Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate, May 3, 2007

The Faculty Senate met on Thursday, May 3, 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115 to continue discussion of the proposals on General Education submitted by the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education.

The formal session began with continued debate on the motion concerning Goal I.2: “Effective writing and critical reading; oral and visual communication.” Larry Krasnoff (guest, Philosophy) said that he hoped the Senate was almost ready to vote on this motion, adding that the course requirements for this goal have become fairly simple, with the amendments that have already been made. The key addition to our current general education curriculum, he argued, is the requirement that students take a speaking-intensive course. Mr. Krasnoff asked the Senate if we really wanted to do this—“put all our eggs in the speaking-intensive basket.” He argued that it might be better to have a third course that is either writing or speaking-intensive. While he said he doesn’t want to get rid of the speaking requirement, this requirement made more sense when the proposal had another writing-intensive course in the major (which was amended out at the previous special Senate meeting). He would like to see other departments (in addition to English and Communication) buy into communication-intensive courses. Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) moved to amend the motion as Mr. Krasnoff had suggested—to change “speaking-intensive” in 3b on p. 19 of the proposal to “communication-intensive.” The requirement, as amended, would read as follows:

b. At least one additional communication-speaking-intensive course, which may be a course in the student’s major.

Brian McGee, Chair of the Communication Department, said that he wouldn’t repeat the arguments made many hours ago in favor of a speaking-intensive course, but that he would like to remind Senators of the force of those arguments. His department would like to see speaking-intensive instruction spread out over the disciplines. Julia Eichelberger, Chair of the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education, said that the committee had designed the proposal so that any department could contribute to the speaking-intensive part of the curriculum. The reason the committee specified this requirement is because they believe every student should receive speaking-intensive instruction, not just those who select such courses.

A vote was taken, and Mr. Wilder’s amendment failed.

Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) then moved to amend the proposal by striking a required cap of 20 students in communication-intensive courses. The language Ms. Caveny moved to strike (from p. 20 of the proposal) reads as follows:

5. Writing- or speaking-intensive classes will have no more than 20 students, and departments offering such courses shall not be penalized for any adverse impact on their department’s Delaware Study target number.
Ms. Caveny said that she understands there’s a workload implication in teaching writing and speaking-intensive courses. Yet, she argued, we haven’t been told precisely what writing-intensive means. She said she doesn’t know what the gain would be for the cost of having only 20 students per section. We have no sense of how many of these courses there will be, she argued, so we don’t really know the true cost; it may be more than what’s proposed. In addition, she said, this is such a big decision it shouldn’t be made solely in terms of the Faculty Senate. Such a decision has tremendous impact on pay and on faculty in other disciplines. Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) said that he shares Ms. Caveny’s concerns about budgetary implications; however, he doesn’t regard her amendment as a happy solution because if we are going to have writing and speaking-intensive courses over and above what we already have, those courses need to have smaller enrollments. Either we approve having them, which the Senate has already done, or we don’t. If we have such courses, he argued, we need to have an appropriate enrollment. We’ve put the administration on notice that we’d like to implement this costly part of the proposal, he said. If we do what Ms. Caveny suggests, the administration will simply make us teach large writing and speaking-intensive courses. Then, either the requirement will “wither on the vine,” or we’ll pretend to fulfill it.

Terry Bowers (English) argued that, currently, the proposal is formulated so that the required writing-intensive courses replace English 101 and 102, which already have caps of 20 students, so it’s a wash. It would be a big mistake to remove caps, he added, because such a move would violate best practices. He then read a brief excerpt from the Modern Language Association best practices, which say that the number of students in writing-intensive courses should be 15 or fewer, with no more than 20. Ms. Caveny’s amendment, he said, would be regressive; it would push the College in the wrong direction.

Mick Norton (Mathematics) said that, just because English 101 and 102 operate with caps of 20 students, this doesn’t necessarily mean that Department X that emphasizes writing should do it in the same way. The number 20 could hamstring departments. Another issue, he added, is whether this is intended to be a hard 20 or a soft 20—you can override caps if necessary. Paul Young (Mathematics) said that he was not really sure whether leaving the cap of 20 in or taking it out would do much to the document either way. One bothersome thing about saying how many students can be in a communication-intensive class, he added, is that we don’t even know how many hours these courses will be. So, he doesn’t know why the document includes the caps of 20 in the first place. Sofia Agrest (Mathematics) said that she doesn’t think there should be caps in the document at all. It should be up to departments how to cap their courses—not an issue for Senators to decide.

Julia Eichelberger replied that the reason the committee put in the cap is because they were trying to identify the conditions under which the proposal’s goals could be met. After much studying, meeting with faculty, etc., it appeared that the learning that needed to occur in communication-intensive classes had to be done in a situation where there was a smaller student/faculty ratio because these courses will require students to present a great deal of written work, have this work responded to, and have an opportunity to
revise it. It’s a labor-intensive method of teaching. Ms. Eichelberger said that she doesn’t teach her upper-division classes that have caps of 30 the way she teaches writing-intensive courses with caps of 20. The cap specified in the proposal, she added, is the norm in writing programs. In including this requirement, the committee wanted to give the Senate leverage to argue that the caps need to be respected.

Deanna Caveny then said she wished to clarify her rationale for the amendment. She said she was not opposed to the English Department negotiating workload based on their professional society recommendations. But faculty workload, she argued, is based on a larger picture than class size. She said she could think of at least two examples in which a smaller class size would have been legitimate in other types of courses—specifically, foreign language courses and science labs, where students do a great deal of writing. She said that what she objects to is the cap of 20 in this place in the document in this context.

Joe Kelly (guest, English) spoke in favor of keeping the language about the cap of 20 in the proposal. This cap, he argued, is something that will protect the faculty. Faculty members asked to teach writing-intensive classes without such a cap will either destroy themselves or do a bad job. The language in this part of the proposal concerning the Delaware Study numbers protects departments; the language about caps of 20 protects faculty members. Such a requirement will help other departments that currently don’t have these caps in place. Brian McGee (guest, Communication) said that the cap of 20 is also consistent with best practices in speaking disciplines. Such language appears in similar proposals at other universities. Harvard, for instance, institutes a cap of 12 on such courses.

Mark Lazzaro (guest, Biology) asked whether the caps of 20 become irrelevant when you move outside of the disciplines of English and Communication. Currently, he pointed out, his department has caps of 24 in biology labs. Scott Peeples (English) suggested that it might be a good idea if other disciplines that want their courses to count as communication-intensive seek to lower their caps. Why not lower labs from 24 to 20, he asked? This might require more resources from the administration, but we won’t get resources if we don’t ask for them. If communication-intensive courses are going to be meaningful, Mr. Peeples argued, he knows from years of experience that they can’t be taught effectively with more than 20 students. Carol Ann Davis (English) said that writing-intensive courses do not simply include a lot of writing, but also require that instructors respond to student writing in a very intense way.

Norine Noonan, Dean of the School of Science and Mathematics, argued that certain Senators, who make statements about departments they know little about, are displaying the “moral superiority of the uninvolved.” She said that she has taught a communication-intensive course that probably has more writing in it than any other course at the College. She argued that 20 is not a magic number. The intent of the Delaware Study is to give departments flexibility in determining course loads. She would prefer to see the proposal say “small courses,” not 20. Why not 12 or 17, she asked—there is nothing magic about the number 20. For folks to say science courses should be capped at 20 students betrays ignorance of the practice in her discipline.
Larry Krasnoff reminded Senators that the amendment strikes the entire passage about caps in communication-intensive courses; the amendment does not suggest taking out the number 20 and replacing it with the word “small.” In this proposal, we’re making recommendations that may or may not be put into practice. The number 20 is an estimate, it’s a guess. This debate shouldn’t be seen as English vs. the Sciences. The cap of 20 students, Mr. Krasnoff argued, seems like a reasonable number for numerous disciplines.

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) then asked if we could possibly solve the problem by inserting the word ‘normally’ in front of the number. Ms. Caveny replied that she would not consider that a friendly amendment. What would be acceptable as a friendly amendment, she said, would be a more general statement about sizes appropriate to course objectives. Melissa Hughes (Biology) said that the cap of 20 seems to be an arbitrary cut-off. If her department dropped biology labs from 24 to 20 students, that would be 116 students cut off, so sticking to a hard cap of 20 would have a major impact. David Kowal (Art History) then made a friendly amendment to revise the language about caps to read as follows:

5. Writing- or speaking-intensive classes will have caps that are appropriate to their discipline and course objectives, no more than 20 students, and departments offering such courses shall not be penalized for any adverse impact on their department’s Delaware Study target number.

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) said that she’s not sure if she’s for or against this amendment, but she suggested that courses at the College of Charleston are already supposed to have caps that are appropriate to their discipline and course objectives. Frank Morris (Classics) argued that Foreign Languages and English have taught large communication-intensive courses as part of the General Education Curriculum for many many years. It took a long time to get the caps down to 20, he said. He said that objections to the caps of 20 seemed to be for courses in the major. Mr. Morris urged Senators not to take away from English and Foreign Languages caps that are best for effective teaching and that they worked so hard to attain.

Scott Peeples (English) then pointed out that the cap of 20 applies only to a required first-year composition course, a writing-about-literature course, and a speaking-intensive course. He asked whether biology labs would even fit in here. While the English Department hopes that other departments will propose to teach literature courses, he wondered how likely this was to happen in the sciences. Richard Nunan agreed. He argued that the Senate has been talking about something irrelevant. Mr. Peeples is absolutely right, he said. If we adopt Ms. Caveny’s amendment, what will happen in practice is that English and Foreign Languages will have to fight the battle for small class size all over again. They’ll probably win, he argued, but other departments that might entertain the possibility of teaching a literature course could then be told that their courses will have 30 students because they’re not English or Foreign Languages.
Paul Young argued that the cap does not belong in the proposal, because, at some point, we may approve a General Education Committee that will make such decisions. Sofia Agrest said that the supporters of the amendment are not asking that English 101 or 102 go up in size. The amendment, however, gives other departments flexibility. Norine Noonon asked whether a course in the major that wanted to be designated writing-intensive would be required to have a cap of 20. Ms. Eichelberger replied that it would.

Darryl Phillips (At-Large, Classics) said that it would be one thing if we were going to designate only English 101 or 102 as having caps of 20. But this proposal, he argued, could allow his department to offer their entire curriculum as writing-intensive. We’re not here in the Senate to make statements, he said, we’re here to make a curriculum. We’re here to make something that works. If we come up with something that’s not feasible, that we can’t implement, then we haven’t done our job. Pete Calcagno (Economics/Finance) said that he appreciates best practices, but the cap of 20 hampstrings all departments. In Business and Economics, he argued, there will be no writing-intensive courses offered if this cap is left in. At this point, Hugh Wilder reminded Senators of Scott Peeples’ point—that the proposal currently requires only two writing-intensive courses: a freshman composition course and a literature course. Unless Economics or Biology is seriously considering offering a freshman composition course, a literature course, or a speaking-intensive course, these comments aren’t relevant. Melissa Hughes said that the cap of 20 would preclude Biology from offering any of those types of courses.

Deanna Caveny said that part of the reasoning for her amendment is the feeling that there are lots of disciplines who currently require a great deal of writing that she doesn’t want to require less writing because they’re not designated as writing-intensive. She doesn’t want the statement about caps of 20 to have unintended consequences for courses that have been very writing-intensive and don’t currently cap at 20 students (a history course for instance). This might cause students to do less writing rather than more. Frank Morris said that he was in sympathy with Hugh Wilder’s point, that we’re talking about something that will replace English 101 and 102. If that’s our context, we’re not speaking generally, we’re speaking quite specifically. It’s the third course, the speaking-intensive course, that brings in the greatest possibility for another department to teach. He asked if it would give more flexibility to the proposal if we added language suggesting that communication-intensive courses in a major do not have to be capped at 20. Ms. Caveny replied that increased flexibility was not her motivation in making the amendment, though she said this seems to be the motivation of those in the sciences who are speaking in favor of the amendment.

Chris Lamb (Communication) then called the question on the amendment. The Senate approved calling the question. The Senate voted against Ms. Caveny’s amendment.

Discussion then returned to the main motion. There was some debate about whether the motion could be amended to make it clear that caps of 20 would apply only to the required freshman composition course, to the required writing-about-literature course, and to the speaking-intensive course, but attempts to make such amendments were
overruled by Speaker Bob Mignone, who said that these amendments were too similar to the amendment that had just been defeated by the Senate.

Terry Bowers (English) called the question on the main motion (to approve the defining characteristics and coursework associated with Goal I.2). The Senate approved calling the question. The Senate then approved the entire motion (as amended in several previous special Senate meetings). Please see Appendix 1 for a copy of the amended motion.

Deanna Caveny moved that the Senate adjourn “sine die” (which would cancel all remaining scheduled special Senate meetings). Because such a motion is not debatable, a vote was taken immediately. The Senate voted in favor of Ms. Caveny’s motion and will adjourn until next fall, when the General Education Proposal may be re-introduced.

Respectfully Submitted,
Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix 2.
General Education Motion Concerning Goal I.2: “Effective writing and critical reading; oral and visual communication”

Please note that this version of the motion reflects the final vote taken on May 3, 2007. --Postponed items appear in blue (these items address the formation of a CAC Committee and have been postponed until the end of the agenda, when the Senate discusses the formation of a General Education Committee). --Added items appear in red. --Deleted items have been struck through.

I.2a. The General Education Committee proposes the following as the defining characteristics of the second sub-goal.
   Effective writing and critical reading; oral and visual communication
   a. Students should be able to
      • Understand, analyze, and interpret intellectually challenging written texts and oral and visual presentations
      • Use writing and speaking to increase their own understanding of a topic and to communicate their point of view persuasively
      • Strengthen written and spoken work through the process of drafting, revising, and editing
      • Create formal papers and public presentations that are appropriate for the situation and audience
      • Produce well-organized papers and public presentations that convey substantive information and that conform to the conventions of edited American English
      • Interpret visual images and employ images to communicate ideas and concepts
   b. Students should complete rigorous writing and speaking assignments and receive significant feedback on their work in first-year courses and in other courses throughout their college career.

I.2b. The Committee proposes the formation of a faculty committee, known as the Communication Across the Curriculum Committee, to oversee this aspect of general education. This committee will be a subcommittee of the General Education Committee (see “Committee Proposal”).
   1. Composition of the committee: 5 voting faculty. 3 are also members of the General Education committee; 2 are the chairs (or chairs’ designees) of the departments of English and Communication.
   2. A Director (or co-directors) of Communication Across the Curriculum, appointed by the Provost, will serve as a non-voting, ex officio member of the committee. The director or directors must possess appropriate expertise in communication instruction and must be teaching writing-intensive or speaking-intensive courses.
   3. Duties of the committee:
      a. Evaluate requests to designate a course or sequence as writing intensive (WI) or speaking intensive (SI).
      b. Initiate, review and recommend changes to CAC policies and programs.
      c. Work with the Assessment Committee and Office of Assessment to assess CAC program.
      d. Support and advise the Director of CAC in training faculty who teach writing-intensive (WI) and speaking-intensive (SI) courses, in guiding student mentors assigned
4. The Committee will forward all recommendations for course designations and for changes to the CAC program to the General Education committee and to the Faculty Senate.

