B.”

Added to the list of electives: ARTH/HPCP 339 (History of American Interiors)
HPCP 420 Preservation Law & Economics

Change in Requirements for Minor
Added to the list of electives: ARTH/HPCP 275 (History of Land Design); ARTH/HPCP 339 (History of American Interiors) and HPCP 420 Preservation Law & Economics are

6) Business Administration packet

New course proposal:
MGMT 350: Business, Leadership and Society

New Concentration:
Leadership and Organizational Studies

7) Art Management packet
New course proposals:
ARTM 210: Introduction to Music Management: proposal and syllabus
ARTM 325: Understanding Creativity: proposal and syllabus

8) Theater packet

New course proposals:
THTR 145: Elementary Tap
THTR 146: Intermediate Tap
THTR 322: Children’s Theater Repertory
THTR 339: Advanced Ballet
THTR 421: Creative Drama II

Course changes:
  a. Change in course description:
     THTR 176: attendance at events and written critics
     THTR 200
     THTR 201: include student teaching in description
     THTR 202: include stage management in description
     THTR 331: lecture only, no practicum
     THTR 387: reflect content
     THTR 388: reflect content
  
  b. Change in course description and prerequisites:
     THTR 316:
     THTR 383: lecture only
  
  c. Change in course number and prerequisite:
     THTR 270 (changed from THTR 370), change to lower courses prerequisites
  
  d. Change in prerequisite:
     THTR 180, THTR 310, THTR 311 and THTR 377
  
  e. Change in course title and description:
     THTR 221: to Creative Drama I (from Creative Dramatics)
     THTR 380: change to Sound design and Production for the Stage (from Seminar in Sound for the Theater) reflect content
  
  f. Change in course title:
     THTR 240: to Costume I: introductory studies (from Costume: introductory studies)
  
  g. Change in course title, description, and prerequisite:
     THTR 340: to Costuming II (from Costume design)
     THTR 207: to Drafting and Rendering (from Graphics for the Theater) reflect content, eliminate reference to computer graphics
h. Change in course title and prerequisites:
THTR 440: to Costume design (from Costume design research)

Change in Requirements for Concentration
Theater for Youth concentration:
Deletion of 2 courses (EDEE 311 and elective) being replaced by THTR 322 and THTR 421 (new courses above)

Deletion of ARTM 200 being replaced by 1 hour in either THTR 201/202 and 2 hours THTR 200

During discussion of the Astronomy packet, Glen Lesses (Philosophy) said that he found the new majors “extremely attractive.” But he pointed out that the College has a catalogue requirement that a department offering a major with more than 36 hours must also offer one with no more than 36 hours. He asked about an alternative offering to the B.S. in Astrophysics. Jon Hakkila, Chair of the Department of Physics and Astronomy, replied that the B.A. in Astronomy is the alternative offering. The name is different so as not to scare students away.

The next issue raised concerned the Communication packet. Julia Eichelberger (At-Large, English) asked about the amount of writing required for COMM 223: Interviewing, one of the new courses proposed. The syllabus seemed to imply that only 3 or 4 pages of writing would be required. Terry Bowers (English) also questioned the course, arguing that the course objective of students becoming better interviewees might be something better learned on the side rather than in an academic course. He asked whether the course required research. Brian McGee, Chair of the Communication Department, responded to both questions, pointing out that the field project required in this course is quite substantial, requiring both a good deal of writing and in-depth research.

Scott Peeples (English) then raised a question about the Business Administration packet. He pointed out that the syllabus for MGMT 250: Business, Leadership and Society, a new course being proposed, includes a line which states that all company analyses performed by students become the property of the professor. He asked whether this practice were legal and argued that he found it objectionable in any case. George Pothering (At-Large, Computer Science) pointed out that when students used to do software engineering projects in his department, the projects remained the property of the department.

Next, Susan Kattwinkel asked about the new concentration in Leadership and Organizational Studies. She argued that the proposal restricts admission, but has no clear guidelines or requirements for who would be admitted. Tom Kent, Chair of the Department of Management and Entrepreneurship, responded that the department would look for the best fifteen applicants, pointing out that this is not a major, but a concentration within an already existing major. Brian McGee then voiced his support for
the new concentration, but requested that the department notify departments that support these courses if the number of majors increases.

The last curriculum proposals discussed concerned the Theatre packet. Glen Lesses, pointing out that many dance classes are cross-listed with the Department of Physical Education and Health, wondered why the proposed new courses in tap dancing aren’t cross-listed. Todd McNerney, Chair of the Theatre Department, replied that these courses have been previously taught as special topics and have never been cross-listed. The intent of the department is to eventually institute a dance major, at which time they will have to de-cross-list the dance technique courses so that students won’t have too many PE courses (since the College only counts a certain number of PE courses toward graduation).

None of the other curriculum proposals elicited discussion. All of the motions brought by the Curriculum Committee passed.

Constituent Concerns

The Speaker recognized Scott Peeples (English) who announced that, at the next Faculty Senate meeting, he planned to introduce a motion on behalf of Amnesty International to encourage the College not to renew its Coca-Cola contract. Mr. Peeples wanted to give faculty members a heads-up about this matter.

Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) then asked about the possibility of having an ombudsman on campus. Provost Jorgens replied that the administration is investigating this possibility right now. An ombudsman is a neutral person who mediates campus disputes in the hopes of avoiding the grievance process.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, January 31, 2006, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

The minutes from the November 29 Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens announced that she wanted to report to the Faculty Senate on a regular basis in order to foster dialogue between faculty and administration. She then went on to discuss several issues:

1) The office of Academic Affairs, working with individual departments, is busy producing brochures that describe each major. The Provost believes these will be a good recruitment tool as well as useful for advising. The first group of brochures should be printed in the next couple of weeks. Associate Provost Amy McCandless is overseeing this effort.

2) Next, Ms. Jorgens briefly announced that, in anticipation of the new grading system which will go into effect next fall, faculty will be able to assign dual grades to students this semester (grades using both the old and the new system), if they choose. Dual grading options will be available on Cougar Trail both at mid-term and at the end of the semester. These grades will then be available for students to view side-by-side, so they can begin to see how the new grading system might affect their GPA’s.

3) Ms. Jorgens voiced her enthusiasm for the general education review project that has been taking place on campus. She thanked the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education for their hard work, singling out Julia Eichelberger in particular.

4) The new Faculty Activity System (an on-line database of faculty accomplishments) is now up and running, Ms. Jorgens announced. Some departments have asked faculty members to use the system to provide annual report information. The administration will be using the system to help prepare for the upcoming SACS review. Ms. Jorgens hopes that, as faculty members begin adding data, we will find that it simplifies report writing and is a useful tool.

5) Next, the Provost discussed enrollment, pointing out that our undergraduate enrollment this semester is 9,418 students. Projected enrollment was 9,394. Her office estimates that, when the drop period ends, enrollment will be right on projected targets. Ms. Jorgens added that we’re doing a good job of sticking with the enrollment caps put into place by President Higdon. In addition, she announced that the average SAT score this year is 1213, up 5 points from last year. Graduate enrollment is slightly down, but should end up being close to projected targets when all classes are accounted for. For
more information about enrollment, faculty may visit the “enrollment planning” portion of the Academic Affairs website.

6) Finally, Ms. Jorgens briefly discussed several administrative searches taking place on campus this semester. The search committee for a new Chief Information Officer, chaired by Ms. Jorgens, has seen two very strong candidates. We are also searching for a new Registrar, for a new Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, and for a new Associate Vice President for Research who would also be Dean of the Graduate School.

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone then opened the floor to questions. Mick Norton (Mathematics) asked about specific numbers for graduate enrollment. The Provost replied that we currently have 908 graduate students enrolled at the College. In response to a question about SAT scores, Ms. Jorgens said that SAT scores of out-of-state students are higher than those of in-state students, mostly because we have a larger pool of out-of-state applicants, for fewer slots. Finally, Agnes Southgate (Biology) asked how our goal to attract students with higher SAT scores will affect demographics at the College. The Provost replied that the administration also has diversity as a goal, and that they’re working to make sure these goals don’t conflict. The College is always looking for both well-qualified and diverse applicants.

**Bob Pitts—Dean, School of Business and Economics**

The Speaker then recognized Bob Pitts, Dean of the School of Business and Economics, who spoke to the Senate about the goals, organizational structure, students, faculty, programs, and initiatives of the School of Business and Economics. (Copies of Mr. Pitts’ power point presentation are available in the Dean’s office.)

**Speaker**

Mr. Mignone began his report by thanking Bob Pitts and Rhonda Mack for providing the Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115) for the Senate to use after a mix-up about Education Center 116, our usual venue. He also thanked all faculty and staff members who participated in the College’s MLK Day activities. These included Thomas Baginski, Lee Baginski, Rita Balaban, Jeri Cabot, James Carter, Teresa Hooper, Linda Jones, Bill Lindstrom, Greg Liotta, Gabriel Magwich, Mike Marcell, Betsy Martin, Lil Maughan, Bonnie McCarty, Vanessa McNamara, Carolyn Morales, Cal Morrison, Alison Piepmeier, Rob Rusnak, Dinesh Sarvate, Alada Shinauld-Small, Alexa Thacker, Cassie Thomas, Fran Welch, and Kristen Wing.

Next, Mr. Mignone discussed several topics of interest to faculty:

1) He announced that a new sexual harassment policy is in place at the College and asked Associate Provost Amy McCandless to make a few remarks about it. Ms. McCandless pointed out that this new policy covers not just sexual harassment, but is a general harassment and discrimination policy. Some of the changes from the College’s old policy include the following:
--Includes non-protected status harassment as well
--Adds non-college-related child abuse reporting
--Simplifies designated recipients of harassment complaints.
(Under the new policy, faculty members report to the Associate Provost; students to the Dean of Students; staff to the Human Resources Office; anyone can also report to the General Counsel.)
The policy is available on the Senate website, at http://www.cofc.edu/~senate/senatemeetings.html#jan.

2) The Council of University Chairs has put together an op-ed piece concerning tuition increases. This piece is also available on the Senate website, at http://www.cofc.edu/~senate/senatemeetings.html#jan.

3) The College’s new anti-spam program will be going into effect at the end of the month. Mr. Mignone noted that he has been using the program for a while now and reports that it works great.

4) The Treasurer’s Office has instituted a new drop policy for students who have not fully paid tuition bills. If a student has more than a $500 balance when classes begin, that student will be dropped from classes automatically. Mr. Mignone has passed this policy along to the Academic Planning Committee for review. The policy is also available on the Senate website, at http://www.cofc.edu/~senate/senatemeetings.html#jan.

5) Next, Mr. Mignone followed up on a question that had been raised by George Hopkins (History) at the previous Senate meeting, about outsourcing custodial services at the College. Mr. Mignone reported that, since President Higdon’s arrival, the College has become 75-80% larger in terms of square feet. The administration has been looking at ways to cut costs, and one way is by contracting out custodial services. At least part of the custodial work for McAlister Dorm, the library, the Beatty Center, and the science center will be contracted out. Mr. Mignone also noted that custodial workers at the college are temporary workers and, anecdotally, seem pleased about the new arrangements because they will receive paid holidays, sick days, and possibly even medical benefits while receiving the same pay. Mr. Mignone promised to continue to follow up on this issue.

6) Finally, Mr. Mignone reported that, over the past year, the College has made very impressive advances in fund-raising, garnering over 12 million dollars this year, compared to over 6 million the year before. The 12 million dollar figure doesn’t include very recent large gifts of 2 and 3 million dollars. Mr. Mignone noted that President Higdon deserves credit for all his hard work in this respect, that he has been doing a great job of raising money, and that such fund-raising efforts help all of us at the College.