1.2c The Committee proposes that each student be required to complete four three communication-intensive courses or instructional sequences, as described below, to meet this sub-goal. The requirement described in this proposal will replace the current English 101-102 requirement only if the Senate approves the creation of a standing General Education committee.

1. The CAC committee will use the defining characteristics of “effective writing and critical reading; oral and visual communication” (proposal 1.2a) to evaluate course proposals for writing-intensive (WI) and speaking-intensive (SI) courses. Since these criteria are still very general, the CAC committee will also develop more detailed criteria for WI and SI courses, according to the following suggested guidelines. These criteria must be approved by the General Education Committee and by the Faculty Senate.

a. Assignments in WI or SI courses shall require students to demonstrate understanding of the course content and/or academic research; all such assignments have the dual goals of improving the students’ communication skills and of advancing the other learning objectives of the course.

b. Students must generate a significant quantity of written communication or oral/visual communication. The amount of writing or speaking will be determined and published by the CAC committee.

c. A WI- or SI-designated course must include several opportunities for individualized feedback by the instructor and revision by the student. Some of the writing or speaking may be informal in nature, but at least half of the assignments should be presented formally, in accordance with the conventions of an academic discipline, and/or in a format suitable for an academic or professional audience.

d. A significant portion of the course grade (to be determined by the CAC committee) must be based on the quality of the student’s work in either writing or speaking.

2. Once these criteria have been established, courses may be approved as WI or SI if their department demonstrates that they meet the criteria. Departments will submit proposals for individual courses to the CAC committee, furnishing course descriptions and other evidence that this course meets the criteria.

3. The four three required communication-intensive courses, which will replace the current requirement for English 101 and 102, must include the following.

a. During the student’s first year, one composition course (a writing-intensive course devoted to academic writing).

b. At least one speaking-intensive course, which may also be a literature course (described in c, below) or a course in the student’s major.

c. One course in literature, a rich and creative form of verbal communication. Courses satisfying this requirement must also be either writing-intensive or speaking intensive. Courses must also explore a significant quantity of literary works (at least five full-length prose works or three volumes of verse) must analyze ways these texts employ language imaginatively and artistically to create multiple levels of meaning, and must explore the ways some of these texts have been interpreted by literary critics.
Departments wishing to have courses approved for satisfying this requirement will submit proposals to the CAC committee, furnishing course descriptions and other evidence that the course fulfills these criteria for a literature course as well as the criteria for a communication-intensive course.

d. A third approved communication-intensive class in any discipline.

e. A fourth approved communication-intensive class or instructional sequence within the major. If departments choose, this course or sequence may be the same as the one in which students receive instruction in gathering and using information in the major (described in Proposal I.1).

f. An “instructional sequence” within a major may be composed of multiple courses that provide sufficient communication instruction to the student who takes them all. A set of linked courses (such as a Learning Community or a minor) may also be classified as communication-intensive if the combined courses provide enough instruction to satisfy the criteria.

g. Communication instruction within the major should include both writing and speaking instruction, although a department may emphasize one mode more than another.

4. Students may select two to four examples of work completed in these required courses to be uploaded within their online record (as described in “Online Record Proposal”). These work samples may be used for institutional assessment, and students may choose to display them when applying for employment or graduate school admission.

5. Writing- or speaking-intensive classes will have no more than 20 students, and departments offering such courses shall not be penalized for any adverse impact on their department’s Delaware Study target number. If a communication-intensive sequence is designed by a major department, the caps of 20 are not required for all courses in the sequence.

6. A course’s designation as WI or SI is dependent on the faculty member who teaches it as well as on its curriculum. For a section of a course to be so designated, its instructor must undergo formal training in communication instruction. If a previously approved WI or SI course is later taught by another faculty member who has not received this training, that faculty member’s sections of the course will not satisfy a communication-intensive requirement.

7. Formal training in communication instruction for approved courses will be offered at a time convenient to faculty members (either during a summer institute or at some other convenient time), and faculty completing this training will receive a stipend for their time.

8. The College will provide additional support for faculty who teach WI and SI courses, such as pedagogical workshops during the academic year and, when appropriate, student mentors trained to provide supplemental instruction in particular courses.

Rationale: This new requirement recognizes that students need a higher level of research and communication skills than they can acquire through the current writing requirement (English 101 and 102 in the first year). The Ad Hoc Committee has heard this need expressed repeatedly by individual departments, by faculty participating in the 2005 Faculty Forum, and at many other meetings across campus. There is a clear consensus that many College of Charleston students still
need further instruction in research, writing and speaking by the time they enroll in upper-level courses.

The present requirement of English 101 and 102, which focuses mainly on writing and not speaking, and which “front-loads” communication instruction in the first year, cannot equip students with all the communication skills that they will need throughout college. Confining such instruction to a single department makes the problem worse, since students may construe writing and speaking as minimal, quantifiable skills (an ability to proofread written work, a willingness to speak in public) that they should “get out of the way” and never develop further. However, writing and speaking are complex intellectual tasks that require students to deploy many different skills at once. The more complex the course material becomes, the more challenging, and the more dependent on disciplinary conventions, the communication becomes. Interpreting aural and visual information also becomes more challenging as a student attempts to navigate more complex information and concepts.

Students will learn and retain more of a course’s content through doing more and better writing and speaking on this material; moreover, students who do more of this writing and speaking over their whole college career will have more lasting, or “transferable,” abilities and intellectual perspectives after they finish here. Strong communication skills are a hallmark of a liberal arts and sciences education, and they make our graduates more effective in absolutely any field.

While some departments are already delivering excellent research and communication instruction to their majors and in their General Education courses, other faculty are less familiar with teaching these skills and may not yet be able to deliver this labor-intensive instruction alongside other teaching demands. Therefore we recognize that the following requirements can only be implemented over a period of time and that they will be more expensive to staff. We recommend forming a CAC committee as soon as possible to develop a strategic plan for developing and approving communication-intensive courses.
Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate, April 26, 2007

The Faculty Senate met on Thursday, April 26, 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115 to continue discussion of the proposals on General Education submitted by the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education. Discussion focused on the motion concerning Goal I.2: “Effective writing and critical reading; oral and visual communication.”

Mark Long (Political Science) made an amendment to strike the words “or speaking-intensive” from the proposal that a required course in literature must be either writing-intensive or speaking-intensive. Mr. Long explained that it looked like other schools tended to have writing-intensive literature courses, that Senate conversations had assumed that a second communication-intensive course would focus on writing, and that we should send a message to students that writing is important. Julia Eichelberger, Chair of the Ad-Hoc Committee, replied that her committee did not consider this a friendly amendment because the motion as written offers more flexibility. Courses in foreign literatures as well as oral interpretation of literature might be more likely to be speaking-intensive than writing-intensive.

Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) said that we have many students go into professional schools for which they have interviews. He believes our courses should not be either/or, but should incorporate both writing and speaking-intensive experiences. He said he was against the amendment for this reason. Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) said he wanted to underscore Mr. Long’s point that if we keep the alternative “or speaking intensive,” students could satisfy the communication-intensive requirement with only one writing-intensive course. He added that earlier, when he made a motion to move the literature course to a different section of the proposal, an argument was made that literature forms a natural pairing with writing. Mr. Wilder urged the Senate to act on this argument and support the amendment. Paul Young (Mathematics) argued that the required literature course didn’t seem to correspond to any of the identifying characteristics under Goal I.2. Ms. Eichelberger replied that the first defining characteristic—“Understand, analyze, and interpret intellectually challenging written texts and oral and visual presentations”—corresponded to the literature course.

The Senate voted to approve Mr. Long’s amendment.

Annalisa Calini (At-Large, Mathematics) made a motion to remand the current motion (the defining characteristics and recommended coursework associated with Goal I.2) back to the Ad-Hoc Committee for further consideration. Ms. Calini’s motion reads as follow:

**Motion to refer the current motion to the General Education Committee with three mandates.**

I propose to refer the current motion to the General Education Committee with three mandates:
1. Introduce a guaranteed maximum number of general education credits, not significantly above the current 56, with demonstrated reasonable options for any student to stay within this limit.

2. Formulate a concrete proposal on how to deal with the general education requirements for transfer students.

3. Address budget issues related to the Communication Intensive area of the General Education proposal, and design an equitable overall budget and workload plan for the new General Education proposal.

Rationale for the first mandate: The current number of required general education credits is already higher than at liberal arts and sciences institutions that we consider our peer or model institutions. Currently, every student at the College of Charleston can satisfy the requirements of general education and a 36-hour major in almost every department, with 30 credits left for electives within their 122 credit hours.

In the worst case scenario of the new General Education proposal, there would only be at most 9 credits left for electives: far too few to meet the needs of a diverse student body. Realistically, many students lacking foreign language skills or aptitudes in a few specific disciplines will require about 68 hours or more to fulfill the new general education mandates. Thus, to go beyond just general education requirements and a minimal major would add financial burdens or unreasonably packed schedules for many students. (Note that, already in the current situation, an average of over 15 credit hours must be completed per semester in order to graduate in four years.)

Introduction of a cap on the maximum number of required general education credits would be in the same spirit as our current 36-hour option in almost every major. Both facilitate an adequate choice of electives and options for minors, needed to accommodate the diverse interests of our students.

Rationale for the second mandate: This concern has been raised several times on this floor, and it is not addressed in the proposal. For our large number of transfer students, the issues raised in the rationale for the first mandate are even more severe. This is an important problem and I do not believe that it can be left be worked out by a future committee after a new general education plan is in place.

Context for the third mandate: I speak both as a senator and a member of the Budget Committee, where I already voiced my concerns. The set of motions, of which the currently discussed motion is a part, includes a proposal that Communication Intensive Courses be staffed at a different funding level than any other area of general education. (The Freshman Seminar not being a distinct "area" of general education.) The following three conditions are proposed for
Communication Intensive Courses (and uniquely for such courses): 1. Caps of 20 students per section, 2. A guarantee to departments that offer Communication Intensive Courses to not be penalized for the small FTEs; 3. Faculty lines be allocated at the rate of one for a full-time load of 60 students per semester (i.e. three such sections). The last condition appears in the budget section of the proposal.

The issues I would like to be addressed are:

1. Why should Communication Intensive Courses be funded at a different level from other general education courses? Though some Communication Intensive Courses (e.g. writing intensive courses) carry a heavier load for the instructor, others, for example speaking intensive courses or possibly communication intensive courses in the major, might carry a teaching load lighter than average.

2. Several other general education areas would equally benefit from these conditions, for example language courses. Why was no other area identified for this differential treatment?

3. As, regrettably, a finite amount of funds is available, committing half a million dollars to one area of general education would occur at the expense of other areas, or cause further increase in students' tuition. Either way, the proposed allocation is inequitable.

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone ruled Ms. Calini’s motion out of order, stating that the task she wanted the Ad-Hoc Committee to accomplish was impossible because the Committee could not guarantee the requirements of Mandate 1 (to guarantee a maximum number of general education credits not significantly above the current 56) by re-considering only the communication-intensive part of the proposal. The number of hours that the Committee calculated would be necessary for students to meet these new General Education requirements is based on the entire proposal—for instance, extra hours are added in science and potentially in foreign language later in the document.

Darryl Phillips (At-Large, Classics) raised a point of order, stating that it should be acceptable to refer a pending motion back to the committee that brought it forth. Mr. Phillips then challenged Mr. Mignone’s out-of-order ruling. The challenge was seconded and the Senate then began to debate the merits of the challenge.

Scott Peeples (English) spoke in favor of Mr. Mignone’s ruling, arguing that only Mandate 3 of Ms. Calini’s motion deals with the pending motion (the communication-intensive portion of the proposal). The other two mandates, he argued, deal with the entire package. Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) disagreed, arguing that the hours from the other parts of the proposal have not been added yet, thus we should ignore them. Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) said that, because the proposal involves a lot of effort that was sincerely made, the Senate has the responsibility to try to evaluate the proposal itself in good faith. He reminded Senators that there are a series of amendments
before the Senate that might alter the document quite a bit. What Ms. Calini’s motion asks us to do, he argued, is excuse the Senate from doing our homework on this proposal.

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) said that Ms. Calini’s motion brings up important issues, but she argued this was not the time to deal with them. She suggested that maybe these mandates could be sent to a new General Education Committee if one is formed. Melissa Hughes (Biology) spoke in favor of the challenge, arguing that, if we were in a normal Senate meeting and a proposal came that had this many questions associated with it, we’d send it back. Larry Krasnoff (guest, Philosophy) argued against the Speaker’s ruling, saying that he believed Ms. Calini’s motion was in order because it says “not significantly above 56,” it does not specifically stipulate 56 hours of general education requirements. Mr. Krasnoff said that it may turn out that this motion binds the committee to withdraw some of its other motions that are pending, but that haven’t been discussed yet.

A vote was taken, and Mr. Phillips’ challenge was successful. Mr. Mignone’s out-of-order ruling was overturned, and the Senate returned to a discussion of Ms. Calini’s motion to refer back to committee.

Ms. Eichelberger said that the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education was going to be dissolved very soon. She also said that the current committee would not understand what would constitute satisfying the 3 mandates because, in the view of committee members, the current proposal addresses these issues as much as they feel they can address them. There is a budget and a workload plan already, Ms. Eichelberger said, and the committee already feels their plan is equitable.

Calvin Blackwell then pointed out that, in his view, a problem with the current proposal is that it does not specify what is being replaced. He wondered what it would mean if the Senate voted to approve the foreign language requirement but not the communication-intensive requirement, or if we voted to approve the science courses but not the writing-intensive courses. He wondered what the general education curriculum would look like in such a case. Darryl Phillips spoke in favor of the motion to refer back to committee as well, arguing that a majority vote was needed to send this to committee or to approve or disapprove it. This evidence, he argued, shows that Ms. Calini’s motion is a sincere effort to make the proposal better. He added that Ms. Hughes’ point about the number of questions associated with the proposal and the amount of time we’ve spent on it suggests we’re not dealing with a coherent, well-vetted proposal.

Kay Smith, Associate Vice-President for the Academic Experience, said that she would like to formulate a concrete proposal on how to deal with general education for transfer students. But in some cases, she said, these decisions must be delayed until some sort of curriculum is approved. Her office has to know more fully what they’re dealing with before they can specific make decisions.

Richard Nunan argued that Mr. Blackwell’s point about the proposal not specifying what gets replaced is a red herring because this is a simple matter for the Senate to take care
— in the event that certain parts don’t pass, we could make motions to go back to the status quo, he said. Mr. Nunan added that he thought we should be voting on each motion on its merits instead of engaging in “parliamentary shenanigans” to get rid of the whole thing. He referred to a statement made by Mr. Phillips earlier, that there would be further motions to refer back to committee on every motion to be introduced. Mr. Nunan argued that this was an attempt to kill the entire proposal rather than discussing its merits.

Paul Young (Mathematics) said that he supported Ms. Calini’s third mandate because he doesn’t think the proposed budget is equitable. Mr. Young said that he was also concerned about the impact on space — where will we get classrooms to teach all the communication-intensive courses that have caps of 20 students, he asked. He suggested a friendly amendment to Ms. Calini’s motion that she also ask the committee to address “budget and space” issues. Ms. Calini accepted this as friendly amendment.

Doryjane Birrer (English) objected to the idea that this proposal is not well thought out or thoroughly vetted. How could the process have been conducted done more thoroughly, she asked. Ms. Birrer also argued against the view that this part of the proposal significantly increases the number of hours associated with general education. We already require a freshman composition course and a literature-based writing course, as the proposal recommends. The third communication-intensive course may be in any discipline, and the fourth would be in the student’s major. These additional requirements are not as constraining as people seem to be claiming they are, she said.

Erin Buetel (Geology) argued that, while each of these sections is really good and well thought-out and brings something wonderful to general education, the problem is that the pieces don’t necessarily all come together as a cohesive whole. Because we are looking at the proposal piecemeal, she said, we can’t discuss certain important things. Those in favor of Ms. Calini’s motion are not trying to derail the proposal, she added.

At this point, Mr. Mignone interceded to remind Senators that someone could move to suspend the rules and consider the entire package as a whole, if he or she wished.

Larry Krasnoff then said that, after having argued that Ms. Calini’s motion was in order, he was going to speak against it. He argued that Ms. Calini’s three different mandates don’t go together. He agreed with Ms. Eichelberger that the Ad-Hoc Committee presumably thinks the budget is already equitable. The way to accomplish this mandate, he said, is to defeat the writing-intensive motion. In addition, he argued that the issue of transfer students has come up in every motion — the Senate has been discussing this issue all along. As for the first mandate, Mr. Krasnoff said he thought it was reasonable to ask for a maximum number of hours across the board. The people who want that mandate in particular should come back with a motion to that effect, he argued. But he urged Senators to vote against Ms. Calini’s motion because it lumps too much together.

Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) spoke in favor of the motion to refer back to committee because she thinks mandates 1 and 3 are very important. Scott Peeples (English) spoke against the motion. First, he said that thinking of the proposal as
requiring a stable number of required hours was misguided. Under the proposal, students would have to go out of their way not to double-dip for credit hours. The plan does not call for \( x \) number of hours, but calls for a different number of hours for different students. Second, Mr. Peeples said that if we send this proposal back, a different committee will consider it. We’ll basically be saying, “we don’t like it, bring us something new,” and we’ll probably say that again when we see a proposal from a new committee. This seems like irresponsible behavior on the part of the Senate.

Reid Wiseman then said he didn’t understand why we should equivocate about 4, 8, or 12 extra hours as if it were a punitive, regressive measure to ask our students to be engaged in more general education. Terry Bowers (English) said that if, at the end of our debate, people think there are real problems that need to be worked out by committee, that would be the time to task the committee with working out more precise details. Ms. Calini’s motion, he argued, short-circuits the process and is ill-timed. We’re not going to get any type of general education reform if we approve motions such as this. Deanna Caveny said that the Senate should be discussing the content of Ms. Calini’s motion and the content of the larger motion from the Ad-Hoc Committee rather than whether this is the proper time for such motions. Everyone here has the appropriate objective of having a better general education proposal, she argued. It is disrespectful of Senators to talk about the motives behind motions. In addition, she said that there would less double-counting available in some majors than in others. Some majors have more hours, a more vertical progression. The Ad-Hoc Committee’s proposal could also harm the many students who come in with AP credit, she argued, because they might not be able to do as much double-counting. Ms. Eichelberger, referring to an earlier comment by Erin Beutel, that the proposal needed to have a consistent vision, argued that the goals approved by the Senate are the vision that has guided the committee.

Calvin Blackwell then moved to suspend the rules and consider the entire package all at once. (A motion to suspend the rules requires a 2/3 super-majority vote.) A vote was taken, and the Senate did not vote to suspend the rules.

Deanna Caveny then called the question on Ms. Calini’s motion to refer back to committee. The Senate approved calling the question. Ms. Calini’s motion failed.

Discussions then turned back to the main motion concerning Goal I.2. Richard Nunan said that one thing that he’s noticed about this motion is that there’s an assumption among Senators that students would satisfy these requirements early in their careers. This may be true for freshman composition, he said, and it used to be true for English 102. He then asked whether English 102 would continue to exist under this proposal. Ms. Eichelberger said that English 102 is not a requirement of this proposal. Currently, English 101 could most likely satisfy the proposal’s freshman composition requirement. English 102 would probably not continue to be offered because it would not precisely fit the way the new writing and literature course is proposed. Under this proposal, every department could reassess their own courses, put them forward to count. The English Department, might, for instance, go to topical literature courses rather than English 102. That’s a decision the English Department will have to make. Mr. Nunan said that the fact
that this course might be effectively replacing English 102 could be a convincing argument to the administration to keep a 20-student cap on it. But he said that the same argument couldn’t be made to the administration about having a 20-student cap for a speaking-intensive course. He worries that this will be too expensive, so we’ll wind up counting courses that have some writing or speaking component in them now for the other required courses in this part of the proposal. In that case, we would be creating a rather large bureaucracy for no great outcome. Ms. Eichelberger said that many other universities that have similar communication-intensive requirements do offer a large number of courses across disciplines. Currently, about 50% of students already take a public speaking class. So this might not be as expensive or difficult to implement as it might seem. In addition, if a requirement turns into an unfunded mandate, a future General Education Committee could alter such a requirement.

Darryl Phillips then proposed a friendly amendment, which was accepted, to insert the words “which will replace the current requirement for English 101 and 102” in number 3 on p. 19 of the Proposal. The sentence will now read:

3. The four required communication-intensive courses, which will replace the current requirement for English 101 and 102, must including the following.

Erin Beutel (Geology) said that she was concerned that certain classes that have a great amount of content cannot meet the requirements to be writing-intensive courses, if these requirements include significant revision and that a significant part of the grade be based on writing. Ms. Eichelberger replied that the Proposal doesn’t spell out precise requirements for Communication Across the Curriculum; these will be developed later and will be brought to the Senate for approval by a CAC Committee. In addition, she said that the communication-intensive requirement in the major needn’t be met by a single course. It can be met by an instructional sequence that spans a number of courses.

Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance), responding to a comment made by Mr. Nunan earlier about parliamentary shenanigans, said that if he has a problem with this proposal, it’s his obligation to use every tool to get the proposal he thinks is best, so he will continue to use parliamentary tactics to do so. He added that, in his view, the proposal could be simpler. Why not just keep English 101 and 102, he asked, and then have students take another writing-intensive course and another communication-intensive course. He doesn’t like the idea of telling departments what to do in their majors. An overly complicated general education requirement that forces students to come to advisors for help figuring it out does not foster independence. The details of this proposal are bad, he said.

Darryl Phillips then argued that this proposal actually reduces the writing requirements placed on freshman when a problem is that freshman don’t write often enough. He would like to see two writing-intensive courses required during the freshman year. Mike Duvall (English), pointing out that he was the one that had pulled up the responses of CofC students on a national survey at a prior meeting, said that data showed that CofC seniors, compared to seniors at other colleges, reported an even lower number of writing
assignments and reported feeling even less challenged by their coursework than CofC freshmen did, when compared with freshmen at other institutions. This proposal, he argued, spreads writing instruction out over the freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior years. In addition, there is flexibility in the proposal in terms of an instructional sequence that can be used to fill the writing-intensive requirement within majors. Mr. Duvall added that he’s worked in Writing-Across-the-Curriculum programs at other schools—the writing done in disciplines in such programs is completely driven by course content, he said. Such programs work well at other places.

Pete Calcagno (Economics/Finance) said that we keep referring to peer institutions and what’s being done elsewhere. He likes the idea of writing-intensive courses, but he wondered whether the peer institutions have English 101 and 102 and another writing-intensive course or some other model. Ms. Eichelberger replied that many different models are used at other schools. Some have a single freshman writing class, then a junior-level writing-intensive class in the major. Some have more than one WI course for freshmen; some have more than one course after freshman year. There is not a single model that is used more than another. But the thinking behind these programs is that students gain more by having writing instruction spread out over their college careers.

Scott Peeples (English) said that what we have in the proposal now is is pretty simple: a freshman composition course, a writing-intensive literature course, a speaking-intensive course, and a communication-intensive course in the major. Ms. Eichelberger said that Mr. Peeples was almost right. But if a student had a speaking-intensive course in the major, then a third course could be writing-intensive.

Jack Parson (Political Science) asked if the writing-intensive literature course in the Proposal is equivalent to English 102. He asked, as well, whether this course would have to be offered in a department that does literary studies. Ms. Eichelberger replied that any department could propose such a course, but it would most likely be a literature department that would do so. Carol Toris (Psychology) asked if all four communication-intensive courses would consist of 3 credit hours. Ms. Eichelberger said that the course in the major doesn’t have credit hours attached to it, but that the other three would be 3 credit hour courses. Pete Calcagno asked whether students taking only English 101 and another writing-intensive course would be fully prepared to take upper-level English courses without having had English 102. Ms. Eichelberger said the writing-intensive literature course in the proposal would take the place of English 102, and that the English Department would have to decide what prerequisites to install for their 300-level courses.

Paul Young then moved to amend the motion by eliminating number 3e on p. 19. Hugh Wilder added a friendly amendment to remove number 3f as well. The requirements that would be eliminated under Mr. Young’s amendment read as follows:

e. A fourth approved communication-intensive class or instructional sequence within the major. If departments choose, this course or sequence may be the same as the one in which students receive instruction in gathering and using information in the major (described in Proposal I.1).
f. An “instructional sequence” within a major may be composed of multiple courses that provide sufficient communication instruction to the student who takes them all. A set of linked courses (such as a Learning Community or a minor) may also be classified as communication-intensive if the combined courses provide enough instruction to satisfy the criteria.

Doryjane Birrer (English) said that she was “stymied” as to why we would want to decrease the chances that our students leave with effective writing skills by removing a requirement that writing be done in the discipline, especially in light of Mr. Duvall’s sharing of the statistics that seniors are even less challenged in terms of their writing than other students at the College are. David Gentry (At-Large, Psychology) said that some of the reasons for this amendment might be that majors do not have sufficient time to fill the requirement, that courses are overly full, and that the requirement might require substantive changes in the major.

Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) said that what her department does in terms of writing might be substantively different from what a CAC Committee might want. The content in Mathematics is so dense that students are not going to be writing five-page papers, but half-page proofs, and the revising process might be different as well. The problem, she argued, is that the details of what counts as writing-intensive aren’t in the proposal. She said she feels her students write a lot, but that their writing looks different from writing done in other disciplines. Ms. Eichelberger said that criteria would be developed so that every discipline would work with writing as it exists in their discipline. In addition, a committee would have to come back with criteria for Senate approval.

Mr. Young said that his main reason for moving to delete 3e is because he doesn’t want this committee—which doesn’t yet exist—to have power over what courses are taught in majors. He doesn’t want to be put in a position where he can’t teach 30 students in a class and has to tell 10 of them “to take a hike.” Ms. Eichelberger said that the cap of 20 students in communication-intensive courses doesn’t apply to the requirement within majors. Mr. Young said that he believes it does, according to his reading of the document. Norine Noonan, Dean of the School of Science and Mathematics, said that she thinks this requirement is somewhat deterministic. It assumes the majors don’t know what they’re doing. The proof, she argued, is “in the pudding”—do our graduates get jobs, are they successful in professional schools? If that’s happening, we don’t need to revisit our requirements. She said she doesn’t want to institute a requirement where others have power over majors.

Doryjane Birrer said that, while she can’t speak to all possible permutations of communication-intensive courses in majors, she previously taught at an institution with requirements similar to those being proposed here. The job of Communication-Across-the-Curriculum programs is to work with departments to develop writing assignments that are geared toward integrating course content. This doesn’t necessarily mean long assignments. Revising can be done on short pieces as well as long pieces.
At this point, a vote was taken on Mr. Young’s amendment. The Senate voted in favor of the amendment.

Richard Nunan then moved to amend section 3c of the Proposal by removing the language in red:

… Courses must also explore a significant quantity of literary works (at least five full-length prose works or three volumes of verse), must analyze ways these texts employ language imaginatively and artistically to create multiple levels of meaning, and must explore the ways some of these texts have been interpreted by literary critics.

Mr. Nunan reminded Senators that he had made an earlier amendment to move 3c to a different part of the proposal. That amendment failed, so the literature requirement is staying in the communication-intensive part of the Proposal. He said if the idea is to encourage departments other than English to teach literature in a writing-intensive way and make such courses available to students, he doesn’t want to preclude other departments from using their own disciplinary approach rather than literary theory. Paul Young said that a problem with this course is that what counts as literature is encoded in this document while committees will determine what counts as writing-intensive and speaking-intensive. Larry Krasnoff (guest, Philosophy) then asked whether students currently are required to read criticism in English 102. Ms. Eichelberger said “yes,” although she added that “there’s criticism and there’s criticism.” She would never have her English 102 students read Derrida, for instance, but they might read an interpretation of a story or a play. Kay Smith said that there seems to be a difference between using literature to teach something else like political theory and using literature to teach literature. Mark Long (Political Science) then asked whether the proposed course was about literature or about writing. Ms. Eichelberger replied that it’s a course that studies literature and writing. Jim Newhard (Classics) spoke in favor of the amendment, saying that even within one department, people have different focuses in teaching literature. Larry Krasnoff spoke in favor of the amendment as well. He said that it would be a problem if this requirement is taken so seriously so that a course like a political science course on utopian literature wouldn’t be allowed (such a course, he acknowledged, is taught by his wife). There are plenty of courses in an English Department, he argued, that take a cultural studies approach that wouldn’t count either, under the present language.

Discussion ended, and the Senate voted to approve Mr. Nunan’s amendment.

The Senate returned to discussion of the main motion as amended. Hugh Wilder suggested some further minor changes in the motion for consistency (these changes are reflected in Appendix 1, where the entire amended motion is reproduced).

Darryl Phillips asked that the entire motion as amended be read out loud. This was done, and Senators were assured that the amended motion would be posted to the Senate website.
Calvin Blackwell then moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion to adjourn failed. Several Senators then called for a quorum count. It was determined that the Senate had a quorum.

Darryl Phillips then argued that the entire motion that we’d been debating (concerning Goal I.2) was out of order. Robert’s Rules says this qualifies as, technically, an “absurd motion,” Mr. Phillips argued, because we’re referring something to a committee that does not exist. Mr. Mignone ruled against Mr. Phillips’ point-of-order, stating that he would interpret the main motion as being in order. Mr. Phillips then challenged the Speaker’s ruling. Larry Krasnoff argued against the challenge, saying that this kind of challenge would be crippling to the entire General Education reform process. He urged Senators to defeat it. Mr. Phillips said that if this motion is ruled out of order, as he believes it is, we could defer the work we’ve already done on it, and remove a formal vote from the process until later when we form a CAC committee.