Old Business

Academic Planning Committee—Report Concerning Service Learning
The speaker then recognized Chris Hope, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, who made the following recommendation to the Senate:

The Senate Academic Planning Committee recommends against a separate Cougar Trail designation of course sections that incorporate service learning at this time. This recommendation would not prevent faculty members teaching such courses or from advertising their availability in other ways.

**Rationale:**

- As expressed in the attached interim report, we feel there is a need for more systematic faculty oversight regarding service learning for academic credit. A mechanism for providing such oversight should be established before considering the implementation of the designation.

- Presently, there is much variation among classes and sections identified as service learning: the service may be optional or required, the number of hours required at the service site varies greatly. Given the lack of current, clear campus-wide guidelines, we feel that students would gain little information from a designation of “service learning” attached to a course section, even assuming that students would notice and correctly interpret the designation upon registration.

- Nearly all classes require outside-of-class time commitments and some require such commitments at scheduled times. The logistics of scheduling service learning may be somewhat more complex, but do not appear to be significantly different from these other cases.

In the discussion that followed, Jack Parson (Political Science) asked what was meant by “not recommended at this time.” He asked whether this meant the committee will continue to look at the issue. Ms. Hope replied that the Committee would do so if the Senate asks them to.

Next, Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) asked if there were an alternate source in place for students to find out about service learning courses, such as a list maintained by the Registrar’s Office. Ms. Hope replied that there certainly could be, but that such a list is not currently in place.

Joe Kelly (At-Large, English) asked what would actually happen if the Senate supports this recommendation. Mr. Mignone pointed out, in response, that the Senate is only an advisory body to the administration, but that Senate recommendations concerning academic matters are generally followed.

Julia Eichelberger (At-Large, English) then asked if the office of Service Learning was aware of the various courses being offered. She wondered if they maintained a list of courses. Ms. Hope responded that Lauren Collier puts out a call for courses and lists the
ones she’s aware of. This list is sent to the advising office. Carol Ann Davis pointed out that one advantage of faculty oversight of service learning might be the creation of a centralized list. Kay Smith, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, responded, pointing out that service learning is a pedagogy in a toolbox of various pedagogies. It’s sometimes a small and sometimes a large component of a course. Student surveys show that the entering class of 2005 is more committed to social action and civic responsibility than any class in the previous 25 years. She worried that faculty over-supervision of service learning could have a chilling effect on students’ desire for such courses.

Discussion ended, and the Committee’s recommendation passed on a voice vote.

George Hopkins—Motion Concerning Celebration of Labor Day

The speaker next recognized George Hopkins (History) who made the following motion concerning celebration of Labor Day:

The Faculty Senate shall create an Ad Hoc Committee to Plan Labor Day Celebrations and authorize the Faculty Committee on Nominations to recommend candidates for such a committee to the Senate as soon as possible.

Rationale

At its November 29, 2005 meeting, the Faculty Senate voted that "the College of Charleston recognize Labor Day by providing for special academic presentations and events celebrating the contributions of the Labor Movement and working people, as is done with MLK Day." Establishing an Ad Hoc Committee to Plan Labor Day Celebrations would create a mechanism to implement the College's recognition of Labor Day, beginning with next Labor Day, September 4, 2006.

The motion passed without discussion.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

The Speaker then recognized Agnes Southgate, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, who moved the following proposals:

1) Proposal to change degree requirements:
   - Interdisciplinary minor in Archaeology: change required courses.
   - Interdisciplinary minor in Archaeology: add courses to elective lists.

2) New course proposals:
   - RELS 381: Religious Studies Internship
   - PHIL 398: Student Research Associate Program
3) Proposal to delete a course: PHIL 214

4) Proposals to change a course:
   - PHIL 399: Tutorial: change requirement
   - ANTH 202: Introduction to Archaeology: delete prerequisite

5) Proposals to change course description and remove restriction
   - ANTH 340/SOCY 340
   - ANTH 351/SOCY 351
   - ANTH 356/SOCY 356
   - ANTH 357/SOCY 357
   - ANTH 362/SOCY 362

Terry Bowers (English) asked if there were any writing required for the RELS 381: Religious Studies Internship course. Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) replied that, while there is no statement that writing is required, the feeling in the department is that it will be.

Jose Gavidia (Management and Entrepreneurship) asked about the rationale for the change in requirements for the PHIL 399: Tutorial course. The new requirement states that a tutorial proposal must be approved by the department rather than the department chair. Ms. Southgate replied that the change was requested in order to reflect current practice. Ned Hettinger (Philosophy) added that tutorial proposals are circulated to the department and must receive approval from the department as a whole rather than simply from the chair.

All of the motions brought by the Curriculum Committee passed.

**Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs**

The Speaker recognized Betsy Martin, Chair of the Graduate Education Committee, who introduced the following proposals:

1. List of courses which the Master of Environmental Studies program wishes to delete

2. New course proposals:
   - SMFT 524 - Space Science for Teachers
   - Thirteen new course proposals from the historic preservation program:
     HSPV 605 - American Architectural Styles 1650-1950
     HSPV 610 - History and Theory of Historic Preservation
     HSPV 611 - Documentation in Historic Preservation
     HSPV 612 - Materials and Methods of Historic Construction
     HSPV 680 - Special Topics
     HSPV 800 - Internship in Historic Preservation
     HSPV 802 - Historic Preservation Research Seminar
HSPV 803 - Advanced Materials and Methods of Conservation
HSPV 804 - Management and Administration of Historic Preservation
HSPV 805 - Preservation Studio
HSPV 810 - Conservation Science Laboratory
HSPV 880 - Special Topics
HSPV 891 - Research Thesis

All of the proposals passed without discussion.

Ad-Hoc General Education Committee—Goals of General Education

The Speaker then recognized Julia Eichelberger of the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education, who moved that the Faculty Senate endorse the following statement of purpose and goals for general education:

Statement of Purpose for the Common Requirements of the College of Charleston’s Undergraduate Curriculum

All graduates of the College of Charleston complete a challenging sequence of coursework and experiences that prepare them to function intelligently, responsibly, creatively, and compassionately in a multifaceted, interconnected world. These College-wide requirements enable each student, regardless of major, to develop crucial intellectual skills in analysis, research, and communication. Their coursework in the liberal arts and sciences offers students a broad perspective on the natural world and the human condition, and encourages them to examine their own lives and make useful contributions to their own time and place. Through students’ work in their chosen major, where they acquire specialized knowledge and skills in a particular discipline or profession, students continue the intellectual growth fostered by the core curriculum. Over the course of their undergraduate careers, all College of Charleston students develop the following intellectual skills and areas of knowledge:

I. Research and Communication in Multiple Media and Languages, including proficiency in
   - Gathering and using information
   - Effective writing and critical reading
   - Oral and visual communication
   - Foreign language

II. Analytical and Critical Reasoning, including the ability to perform
   - Mathematical and scientific reasoning and analysis
   - Social and cultural analysis

III. Historical, Cultural, and Intellectual Perspectives, including knowledge of
   - Human history and the natural world
   - Artistic, cultural, and intellectual achievements
   - The mind and the way humans interact in groups and societies
   - International perspectives
Perspectives and contributions of academic disciplines

IV. **Interdisciplinary and Intercultural Perspectives**, gained by
Using multiple approaches to interpret complex phenomena
Experiencing and understanding multiple cultural perspectives

V. **Personal and Ethical Perspectives**, including experiences that promote
Self-understanding
Curiosity and creativity
Personal, academic, and professional integrity
Moral and ethical responsibility
Communal and global responsibility

VI. **Advanced Knowledge and Skills in Major Area of Study**, consisting of
Skills and knowledge of the discipline
Sequence of coursework that fosters intellectual growth
Coursework that extends and builds upon knowledge and skills gained from the core curriculum
Applications of coursework in the major that go beyond the classroom

A lengthy discussion followed. The Speaker first recognized Jack Parson (Political Science) who asked three questions: 1) Over the past 8-9 years, there have been many conversations about goals; are these very different from our current goals? 2) The motion lists 6 goals, but there seem to be at least 12 here. “Interdisciplinary and Intercultural Perspectives,” for instance, are very different things. Why are these conjoined together? 3) Why are economic and political goals not listed?

In response, Ms. Eichelberger took the third question first, explaining that the Gen-Ed Committee considered social and cultural analysis as broad categories, encompassing both the political and economic. In reply to the Mr. Parson’s second question, she pointed out that all the goals have sub-requirements and that one course couldn’t fulfill any of the goals. Mr. Parson then asked why we don’t simply say we have 12 or 14 goals, each of which could be a coherent package. Ms. Eichelberger responded that each goal listed represents a different means of acquiring knowledge. The Gen-Ed Committee feels there is commonality in the linked goals. In addition, the committee was striving for a small list so that the goals could be expressed holistically to students, thus helping students to understand their educational programs more fully. Finally, Ms. Eichelberger addressed the third question, arguing that important differences exist between the proposed goals and the college’s current goals. For instance, the major is included in the new list, as is a requirement for interdisciplinarity.

Next, Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) argued that Goals 3, 4, and 5 sound as if they are stated from a social scientist or empiricist perspective rather than a knowledge-based perspective. In Goal 5, for instance, the emphasis is on characteristics of students rather than on the knowledge the students need to develop these characteristics. Ms. Eichelberger suggested that Ms. Caveny work up some different wording, and that the committee would be happy to consider it.
Darryl Phillips (Classics, German, Italian, Japanese, Russian) spoke next, noting that he liked Goals 1-4, but that he feared Goal 5 might prompt the College to start offering 3 hours of credit for courses in self-understanding and the like. Mr. Phillips moved to amend the committee’s motion by removing Goal 5 and putting it in a separate category as an outcome rather than a goal. Discussion of Mr. Phillip’s amendment followed.

Ms. Eichelberger pointed out that the goals offered by the Gen-Ed Committee came out of faculty forums and departmental discussions. The committee tried hard to honor this input. She also thought it was important for students to see the items under Goal 5 listed so that they could think about their own progress in these areas. Claire Curtis (Political Science) then added that Goal 5 was connected to knowledge, to classes that look at ethical concerns relating to knowledge, so that this goal is not simply outcome-based. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre), also a member of the Ad-Hoc General Education Committee, noted that the committee wanted to avoid “teaching to the test” in coming up with their list of goals. Thus, they had no specific courses in mind at this point that would be matched to the goals. Mary Beth Heston (Art History), also a member of the committee, added that the more the committee discussed general education, the more it became clear that general education includes not just traditional academic courses, but other experiences as well.

Mike Skinner (Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education) spoke next, arguing that he agreed with Mr. Phillips’ amendment in spirit, but he thought the problem could be solved by adding the word “dispositions” to the last sentence of the statement of purpose. Mr. Phillips then withdrew his amendment in favor of Mr. Skinner’s amendment to add the words “and dispositions” to the last sentence of the paragraph preceding the goals.

After some discussion about the relative merits of the word “disposition” versus “characteristics,” “personality traits,” etc., Mr. Skinner’s amendment passed. The final sentence of the statement of purpose will now read: “Over the course of their undergraduate careers, all College of Charleston students develop the following intellectual skills, areas of knowledge, and dispositions.”

Discussion then turned back to the main motion. Mr. Phillips spoke again, arguing that Goal 6 was also problematic; while he supported the major being included in the goal statement because it is the culmination of the general education program, he didn’t want the Senate, without much discussion, to spell out what the majors should consist of. Mr. Phillips argued that the last sub-point under Goal 6 did just this. He’d be happier with a general statement that left the major in the hands of the departments. Ms. Eichelberger responded that the committee wanted to emphasize a shared sense of intellectual development in the language used to describe the major. How each major filled in the blanks would be left up to the departments. Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) then spoke in support of Mr. Phillips’ point, arguing that the last item under Goal 6 implies that majors would be required to add a “beyond the classroom” experience. Susan Kattwinkel pointed out that she saw that last item as suggesting “beyond the major,” perhaps into other courses. Jose Gavidia (Management and Entrepreneurship) read a statement from
the AACU outcomes, arguing that the ability to transfer skills and knowledge from one setting to another captures the spirit of what the committee intended.