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) argued that if we wait much longer to vote, we’ll forget what we decided. We should vote now before we lose a quorum, she said. She then called the question on Mr. Phillips’ challenge. The Senate voted in favor of calling the question. Mr. Phillips’s challenge was defeated.

At this point, because a few additional Senators had left, there were calls for another quorum count. The Speaker determined that the Senate no longer had a quorum, and the meeting was adjourned.
Appendix 1.

General Education Motion Concerning Goal I.2: “Effective writing and critical reading; oral and visual communication”

Please note that this version of the motion reflects all amendments as of April 27, 2007.

--Postponed items appear in blue (these items address the formation of a CAC Committee and have been postponed until the end of the agenda, when the Senate discusses the formation of a General Education Committee.

--Added items appear in red.

--Deleted items have been struck through.

1.2a. The General Education Committee proposes the following as the defining characteristics of the second sub-goal.

**Effective writing and critical reading; oral and visual communication**

a. Students should be able to
   - Understand, analyze, and interpret intellectually challenging written texts and oral and visual presentations
   - Use writing and speaking to increase their own understanding of a topic and to communicate their point of view persuasively
   - Strengthen written and spoken work through the process of drafting, revising, and editing
   - Create formal papers and public presentations that are appropriate for the situation and audience
   - Produce well-organized papers and public presentations that convey substantive information and that conform to the conventions of edited American English
   - Interpret visual images and employ images to communicate ideas and concepts

b. Students should complete rigorous writing and speaking assignments and receive significant feedback on their work in first-year courses and in other courses throughout their college career.

1.2b. The Committee proposes the formation of a faculty committee, known as the Communication Across the Curriculum Committee, to oversee this aspect of general education. This committee will be a subcommittee of the General Education Committee (see “Committee Proposal”).

1. Composition of the committee: 5 voting faculty. 3 are also members of the General Education committee; 2 are the chairs (or chairs’ designees) of the departments of English and Communication.

2. A Director (or co-directors) of Communication Across the Curriculum, appointed by the Provost, will serve as a non-voting, ex officio member of the committee. The director or directors must possess appropriate expertise in communication instruction and must be teaching writing-intensive or speaking-intensive courses.

3. Duties of the committee:
   a. Evaluate requests to designate a course or sequence as writing intensive (WI) or speaking intensive (SI).
   b. Initiate, review and recommend changes to CAC policies and programs.
   c. Work with the Assessment Committee and Office of Assessment to assess CAC program.
   d. Support and advise the Director of CAC in training faculty who teach writing-
intensive (WI) and speaking-intensive (SI) courses, in guiding student mentors assigned to WI and SI courses, and in other areas of CAC administration.

4. The Committee will forward all recommendations for course designations and for changes to the CAC program to the General Education committee and to the Faculty Senate.

1.2c The Committee proposes that each student be required to complete four three communication-intensive courses or instructional sequences, as described below, to meet this sub-goal.

1. The CAC committee will use the defining characteristics of “effective writing and critical reading; oral and visual communication” (proposal 1.2a) to evaluate course proposals for writing-intensive (WI) and speaking-intensive (SI) courses. Since these criteria are still very general, the CAC committee will also develop more detailed criteria for WI and SI courses, according to the following suggested guidelines. These criteria must be approved by the General Education Committee and by the Faculty Senate.

   a. Assignments in WI or SI courses shall require students to demonstrate understanding of the course content and/or academic research; all such assignments have the dual goals of improving the students’ communication skills and of advancing the other learning objectives of the course.

   b. Students must generate a significant quantity of written communication or oral/visual communication. The amount of writing or speaking will be determined and published by the CAC committee.

   c. A WI- or SI-designated course must include several opportunities for individualized feedback by the instructor and revision by the student. Some of the writing or speaking may be informal in nature, but at least half of the assignments should be presented formally, in accordance with the conventions of an academic discipline, and/or in a format suitable for an academic or professional audience.

   d. A significant portion of the course grade (to be determined by the CAC committee) must be based on the quality of the student’s work in either writing or speaking.

2. Once these criteria have been established, courses may be approved as WI or SI if their department demonstrates that they meet the criteria. Departments will submit proposals for individual courses to the CAC committee, furnishing course descriptions and other evidence that this course meets the criteria.

3. The four three required communication-intensive courses, which will replace the current requirement for English 101 and 102, must include the following.

   a. During the student’s first year, one composition course (a writing-intensive course devoted to academic writing).

   b. At least one speaking-intensive course, which may also be a literature course (described in c, below) or a course in the student’s major.

   c. One course in literature, a rich and creative form of verbal communication. Courses satisfying this requirement must also be either writing-intensive or speaking intensive. Courses must also explore a significant quantity of literary works (at least five full-length prose works or three volumes of verse), must analyze ways these texts employ language imaginatively and artistically to create multiple levels of meaning, and must explore the ways some of these texts have been interpreted by literary critics. Departments wishing to have courses approved for satisfying this requirement will
submit proposals to the CAC committee, furnishing course descriptions and other evidence that the course fulfills these criteria for a literature course as well as the criteria for a communication-intensive course.

d. A third approved communication-intensive class in any discipline.

e. A fourth approved communication-intensive class or instructional sequence within the major. If departments choose, this course or sequence may be the same as the one in which students receive instruction in gathering and using information in the major (described in Proposal I.1).

f. An “instructional sequence” within a major may be composed of multiple courses that provide sufficient communication instruction to the student who takes them all. A set of linked courses (such as a Learning Community or a minor) may also be classified as communication-intensive if the combined courses provide enough instruction to satisfy the criteria.

g. Communication instruction within the major should include both writing and speaking instruction, although a department may emphasize one mode more than another.

4. Students may select two to four examples of work completed in these required courses to be uploaded within their online record (as described in “Online Record Proposal”). These work samples may be used for institutional assessment, and students may choose to display them when applying for employment or graduate school admission.

5. Writing- or speaking-intensive classes will have no more than 20 students, and departments offering such courses shall not be penalized for any adverse impact on their department’s Delaware Study target number. If a communication-intensive sequence is designed by a major department, the caps of 20 are not required for all courses in the sequence.

6. A course’s designation as WI or SI is dependent on the faculty member who teaches it as well as on its curriculum. For a section of a course to be so designated, its instructor must undergo formal training in communication instruction. If a previously approved WI or SI course is later taught by another faculty member who has not received this training, that faculty member’s sections of the course will not satisfy a communication-intensive requirement.

7. Formal training in communication instruction for approved courses will be offered at a time convenient to faculty members (either during a summer institute or at some other convenient time), and faculty completing this training will receive a stipend for their time.

8. The College will provide additional support for faculty who teach WI and SI courses, such as pedagogical workshops during the academic year and, when appropriate, student mentors trained to provide supplemental instruction in particular courses.

Rationale: This new requirement recognizes that students need a higher level of research and communication skills than they can acquire through the current writing requirement (English 101 and 102 in the first year). The Ad Hoc Committee has heard this need expressed repeatedly by individual departments, by faculty participating in the 2005 Faculty Forum, and at many other meetings across campus. There is a clear consensus that many College of Charleston students still need further instruction in research, writing and speaking by the time they enroll in upper-level courses.
The present requirement of English 101 and 102, which focuses mainly on writing and not speaking, and which “front-loads” communication instruction in the first year, cannot equip students with all the communication skills that they will need throughout college. Confining such instruction to a single department makes the problem worse, since students may construe writing and speaking as minimal, quantifiable skills (an ability to proofread written work, a willingness to speak in public) that they should “get out of the way” and never develop further. However, writing and speaking are complex intellectual tasks that require students to deploy many different skills at once. The more complex the course material becomes, the more challenging, and the more dependent on disciplinary conventions, the communication becomes. Interpreting aural and visual information also becomes more challenging as a student attempts to navigate more complex information and concepts.

Students will learn and retain more of a course’s content through doing more and better writing and speaking on this material; moreover, students who do more of this writing and speaking over their whole college career will have more lasting, or “transferable,” abilities and intellectual perspectives after they finish here. Strong communication skills are a hallmark of a liberal arts and sciences education, and they make our graduates more effective in absolutely any field.

While some departments are already delivering excellent research and communication instruction to their majors and in their General Education courses, other faculty are less familiar with teaching these skills and may not yet be able to deliver this labor-intensive instruction alongside other teaching demands. Therefore we recognize that the following requirements can only be implemented over a period of time and that they will be more expensive to staff. We recommend forming a CAC committee as soon as possible to develop a strategic plan for developing and approving communication-intensive courses.
Minutes of the Spring 2007 Faculty Meeting

The faculty met on Monday, April 23, 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Physicians Auditorium. Speaker Bob Mignone called the meeting to order, and the minutes from the Fall, 2006 meeting of the faculty were approved.

Reports

The President/The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens reported to the faculty that President Benson was sick and that she would deliver remarks in his stead. She said that she hoped many faculty members were able to join a group on the Cistern for a moment of silence in recognition of the recent tragedy at Virginia Tech. She said that the administration understands that a college campus must be a safe environment for learning, and she finds it terribly appalling when she hears arguments that faculty should be armed. Arms, she asserted, don’t belong anywhere in an environment that’s an open one for discussion and dialogue. Provost Jorgens reassured faculty members that CofC is as well-prepared as it can be for eventualities such as the shooting at Virginia Tech. Such events carry a certain unpredictability no one can protect against, but a task force has been formed to continue to investigate these matters and to make sure the campus is as safe as possible.

Next, the Provost provided some news on faculty salaries, reporting that the state House and Senate finance committees approved a 3% increase in state employees’ salaries, which is the same increase approved last year. They also provided 38.5 million dollars for growth in employee health insurance programs, so there will be no increase in employee premiums. To assist in funding retirement benefits, however, employers will have to contribute more. Mr. Benson, she added, is committed to reviewing faculty salaries with a view to increasing them via some kind of merit increase rather than across-the-board raises.

Ms. Jorgens also reported on several building projects at the College. Last Friday, the College celebrated the opening of its brand-new Education Building. The Simons Center addition is going up as well and the new basketball arena is underway. Finally, the College has good, solid plans to start the new Science Center in early September of 2007.

The Provost then briefly discussed general education reform at the College. She reminded faculty that when we launched our general education revision, she had a few significant goals in mind: 1) that faculty would have a good idea about what the goals of the general education program are; 2) that these goals should be communicated to students both in the catalogue and from professors. Ms. Jorgens said it was important that students know why they are taking required courses. She wants to avoid student and faculty apathy regarding general education. She added that a strong general education curriculum is essential to our identity as a national liberal arts and sciences institution. She understands that much discussion and some tweaking of the proposal currently on the Senate floor will be necessary—that’s natural. She urged faculty members to take part in
this discussion and said that she hopes we get a new general education curriculum in place as soon as possible.

Finally, Ms. Jorgens thanked all those who participated in the recent SACS review, which went extremely well. The SACS committee recommended that we get an assessment of general education in place. The only other recommendation related to the fact that the College had not notified SACS of a new master’s program in time. We received no sanctions on the QEP plan, an amazing achievement. The Provost also thanked Conrad Festa for his service as interim president. She thanked the faculty for our continued hard work and commitment. She said we were off to an excellent start with our new president, Mr. Benson, and that next year should be very exciting.

**Awards of Distinction**

The Provost then announced the 2007 faculty awards of distinction. She honored the recipients of these awards with the following remarks:

**Distinguished Teaching Award—Terry Richardson**

The recipient of the Distinguished Teaching Award “personifies and conveys to students the ideals historically associated with liberal education . . . integrity, curiosity, breadth of knowledge, analytic and synthetic thinking, respect for views of others, and critically examined set of personal values.”

He believes in the importance of teaching scientific reasoning, and to that end he deploys an astonishing number and variety of methods, for instance, the “critical thinking failure of the day.” Other examples include cartoons, real-world applications of scientific principles, and analysis of "evidence" using photographs of tomatoes from his own garden. He further demystifies his demonstrations and experiments by using household objects in place of technical equipment.

He has been a full-time faculty member at the College of Charleston since 1981, has taught 25 different courses, from the introductory level on up, and recently worked with graduate students from the University of South Carolina on a research project involving telescope lens development. In undergraduate work, he focuses especially on what he calls “algebra based physics”—i.e., physics for students who don’t know calculus. Those students make up a very tough audience, and he does wonders with them. Even students who have taken his courses simply to fill a requirement write to him, sometimes years later, to express their thanks for major changes in their thinking. He currently holds the William Marion Mebane Distinguished Teaching Chair.

In the community, he showcases a very human side of science. Hundreds of Charleston area residents have had their first introduction to meteor showers through his viewing sessions or viewed eclipses through his own telescope set up in their neighborhood. Schools, too, have benefited from his visits and advice. His dean describes him as “a great ‘public face’ for the College.” His department chair calls him “a consummate
science educator.” The selection committee unanimously agreed that Terry Richardson of the Physics Department fully deserves the College of Charleston’s highest teaching honor.

Distinguished Research Award—Paul Allen

The recipient of the Distinguished Research Award has a career distinguished by its vast number of publications, by its ongoing productivity and creativity, and by the many accolades it has garnered.

He has produced over 50 published poems in well-regarded literary journals. His book publications include the award-winning collection American Crawl (Vassar Miller Prize), the chapbook His Longing, and the forthcoming Ground Forces, due out in 2008. His work has been reprinted in nine anthologies.

In the past several years, he has made a name in a new field of creative expression as a songwriter and performer. His many invitations to perform his work, including most notably his 2005 appearance at The Millennium Stage of The Kennedy Center, indicate the broad appeal of his work in this new area of creative "research."

Other poets speak highly of his work, remarking especially upon the breadth of its emotional and intellectual range. Sydney Lea writes, "I know of no contemporary who could manage self-effacement, humor, ribaldry and genuine spiritual seeking all in the same compass as this writer so brilliantly does."

Paul Allen’s career at the College of Charleston exemplifies the very sort of achievement that the Distinguished Research Award was designed to honor.

Distinguished Service Award—Jack Parson

The recipient of the 2007 Distinguished Service Award has devoted 27 years of service to the College of Charleston. During this time he has held both a faculty position and administrative posts. He has served on numerous committees and task forces, represented the faculty in the Faculty Senate and has taught in the Study Abroad program. His many contributions to the College and to the academic community at large include serving as Director of the Institute for Public Affairs and Policy Studies (now the Riley Institute), Speaker of the Faculty, chair of the Political Science Department, director of the African Studies program, and Founder & Director of the Office of International Education. He also founded and participated in the planning of the College’s Model United Nations Conference, now in its second year, and has served as an officer or member of the National Board of Directors of the African Studies Association. As his chair states in his nominating letter, “Jack serves as a role model for the ethos of ‘living service’ as a professional responsibility.” The 2007 award for Distinguished Service goes to Jack Parson.
Distinguished Advising Award

Our Distinguished Advising Award recipient has played a fundamental advising role from the general education level through his department’s major and senior capstone experience. He has served as both a guide to our students and a standards-bearer for his department.

Each semester, he handles hundreds of requests from students, mostly for placement advice, pre-requisite and placement overrides, or transfer evaluations. In spite of a steady stream of such requests, he handles each as if it were his first and individualizes it, taking into account many factors about the student and then explaining his recommendations. Recognizing that placement is a difficult and inexact “science” and wanting to have confidence in the guidelines, he assessed student success rates relative to placement data, so the department could fine-tune its recommendations. He has also worked with other faculty to ensure that the pre-requisite courses serve students well in both content and level of difficulty. In evaluating students’ work for capstone credit, he is meticulous, often going through several careful readings of the proposal and final product, giving detailed advice to ensure that our student projects and final papers are something of which the students and our department can be proud. Regardless of whether the news he is delivering to a student is good or bad, he performs his duties with a firm but gentle and caring manner, giving each student the time, respect, and attention that he or she deserves. For this, the College is recognizing Professor Tom Kunkle of the Math Department with the 2007 Distinguished Advising Award.

Distinguished Teacher-Scholar Award—Simon Lewis

The recipient of the 2007 Distinguished Teacher-Scholar Award earned B.A. and M.A. degrees from Oxford University, an M.A. degree from the University of South Carolina, and a Ph.D. from the University of Florida, all in English Literature. Growing up in South Africa and studying in England prepared him well for his primary teaching and research areas in the field of world literature. Since coming to the College in 1996, he has offered eight different classes that look at non-western literature and culture from a postcolonial perspective. A colleague notes that the recipient’s research and teaching are virtually inseparable and energize each other in ways that create what might be called “the electricity of learning” in the classroom. In addition to classroom teaching, he has directed numerous independent studies, bachelor’s essays and master’s theses.

A colleague writes, “What distinguishes both his teaching and scholarship is his probing critical mind, which does not accept at face value the many presumed “truths” that characterize most postcolonial theory and criticism, particularly about African literature.” He invariably provides fresh ways of understanding postcolonial literature----quite evident is his first book, White Women Writers and Their African Invention. A summary statement in a review of his book in Choice notes the book’s accessibility to students as well as to scholars. His numerous publications have appeared in journals all over the world. He directs the Program in the Carolina Lowcountry and Atlantic World and edits its literary journal Illuminations.
I am pleased to announce the Distinguished Teacher-Scholar recipient: Professor Simon K. Lewis of the English Department.

Emeritus and Retiring Faculty

The Provost then recognized several faculty members who were retiring from the College of Charleston. These included:

Samuel M. Hines, who has been at the College of Charleston since 1973, and who is moving down the street to become Provost at The Citadel. He will be recognized at a special reception in Alumni Hall from 4:00 to 6:00 pm on Thursday, May 10th.


Jung-fang Tsai, Professor of History from 1976-2007.

J. Fred Watts, Professor of Physics, who retired in December after 36 years of service.


Elizabeth M. Martin, Associate Professor of Chemistry from 1975-2007.

Paige Wisotzka, Associate Professor of French with 24 years of service.

Deborah Euland, Senior Instructor of Foundations, Secondary and Special Education with 18 years of service.

The Speaker

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone then delivered what would be his last report as Speaker. He began by thanking the Faculty Secretary (Susan Farrell), the Senate Parliamentarian (George Pothering), and the Senate Webmaster (Deb Vaughn). He also thanked Bertie Mack for managing the secretariat’s office. Mr. Mignone then said he wanted to single out a few committee chairpersons who had done a tremendous job during the previous year—Michael Phillips for modernizing the Senate election process, Brian McGee for undertaking major updates to the Faculty Administration Manual, Jane Clary for her committee’s taking the initiative to improve the T&P process, and Julia Eichelberger for her 3-year effort to overhaul general education.

Mr. Mignone ended his report by noting that shared governance between the faculty and administration is the key to our success at the College. He urged faculty members to continue to bring our perspectives out of our offices and classrooms and into the college as a whole.
New Business

Nominations and Elections Committee—Election of Faculty Committees

Mr. Mignone recognized Michael Phillips, Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, who noted that all committee slates had been circulated. The faculty approved the slates submitted by the Nominations Committee. Please see Appendix 1 for a complete list of new committee members.

The President: Approval of Degree Candidates

Because of the President’s illness, Provost Jorgens presented the degree candidates in his place. The faculty approved the 2007 degree candidates. Ms. Jorgens then gave a special thanks to Bob Mignone. She said it had been a distinct pleasure to work with both Mr. Mignone and Hugh Wilder, his predecessor as Speaker of the Faculty. She said she very much appreciated the work that they had done.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by
Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix 1

2007-2008 Committee Rosters

Faculty Senate Committees (* incumbent)

**Academic Planning**- 7 (at least 4 senators)
Erica Artiles, Assistant Professor, English
Linda Fitzharris, Associate Professor, Elementary & Early Childhood, Senator
Douglas Friedman, Associate Professor, Political Science
Todd Mc Nerney*, Associate Professor, Theatre, Senator
Scott Peeples*, Associate Professor, English, Senator
Howard Rudd, Professor, Management & Entrepreneurship
Paul Young, Professor, Mathematics, Senator

**Budget**- 7 (at least 4 senators)
Scooter Barnette, Senior Instructor, PE & Health, Senator
Michael England, Senior Instructor, Mathematics, Senator
Anthony Leclerc, Associate Professor, Computer Science
Bing Pan, Assistant Professor, Hospitality & Tourism
Darryl Phillips, Associate Professor, Classics, Senator
Norris Preyer, Associate Professor, Physics/ Astronomy, Senator
Vijay Vulava, Assistant Professor, Geology and Environmental Geosciences

**Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual**- 3 (at least 2 senators)
David Gentry, Professor, Psychology, Senator
Brian McGee*, Associate Professor, Communication
C. Michael Phillips, Librarian III, Senator

Faculty Committees (* incumbent)

**Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid**- 7
Barbara Borg, Associate Professor, Sociology/Anthropology
James Deavor, Professor, Biochemistry/Chemistry
Chris Korey*, Assistant Professor, Biology
Larry Krasnoff*, Associate Professor, Philosophy
George Pothering*, Professor, Computer Science
James Ward, Assistant Professor, Art History
Chris Warnick, Assistant Professor, English

**Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness**- 9
Julia Blose, Associate Professor, Marketing & Supply Chain Management
Burton Callicott*, Librarian II
Roxane DeLaurell, Assistant Professor, Accounting/Legal Studies
Kara Hammond, Assistant Professor, Studio Arts
Caroline Hunt*, Professor, English  
Christine Moore, Senior Instructor, Computer Science  
Karen Smail, Assistant Professor, PE & Health  
Parissa Tadrissi, Assistant Professor, Hispanic Studies  
William Veal*, Assistant Professor, Elementary & Early Childhood  

**Bookstore Council-1**  
Richard Voorneveld, Associate Professor, Foundations, Secondary & Special  

**Compensation-7**  
Calvin Blackwell, Associate Professor, Economics/Finance  
William Danaher, Associate Professor, Sociology/Anthropology  
Michelle Futrell, Senior Instructor, PE & Health  
Anthony Harold, Associate Professor, Biology  
Laura Turner, Associate Professor, Theatre  
Katherine White, Assistant Professor, Psychology  
Hugh Wilder, Professor, Philosophy  

**Curriculum Committee-9**  
John Bruns, Assistant Professor, English  
Timothy Callahan*, Assistant Professor, Geology and Environmental Geosciences  
Edith Ellis, Assistant Professor, PE & Health  
Sara Frankel, Assistant Professor, Studio Arts  
Gerald Gonsalves*, Assistant Professor, Management & Entrepreneurship  
Katherine Johnston-Thom, Professor, Mathematics  
Nancy Nenno, Associate Professor, German and Slavic Studies  
Bob Perkins, Associate Professor, Foundations, Secondary & Special  
Thomas Ross, Associate Professor, Psychology  

**Educational Technology-7** (no more than 2 from one department)  
Lancie Affonso, Instructor, Computer Science  
Jarod Charzewski, Assistant Professor, Studio Arts  
Maria Colomina-Garrigos, Assistant Professor, Hispanic Studies  
Jannette Finch*, Librarian II  
Mark Hurd*, Associate Professor, Psychology  
Debby Jeter, Senior Instructor, Mathematics  
Michael Reardon, Assistant Professor, Communication  

**Faculty Advisory Committee to the President-11**  
Steven Arsenault, Associate Professor, Accounting/Legal Studies  
Matthew Canepa, Assistant Professor, Art History  
Jason Coy, Assistant Professor, History  
Heath Hoffmann, Assistant Professor, Sociology/Anthropology  
Claudia Moran, Instructor, Hispanic Studies  
James Newhard, Assistant Professor, Classics  
Gorka Sancho*, Assistant Professor, Biology
Leslie Sautter, Associate Professor, Geology and Environmental Geosciences
Sandra Shields, Associate Professor, Mathematics
Katina Strauch, Librarian IV
Catherine Veninga, Assistant Professor, Political Science

**Faculty Grievance Committee** - 5 regular (3 tenured, 2 not tenured) – 4 alternates (2 tenured, 2 not tenured)
Deborah Boyle, Associate Professor, Philosophy, Tenured
Tim Carmichael, Assistant Professor, History, Non-Tenured
Angela Halfacree, Associate Professor, Political Science, Tenured
Catherine Holmes, Senior Instructor, English, Non-Tenured
Deborah Miller, Professor, PE & Health, Tenured
Alternate: Carla Breidenbach, Assistant Professor, Hispanic Studies, Non-Tenured
Alternate: Tom Heeney, Associate Professor, Communication, Tenured
Alternate: Jess Miner, Assistant Professor, Classics, Non-Tenured
Alternate: Jason Overby, Associate Professor, Biochemistry/Chemistry, Tenured

**Faculty Hearing Committee (all tenured) - 5 regulars** (at least 2 full Prof) - 6 alternates (2 full Prof)
Bill Barfield, Associate Professor, PE & Health
Barbara Duval*, Professor, Studio Arts
Rick Heldrich*, Professor, Biochemistry/Chemistry
Ned Hettinger, Professor, Philosophy
Michael Skinner, Professor, Foundations, Secondary & Special
Alternate: Tessa Garton, Professor, Art History
Alternate: Caroline Hunt, Professor, English
Alternate: Tom Kunkle, Associate Professor, Mathematics
Alternate: Allen Lyndrup, Professor, Theatre
Alternate: Renee McCauley, Associate Professor, Computer Science
Alternate: Frank Morris, Associate Professor, Classics

**Faculty Research and Development**-9
Gary Asleson, Professor, Biochemistry/Chemistry
Peter Calcagno, Associate Professor, Economics/Finance
Tim Carens*, Associate Professor, English
Giovana De Luca, Assistant Professor, Italian
Brenton LeMesurier*, Associate Professor, Mathematics
Clifton Peacock*, Professor, Studio Arts
Scott Poole, Assistant Professor, History
Gioconda Quesada*, Assistant Professor, Marketing & Supply Chain Management
Timothy Scheett, Assistant Professor, PE & Health

**Faculty Welfare Committee**-8
Tracy Burkett, Associate Professor, Sociology/Anthropology
Diane Cudahy, Associate Professor, Foundation, Secondary & Special
Bethany Goodier*, Assistant Professor, Communication
Stephane Lafontune, Assistant Professor, Mathematics
Glenn Lesses*, Professor, Philosophy
Amy Rogers, Assistant Professor, Biochemistry/Chemistry
Michelle Van Parys, Associate Professor, Studio Arts
Janice Wright, Associate Professor, Hispanic Studies

Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs- 5 (at least 1 grad faculty)
Susan Gurganus, Professor, Foundations, Secondary & Special, grad teaching
Patrick Hurley*, Assistant Professor, Political Science, grad teaching
Amanda Ruth, Assistant Professor, Communication, grad teaching
Heather Tierney, Assistant Professor, Economics/Finance
Joseph Weyers, Associate Professor, Hispanic Studies

Honors Program Committee - (5, 3 teaching in Honors Program)
Zeff Bjerken, Associate Professor, Religious Studies, honors teaching
Marie Fitzwilliam*, Senior Instructor, English, honors teaching
Thomas Ivey, Associate Professor, Mathematics
Philip Powell*, Librarian II
Robert Westerfelhaus, Associate Professor, Communication, honors teaching

Honor Board-8
Carrillo-Arciniega, Raul, Assistant Professor, Hispanic Studies
Christian Coseru, Assistant Professor, Philosophy
Cara Delay, Assistant Professor, History
John Duvall, Assistant Professor, English
Deborah McGee, Associate Professor, Communication
Whit Schonbein, Assistant Professor, Philosophy
Elena Strauman, Assistant Professor, Communication
Eric Thomas, Assistant Professor, Religious Studies

Honor Board Advisors-8
Karen Berg, Senior Instructor, Hispanic Studies
Doryjane Birrer, Assistant Professor, English
Tom Carroll, Instructor, PE & Health
Mark Long, Assistant Professor, Political Science
C. Michael Phillips, Librarian III
Elizabeth Rhodes, Instructor, Geology and Environmental Geosciences
Jared Seay, Librarian II
John White, Librarian I

Library-7
James E. Carter, Associate Professor, Mathematics
Briget Doyle*, Assistant Professor, Geology and Environmental Geosciences
Natalia Khoma, Assistant Professor, Music
Jennifer McStotts, Assistant Professor, Sociology/Anthropology
Elijah Siegler*, Assistant Professor, Religious Studies
Anthony Varallo, Assistant Professor, English
D. Reid Wiseman, Associate Professor, Biology

Parking Advisory and Adjudication Committee-2 (1 regular and 1 alternate)
Luis Linares-Ocanto*, Associate Professor, Hispanic Studies
Alternate: Ann Wallace, Elementary & Early Childhood

Post-Tenure Review Committee -(5 tenured regulars; 5 tenured alternates)
Marion Doig, Professor, Biochemistry/Chemistry
Lynne Ford, Associate Professor, Political Science
Diane Johnson, Professor, Art History
Charles Kaiser, Professor, Psychology
Denis Keyes*, Associate Professor, Foundations, Secondary & Special
Alternate: Edward Hart, Associate Professor, Music
Alternate: Celeste Lacroix, Associate Professor, Communication
Alternate: Robert Mignone, Professor, Mathematics
Alternate: Robert Neville, Librarian III
Alternate: Myra Seaman, Associate Professor, English

Recycling and Environmental Responsibility-5
Deborah Bidwell, Instructor, Biology
Andrea Canberg, Instructor, Hospitality & Tourism
Yoshiki Chikuma*, Instructor, Japanese
Jeffrey Diamond, Assistant Professor, History
Noah Wasielewski, Assistant Professor, PE & Health

Student Affairs and Athletics-5
Elizabeth Baker, Senior Instructor, English
Susan Balinsky, Associate Professor, PE & Health
Jocelyn Evans*, Associate Professor, Economics/Finance
Merissa Ferrara, Assistant Professor, Communication
Sheila Seaman, Librarian III

Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review- (5 regulars, 5 alternates, all tenured)
Richard Nunan*, Professor, Philosophy
Pamela Riggs-Gelasco*, Associate Professor, Biochemistry/Chemistry
Dinesh Sarvate*, Professor, Mathematics
Julie Swanson, Associate Professor, Foundations, Secondary & Special
Rhonda Swickert, Associate Professor, Psychology
Alternate: Isaure de Buron*, Associate Professor, Biology
Alternate: M. Luci Moreira, Associate Professor, Hispanic Studies
Alternate: Laura Penny, Associate Professor, Physics/Astronomy
Alternate: Chris Starr, Associate Professor, Computer Science
Alternate: Patricia Ward, Professor, English
Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate, April 12, 2007

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, April 12, 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115 to continue discussion of the proposals on General Education submitted by the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education.