Bishop Hunt (At-Large, English) then raised a different issue; he asked about the link between “the mind” and “the way humans interact in groups and societies,” under Goal 3. He suggested leaving out the term “the mind.” Claire Curtis argued for unlinking “the mind” and “the way humans interact in groups and societies,” but retaining both. Bishop Hunt then moved to amend the motion by removing the words “the mind and” from bullet point 3 under Goal 3. Terry Bowers (English), in discussion of Mr. Hunt’s amendment, said that he didn’t have a problem with the language as it existed, since “the mind” suggests psychology which fits naturally with sociology. He also argued against making a longer list.

After a vote, Mr. Hunt’s amendment failed. Discussion turned back to the main motion.

Erin Beutel (Geology) then moved to amend the original motion by changing the final bullet point under Goal 6 (the one Mr. Phillips had originally objected to) to the language read from the AACU outcomes by Jose Gavidia.

The amendment passed. The final bullet point under Goal 6 (“Applications of coursework in the major that go beyond the classroom”) will be replaced by this phrase: “The ability to transfer skills and knowledge from one setting to another.”

Next, Bob Dukes (Physics and Astronomy) called the question on the main motion. A 2/3 majority voted in favor of calling the question. A vote was then held on the main motion.

The motion, as amended by Mike Skinner and Erin Beutel, passed.

**Constituent Concerns**

The Speaker recognized Terry Bowers (English) who asked about the status of electronic course evaluations. Mr. Mignone replied that there will be a recommendation from the Educational Technology Committee concerning this issue soon. Christophe Boucher (History), a member of the committee, added that they hope to have a recommendation about electronic course evaluations for the faculty to consider at the next Senate meeting.

Next, the Speaker recognized Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) who asked, on behalf of her colleagues in the Theatre Department, that any faculty members using Theatre classrooms please leave the rooms clean and well-orderly when class is over.

Finally, Hugh Wilder ( Philosophy) announced that on Monday, February 13th at 5:00 p.m. in Alumni Hall, the president of the Student Government Association will deliver a state of the student body address. All faculty members are welcome to attend.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:05.
Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 29 2005 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, November 29, 2005, at 5:00 p.m. in Education Center 116.

The minutes from the November 1 Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

Speaker

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone reminded faculty that the new plus/minus grading system will go into effect in fall of 2006. In the faculty newsletter for fall of 2005, Mr. Mignone will discuss how he plans to use the new grading system, and he hopes that all faculty members will begin to consider how they will calibrate grades in the new system as well.

Next, Mr. Mignone announced that he had been thinking a great deal about difficulties in distributing information between the faculty and the administration. To better facilitate such communication, he would like to put together an informal executive council consisting of the Speaker of the Faculty, the Speaker Pro-Tem, the Faculty Secretary, and the Senate Parliamentarian. While not an attempt to institute anything formal, such a group would have regular meetings with the President, the Provost, and Department Chairs. Mr. Mignone asked Senators to convey their thoughts about such a council to him.

Mr. Mignone also asked faculty members to look for a forthcoming e-mail from him about the January MLK Challenge, and he reminded faculty of the meeting to be held with the President and the Provost Friday, December 2 at 9:30 am in Addlestone Library 227 to discuss college identity.

Susan Kattwinkel—Ad-Hoc Committee on the First Year Experience

Susan Kattwinkel, reporting on behalf of the Ad-Hoc Committee on First Year Education (in place of Melanie Kyer who very recently gave birth), announced that the committee has been working with Provost Elise Jorgens and Associate Vice President of the Academic Experience Kay Smith on the logistics of the first-year seminar proposal approved in spirit by the Senate last year. In the spring, the committee will work with the Ad-hoc Committee on General Education to answer remaining questions about the course.

Phil Paradise—Student Government Association

Because Phil Paradise was detained at an SGA Senate meeting, his report was moved later in the meeting.
Old Business

Faculty Welfare Committee—Motion Concerning the Labor Day Holiday

The speaker then introduced Bill Danaher of the Faculty Welfare Committee who submitted the following motion concerning the Labor Day Holiday:

The Faculty Welfare Committee acknowledges that instituting a Labor Day Holiday could be accomplished within the Academic Calendar; however, the staff, for which Labor Day should be recognized, would be adversely affected. Therefore, we recommend that no change be made in the Academic Calendar and that instead, the College of Charleston recognize Labor Day by providing for special academic presentations and events celebrating the contribution of the Labor Movement and working people.

In the discussion that followed, George Hopkins (History), who made the original motion for a Labor Day Holiday, informed the Senate that he had met with the Faculty Welfare Committee and understood that the issue was a complicated one in terms of scheduling. He supports the motion of the committee, but added a friendly amendment (in bold):

The Faculty Welfare Committee acknowledges that instituting a Labor Day Holiday could be accomplished within the Academic Calendar; however, the staff, for which Labor Day should be recognized, would be adversely affected. Therefore, we recommend that no change be made in the Academic Calendar and that instead, the College of Charleston recognize Labor Day by providing for special academic presentations and events celebrating the contribution of the Labor Movement and working people, as is done for MLK Day.

The speaker then recognized Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) who asked what individual or group would be responsible for making the presentations and events happen. Mr. Danaher replied that the Faculty Welfare Committee hadn’t discussed that specific issue, but had talked about encouraging faculty to discuss Labor Day in their classes.

Julia Eichelberger (At-Large, English) then raised the possibility that Convocation could serve as a Labor Day commemoration, if we had classes on the first Monday of the semester and moved Convocation to Labor Day and didn’t hold classes. Mr. Danaher replied that there would still be a problem in that staff members wouldn’t get the day off.

Glen Lesses (Philosophy) said that he would like to see a fuller explanation of the adverse effect a Labor Day holiday would have on staff, especially since other universities in the state take the holiday and it doesn’t seem to adversely affect their staff. Mr. Danaher replied that other colleges and universities have different schedules; they start sooner, end later, and/or conduct labs differently. Claire Curtis (Political Science) added that a Labor Day holiday would affect staff members adversely because they currently take Labor Day off during the December-January break. Also, Ms. Curtis
pointed out that the University of South Carolina doesn’t take Memorial Day as a holiday. In order to retain the Dec.-Jan. break, staff members would have to give up another holiday. Mr. Hopkins then added that he believed it would make a mockery of the holiday to have it just for faculty and students and not for staff members.

The motion, as amended by Mr. Hopkins, passed on a voice vote.

Phil Paradise—Student Government Association

The Speaker then recognized Phil Paradise and Hallie Ritzu, of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Student Government Association, who brought a resolution just passed by the SGA Senate that afternoon. The resolution concerns the new plus/minus grade policy, to be instituted at the College in fall of 2006. Mr. Paradise pointed out that he and his fellow students realize the time to debate the policy itself is over, but the students would like to discuss implementation of the policy with the faculty. The SGA resolution reads as follows:

A Resolution

TO STATE THE OPINION OF THE STUDENT BODY AT-LARGE CONCERNING THE ADDITION OF MINUSES TO THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON GRADING POLICY, GIVE VOICE TO THEIR COLLECTIVE CONCERNS, AND SUPPORT THE ADOPTION OF POLICIES AIMED AT HELPING TO EASE THE EFFECT OF THE POLICY’S IMPLEMENTATION ON THE STUDENT BODY.

WHEREAS, the College of Charleston Student Body, through their Student Government Association passed a resolution in 2001 stating their opposition to this policy, circulated several petitions against the policy, and spoke against it in the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, while the Student Government Association acknowledges the Faculty Senate’s approval of this policy and its subsequent implementation in Fall 2006; the students of the College of Charleston continue to stand behind their previously held opposition to the changes in the grading policy; and

WHEREAS, the implementation of this policy has not been widely addressed and discussed until recently, and students are in large part uninformed and unprepared for the changes associated with it; and

WHEREAS, the implementation of this policy will have a profound, and largely negative, impact on the grade point averages of many of the students of this institution; and

WHEREAS, student success is a fundamental goal of this institution, faculty and staff, in accordance with President Higdon’s Fourth Century Initiative,
NOW THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the College of Charleston Student Senate in regular session assembled the following:

THAT this policy having been approved by the Faculty Senate, the focus should be shifted to educating the students of this policy and the implementation of it; and

THAT the Faculty Senate create a suggested grading scale that professors could use to base their scales off. This would encourage a greater standardization of the grading policy, while respecting the rights of individual faculty members to determine their own grading policy.

THAT during the spring semester of 2006 The College of Charleston should keep dual grades. The Faculty should assign the actual grade and what the grade would be under the new policy and give the student both of these grades during the time set for midterms and at the conclusion of the semester. This will allow both students and faculty to begin adjusting to the new grading scale before it is actually implemented; and

THAT a key should be included on the transcripts of students for not less than the next 5 years stating the date of the scale change and both scales. This measure will allow other academic institutions and potential employers to see this change so that they may take the changes into consideration as they review that student’s transcript; and

THAT the administration should ensure that there are a sufficient amount of ‘bridge’ scholarships to help students who may lose their state supported scholarships because of the change in the grading scale. This would help to offset the negative effect on these students, which, from the beginning, has been one of the major concerns of the administration; and

THAT the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate should research and consider the implementation of an extension of the period allowed for a withdrawal with the grade of ‘W’ to coincide with the implementation of the changes in grading policy during the fall of 2006; and

THAT the Faculty Senate and Student Government Association research the extension of the withdrawal period from six weeks to nine weeks or from one-third to two-thirds into the semester if the student has a passing grade in the class at the time of withdrawal; and

THAT the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate research and consider the implementation of academic redemption at this institution; and

4
THAT this resolution not be seen as endorsement of the policy, but that the Student Senate will work with the faculty and administration to educate the students of the College of Charleston about the changes in the grading scale to help ease the transition for the students.

In the discussion that followed, Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) asked what the SGA planned to do to apprise students of changes in the grading policy. Mr. Paradise replied that the SGA may hold forums to discuss implementation. He added that the students want to work with the faculty to ease the transition to the new grading system.

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) then asked Mr. Paradise to clarify exactly what the Senate is being asked to do in response to this resolution. Speaker Bob Mignone replied that the SGA resolution entailed a series of recommendations. Any one of the recommendations could have faculty sponsorship through an appropriate committee. In any case, the resolution will appear in the Faculty Senate minutes, and forums with faculty and students may be held in the spring.

Joe Kelly (At-Large, English) then pointed out that, if a specific committee isn’t charged to do something, then nothing will happen. The proposal that faculty keep dual grades in the spring is a case in point. Mr. Mignone responded that the administration had already planned a pilot program of keeping dual grades in the spring, and that long-term studies on the effects of the new grading system are in the works as well. Provost Jorgens then pointed out that the pilot program in the spring is voluntary, but that the SGA is asking that every faculty member keep dual grades next semester. Mr. Paradise added that it would be good for students to see side-by-side grades next semester, and that keeping dual grades would help professors think about how to assign grades under the new system. Mr. Kelly then asked if we could send the resolution to the Academic Standards Committee right now. Mr. Mignone replied that he would communicate with the Academic Standards Committee about the SGA resolution.

The Speaker next recognized Hugh Wilder (At-Large, Philosophy), who stated that he would like the Senate to take up the students’ invitation to work with them. He argued that we should either take action on the resolution today, or else get a promise that the appropriate committee will take up the issue. Mr. Mignone pointed out that the Speaker doesn’t charge committees, but that he would organize forums between faculty members and the SGA next semester. Mr. Wilder asked if a motion was in order today to remand the resolution to a committee. Parliamentarian George Pothering replied that a one week requirement for notification of a motion coming before the Senate is in the standing rules. The standing rules can be suspended, however, with a 2/3 majority. Julia Eichelberger (At-Large, English) moved to suspend standing rules, and the motion passed.

Hugh Wilder then made the following motion:

The Senate refers the entire SGA resolution to the Academic Standards Committee for its consideration and recommendations for action where appropriate. The Committee will report back to the Senate at its February 28 meeting.
Julia Eichelberger seconded the motion, and the floor was opened to discussion. After some discussion about the workload of the Academic Standards Committee, Reid Wiseman asked Mr. Paradise if the SGA had approached the administration about the issue of bridge scholarships. Provost Jorgens then explained that the Bridge Scholarship Program is designed to track and offer financial assistance to students whose GPA’s fall minimally below the requirement to retain scholarships. The program was in place this year and will be continued next year. Mr. Wiseman asked how many students applied for these scholarships. Provost Jorgens and Associate Dean Cherry responded, pointing out that 117 students were initially identified as being at-risk. These 117 were contacted and invited to apply. Around 10 of these students didn’t return to the college, about half raised their GPA and maintained their original scholarships, and 44 students actually applied for and received the bridge scholarship.

At this point, discussion ended, and Mr. Wilder’s motion passed on a voice vote.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

The Speaker then recognized David Gleeson, of the Curriculum Committee, who moved the following proposals:

1a) Proposal to change degree requirements for minor: Minor in Asian Studies (Addition of two core courses and addition of courses available for electives)

1b) New course proposal: ASST105: Value and Tradition in Asian Civilizations (core course)

2a) Proposal for a new interdisciplinary minor: Neuroscience from Departments of Biology and Psychology. (Includes addition of 5 new courses and change in existing courses’ requirements)

2b) New course proposals:
   - BIOL351/PSYC351: Neuroscience I
   - BIOL352/PSYC352: Neuroscience II
   - BIOL446/PSYC446: Special Topics in Neuroscience
   - BIOL447/PSYC447: Seminar in Neuroscience
   - BIOL448/PSYC448 F&S Research in Neuroscience

2c) Proposals to change a course:
   - PSYC386: Psychopharmacology: change in course requisite
3) Proposals to change a course:
   - POLS220: Criminal Justice: removal of prerequisite
   - COMM380: Studies in communication: variable credit

4) New course proposals:
   - LACS106: Introduction to Contemporary Argentina
   - ECON340: Public Finance
   - MUSC360: Reading Band
   - ARTM362/HTMT362: Events Management

Mick Norton (Mathematics) asked about staffing considerations for the new neuroscience courses (proposal 2b). Mr. Gleeson replied that the Curriculum Committee had discussed staffing concerns as well, but that the representatives from the Biology and Psychology Departments had convinced committee members that staff would be available. Grant money for the next five years will help fund the new interdisciplinary minor.

Next, the Speaker recognized Glen Lesses (Philosophy), who raised a question about the new course proposal for LACS 106. The posted material in the course proposal implies that students taking the course will receive both Humanities and Social Sciences credit, which is quite unusual, he pointed out. Jack Parson (Political Science) said that the intention of the course is that students will receive either Humanities or Social Sciences credit, but not both. Mr. Gleeson concurred.

All of the motions brought by the Curriculum Committee passed.

Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

The Speaker recognized Betsy Martin, Chair of the Graduate Education Committee, who introduced the following proposals:

1. Two proposals to change the titles of PUBA 637 and EVSS 637 from Wetlands Protection to WETLANDS POLICY. (Cross-Listed Courses)

2. Two proposals to change catalog descriptions of PUBA 706 and EVSS 601. (Cross-Listed Courses)


All of the proposals passed without discussion.

Faculty Welfare Committee—Faculty Leave Policy
The Speaker then recognized Bill Danaher of the Faculty Welfare Committee, who submitted a motion concerning the College’s faculty leave policy. During discussion, Bishop Hunt (At-Large, English) asked whether the motion should be referred to the By-Laws Committee. Mr. Mignone replied that the motion is not about by-laws, but that, if it is approved, it could be referred to the By-Laws Committee for wording.

Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) then asked whether the family leave being suggested in the policy was something a faculty member could decide on his or her own, or if the decision is up to the Provost. The wording of the proposal, she argued, is unclear. Scott Peeples (English) pointed out that if the leave consists of 120 days or more, the faculty member may elect to extend the tenure/probationary period. For fewer than 120 days, the faculty member may petition the Provost for such an extension.

Calvin Blackwell (Economics and Finance) then pointed out that the current wording of the proposal is a bit awkward, because it could be taken to imply that a tenure decision could be made more than once. Lisa Thomson Ross (Psychology) responded that what’s at issue in the policy is not the number of times a tenure decision is made, but when the decision is made. Mr. Blackwell then offered a friendly amendment to revise the language for clarity. Deanna Caveny, Bishop Hunt, and Jack Parson also made friendly amendments for the sake of clarity, all of which were accepted by Mr. Danaher on behalf of the committee.

The motion, with four friendly amendments, was approved. The amended motion reads as follows:

**Faculty Welfare Committee—Family Leave Policy**

The Faculty Welfare Committee moves the following as an omnibus motion that the Faculty Senate recommends the following changes to the Faculty & Administration Manual.

1. In the current edition of the Faculty/Administration Manual, delete the following sentence in section IV. J., 4th paragraph concerning Third Year Review, Tenure, and Promotion of Instructional Faculty”

“A tenure decision is made only once.”

and insert in its place

“A tenure decision is made only once. Under normal circumstances, this decision is made no later than the sixth year unless exceptions have been granted in accordance with the College’s FMLA and ADA policies or section. (See section IV.U.7 for a discussion of the effect of leaves of absences on the tenure/promotion schedule.)”
2. In the current edition of the Faculty/Administration Manual, delete the following sentence in section IV. K., 3rd paragraph concerning the promotion of instructors:

“A promotion decision is made only once.”

and insert in its place

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

3. In the current edition of the Faculty/Administration Manual, delete the following sentence in section IV. L., 5th paragraph concerning Third Year Review, Tenure, and Promotion of Library Faculty”

“A promotion decision is made only once.”

and insert in its place

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

4. Insert the following as section IV.U.7.:

A faculty member who uses 120 days or more of paid and/or unpaid disability, family, or other college sanctioned leave during any consecutive two-year period may elect to extend the tenure/probationary period by one year. Examples of such leave would include extended absence or disability due to illness, injury, acute family responsibilities, or military service. Unforeseen circumstances in the completion of a terminal degree, such as the death of a doctoral advisor, would also qualify.

A faculty member who adds a child to his or her family by either birth or adoption may elect to extend the tenure/probationary period by one year. This option must be exercised by notifying his or her chair in writing within 90 days of the birth or adoption of the child, but no later than the Monday following the spring commencement prior to the academic year in which the tenure decision is to be made. If this option is exercised in the first two years of the appointment, the third year review shall be postponed one year.
A faculty member who has used less than 120 days of paid and/or unpaid
disability, family, or other college sanctioned leave during any consecutive two-
year period but who has, nonetheless taken a significant amount of such leave prior
to consideration for an award of tenure or promotion, or who has experienced
circumstances which, at the faculty member’s election, could have resulted in a
significant period of such leave, may petition the Provost for an extension of the
probationary period. Such petition must be made no later than the Monday
following the spring commencement prior to the academic year in which the tenure
decision is to be made. The decision to grant such an extension of the probationary
period shall be made by the Provost, after consulting with the faculty member’s
dean and department chair.

If at all possible, the decision to delay tenure or promotion should be arranged with
the Provost prior to the commencement of leave.

If such elections as described above are made or if the Provost grants the petition,
the faculty member thereby waives the provisions of the Faculty/Administration
Manual requiring that a decision regarding the award of tenure be made within six
years. Any such extensions shall not supercede the termination for cause at any
point in the probationary period as outlined in the Faculty and Administration
Manual.

No faculty member may elect to exercise this option more than twice.

Claire Curtis—Motion Concerning College Identity

The Speaker next recognized Claire Curtis (Political Science), who made the following
motion:

The faculty senate shall convene a campus-wide conversation on the identity of
the College of Charleston as a liberal arts and sciences institution. This event
shall be open to all members of the College community, and it shall be organized
and led by a committee of faculty chosen by the Speaker of the Faculty after a call
for volunteers from the entire faculty. We shall extend an invitation to the
Provost and the President to come and share in this deliberative process. This
conversation shall take place no later than the week of January 16.

Rationale:

Discussions within departments, among colleagues and on Open Discussion
clearly reveal both a great deal of concern about the "identity" issue and a lack of
transparency about what the faculty and the administration think. Our sponsoring
such an event will give faculty a chance to share their thoughts with one another
and with the administration about this important issue.
After Julia Eichelberger (At-Large, English) seconded the motion, the floor was opened to discussion. Betsy Martin (Chemistry) spoke in support of the motion, arguing that she had served on many, many committees in which the College as a liberal arts and sciences institution has been a theme. Thus, the motion seems appropriate.

Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) then asked if the Provost had yet written a white paper about the College’s identity. Provost Jorgens replied that she has not, but that she wants to put the issue in front of the faculty and will do so at the meeting on Friday, December 2. She apologized for the awkward time, and expressed her willingness to repeat the meeting at another time. Ms. Jorgens added that she wants to make sure any faculty decision about College identity is well-informed.

Lisa Thomson Ross (Psychology) then asked whether the advertisement for a new Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences had gone out. The Provost said it had, in somewhat changed form. Ms. Curtis, who had the text of the advertisement with her, read portions of it to the assembled Senators.

Ms. Curtis then requested that Provost Jorgens publicly post her comments on the web after the December 2 meeting. Ms. Jorgens agreed to do so, cautioning that her remarks would be in the form of notes.

Finally, Reed Wiseman closed the discussion by informing Senators that he’d written to newspaper language columnist James Kilpatrick about the use of the word “eminent” versus “pre-eminent” in the descriptions of itself used by the College. Mr. Wiseman promised to report back with any updates.

Ms. Curtis’s motion passed on a voice vote.

Constituent Concerns

The Speaker recognized George Hopkins (History), who expressed concern that members of the College custodial staff "had been called to a meeting in which they were informed that the College was looking into contracting out their work and that some of them might be fired." Mr. Hopkins wondered whether a plan to privatize our custodial employees, many of whom are African American and have worked here for many years, exists, and if it does, whether this violates our core value of community. There was no response to the question.

Good of the Order

Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Lynn Cherry, requested all faculty members to consider participating in fall commencement exercises.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, November 1, 2005, at 5:00 p.m. in Education Center 116.

The minutes from the October 11 Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

Provost

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone recognized Provost Elise Jorgens, who had requested to speak with the faculty about the new plus/minus grading policy. Provost Jorgens announced that the policy would be implemented in the fall semester of 2006. She explained that she hadn't anticipated the "level of anxiety" her request to delay implementation of this policy would cause on campus and that she did not wish to interfere with faculty governance. Provost Jorgens asked that the Academic Standards Committee continue to conduct research into the effects of the policy. The committee will also be responsible for tracking average GPA's at the college over the next four or five years. While the Provost does not expect a marked difference in average GPA's over this period, she thinks it is important we gather as much information about the effects of the new policy as possible.