Before the meeting was officially called to order, Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone announced that he and Parliamentarian George Pothering had researched *Robert’s Rules of Order* after the last special meeting. Mr. Mignone then offered Senators several options for motions that could be made by those who want to deal with the entire General Education package as a whole.

Mr. Mignone offered two options that would require the Senate to first finish discussion and take votes on the individual motions.
1) A Senator could make a motion to rescind, which would include all or part of the proposal. An “aye” vote by a simple majority could rescind. A “no” vote would affirm the Senate's previous actions.
2) A Senator could move to suspend the rules, which would require a 2/3 vote. Then the Senate could reconsider the entire package and affirm it with a simple majority or deny it by a simple majority.

Mr. Mignone mentioned a third option as well, that could take place immediately:
3) A Senator could move to table the current motion. If the Senate voted to table, then a motion to suspend the rules (which requires a 2/3 vote) could be made in order to consider the entire proposal as a package and bring it back on table. A motion to consider by paragraph would allow the Senate to consider the proposal piece by piece, but not vote until the entire package had been debated.

Mr. Mignone then called the meeting to order. Discussion of the second sub-goal (“Effective writing and critical reading; oral and visual communication”) under Goal I of the proposals continued.

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) began discussion by moving that the proposals dealing with the formation of a CAC Committee (General Education Proposal, p. 18—all of 1.2b and #1 under 1.2c) be postponed until the Senate considers the recommendation to create a General Education Committee. The two proposals would then be considered together. Upon Mr. Mignone’s advice, Mr. Wilder withdrew his motion in order to first make a motion to divide the question so the Senate could consider the CAC proposals separately from the other issues under Goal I.2. The question was divided by consensus. Then Mr. Wilder re-stated his previous motion, pointing out that the CAC Committee is proposed as a subcommittee of the General Education Committee, which is why we need to consider them simultaneously.

The Senate voted in favor of Mr. Wilder’s motion to postpone.
Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) next introduced an amendment that would delete the requirements that students take at least one speaking-intensive course and that they take a third approved communication-intensive course in any discipline. Mr. Nunan said that he was concerned about the proliferation of courses in the overall proposal. He added that he believes Ms. Eichelberger may have been too optimistic about the 56-59 credit hours she suggested would be required for students to complete these general education requirements. Not all students and not all advisors are savvy enough to take advantage of courses which could double-count, he argued. Mr. Nunan said he was also concerned about the history of Writing Across the Curriculum programs at the College. In past attempts to develop such programs, he argued, the administration supported faculty efforts, but then did not come up with funds to pay for them. Based on this history, Mr. Nunan said he is pessimistic about the likelihood that we’d scale back the number of students we’d be required to service in terms of the Delaware numbers. He does not believe the administration would follow through on this piece of advice from the Senate. While he thinks First-Year Seminar courses would be funded because of the QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan), and also that a literature course would be funded because we currently have English 102, he is not confident that other courses would be paid for, and he said that he wants to be realistic.

Ms. Eichelberger pointed out that, at the present moment, the Senate has not approved any communication-intensive courses, though Mr. Nunan had implied that a literature requirement and other courses had been approved. All we have right now is the status quo, she said—English 101 and 102. She also pointed out that the Ad-Hoc Committee had developed a budget and had discussed the issues Mr. Nunan raised. Both the President and the Provost have seen the budget, and both have said they would support these proposed requirements. Ms. Eichelberger added that it was far more likely we will get support for such initiatives if we ask for it than if we don’t. If we put this requirement in place and the money doesn’t show up, she is confident that a future General Education Committee would pull the requirement, declaring it to be an unfunded mandate.

Paul Young (Mathematics) then pointed out that, if we delete the courses Mr. Nunan suggests deleting, this section of the proposal would have little resemblance to the sub-goals listed. He asked why we would even need a CAC Committee if we approve this amendment. Mr. Nunan replied that he has another amendment, which will be introduced later, for limiting the CAC Committee and deleting the position of CAC director. His amendment doesn’t delete the Committee entirely, because there would still be a communication-intensive component to the general education curriculum that a committee would have to deal with.

Brian McGee (guest, Communication) spoke next. He said that the speaking-intensive requirement in the General Education Proposal is not what the Communication Department proposed to the committee. It does not represent best practices in the discipline, which would require a discipline-specific course. He realizes such a requirement is unrealistic. But, nevertheless, Mr. McGee said that he supports the speaking-intensive requirement in the proposal because “doing something is better than doing nothing.” With Mr. Nunan’s amendment, we would have no speaking-intensive
course required in the curriculum at all. As far as internal politics go, the Communication Department itself would gain or lose nothing with this proposal. Several colleges around the country have a similar requirement, but don’t even have departments of communication. Developing speaking-intensive courses, he added, is well within the capacity of the people in this room. Currently, about 50% of CofC students take COMM 104 (Public Speaking), either here or with transfer credits. The national trend has been to add oral communication requirements to curricula over the past 50 years. The college is years behind the time in this area. We currently have an unimaginative distribution series created in the 1970’s, based on a Harvard model created in the 1950’s. If we can’t approve this modest proposal, we’re swimming against the tide and repudiating the goals we’ve set ourselves for decades.

Jack Parson (Political Science) said that he was uncomfortable with the notion that we’re not doing any of this now. He argued that there is already a lot of writing and speaking-intensive instruction that goes on at the College. By practice, we’re closer to the norm than has been suggested. Mr. Parson added that he’s also concerned about budgetary issues. If we’re going to have communication-intensive courses in majors with 20 students, the budget assumes that what we’re funding is lines (adjuncts). Not every department is in the same position to call upon adjuncts. The only way around adjunct reliance is to provide a department a full line on the agreement that x number of writing-intensive courses be offered. The budget of $500,000, he argued, won’t go that far.

Darryl Phillips (At-Large, Classics) said that he wanted to follow up on Mr. Parson’s first point. He believes that discussion of the College’s current status quo is overly bleak and is part of a rhetoric being used to get Senators to accept the proposal. He pointed out that we’ve been collecting data in student evaluations about what kind of work gets done in classes (papers, tests), etc. and asked whether anybody had looked at this data. Kay Smith, Associate Vice-President for the Academic Experience, replied that the National Survey of Student Engagement had asked a similar question of freshmen and seniors at the College. These students reported a low number of pages of assigned writing.

Hugh Wilder asked about a discrepancy between p. 1 of the proposal and Ms. Eichelberger’s presentation last Tuesday concerning the number of hours these requirements will take students to complete. Ms. Eichelberger replied that the Ad-Hoc Committee’s original calculations misrepresented how many hours the communication-intensive courses would require. They had overlooked the fact that the fourth communication-intensive course (or sequence of courses) would be part of the major. In addition, the Ad-Hoc Committee had hypothetically estimated the worst-case scenario for the number of required hours if there were absolutely no double-counting—if every requirement had to be filled by a distinct course. After further study, they decided that it was nearly impossible for this worst-case scenario to occur. She added that, even if one doesn’t accept the Ad-Hoc Committee’s estimated hours, writing and speaking are such fundamental skills that they are worth adding a few hours. In response to Mr. Parson’s concern about departments giving courses in the major, she said that the cap of 20 students does not apply to communication-intensive courses in the major.
Melissa Hughes (Biology) said that, while she understands that many of the requirements will be able to double-count, she worries that many students might not know how to double-count courses. Also, there is a problem in that students transferring in might not have major courses that count as communication-intensive, so this would add hours. Ms. Eichelberger replied that her committee had looked at every department and major and each one had some kind of capstone, seminar, or research-methods course that seems like it would be easily double-countable. George Hopkins (History) asked whether these courses would be denoted as being able to double-count in the registration function used by students. Ms. Eichelberger said “yes,” stating that the on-line record would also serve as a portal whereby students could access lists of courses that count toward the various requirements.

Scott Peeples (English) responded to Mr. Parson’s previous point about communication-intensive instruction already being in place at the College. He agrees that such instruction is wide-spread, but he argued that instituting requirements would guarantee that all students receive such instruction. If we’re already largely doing what these proposals suggest, we would not be making that much of a change, we’d merely be codifying something, and that would not be hard to accomplish. Mike Duvall (guest, English) then said that he had pulled up on his laptop computer the results of the national survey that Kay Smith had mentioned earlier. He read to Senators some of these results, including the fact that freshmen at the College scored significantly lower than freshmen at other universities on questions which asked how many papers they had written and how much time per week they devote to class preparation. The same was true for seniors. Mr. Duvall argued that these numbers give an indication that students don’t feel all that challenged at the College. Student engagement, he said, as well as the number of hours spent on classwork, goes up with writing-intensive courses.

Michelle Van Parys (Studio Art) said that her department currently has no course that would count toward the requirement of a communication-intensive course within the major. So they’d have to design something new. Brian McGee replied that several people have raised concerns about delivering communication-intensive courses within the major. He pointed out that this discussion, however, was not relevant to Mr. Nunan’s amendment. In addition, noting that he had been accused of the ancient rhetorical trope of “hyperbole,” he said that he would like to deny the charge, because there is currently no structural way to ensure that students take speaking-intensive courses. Many students simply slip through the cracks.

Norine Noonan, Dean of Science and Mathematics, asked how the Ad-Hoc Committee planned to deal with transfer students who make up 30% of our student population. Ms. Eichelberger said that the transfer student issue is an ongoing problem at the College, whether or not we take up these proposals. Many other colleges designate courses as writing-intensive or speaking-intensive, so sometimes the transfer credit issues would be clear (i.e. for public speaking courses). Other courses would have to be evaluated the way transfer credit is awarded now.
Richard Nunan then asked to make a brief point about the number of courses we’d require students to take under these proposals. He pointed out that this section is only the first place courses are added. A number of proposals are coming down the road that add courses as well, including in the sciences and in foreign language. It is not clear, he said, how AP credit will be affected. Mr. Nunan argued that these things keep adding up and that we need to think about that. Fran Welch, Dean of Education, said that Mr. Nunan was making the assumption that we’re adding courses. It’s possible to retool courses, she argued. The School of Education does this all the time—they look at existing courses and add to them to meet accreditation or other requirements.

Norine Noonan asked to return to the transfer student issue—just saying we have to deal with this problem later is not going to be acceptable, she said. Most of our transfer students come from Trident Tech or from other colleges in the state, she argued, so that we pretty much know what courses they bring. Very few of them are designated as writing-intensive or speaking-intensive. So it will require a considerable effort to figure out if these courses count, or else we’ll have to burden the transfer students with extra courses. Ms. Eichelberger said that students at Trident Tech, for instance, have to take two writing courses. Thus, they’d transfer in with two, then have to take two more. Part of the point of the proposal and of Communication Across the Curriculum in general is that students should have repeated writing instruction throughout their time here. We would be asking no more of these students that we would be asking of our own students. Bob Perkins (Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education) said that he is currently working on a project in cooperation with Trident Tech. Part of what they’re doing is asking our English Department to meet with theirs to develop a consistent process to make transfer credit easier.

Doryjane Birrer (English) said that if we were to have a student come in with no writing or speaking-intensive courses whatsoever, then she’d want them to have to take such courses to make the transition to the College. If that means transfer students would have to take additional courses, then they’d have to do so—they would need them. Kay Smith pointed out that there have been some changing trends in transfer students in recent years. The College is getting more freshman transfers as well as more transfers from 4-year colleges. Our considerable investment in the First-Year Experience is designed to increase retention. By doing this, we will be able to take fewer transfers. Tony Chowning (Communication) said that his understanding is that Trident Tech students are required to take the equivalent of COMM 104, our public speaking course. His wife, he said, transferred to the College with 3 semesters left and there were a number of courses she had to take. She realized this and accepted it, as he believes most transfer students do. Paul Young spoke about the issue of transfer students as well, arguing that it would not be so hard to approve a course, but that only sections of courses that have been approved as writing or speaking-intensive courses would count toward this requirement. So would we need a system to ascertain whether a particular Trident Tech professor had writing-intensive training and whether the class had fewer than 20 students in it.

Frank Morris (At-Large Classics) said he was concerned that the proposal eliminates ENGL 102 when, in the past, we’ve been advised by the History Department that they
like their students to have 102 before they take the introductory history sequence. Ms. Eichelberger said that the Ad-Hoc Committee devised this proposal not with the idea to eliminate ENGL 102, but on the operating principle that the various skills students need to learn are not the province of single departments. Even the proposed first year composition course is not identified as English 101 in the proposal and nothing would prevent another department from proposing a course to satisfy this requirement. In most cases, the literature course students take would be their second communication-intensive course, to be followed by two others. This proposal spreads writing instruction out over the student’s whole career rather than front-loading it in their freshman year. In addition, Ms. Eichelberger said that she believes the History Department doesn’t hold with the view anymore that students should wait to take the introductory sequence until after completing ENGL 102. Chair of the History Department, Bill Olejniczak, confirmed this.

Terry Bowers (English) said he wanted to address the joke Mr. Nunan made when introducing his amendment—that this amendment (not the one to drop the literature requirement made at the previous special meeting) would really “gut the communication-intensive program.” Writing, Mr. Bowers argued, is an absolutely fundamental skill if we’re really serious about the intellectual development of our students. The proposal from the Ad-Hoc Committee formalizes something we probably already do. But it also sends a message to students, to the public, and to us that writing is an ongoing skill.

Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) then moved to divide the question so that the Senate could consider the two parts of Mr. Nunan’s amendment separately—1) to eliminate the speaking-intensive requirement, and 2) to eliminate a third approved communication-intensive course in any discipline. The Senate voted to divide the question. Discussion now focused on the speaking-intensive requirement.

Tony Chowning spoke against Mr. Nunan’s amendment, saying that this is his area of specialty. He teaches public speaking and his degree is in speech communication. Students who just give presentations in other courses, he said, are not getting the speaking-intensive skills they need. They’re not learning how to do it well. Employers, he added, want communication skills. If we are not going to require COMM 104, we need some other means to be sure faculty are teaching skills, not just getting students in front of the class to speak. Students are currently not getting these skills. Mick Norton (Mathematics) said that he is currently working with a student on a senior thesis project. He would like her to give a public talk about her research, but she declined because she said she faints when she has to speak publicly. What do we do with students like this, he asked. Brian McGee suggested that, if the student has a disability, she should be referred to the SNAP program. He also said that his discipline has 40 years of research in dealing with communication-apprehensive students. Mr. Norton’s example, he argued, speaks to the need for providing background to faculty on teaching these skills. David Gentry (At-Large, Psychology) pointed out that COMM 104 would not be a course that could be double-counted. He wondered what else would count as a speaking-intensive course.