The Speaker

Speaker Bob Mignone reported that the general education forums held on October 24th and 25th were very successful, with over 60 attendees each day. The Ad-hoc General Education Committee plans to distill out and synthesize the goals and objectives suggested at the forums and by departments and bring a list for Senate approval sometime next spring. Mr. Mignone also announced that the committee plans to hold forums in the spring as well, to discuss the methods we use to deliver our general education at the College.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

The following proposals put forth by the curriculum committee passed without discussion:

1. Proposal to change a course
   ECON 320: Managerial Economics. Change in prerequisite: remove ECON 317

2. Proposal to change degree requirements for a Minor/Concentration
Film Studies Minor. Change in distribution of courses as well as increase in the number of courses available to choose from.

**Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs**

The Speaker recognized Betsy Martin, Chair of the Graduate Education Committee, who introduced two proposals:

1. New Program—Master of Arts in Communication

2. M.Ed. in Languages Proposal—Change in Program Requirement for ESOL-track students

In discussion of the first proposal, Glen Lesses (Philosophy) asked whether the new M.A. in Communication had been vetted by the Budget and Academic Planning Committees. Chris Hope, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, reported that her committee asked many questions about the proposed M.A. Program, were satisfied with the answers they had received, and approved the proposal. Erin Beutel, Chair of the Budget Committee, then noted that the proposal had been approved by the Budget Committee as well. The proposal passed on a voice vote.

The second proposal passed without discussion.

**New Admission Policy for the School of Business and Economics**

The Speaker then recognized Lynn Cherry, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, who introduced on behalf of the Academic Standards Committee (Chair Renee McCauley was unable to make the meeting) a new admission policy for the School of Business and Economics.

Bill Barfield (Physical Education and Health) opened discussion by asking how many students the new policy would eliminate from the School of Business and Economics. Rhonda Mack (Marketing and Supply Chain Management) replied that 81 students would be eliminated in one year. Yet, Ms. Mack pointed out, the intention of the proposal is to set up a pre-candidacy program to get students ready to enter the School. They hope not to eliminate so many students by working with students before admission.

The speaker then recognized Julia Eichelberger (At-Large, English), who asked whether a department or school could simply decide that they would have a higher GPA requirement than the rest of the college. Ms. Eichelberger wondered what the rationale for such a decision might be. Lynn Cherry responded that the School of Education has an admissions requirement above a 2.0 GPA because of accreditation issues. Ms. Eichelberger then asked whether accreditation requirements for the School of Business and Economics specifically required a 2.5 GPA. Rhonda Mack replied that accreditation did not specifically require a 2.5 GPA, but pointed out that it did require tracking and
retention of students. Ms. Mack added that the proposed admission policy is typical of business schools around the country.

Mike Skinner (Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education) then pointed out that the 2.5 GPA requirement in the School of Education is a state-mandated requirement and thus goes beyond the needs of accreditation. Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) commented that there is a difference between entrance and exit requirements. The School of Business and Economics, she pointed out, is not requiring a 2.5 GPA to exit the program.

The Speaker next recognized Joe Kelly (At-Large, English) who argued that the issues of accreditation raised in the proposal did not seem to be addressed by the entrance requirement. He worried that the intervention required by accreditation standards might involve simply kicking students out of the School of Business and Economics. He asked where such students would go and argued that a 2.5 GPA for admission to a School should be instituted across the board or not at all. The proposal, Mr. Kelly, argued, creates a “de-facto honors college” out of a specific school.

Jack Parson (Political Science) then asked whether a student who meets the entrance requirement with a 2.5 GPA could still graduate with a 2.0 GPA. Ms. Mack replied that yes, a student could do so. The problem is with students having access to courses that fill up and close and with students getting in the necessary prerequisites. The proposal also addresses enrollment issues, Ms. Mack argued. The School of Business and Economics has the largest or second largest class sizes on campus. The School needs to curb enrollment. They’ve already had to cut service courses. The proposal the School put forth, according to Ms. Mack, asks that students come with a willingness to succeed; students in the School have the second-lowest SAT scores of any school at the College already.

The Speaker then recognized George Hopkins (History) who reminded faculty members of a situation at the University of South Carolina a few years ago in which a group of students virtually became “academic boat people” because their GPA’s, while high enough to be retained at the University, were too low to gain admission to many programs.

Hugh Wilder (At-Large, Philosophy) pointed out that the admission standard asked for in the new policy is higher than retention standards at the College. Mr. Wilder pointed out that all schools and departments couldn’t do this. Furthermore, in the School of Education, there is a clear connection between certification and accreditation and GPA requirements. Such a clear connection is missing in the policy proposed by the School of Business and Economics, he argued. Mr. Wilder wondered if the enrollment and prerequisite problems cited by Ms. Mack couldn’t be better handled by earlier advising. He concluded by arguing that this new policy would set a bad precedent at the College.

Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) offered a perspective as a teacher of MATH 105, arguing that, in certain majors and courses which attract students, there tends to be a
large gap between what students expect and what is actually required of them. Such is the case in MATH 105 and might be in the School of Business and Economics in general, Ms. Caveny pointed out.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) argued that there is a difference between simply setting a requirement and advising students thoroughly. She echoed Mr. Wilder’s point that the accreditation requirements could be met by good advising. Bob Dukes (Physics and Astronomy) then offered another possible solution to solve problems pointed out by Ms. Mack, suggesting that the School might implement pre-requisites for upper-level courses that involved attaining specific grades in lower-level courses. Jose Gavidia (Management and Entrepreneurship) argued that the proposed criteria include what Mr. Dukes suggested. Mr. Gavidia pointed out, though, that the School of Business and Economics has a logistical problem in that students are being denied seats in necessary classes. He wants the School to avoid wasting seats on students who aren’t going to graduate.

Jason Overby (Chemistry and Biochemistry) argued that the new admission policy is a matter of student responsibility. He has no problem with the 2.5 GPA requirement because he believes it sends a serious message to students. Rhonda Mack added that the School has surveyed students, and that they responded favorably to the proposed admission requirements, believing these requirements would raise the value of their degrees. Ms. Mack also pointed out that intensive advising in the School is difficult because of the large number of majors.

Agnes Southgate (Biology) noted that the new policy would set a precedent many others would want to follow. She pointed out that the Biology Department is facing similar problems to those experienced by the School of Business and Economics. In response, they’ve created a new class, part of which deals with advising.

Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) then asked about a hypothetical student who has taken 15 hours and has a 2.4 GPA. Could such a student continue in the School? Ms. Mack replied that such a student could take an additional 9 hours and then re-apply.

Brian McGee (Communication) asked Ms. Mack to comment on the statement in the proposal that reads, “Meeting these requirements, however, does not guarantee admission into the School.” She replied that the School can’t currently accommodate all their students. They have students right now who can’t get their senior courses. The School wants to reserve the ability to have room for their best students. Jose Gavidia added that rejecting the proposal would set a bad precedent for our ability to control enrollments. He reiterated that such admission policies are a common practice in business schools across the country and that the policy would encourage students to have higher standards.

Jack Parson then pointed out that the issue is really the 2.5 GPA requirement. He believes the School has provided a good rationale for admission requirements, but that there will be plenty of students admitted with a 2.5 GPA who graduate with a 2.0. Mr. Parson argued that requiring completion of prerequisite courses earlier in a student’s career is a better solution than the GPA requirement.
Glen Lesses spoke next, arguing that, if such a policy is instituted, it needs to be institution-wide, not just the province of a single School. Mr. Lesses argued that the Corporate Communication track would have to absorb students not admitted into the School of Business and Economics.

Deanna Caveny, responding to Mr. Parson’s point, pointed out that the Math Department has been looking at pre-requisites recently. She expects that very few students who enter the School with a 2.0 GPA would exit with a higher grade. Students, she argued, almost never do better in later courses than in the pre-requisite courses. Ms. Mack added that the School of Business and Economics has tracked students for a year and found Ms. Caveny’s point to be true.

Terry Bowers (English) argued that requiring the higher GPA might have the effect of starting a process of grade inflation. Joe Kelly then asked Ms. Mack what the School expected to happen to the students they don’t admit. Ms. Mack replied that they haven’t tracked individual students, but that she expects these are students who drop their majors in the School anyway. The problem is that they leave late.

Jason Overby asked if the University of South Carolina had similar admission requirements. Ms Mack replied “yes.” Mike Skinner asked if USC has a specific GPA requirement, and again, Ms. Mack replied “yes.” Sue Balinsky (Physical Education and Health) suggested that maybe rather than an overall GPA, the School could require a certain GPA for business courses themselves.

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre Department) spoke next, pointing out that we are a liberal arts and sciences college. In the School of the Arts, she argued, students who aren’t going to be great performers aren’t kicked out; we are not a professional college. Ms. Mack responded that the School of Business and Economics is a professional school.

Jack Parson then suggested that perhaps the School of Business and Economics should look at predictor courses and require particular grades in those courses. Ms. Mack replied that the School has brought such proposals forward before, but has not been able to get them through the Senate. Mr. Parson asked if such proposals had been brought in the context of admissions, pointing out that they might be more “marketable” within that specific context. Ms. Mack replied that they had not.

Julia Eichelberger pointed out that any student with a 2.5 GPA would be more likely to succeed than a student with a lower GPA. She can’t ignore the fact that the proposal allows the School of Business and Economics to teach students who do better and makes it the job of other Schools to deal with poorer students. Michelle Mac Brooks (Chemistry and Biochemistry) responded that some students don’t do well in certain courses. They might not be poor students, but they may have a different calling. Scott Peeples (English) then pointed out that the new policy requires a 2.5 GPA overall, not just in business classes.
Sarah Owens (Hispanic Studies), arguing that we were beginning to repeat ourselves, then called the question. Liz Jurisich (Mathematics) seconded. The Senate voted in favor of calling the question. After a division of the house, the motion for the new admission policy failed.

**Noting Non-Credit Experiences on Academic Transcripts**

The Speaker next recognized Glen Lesses (Philosophy), who made the following motion:

“The Academic Planning Committee shall recommend to the Senate by the February 2006 meeting whether to eliminate non-credit experiences from the academic transcript.”

After Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) seconded the motion, Mr. Lesses explained that, in December of 2003, the Senate had rejected a motion from Career Services to establish a non-credit course to record non-credit internships on the academic transcript. He considers this motion unfinished business from the earlier meeting and is worried about the integrity of the academic transcript.

George Pothering (At-Large, Computer Science) asked whether Mr. Lesses’ motion was intended to be about non-credit experiences or just internships. He pointed out that the catalog currently lists courses that have no credit attached and asked whether these courses should be reviewed as well. Mr. Lesses replied “yes,” that he thought they should be reviewed.

Liz Jurisich (Mathematics) then pointed out that internships are experiential, but that we should consider research projects differently. Mr. Lesses replied that a committee should consider those questions. Mark Lazzaro (Biology) then added that some academic experiences have the number of hours allowed to them capped. Students who go beyond the capped hours would not have these experiences represented on the transcript if non-credit experiences are eliminated. Mr. Lesses replied that just such complications should be explored by a committee.

Calvin Blackwell (Economics and Finance) pointed out that the Internship Director for the School of Business and Economics has spoken about the benefits of noting non-credit experiences on the academic transcript. Some companies, he argued, won’t credit such experiences unless they’re officially noted by the College. Mr. Blackwell asked what the costs of such notation would be to the College.

At this point, Mr. Mignone interrupted the discussion to note that it was somewhat off-topic since we were not debating the issue of eliminating non-credit experiences itself, but rather whether to send this issue to the Academic Planning Committee to explore. Nevertheless, he said he would allow further discussion.

Bob Dukes (Physics and Astronomy) then argued that it sounded to him as if Mr. Lesses had a particular outcome in mind, judging by the language of the motion. Mr. Lesses
acknowledged that the proposal does charge the Committee with deciding whether to eliminate such experiences from the transcript.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) argued that, in light of the Senate’s rejection of the December 2003 request from Career Services, it might be useful to have more information about the topic. The Speaker then asked if anyone present could talk about potential plans to develop a co-curricular transcript. The Provost replied that Student Affairs had been looking into the issue, but she wasn’t sure how far along the investigation is. She pointed out that many schools do indeed use co-curricular transcripts.

Joe Kelly (English) then asked whether there was a difference between the Speaker simply asking the Academic Planning Committee to look into the issue and the Senate voting on it. Mr. Mignone replied that it wasn’t in his purview to simply hand the issue to the Committee. If the Senate votes on the motion, the Committee will be given a specific charge and a response date. Frank Morris (At-Large, Classics) next asked about the particular response date and whether or not it was feasible. Mr. Lesses replied that he chose the February date because it was far enough in the future, but not too distant.

Next, Calvin Blackwell offered a friendly amendment to change the language of the motion. Instead of charging the Committee to investigate whether to eliminate non-credit experiences, Mr. Blackwell wanted the Committee to be charged with reviewing the treatment of non-credit experiences. Mr. Lesses declined to accept the amendment as a friendly one. Claire Curtis added that she would like to see a report on the issue come from the Academic Planning Committee. Joe Kelly then moved Mr. Blackwell’s amendment as a non-friendly one. After some discussion, the amendment was worded as follows:

“The Academic Planning Committee shall review the treatment of non-credit experiences on the academic transcript and report with a recommendation to the Senate by the February 2006 meeting.”

Mr. Lesses pointed out that he didn’t think his language was prejudicial since considerable objection to noting non-credit experiences on the transcript had been expressed in the Senate previously.

Andrew Smelzer, treasurer of the Student Governor Association, then asked to be recognized. He argued that all students would want non-credit experiences noted in some official manner, whether on the academic transcript or a co-curricular transcript.

Bob Dukes then returned to the question of the February date. He asked whether this deadline was realistic. Chris Hope, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, after consulting briefly with the Provost about potential programs coming down the pipeline, agreed that the February date was realistic.
At this point, the Senate voted to amend the motion as proposed by Mr. Blackwell and Mr. Kelly. They then approved the newly amended motion.

**Constituent Concerns**

The Speaker recognized Jack Parson (Political Science), who raised questions about a change in language in the advertisement for a new Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences. The original advertisement had language which read that the College was “committed to becoming a nationally preeminent public liberal arts and sciences university . . . ” The new language reads that “the College is focused on becoming a nationally preeminent public university, committed to maintaining its historic strength in the liberal arts and science tradition.”

Provost Jorgens responded by informing the faculty that she asked for the change in language. She added that, after numerous conversations with President Higdon, the deans, and other groups on campus, she has been working on a white paper suggesting a different way to think about the College. The reality of the situation, the Provost argued, is that we're not a liberal arts college; the language describing us in these terms is misleading because of our large size and the complexity of our mission. Her white paper, when finished, will suggest a new way to promote the College for what we actually are. She had hoped to hold off on the new Dean search for a year until after we’d had these conversations, but unfortunately, that didn’t happen. The Provost hopes to finish this paper in the next few months and then open a conversation with faculty about it.

The Speaker then recognized Reid Wiseman (Biology) who expressed consternation that we aspired for “pre-eminence” in the first place. What’s wrong with the word “eminent” he asked.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:25.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2005 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, October 11, 2005, at 5:00 p.m. in Education Center 116.

One change was made to the minutes from the September, 2005 meeting of the Faculty Senate. In the previous minutes, under the Provost’s Report, it was stated that 23,000 CofC students currently hold Life Scholarships. That number should actually be 2300.

Reports

Senior Vice President for Student Affairs—Victor Wilson

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone recognized Senior Vice President for Student Affairs, Victor Wilson, who had asked to speak with the Senate concerning drug and alcohol use on campus. Noting that drug issues have permeated into classrooms, Mr. Wilson reported that he has put together a drug and alcohol task force to deal with some of the problems. He has obtained the support of President Higdon as well as senior staff to put more meat into the College’s drug policies. One of the newly instituted policies is an automatic one-semester suspension for any student caught with illegal drugs. Mr. Wilson asked that faculty members work with the task force by calling appropriate offices when drug or alcohol use by students is suspected. Mr. Mignone then opened the floor to questions.

Janice Wright (at-large, Hispanic Studies) asked Mr. Wilson about problems departments have been having recently scheduling events at the Stern Center. She also wondered why departments were being charged for room use. Mr. Wilson responded that the person previously in charge of reserving rooms in the Stern Center had just left, so the change in personnel might be contributing to some of the problems. He also pointed out that there are indeed some charges associated with departments reserving Stern Center rooms if no student group is co-sponsoring a particular event. He asked faculty to get in touch with him personally if they encounter problems. He also urged faculty members to visit the Student Life web site to find out more about Stern Center policies.

The Speaker then recognized Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre Department), who asked what happens to students who have drug problems and go into rehabilitation. She wondered if we scare students away from the College when they try to return. Mr. Wilson responded that, if students are working toward resolving their drug issues, the College will work with them. Nevertheless, the act of using illegal drugs at the College will not be permitted. Ms. Kattwinkel replied that she had students in the past who went to rehab for a couple of weeks before returning to the College. She doesn’t want such students, who are working toward resolving their drug use, to be sent to their “academic deaths.” Dean of Students Jeri Cabot replied that students who ask for late withdrawals from courses due to drug use/drug rehabilitation are not allowed to return to the College until they’ve documented treatment.
Julie Davis (Communication Department) than asked if faculty members could be involved in the drug and alcohol task force. Mr. Wilson replied that the task force already does have a faculty member, which has been very useful.

The Speaker

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone began his report by thanking Susan Morrison, who was standing in as Senate projectionist for George Pothering. He then asked Julia Eichelberger, of the ad-hoc General Education Committee, to give a “pep talk” for the general education forums to be held October 24th and 25th. Ms. Eichelberger reported that the same workshop will be held both days in the hopes that as many faculty as possible will be able to attend one of them. The committee would like faculty input on the issue of general education reform; they hope to achieve consensus so that the committee can move forward with a plan that is acceptable to faculty. Faculty members planning to attend the forum can RSVP to Clara Hodges, letting her know the day they plan to be there. Faculty members are also invited to come to the forums even if they haven’t RSVP’d. Provost Elise Jorgens will moderate the forums, and the committee hopes that all departments will be represented. There will be a reception afterward.

Mr. Mignone then recognized Claire Curtis, of the Faculty Welfare Committee, who reported briefly on the status of the Labor Day Policy, which the Senate had asked the Welfare Committee to consider last semester. Ms. Curtis informed the Senate that the Welfare Committee has not yet finalized a plan because of two main problems—1) lab sciences don’t want to lose another Monday out of the course schedule, and 2) the state mandates only a certain number of holidays. The only possible trade-off for a Labor Day Holiday is Memorial Day, but the committee is concerned about the implications of making such an exchange since it will affect staff more than faculty. Ms. Curtis noted that the Faculty Welfare Committee would bring a proposal to the next Senate meeting after they’ve considered these problems in more detail.

Mr. Mignone then discussed the issue of a catalog designation for service learning courses at the College. The administration had planned to implement such a designation in Spring of 2006, but Mr. Mignone has asked Kay Smith, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, not to implement the policy so soon. Mr. Mignone pointed out that this issue came before the Faculty Senate in December of 2003. At that time, the Senate charged the Academic Planning Committee to: 1) look at the issue of a catalog designation for service learning courses, 2) develop standards for determining what courses would qualify as service learning, and 3) determine who the gate keeper for such courses would be. That year, though, the Academic Planning Committee was too involved with the freshman seminar project to address the issue. They passed it to the next year’s committee, and the issue was never dealt with. The administration has agreed to hold off on the designation until the Academic Planning Committee can address the issue. Mr. Mignone expects a report from the committee later in the semester.
New Business

Nominations Committee

The Senate approved adding both John Peters of the Biology Department and Bill Olejniczak of the History Department to the ad-hoc General Education Committee, to replace Allan Strand of the Biology Department, who is taking sabbatical leave. Mr. Mignone reported that the Provost had approved the two-for-one replacement.

Curriculum Committee

The following proposal put forth by the curriculum committee passed without discussion:

1. CRLS 400—Proposal to Change a Course (Change in Credits)

Committee on Graduate Education

The following proposal brought by the Committee on Graduate Education passed without discussion;

1. Master of Education in Languages—Change in admission requirements (a proposal to require letters of recommendation for admission to the program)

Betsy Martin, Chair of the Graduate Education Committee, also pointed out—for information purposes only—that the committee has made new recommendations for acceptable Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) scores.

Smoking Policy

The Speaker then recognized Claire Curtis, of the Faculty Welfare Committee, who introduced a new smoking policy approved by the committee at the end of last year. The policy implements a Smoking Policy Review Committee and makes recommendations for items the new committee should pursue.

Mark Lazzaro (Biology) asked a question about the item prohibiting the College from accepting funding either “directly or indirectly, from tobacco companies or advertisers, including grant monies.” Mr. Lazzaro argued that the “directly or indirectly” wording is too general. He pointed out, that, with this phrase in place, sister companies of Phillip Morris, for instance, might be prohibited from providing grant money. Ms. Curtis agreed to remove the word “indirectly” from the proposal as a friendly amendment.

Glen Lesses (Philosophy Department) then asked whether this same item about funding had been vetted by the College Attorney. He argued that state legislators might have problems with it. Laura Lindroth, of Counseling and Substance Abuse Services, replied that College Attorney Andy Abrams had looked over the policy.
The Speaker then recognized Hugh Wilder (Philosophy Department) who asked if this smoking proposal was the same one that the Student Government Association (SGA) had approved. Ms. Curtis replied that it was, but that the Welfare Committee had removed the fines the SGA wanted instituted. Hallie Ritzu, the Academic Affairs Committee Chair of the SGA, added that the SGA is aware of the changes made by the Welfare Committee.

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) then asked if Greek Life had approved the policy, if they were okay with it. Ms. Curtis replied that the SGA had passed the policy after a contentious meeting which members of Greek Life attended.

Julie Davis (Communication) asked what the new date on the policy would be, since the policy currently states that it will go into effect in the spring semester of 2005. Jeri Cabot replied that the policy would be instituted in fall of 2006.

Calvin Blackwell (Economics and Finance) asked for clarification about how Parts I and II of the proposal related to each other. Ms. Curtis responded that Part I sets up the Smoking Policy Review Committee and its charge. Part II sets out the issues the Welfare Committee recommends that the new Smoking Policy Review Committee address. Mr. Blackwell then asked whether the items in Part II were considered new rules, or merely recommendations. Ms. Curtis replied that, if the Senate passes the proposal, we would only be recommending that the Smoking Policy Review Committee take up the issues outlined in Part II; we would not actually be approving these items.

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) asked about other indoor spaces that many at the College would like to see become smoke-free as well. Ms. Curtis replied that the Smoking Policy Review Committee could take up other issues as well as the ones recommended in the Smoking Policy.

Betsy Martin (at-large, Chemistry Department) then proposed removing the section on grant money entirely, arguing that someone’s research, even if funded by a tobacco company, might work against smoking. Ms. Curtis replied that she couldn’t speak for the entire committee. She argued that she thought the committee’s intent in the grant money section was to show that the College takes the “smoke free” policy seriously.

At the close of discussion, the Senate endorsed the new Smoking Policy on a voice vote.