Ms. Eichelberger replied that the Ad-Hoc Committee had only made a start at defining
these criteria. The proposed CAC Committee would come up with guidelines and have to bring these back to the Senate for approval.

Carol Ann Davis (English) then pointed out that if we get rid of the speaking-intensive requirement and of the third communication-intensive course in the discipline, it would make it much harder for a department to deliver the required communication-intensive course within the major. Students would not have the kind of background they would have if we keep these requirements. Departments would have to provide more elementary instruction than they otherwise would. Glenn Lesses (guest, Philosophy) said that he believes there has been a bit of hyperbole in some of this discussion. If the speaking-intensive requirement were eliminated but the communication-intensive course in any discipline were approved, then there would be another communication-intensive class. It’s not as though there would be no speaking-intensive courses, he added. His worry is that if all these things are included, there would be little flexibility. Mr. Lesses said that he wanted to encourage Senators to make the proposal as flexible as possible. Jerry Boetje (Computer Science) noted that he came out of industry five years ago to teach at the College. In the field of Computer Science, he said, it’s incredibly important that people be able to stand up and give presentations. His department, accordingly, requires COMM 104 of all their majors. Even people coming out of COMM 104, though, need reinforcement. Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) said that she regularly uses the excellent facilities provided by the library research staff to introduce students to research projects. She wondered whether her Communication colleagues could provide a similar service to faculty members—if they could visit classes and teach students the essentials of good public speaking.

Doryjane Birrer (English) called the question on the amendment to strike the requirement for a speaking-intensive course. The Senate voted to call the question. The Senate then voted against this portion of Mr. Nunan’s amendment. The speaking-intensive requirement will stay in the proposal.

Robert Westerfelhaus (Communication) called the question to strike the requirement for a third communication-intensive course in any discipline. The Senate voted to call the question. The Senate then voted against this portion of Mr. Nunan’s amendment. The requirement will stand as it appears in the original motion from the Ad-Hoc Committee.

Richard Nunan then moved another amendment, to strike the possibility that the communication-intensive requirement within the major could be satisfied by an “instructional sequence” rather than an individual class. Mr. Nunan said he was concerned that this provision would turn the requirement into a “paper tiger,” that it would be a way for departments to avoid the requirement. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) said that she understood Mr. Nunan’s concern, but she assumed that her department would naturally meet this requirement through an instructional sequence. She requires a good deal of writing in a two-course required Theatre sequence she teaches, but because the content is so large, she is unable to condense the writing instruction into one class. In addition, she believes spreading the writing-intensive requirement in the major over a sequence of courses helps her students because it builds their writing skills over two
semesters. Ms. Kattwinkel added that she can imagine other departments have similar situations. Paul Young then asked a question about the instructional sequence. He wondered if every course and section in such a sequence would have to be certified and whether each course would have to have an enrollment of 20 or less. Ms. Eichelberger re-iterated that there is no 20-student cap for the communication-intensive course in the major. She said her committee was willing to add language to clarify Mr. Young’s first question—the intent of her committee was to not require training within the major. Mike Duvall (guest, English) said that retaining the flexibility of an instructional sequence rather than a single course might help with speaking-intensive instruction as well. If professors are concerned about student presentations taking up class time, this could be a way to spread speaking requirements out over a number of courses.

At this point discussion ended and a vote was taken. Mr. Nunan’s amendment failed.

Darryl Phillips (At-Large, Classics), noting that he’s given a lot of thought to big procedural questions concerning the proposal, argued that the Senate had been “misguided” in starting debate on individual sections of the proposal. As we’re improving one part of the proposal, he said, this affects other parts. Mr. Phillips moved to table the motion before the Senate so that we could suspend the rules and come back and consider the entire General Education package as a whole.

A vote was taken, and Mr. Phillips’ motion failed on a show of hands.

The Speaker then recognized Richard Nunan, who said that since Robert’s Rules do not allow debate on a motion to table, he wanted to say something about considering the entire package while he has the floor. To discuss the whole proposal at once without voting on separate parts, Mr. Nunan argued, would be completely chaotic. Mr. Nunan then made an amendment that would delete from this section of the proposal language requiring students to post work to an online record (the Senate already approved deleting a requirement that students post such work samples in our previous discussion of the online record). Deborah Vaughn (Accountability, Accreditation, Planning, and Assessment) spoke against the amendment, arguing that the QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) requires assessment of student writing samples. Having these posted to the online record would make it easier to collect these samples.

A vote was taken, and Mr. Nunan’s amendment was approved.

Jack Parson (Political Science) asked whether every item a CAC Committee came up with would have to come back to the Senate for approval. Ms. Eichelberger said that it would. Mr. Parson pointed out that this is an important point, because he has no idea what “communication-intensive” would actually mean in any particular course. While he said that he is not necessarily objecting to this fact, he wants assurance that nothing will be required until Senate approval has been obtained. Darryl Phillips expressed concern that such a committee would have to review and approve syllabi from individual faculty members so that their courses could count as communication-intensive. Faculty members, he said, often don’t make their syllabi very far in advance. He argued that such
a requirement could limit the creativity of professors who constantly adapt and change their courses.

Gary Harrison (Mathematics) then offered an amendment to eliminate paragraph 6 on p. 20 of the proposal, which he thinks is unworkable. The paragraph reads:

A course’s designation as WI or SI is dependent on the faculty member who teaches it as well as on its curriculum. For a section of a course to be so designated, its instructor must undergo formal training in communication instruction. If a previously-approved WI or SI course is later taught by another faculty member who has not received this training, that faculty member’s sections of the course will not satisfy a communication-intensive requirement.

Cathy Boyd, College Registrar, said that the College’s current degree audit system does not recognize an instructor or a section. Courses that are speaking or writing-intensive would have to be approved by course number. She imagines that the same will be true of a new system. Brian McGee said that he spoke with the Associate Provost at the University of Mary Washington at length about this issue. They have been able to adapt their software to recognize instructors and sections. He added that he is convinced that what other universities have done for over a decade, we can do as well.

Larry Krasnoff (guest, Philosophy) argued that this paragraph would be difficult to enforce with transfer students. In general, he would like to see these courses evaluated by the number of papers required, not by whether an instructor is trained. Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) asked how classes would actually be evaluated if this amendment passes. Mr. Harrison replied that Department Chairs could make sure that a person assigned to teach such a course had the proper training and requirements to teach it. Mike Duvall said that, as a former director of a Writing Across the Curriculum program at another university, he wanted to remind Senators that WAC involves more than just the number of papers assigned. Generally there are process requirements (drafting, etc.), writing-to-learn requirements and other criteria. He said we should view the formal training required in the original proposal as faculty development. He argued that it would be dangerous to take this requirement out completely.

Discussion ended, and the Senate voted to approve Mr. Harrison’s amendment.

Mark Long (Political Science) said that he believed there was an implicit notion that the required literature course in this section of the proposal would in fact be a writing-intensive course. Therefore, he moved to amend the motion by striking the words “or speaking-intensive” from this requirement. Ms. Eichelberger said that her committee would not accept this as a friendly amendment, because they do not wish to limit flexibility. She argued that literature courses in foreign languages, in particular, might be designated as speaking-intensive. In addition, there are oral interpretation of literature courses offered in the Communication Department.
Having run out of time, the meeting adjourned at this point. When the Senate next discusses the General Education Proposal, we will begin with Mr. Long’s amendment.

Respectfully Submitted,
Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, April 10, 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115 to continue discussion of the proposals on General Education submitted by the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education.

The Senate approved the minutes from the March 13 special meeting.

**Committee on Nominations and Elections—Proposed Amendment to the FAM**

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone recognized Michael Phillips, Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, who briefly discussed a motion his committee had first presented at the March 27 meeting of the Faculty Senate. This proposal would allow for electronic voting for faculty committees; it would also allow election of contested committees to take place over several days. The motion was reviewed by the Committee on By-Laws and the Faculty Administration Manual, which made a few slight alterations in wording to the proposal. The motion reads as follows:

Faculty By-Laws, Art. V, Sect. 3.A.

Insert new language concerning the election of the Committee on Nominations and Elections and any other contested election to a standing College committee.

A. Members of standing College committees are nominated by March 15 by the Committee on Nominations and Elections and are elected by members of the regular College faculty (as defined in Art. I Article 1 Section 1) by April 1, with the exception of the Committee on Nominations and Elections and any contested standing committees. The latter slates will be presented at the spring faculty meeting for an election that will begin the day after this meeting and conclude on the Friday of that week.

The Senate approved the motion by the 2/3 majority required to make a by-laws change. The motion will now go to the full faculty for ratification.

**General Education Proposals**

The Senate then returned to a discussion of the General Education Proposals from the Ad-Hoc Committee. Discussion began with Proposal IV of the Proposals for a Required First-Year Experience (FYE), since that is where the Senate left off discussion at the previous special meeting on March 13, 2007.

**FYE Proposal IV: That the QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) Committee continue to develop more detailed plans for a required FYE that will support the faculty’s**
goals for general education (p. 15 of the larger proposal)

The speaker recognized Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) who noted that, at the last special meeting, the Senate approved an FYE Committee. The QEP committee is “mostly history,” Mr. Wilder pointed out. He argued that it was appropriate for the FYE Committee (rather than the QEP) to do the work specified in this recommendation. After some additional discussion about the unlikely possibility of the faculty as a whole not ratifying the FYE Committee, Julia Eichelberger, Chair of the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education, agreed to withdraw the motion entirely.

FYE Proposal V. That a required FYE be designed that will accommodate the needs of transfer students (p. 15 of the larger proposal)

Ms. Eichelberger introduced this proposal by stating that her committee believed it would be desirable to have an FYE experience for transfer students, but they wanted the experience for entering students to be designed first. Jack Parson (Political Science) argued that this motion represents a change in the concept of FYE that we had been working with previously. We’ve commonly thought of the FYE as an experience for first-year students who are just beginning college. Transfer students, he pointed out, are a different category. A course for them ought to be organized as an introduction to the College of Charleston. Ms. Eichelberger replied that the committee agrees that this would be a different experience for transfer students than for entering students. The committee has not planned a specific FYE for transfer students, but simply believes that one should be planned in the future. Hugh Wilder said that the QEP committee that designed the FYE did consider the issue raised by Mr. Parson. The FYE described in the QEP is for students with 30 hours or less of transfer credit. The FYE under consideration in this motion would be for transfer students with more than 30 hours of credit, and would be different. Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) asked for clarification of what the term “entering student” meant in the proposal we had already approved. Mr. Wilder replied that entering students are defined as having no more than 30 hours of credit.

The Senate approved the motion.

Proposals for Goal I: Research and Communication in Multiple Media and Languages

Ms. Eichelberger introduced the next set of motions by pointing out the discussion would now turn to specific goals of general education and how these goals would be met. But first, using a power point presentation, she briefly compared the number of hours students would be required to take under the new proposal to present general education requirements. Under the new proposal, students would be required to take between 56 and 59 hours of general education. Currently, students take 56 hours (although this is slightly variable, depending on foreign language credit).

Sub-goal 1: Gathering and using information (p. 17 of the larger proposal)
Ms. Eichelberger pointed out that the sub-goals associated with Goal 1 were developed in consultation with faculty members. The proposals associated with the first sub-goal (“Gathering and using information”) are not attached to student credit hours. The Ad-Hoc Committee, she said, is asking the Senate to approve the defining characteristics of this sub-goal as well as the methods of implementing it. The proposal reads as follows:

I. 1a. The General Education Committee proposes the following as defining characteristics of the first sub-goal.

   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.

I. 1b. To fulfill this sub-goal, the Committee proposes that each student should receive research instruction on multiple occasions, as described below.

   1. Instruction in these skills will be required in the First-Year Experience and freshman writing course(s).
   2. Additional instruction will be encouraged in other General Education courses.
   3. Instruction will be provided within the major so that upper-level students will demonstrate a more advanced level of skill in gathering and using information in their discipline.
   4. The Library faculty will coordinate efforts to support faculty in the teaching of research skills, and will supplement the instruction that faculty provide within a regular course.

Darryl Phillips (At-Large, Classics) opened the discussion by noting that, procedurally, the Senate will not been given an opportunity to talk about the proposal as a whole, which he sees as a problem. The Ad-Hoc Committee, he said, has done a “phenomenal job” of showing us the importance of re-visiting general education. It is essential that we look back at what we’re doing and why, he argued, and he thanked the Committee for inspiring us to do this. The proposals we’ve already passed make significant contributions: we’ve been forced to articulate a rationale for general education, and we’ve approved a way to make this rationale come across to students. In addition, we’ve approved a First-Year Experience that will engage incoming students with roster faculty. Mr. Phillips added that, as he looks at the rest of the proposal, he doesn’t see terribly much that’s objectionable. The problem is that, if we step back and take a look at the whole, it is not what we want. Individual portions of the proposal satisfy specific departments, and the Ad-Hoc Committee did a great job soliciting departmental input, but our job in the Senate is to ask if the entire proposal is the best thing for the College as a whole. Mr. Phillips said he was concerned that the proposal as a whole is overly
complicated. He cited the flow chart on p. 9 as an example. The proposal, he added, is more complicated than our current general education requirements. He wondered if we would be getting an adequate pay-off for the added complication, and he said that he doesn’t think so. He believes we are creating a bureaucracy that we don’t need. He is also concerned that the proposal allocates resources. Paying faculty members to take part in general education, through stipends, sends the message that general education is not a regular responsibility of all faculty members, that general education is something they can opt out of. These proposed requirements, he continued, set us apart from other institutions, but we could be set apart for other reasons—for strong majors or good student/faculty relations. General education might, in fact, be an area where we want to look like other institutions. Hopes of diversifying, for example, might be difficult to meet because these requirements will add problems in evaluating and accepting transfer credit (i.e. for Trident Tech students). Mr. Phillips concluded by urging Senators to consider “the big picture.”

Mick Norton (Mathematics) agreed with Mr. Phillips that the proposal is complicated. He asked the Speaker whether Senators would have the opportunity to vote on the whole package at some point. Mr. Mignone replied that the faculty by-laws allow faculty members to call a special meeting (by submitting a petition with 50 faculty signatures) in which any Senate action can be up for a veto. Potentially, in such a meeting, the entire curriculum could be put to an up or down vote. Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) then asked whether a Senator could move the entire proposal after we’ve discussed it in parts, so that we could have an up or down vote on the entire package in the Senate. George Hopkins (History) pointed out that, in the last general education revision process, there was a specially-called meeting of the faculty. At that time, people who took no part in the process came out and disapproved it. He would hope that a similar thing doesn’t happen again. Mr. Mignone then asked Senators to return to discussing the motion on the floor.

Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) asked whether the goal of the proposal was to create a greater passion for learning in students. If so, he would like to hear how the proposal accomplishes this. Ms. Eichelberger said that the Ad-Hoc Committee members hope the proposal will improve students’ learning, and that it attempts to make conditions for their learning better by making faculty members and administrators more intentional about courses that are offered and what they intend to accomplish. She said that she couldn’t speak to the hearts of students and how those will change.

Erin Beutel (Geology) then tried to move that we consider the proposals as an entire package rather than as individual motions. After some conferring between the speaker and the parliamentarian, George Pothering, about whether Ms. Beutel’s motion could be made as an amendment to the motion that was already on the floor, Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) asked whether we could suspend the rules to discuss the whole package. Mr. Mignone said that a suspension of rules would not be appropriate because we can’t go back to deciding what the rules are going to be when a motion is on the floor. Jack Parson (Political Science) asked whether a motion to approve or disapprove of the whole package would be in order after we complete the process of discussing these
motions individually. Mr. Mignone said that any legitimate motion would have to come a week ahead of time or the rules would have to be suspended. Once motions are passed, he added, we can’t revisit them in the same session of the Senate unless there’s a motion to amend something previously adopted. Ms. Eichelberger then pointed out that the Ad-Hoc Committee felt the structure we’re undertaking now (voting on the motions one at a time) would be the easiest and most rationale way to proceed. Committee members want people to consider the entire package and consider how individual motions fit into the entire package, but they also desire to get as much consensus as possible. Working through items one at a time is a way to try to come to a sequential way. The committee, she added, has held forums and workshops on the entire proposal. The committee’s decision to proceed one motion at a time does not represent a desire to cut off discussion. Melissa Hughes (Biology) argued that, when we’re discussing an individual motion, we should be able to discuss the big picture as well since such a discussion will be relevant to how we view the individual motion. Mr. Mignone replied that he would consider such discussion relevant (discussion of the “big picture” or the entire package). He pointed out that he has already allowed such discussion to take place.

Brian McGee (guest, Communication) asked for clarification about what motion was actually before the Senate. He wondered if we were considering just the defining characteristics of the sub-goal, or the methods of implementing these characteristics as well. Ms. Eichelberger replied that the Ad-Hoc Committee was offering proposals 1a and 1b together as a single motion. At this point discussion ended.

The Senate voted to approve the proposals associated with sub-goal 1.

**Sub-goal 2: Effective writing and critical reading; oral and visual communication**  
(pp. 18-20 of the larger proposal)

Ms. Eichelberger introduced the set of proposals associated with sub-goal 2 by noting that they came out of discussions with departments about the particular skills students need. The consensus seemed to be that students need more skills in these various communication areas. The courses in this area that are required under our current general education curriculum are English 101 and 102. The Ad-Hoc Committee is proposing instead four communication-intensive courses, to include:

--First year college composition  
--A literature course (that would be either writing or speaking intensive)  
--A third approved communication-intensive class in any discipline  
--One communication-intensive course or sequence in the major

** Students would also have to take at least one speaking intensive course (which could be one of the courses listed above)

Please see Appendix 1 for a full list of the exact proposals and rationale associated with sub-goal 2.
After some discussion in which Ms. Eichelberger assured Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) that there were four rather than five communication-intensive courses, Mary Beth Heston (Art History) pointed out that, in order for a literature course to count toward the requirement, that section would have to be approved as writing or speaking intensive by the Communication Across the Curriculum (CAC) committee. Not all literature courses would count, and not even all sections of a particular course might count. She wondered how communication-intensive courses in the major would be approved. Ms. Eichelberger replied that the communication-intensive requirement within the major could be delivered by a sequence of courses, and thus would have more latitude. Each department would present its proposal for meeting the requirement to the CAC committee for approval. Approval in this case would not be section-specific.

Ms. Eichelberger went on to point out that communication-intensive courses would have a small class size and that faculty members would receive a stipend for attending a workshop on teaching these courses. In addition, communication-intensive courses may use a trained student mentor for supplemental instruction. Communication-intensive courses would have to satisfy a rubric developed by a CAC committee that would vet proposals and give support to faculty who are teaching them. Ms. Eichelberger also displayed power point slides showing what other schools are doing with writing and speaking-intensive courses. She argued that the Ad-Hoc Committee’s plan is not as ambitious as some things they’re doing at other schools.

Bob Mignone then informed Senators that he’d spoken to the parliamentarian, and they had concluded that it would be acceptable to entertain a motion to consider the entire general education package. Mr. Mignone strongly urged Senators to wait to make such a motion until after we have discussed the individual parts of the proposal. Otherwise, if we just passed the entire package in an up-or-down vote, all the proposed amendments would be lost.

Hugh Wilder next asked a question about the last bullet point under the defining characteristics of the sub-goal, which addresses visual images (“• Interpret visual images and employ images to communicate ideas and concepts”). He wondered what, in the implementation part of the goal, addressed this bullet point. Ms. Eichelberger replied that there was not a particular, specific requirement that’s attached to visual images. Most courses that require oral presentations do address visual components, she added. In addition, many college composition courses do this. But right now, teaching students to interpret and employ visual images is not a hard and fast requirement. She hopes this is something the CAC Committee can develop more specific guidelines about later. Mr. Wilder said that Ms. Eichelberger’s response perhaps made him more worried. He wondered what would happen with a CAC Committee approving courses that satisfy this goal. If he were to teach a speaking-intensive philosophy class that does not require students to make power point presentations with visual images, would the CAC Committee approve such a course? Ms. Eichelberger said that she thought it would, because the assumption could be that this point would be met in one of the other required communication-intensive courses. Mr. Wilder then suggested that we either drop the
Carol Ann Davis (English) asked whether each individual approved course would have to meet all of the defining characteristics. Ms. Eichelberger replied, “no”—some of the courses will be writing-intensive, for instance, while some will be speaking-intensive. Mr. Wilder then asked what would be lost if we deleted the last bullet point. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) reminded Senators that the items we were discussing are goals—things we’d like to see students take from our curriculum. She urged Senators to recognize that it’s possible (esp. in relation to Goal 5: Ethical and personal concerns) that students won’t come away with everything we hope for. Ms. Eichelberger added that visual images could be explored in courses that meet other goals as well. Terry Bowers (English) said that he was not really worried about the concerns raised by Mr. Wilder because students are fairly adept at using images. Computers, for instance, offer visual images. While acknowledging that we live in a visually-dominated world, and that we need to help students interpret these visual images, Mr. Bowers added that he’s more worried about writing, reading, and critical thinking on the part of students. Yet, he’s willing to keep this defining characteristic in place and doesn’t think it’s a real problem.

Idee Winfield (Sociology/Anthropology) asked whether it would be considered appropriate to change the wording so that “interpreting visual images” would be added to a list of skills in some combination that we’d like to see students develop. Ms. Eichelberger replied that the Ad-Hoc Committee feels that all students should be able to use visual images, but whether this goal translates into these specific courses is not clear. Glenn Lesses (guest, Philosophy) pointed out that the proposal calls for a CAC Committee to use these defining characteristics to vet courses. So it would be useful to have clarification about whether the entire list must be satisfied or only certain items. He said that he was not sure how the proposed committee would operate. Ms. Eichelberger said that the CAC Committee would spend more time elaborating these proposals and would bring them back to the Senate for approval. Her committee wanted to set out parameters, but also to task the CAC Committee with working out specifics—the details of the proposal are enormous, beyond the scope of the Ad-Hoc General Education Committee.

Mark Lazzaro (guest, Biology) said that he was concerned about the proposed structure of the CAC Committee. He wondered why the committee would include the chairs or chairs-designate of the English and Communication Departments. He argued that the CAC Director, appointed by the Provost, would likely be from the English or Communication Department as well. He argued this was too much representation from two departments on campus. Ms. Eichelberger replied that the Ad-Hoc Committee’s rationale for the proposed structure is that those two departments have a lot of experience with writing and speaking intensive courses. Brian McGee (guest, Communication) then asked a procedural question concerning the CAC Committee, which is proposed to be a subcommittee of the General Education Committee. Mr. McGee pointed out that the Senate will not vote on the formation of a General Education Committee until the end of our discussion of the General Education Proposals. He wondered if we should move our discussion of this subcommittee to the end of the discussion as well. Ms. Eichelberger
then reminded Senators that the Ad-Hoc Committee considered the report of the By-laws Committee concerning the proposed structure and description of the new committees as a friendly amendment.

Deanna Caveny (Mathematics) suggested that we add “reading and listening” to the second defining characteristic of the sub-goal, but she declined to make an amendment. Melissa Hughes (Biology) spoke next. She argued that it would be hard to imagine that someone would argue against students have stronger communication skills. She herself is fully committed to WAC (Writing Across the Curriculum) and CAC programs. Her concern, she said, is that this proposal will have a fairly small impact on student experience with a disproportionately large impact on faculty workload. She already teaches writing-intensive courses, but to have these courses count under the proposal, she would have to submit a proposal to a committee, perhaps adjust her syllabus, and go to a summer workshop. The proposal, she argued, adds an enormous amount of bureaucracy and work for faculty members. Mike Duvall (guest, English) responded by saying that Ms. Hughes’ students are lucky to get her as a teacher, but that not all students may get professors as committed to writing as she is. If we don’t implement a CAC program, he added, we will be stuck with the status quo. Ms. Hughes replied that voting down this proposal doesn’t mean we can never change the status quo. Scott Peeples (English), responding to Ms. Hughes’ concerns, pointed out that the reason for any requirement is to make sure students get certain things rather than just hoping for the best. In his view, it is not terribly onerous to fulfill the duties Ms. Hughes mentioned, especially if we come closer to meeting our curricular goals as a result.

Erin Beutel (Geology) pointed out that it would be theoretically possible for a student to get less writing instruction under the new proposal than they currently receive. In addition, she asked who would teach the training workshops for instructors of communication-intensive courses. Ms. Eichelberger said that the workshops would most likely be led by faculty members with expertise in this area.

Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) then reminded Senators that he had a series of amendments he wished to make to the proposal. He asked Hugh Wilder to first present an amendment that was endorsed by the entire Philosophy Department. Mr. Wilder obligingly introduced the following amendment:

```
Delete I.2c.3c (one-course requirement in literature, p. 19), with the understanding that a variant of 3c will resurface as an amendment to section III.2b (coursework related to ‘artistic, cultural, and intellectual achievements).

Rationale: Works of literature are “artistic, cultural, and intellectual achievements.” It makes sense to include the literature requirement in that sub-goal rather than this one concerning effective writing and reading, and oral and visual communication. Furthermore, many domains besides literature promote effective writing and reading, oral, and visual communication. Singling out literature alone in the effective writing and reading, oral, and visual
```
communication sub-goal is not well motivated. This shift will be further discussed with the amendments to III.2b.

Terry Bowers (English) spoke against the amendment, saying that he would like to see a required literature course remain as part of the writing-intensive sequence because students do not just do a lot of writing in such courses, but they study language itself—i.e. figurative language, allusion, tropes, imagery, and prose style—in a fairly systematic way. Studying literature and writing together is a natural pairing. As students learn to become better writers, they’re studying writing as such. Writing, he added, has been taught this way for a long time. Also, he argued that the literature course proposed here should be a foundational course taken early in a student’s career, since it would teach skills we want students to attain early on.

Garrett Mitchener (Mathematics) argued that most literature courses will be accompanied by a writing-intensive credit, so most students will take a literature course anyway. He wondered whether it was worth the bureaucratic difficulty to make a specific literature course required. Idee Winfield (Sociology/Anthropology) also spoke in favor of the Philosophy Department amendment, arguing that other courses in other disciplines, not just literature, could accomplish similar things—i.e. a course on language and culture in the Anthropology Department. Scott Peeples (English) said that if Senators vote in favor of the amendment for the reasons Ms. Winfield urged, it would strip away not only a required literature course, but also the type of course Ms. Winfield proposes could count. Our current practice, he said, is that students take English 101 and 102. English 102 is a literature-based class that’s not only writing intensive, but also pitched toward students coming right out of English 101. If we remove this literature requirement, we will basically be cutting our current freshman writing program in half. Mary Beth Heston (Art History) agreed with Mr. Peeples. She said that one of the primary reasons for reviewing our general education curriculum is to make sure its goals are reinforced at other points in the student’s academic career. She would hate to see us lose this course, since it is intended to serve as a step between English 101 and upper-level communication-intensive courses in the major.

Brian McGee then asked about the intent of the Philosophy Department in regard to the later amendment they plan to make concerning a course in literature. One version of the proposed amendment, he pointed out, requires a course in literature or the arts, while a second version requires a specific course in literature. He wondered whether the intent of the Philosophy Department was simply to move a required literature course to a different place in the proposal or to make literature just one choice among many. Mr. Wilder replied that his department’s position is to recommend a requirement of either art or literature under a later goal (Historical, Cultural, and Intellectual Perspectives). If that amendment fails, there would be a subsequent amendment to institute a specific literature requirement. The Philosophy Department’s intent, he added, is not to gut the communication emphasis of this goal. Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) said that she supports the amendment for the reasons mentioned by Ms. Winfield. She would still like to see four required communication-intensive courses, but she doesn’t think one should be specifically in literature.
Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) then called the question on the amendment. A vote was taken and Mr. Mignone ruled that a super-majority (2/3 of Senators) did not vote to call the question. Therefore, discussion of the amendment continued.

Garrett Mitchener (Mathematics) pointed out that communication-intensive courses would have to be coded for whether they’re writing-intensive, speaking-intensive, literature, or first-year composition. He argued that this would be a complicated process. Ms. Eichelberger replied that current computer systems allow for courses to have multiple designators.

Jerry Boetje (Computer Science) said that he was becoming very uneasy with a set of to-be-shown-later amendments. He said that he doesn’t know what in total the Philosophy Department is trying to change this requirement into. Terry Bowers (English) then argued that the problem with the amendment is that it moves the literature course to another category, which would shift the course’s emphasis to content: literary periods, genres, etc. The intent of putting the course in its present position is to emphasize reading and writing. In addition, Mr. Bowers argued that Larry Carlson, Chair of the English Department, who conducts dozens and dozens of transcript evaluations for transfer students, had asked him to report that the course configuration as originally proposed by the Ad-Hoc Committee coincides with how the course is taught at other schools. Using literature to teach writing, he added, is a norm that’s tried and true.

Jack Parson (Political Science) and Marty Perlmutter (Philosophy) both spoke in favor of the amendment, arguing that literature is, in fact an artistic, cultural, and intellectual achievement. Therefore it belongs under that sub-goal (which comes later in the proposal). Chris Warnick (English) spoke against the amendment and in favor of the original motion, arguing that the Ad-Hoc Committee’s proposal emphasizes Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) over four years. There is a great deal of research to support this approach, and he believes the WAC approach is better accomplished in the original motion than in the amendment. Carol Ann Davis (English) said that, as a poet, she was gratified to hear that literature is an artistic, cultural, and intellectual achievement. Yet, she spoke against the amendment, arguing that literature is uniquely suited to teaching writing because students study form itself, without being distracted by other content.

Paul Young (Mathematics) spoke in favor of the amendment, arguing that literature is not mentioned at all in the defining characteristics of this sub-goal, so it seems odd