**Constituent Concerns**

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) asked for an update on the status of the new plus/minus grading policy that was discussed at the last Senate meeting. Provost Elise Jorgens reported that Kay Smith is working with the Academic Standards Committee on researching the policy. They have a lot of information to go through, she pointed out. Mr. Mignone added that the committee had been assigned a large task and were actively involved in carrying it out. He hadn’t expected the committee to finish this soon. Terry
Bowers (English Department) then asked when we could expect a proposal. Mr. Mignone replied that a proposal would probably come next semester. Joe Kelly (English) then asked what the date was after which it will be too late to implement the policy next year. Mr. Mignone replied that he doesn’t know. The College will need to inform students about the policy, and the Registrar will need a heads-up. Mr. Mignone said that he would contact the Registrar about required lead-time for implementing the proposal and report back at the next Senate meeting.

The Speaker then recognized Bob Dukes (Physics and Astronomy), who pointed out that the Athletic Banquet at the College has been held on a week night the past several years. Athletes who have evening classes on the night of the banquet must miss them because the banquet is mandatory. Mr. Dukes suggested holding the Athletic Banquet on a Friday or Saturday night instead so that the College will not appear to celebrate athletic success over academic success. Mr. Mignone pledged to pass this concern along to the director of athletics.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:45.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, September 13, 2005, at 5:00 p.m. in Education Center 116. Speaker Bob Mignone called the meeting to order, and the minutes from the April, 2005 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved. Mr. Mignone then took nominations for 2005-2006 Speaker Pro Tem. Hugh Wilder nominated Susan Kattwinkel, who was elected.

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone welcomed faculty back, hoping that we all had a productive and relaxing summer. Mr. Mignone covered three items in his report:

1) He noted that in the chair’s retreat in August, the consensual relations policy that came to the Senate last year for information purposes was discussed. Mr. Mignone wanted faculty members to realize that the policy was meant as a baseline that faculty could modify if they wished. Senators may recommend changes in the policy to the Welfare Committee if they want, or they may even form an ad-hoc committee to consider the policy in more detail.

2) Mr. Mignone noted the importance of the general education review currently taking place at the College, pointing out that we review our major offerings quite frequently and that the one common part of the education we deliver merits serious review as well. He reported that the ad-hoc committee on general education has re-affirmed the basic distribution model of general education we currently use, but that the committee would like to improve on the way this model is delivered to students. Forums intended to open up the general education review process to a wider range of faculty members will be held on October 24th and October 25th in the Beatty Center. Specific times for these forums will be announced later.

3) Mr. Mignone addressed the delayed implementation of the new plus/minus grading policy, pointing out that the Provost is concerned about possible consequences associated with implementing the policy. Student handbooks and the Undergraduate Catalog have been revised to make the new grading policy tentative for Fall of 2006 or 2007.

The Provost

Mr. Mignone then recognized Provost Elise Jorgens, who began her report by announcing that the Provost’s office had been debating for the last hour about what to do in the face of possible severe weather caused by Tropical Storm Ophelia. She told faculty her office had been assured that area bridges will stay open. She then went on to deliver her report, which consisted of four main items:
1) The Provost discussed the College’s response to the devastation caused by Hurricane Katrina. She announced that the College has accepted thirty students from institutions of higher education in New Orleans and that we have been getting positive press about our efforts to help students displaced by the hurricane. At least one faculty member has joined us as well. The youngest hurricane evacuee at the College is a 2-year-old student enrolled at ECDC (the N.E. Miles Early Childhood Development Center).

2) Ms. Jorgens echoed Mr. Mignone’s justification for undertaking a review of the College’s general education program. She pointed out that, while this is a faculty review, it is also a priority for the Provost’s office. The stance of the ad-hoc general education committee is that the College’s current distribution model is not a problem. Ms. Jorgens, however, expressed concerns that we currently have a program which students view as something to “get out of the way,” that they often don’t see a connection between general education and the courses they take in their major. In addition, Ms. Jorgens would like to see an acknowledgment from the faculty that general education is essential in everything we teach. She pointed out that, if we don’t feel this way, we shouldn’t be teaching at the College. Faculty members need to talk with students about the value of their general education. Part of delivering general education lies in how we talk about the program with our students. She hopes these issues will come up in the October forums.

The ad-hoc committee, she added, is not putting out a specific proposal at this point. Instead, they want to solicit faculty input in order to generate guidelines about what our general education program hopes to accomplish. These guidelines should help faculty members tell students what we believe it’s important they learn and why. The Provost and the ad-hoc committee want to develop a set of specific expectations for general education and systematically show how each general education course offered fulfills these expectations. Finally, Ms. Jorgens added that she hopes this review of general education will result in a “raising of the bar” at the College, in increased expectations of students, many of whom find our current general education offerings unchallenging.

3) The Provost also announced that she has been working with the Deans on the project of identifying our institutional distinctiveness. This project is an attempt to pinpoint academic strengths and uniqueness at the College—to determine what makes the CofC academic experience stand out, what identifies it as different from experiences students might get at other places. Citing the example of the Historic Preservation Program, Ms. Jorgens noted that several of our programs draw strength from our specific location in Charleston. She assured faculty that this project is not about developing new programs, but is more a way of packaging what we already have in order to draw students not only to our unique programs but to the departments and programs which support them. If we have a strong Historic Preservation Program, for instance, we must also have strong back-up departments in art history, history, etc.

4) Finally, Ms. Jorgens addressed the delayed implementation of the new grading system. While the Undergraduate Catalog initially said the new system would be in place in Fall 2006, Ms. Jorgens pointed out that nothing had been done to get ready for the implementation of the new system, other than putting the notice into the Catalog.
Students, she argued, are not aware of the new policy, and the College has not fulfilled its obligation to inform them about the impending changes. The Provost stated that she has no objection to the new grading policy per se, and that she understands it arose from a desire to stem grade inflation. Studies show that students don’t spend much time studying and that general education courses are not perceived as challenging. While she believes we could ask more of students, the Provost also argued that we don’t have grade inflation on this campus.

Yet, she added, it is clear that the new grading policy will result in lower student GPA’s. The Provost is concerned about students on state scholarships in particular. She is also concerned about instituting a policy that may help professors, but also may make us lose some of our better students. She pointed out that we have new conditions at the College that weren’t present when the new grading policy was passed. At that time, the Life Scholarship was very new. We now have 23,000 students on Life Scholarships. The number of students on Hope Scholarships has increased as well. Thus, the Provost has asked the Speaker of the Faculty, Bob Mignone, to send the grading policy back to the Academic Standards Committee for further review. She has asked Kay Smith to work with the committee to study the policy’s potential impact on students.

In addition, Ms. Jorgens pointed out that a similar policy was proposed at Clemson University recently. Clemson did a pilot study of a new grading system for two years, after which the faculty voted overwhelmingly not to implement the new system. The Provost noted that she is asking for some kind of pilot study or intense analysis at the College as well. Finally, Provost Jorgens apologized that it appeared she’s over-ruling faculty governance. She concluded by stating that she wants to work with faculty on re-examining this issue.

When Ms. Jorgens finished her report, Mr. Mignone pointed out that returning the grading policy to the Academic Standards Committee for further review raised important procedural questions in regard to faculty governance since the proposal was already passed several years ago. As a result, Mr. Mignone announced that he was opening the floor for a fifteen minute period to allow faculty members to express their views on the Provost’s decision.

Mr. Mignone then recognized Richard Nunan (Philosophy), who said that he was sorry to take issue with the Provost, but that he was not happy with her decision to send the grading policy back to committee and to change the Undergraduate Catalog without consulting faculty. He pointed out that the Provost should “play by the same rules” that bind the Senate. Mr. Nunan then want on to discuss what he considered a more substantive question than the one of procedure—that of linking a grading policy to retention. Pointing out that we don’t know that the new grading policy will deflate grades, Mr. Nunan argued that, in any case, the desire to improve retention should not influence the grading policy we use. Mr. Nunan reminded faculty members of the recent events at Benedict College, where faculty members were fired after refusing to base grades partly on effort. While acknowledging that the situation at Benedict is far worse, Mr. Nunan pointed out that what is being proposed by the Provost at the College
undermines faculty control over grading. Finally, Mr. Nunan concluded that he had never been happy with our current, illogical grading policy.

Mr. Mignone next recognized Claire Curtis (Political Science), who informed faculty members that she had looked back at the Senate minutes from 2001-2002 and seen that the issue of retention was discussed at that time. Ms. Curtis concluded, then, that retention is *not* a new issue in regards to the proposed change in grade policy. Finally, Ms. Curtis asked whether professors at the College would be asked to keep two sets of grading records if we run a pilot program similar to the one at Clemson University. At Clemson, she pointed out, all professors were indeed required to keep two sets of records during the pilot period.

In response to Ms. Curtis, Mr. Mignone argued that in 2001-2002 faculty discussed retention but didn’t *investigate* the consequences of the proposed policy. He pointed out that he voted for the policy at the time, and that he wishes to defend faculty governance, but he nevertheless believes it would be acceptable to investigate the issue more fully. Mr. Mignone argued that the faculty and administration should both work to respect the other’s views.

Provost Jorgens then spoke, pointing out that she had talked about the changes to the Undergraduate Catalog with Mr. Mignone, Hugh Wilder, and George Pothering in her office. She said that she had tried to talk with other faculty, but that the Senate was not meeting when she learned about this issue. In fact, Ms. Jorgens pointed out that she discovered the language about the new grading policy in the Catalog the day before it was going to press. She purposefully put in language that left the question open, that made the change tentative rather than killed it entirely.

The Speaker then recognized Hugh Wilder (Philosophy), who pointed out that some of the discussion of the new grading policy had occurred under his watch as Speaker, and some had occurred before. Mr. Wilder then presented faculty members with a timeline of how the new policy was approved in 2000-2002. The Committee on Academic Standards, Mr. Wilder noted, took up the issue in Fall of 2000. At this time, a thorough, comprehensive study of the proposed policy was conducted. The committee gathered information from dozens of institutions and reported their findings to the Senate in March of 2001. After substantial discussion, the Senate voted to approve the new policy in principle. Intense discussion of an implementation process for the policy then ensued. In April of 2001, the Provost at the time established an implementation working group. Many, many people were involved in this group, Mr. Wilder pointed out; it was representative of numerous campus interests. The group studied institutions that had made transitions to new grading systems. In March of 2002, the Academic Standards Committee reported back to the Senate, after the work of the implementation group was completed, that an August 2006 date to actually implement the new policy seemed appropriate. The Senate then voted to implement the policy at that date. The intent was for the working group to continue. But because both the registrar at the time and the acting Provost left, little was actually done. Finally, Mr. Wilder argued that students *are* aware of the new grading policy. He pointed out that the Student Government
Association has passed at least two resolutions opposing the policy. Mr. Wilder concluded by stating that the College has already considered this issue in a very deliberative way and that a great deal of work has gone into it.

Next, the Speaker recognized Jim Carew (Geology), who argued that the faculty had adequately addressed concerns about the new grading policy when it came to the Senate several years previously. Mr. Carew pointed out that the faculty had already accepted delays in implementing the policy which were demanded by the administration at the time. To re-open this issue now is wrong, he argued. If the administration dropped the ball in implementing the policy, that is their problem. Mr. Carew added that there is a group of at least twenty-two professors who will drop the B+ and C+ grade from the potential grades they assign if the new grading policy is not implemented.

Hugh Haynsworth (Graduate School) then very quickly pointed out that the new grading policy does not affect the graduate program at the College.

Bob Mignone then closed the discussion. Although he corrected the Provost’s assertion that she met with him, Hugh Wilder, and George Pothering before changing the Catalog, pointing out that this meeting actually took place two weeks after the Catalog change, Mr. Mignone nevertheless re-iterated that he sees nothing wrong with re-examining the new grading policy in terms of the way the College has changed since 2000-2001. Mr. Mignone affirmed that he has sent the proposal for the new grading policy back to the Academic Standards Committee for further review.

**Old Business**

**XF Grade**

Mr. Mignone then recognized Renee McCauley, Chair of the Academic Standards Committee, who re-introduced the proposal to institute an XF grade as an honor board sanction for cases of intentional and pre-meditated violations. The proposal had first come before the Senate last April and was remanded to the committee for further refinement at that time. Ms. McCauley pointed out that the committee had added examples of Class 2 and Class 3 offenses to the original proposal.

Jeri Cabot, Dean of Students, spoke next about some procedural matters concerning the XF grade. She pointed out that the form faculty members fill out when they bring an honor board case would include a line asking whether the faculty member believes the case merits an XF grade. Class 3 violations, which are considered more the result of confusion or ignorance on the part of the student rather than deliberate intent to deceive, would involve a different form, which could direct faculty members to various outcomes that would be intended to correct student ignorance about plagiarism.

Bob Perkins (Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education) asked whether faculty recommendations about the XF grade would be honored. Ms. Cabot replied that the faculty only makes recommendations, that the honor board would not be required to
follow these recommendations, but that they would be treated as another piece of data in the decision-making process. Mr. Perkins then pointed out that his department believes the XF grade constitutes double-jeopardy for students and that, under this policy, grading would be taken out of faculty hands.

Reid Wiseman (Biology) spoke next, arguing that the new policy treats plagiarism as a “mortal sin” rather than the “venial sin” it should be. He pointed out that he would hate to harm students’ graduate school and career opportunities with this new policy. Ms. Cabot replied that, after two years, students may petition to have the XF grade expunged from their records. Mr. Wiseman responded that that would still be putting students in limbo for two years. Ms. Cabot replied that students might already be in limbo because many law schools and graduate programs already ask about honor violations. Finally, Mr. Wiseman asked whether the point of the XF grade is to have a teaching or a punitive effect on students. Ms. Cabot responded that the grade is punitive, but that it assures consistency and sends students the message that we take plagiarism very seriously at the College. She pointed out that the administration would spend time talking to students about the implications of the XF grade if it is approved.

Bill Barfield (Physical Education and Health) asked how many students such a policy would have affected, had it been in place the last couple of years. Ms. Cabot replied that the honor board hears approximately 60-70 cases a year. About one third of these cases involve serious plagiarism—plagiarism in which pre-meditation and deceptive intent are involved.

Michelle Brooks (Chemistry and Biochemistry) spoke next, pointing out that the XF grade was specifically reserved for students who have planned to cheat and deceive. Ms. Brooks feels that such violations merit a severe sanction.

Paul Young (Mathematics) spoke against the XF grade, arguing that the rationale of ensuring consistency is not necessarily a good one. Mr. Young noted that he has brought two dozen cases before the honor board in his time at the College and that no cases received identical sanctions. He sees this as a good thing because the individualized sanctions were proportionate and appropriate to the individual cases he had brought. Further, Mr. Young argued that faculty members who don’t want to lose authority to grade students will be reluctant to bring cases to the honor board. He added that it was preposterous to believe that the XF grade sends a message to admissions officers why a student failed a course. Faculty, he noted, aren’t the only ones who can turn students in to the honor board. What if a student turns him or herself in? In such a case, the grade would still be out of the faculty member’s hand. Mr. Young also argued that he saw no right for faculty appeal in the policy as it now stands. He concluded by stating that he doesn’t object to honor violations being noted on student transcripts, but that these violations should not be tied to grades.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) then asked about data at other schools. Did the number of cases brought before honor boards change after similar policies were adopted? Ms. Cabot replied that data on that issue was not available. Ms. Curtis then asked if anything
on student transcripts currently notes suspension or expulsion for honor board violations. Ms. Cabot replied “no.” She also pointed out, in response to one of the issues Paul Young had raised, that the student transcript would explain what the XF grade signified.

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) then asked who determines the class of the violation students will be charged with. Ms. Cabot replied that the honor board would make that determination.

Bob Perkins (Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education) pointed out that the XF proposal provides for an automatic XF sanction if a student is convicted of a Class 1 or 2 violation.

Next, Joe Kelly (English) argued that the XF grade does not represent a usurpation by the honor board of the right of faculty members to assign grades. Rather, it represents the faculty agreeing, as a whole, to take honor violations seriously. Individual faculty members would surrender control of serious plagiarism cases to the faculty as a whole. Mr. Kelly added that he believed the severity of the penalty—an XF staying on student records for two years—was perfectly reasonable. Freshmen and sophomores who make mistakes will have the grade expunged before they graduate. A senior who cheats, though, should be kept out of graduate school for a while.

At this point, Jeri Cabot interjected into the discussion a point of information—that faculty members can appeal an XF grade. The faculty right of appeal is already built into the current honor board system and thus is not a change in policy and wasn’t included in the XF proposal.

George Hopkins (History) argued that we should think of the XF grade as separating a “felony” from a “misdemeanor.” The XF sanction is for pre-meditated, deliberate cases. Such violations deserve a felony-weight punishment. Mr. Hopkins also pointed out that the XF policy would affect maybe twenty students a year out of the 10,000 who attend the College. Finally, Mr. Hopkins asked, in response to a point raised earlier by Paul Young, how many students in the past year had turned themselves in for plagiarism. Ms. Cabot replied that only one student had done so and that “it made [her] semester.”

Paul Young then pointed out that the first two items mentioned in the examples of Class 2 violations didn’t seem to be pre-meditated, yet still required the XF sanction.

Next, Alisa Whitt (Library) said that, in her experience, the honor board tries very hard to be fair. More faculty should serve on the honor board, she argued. If they did, some of the mistrust between the honor board and faculty members would be alleviated.

Claire Curtis then pointed out that she had an experience in which she thought the sanctions imposed by the honor board on a case she brought were too harsh. The board was very open to her input. Ms. Curtis encouraged faculty members to attend the honor board cases they bring, so that their input can be heard.
Bob Dukes (Physics and Astronomy) then asked about whether the College’s honor code required faculty to report violations or themselves be considered guilty of an honor violation. Ms. Cabot replied that the honor code no longer used this language. While she argued that faculty members are obligated to report honor violations, she also acknowledged that this duty is hard to enforce.

At this point, discussion ended. After a division of the house, the Speaker announced that the XF grade proposal passed, on a vote of 34-20.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

The following proposals put forth by the curriculum committee passed without discussion:

1. S05-01 ARTH 339 Historic American Interiors—New Course Proposal
2. S05-38 BS in Discovery Informatics—Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major

Committee on Graduate Education

The following proposals brought by the Committee on Graduate Education passed without discussion;

1. Program Change Proposal for MAT - Early Childhood Education (EDEC)
   New course proposals supporting the program change
   EDEE 615 - Assessment in Student Learning
   EDEE 682 - Field Experience III in Early Childhood Education
   Course Change proposal supporting the program change
   EDEE 642 - Social Studies for the Elementary School Teacher (title change)

2. Program Change Proposal for MAT - Elementary Education (EDEL)
   New courses proposals supporting the program change
   EDEE 645 - Field Experience I in Elementary Education
   EDEE 690 - Creating Effective Learning Communities
   EDEE 695 - Field Experience III in Elementary Education
   EDEE 614 - Field Experience II in Elementary Education
   Course Change proposals supporting the program change
   EDEE 640 - Language Arts for the Elementary School Teacher (title and course description change)
   EDEE 653 - Techniques for Teaching Reading (title and course description change)
   EDEE 610 - Integrating Assessment and Instruction (title and course description change)
   EDEE 606 - Individualizing Instruction (title and course description change)
   EDEE 642 – Social Studies for the Elementary School Teacher (title change)
3. Course Change Proposal (not in EDEC or EDEL)
   EDFS 687 - Technology Education for Teachers (title change)

   Proposal to Modify Probation Standards

The speaker then recognized Renee McCauley, Chair of the Academic Standards Committee, who introduced a proposal to modify probation standards.

Bill Barfield (Physical Education and Health) asked for a clarification of what was meant by “satisfactory academic improvement” in the proposal. Lynn Cherry, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, replied that a student may raise his or her GPA one semester, but not enough to get off academic probation, particularly if the previous GPA had been especially low. But the Office of Undergraduate Studies would nevertheless consider that the student was making satisfactory progress if, in the following semester the same GPA for the same number of hours could pull the student out of probation.

After a division of the house, the proposal passed.

   Resolution of Endorsement for Recycling Coordinator

Burton Callicott, Chair of the Recycling and Environmental Responsibility Committee, introduced a resolution that the College hire a Recycling Coordinator. Explaining that a student audit discovered that 60% of the trash in College cans is actually recyclable, that ARAMark doesn’t recycle at all, and that the committee had sent a similar proposal to Mr. Higdon a year and a half ago and received no response, Mr. Callicott asked that the Senate support his committee’s resolution.

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) asked whether the proposal suggested we actually have to recycle items at the College itself, or if we can send items off to be recycled for us elsewhere. She pointed out that, across the country, a majority of items sent to be recycled in fact end up in landfills. Thus, she asked, would such a proposal actually do any good? Mr. Callicott replied that a Recycling Coordinator might encourage the College to purchase necessary recycling equipment ourselves, thus saving money in the long run by avoid tipping fees and profiting from aluminum recycling.

Jason Overby (Chemistry and Biochemistry) then pointed out that, in the list of the duties to be performed by a Recycling Coordinator, #8 (overseeing disposal of material from science labs) seemed completely different from recycling duties.

George Hopkins (History), in response to Susan Kattwinkel’s earlier observation, pointed out that he had called an investigative reporter at the Post and Courier to ask about recycling. To the best of this reporter’s knowledge, recycling was actually being done (items sent for recycling were not simply ending up in landfills).

Julia Eichelberger (English) pointed out the issue the Senate was considering was a Resolution, not binding law. The specifics of the position would not be dictated by this proposal.
Allan Strand (Biology) then noted that many small towns can’t respond to the new enthusiasm for recycling. They have no room to store material sent for recycling, thus make the bad decision to landfill the items. This fact might explain Ms. Kattwinkel’s previously stated concern about items sent for recycling that get dumped instead.

Joe Kelly (English) then moved, as a friendly amendment, that Item #8 (which Jason Overby had spoken against) be removed from the duties ascribed to the Recycling Coordinator. Mr. Callicott accepted the amendment.

Bob Dukes (Physics and Astronomy) pointed out that the College has received grants in the past to explore recycling and environmental issues. Mr. Callicott replied that he imagined the position could expand to become that of a general environmental consultant.

George Pothering (Computer Science) then asked whether the three full-time employees mentioned in the proposal would have to be newly hired, or if these would be employees already at the College. Mr. Callicott replied that the proposal envisioned employees already here.

At the close of discussion, the Senate endorsed the Resolution on a voice vote.

**Constituent Concerns**

Alex Kasman (Mathematics) pointed out that all incoming students, during orientation, were required to participate in a 4-hour alcohol awareness program. Yet, there seemed to be no sanction for students who didn’t participate, despite the program’s supposedly mandatory nature. Mr. Kasman was concerned that such a policy sent a message of laxness about requirements to students. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) added that the College has a number of such requirements. Attendance at Convocation, for instance, is required, but there are no penalties for not showing up. Jeri Cabot, Dean of Students, spoke to these concerns. She pointed out that the alcohol awareness program was actually a 3-hour, online course. The language used to get students to participate was “strongly encouraged,” not “required.” In fact, 87% of students did participate in the alcohol awareness program. Ms. Cabot also argued that the program has an effect, that Student Affairs sees results from it.

Bob Mignone then closed the meeting by welcoming the new faculty secretary, and by thanking George Pothering for agreeing to serve as projectionist at Senate meetings as well as Deb Vaughn for continuing her service as Senate webmaster. The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary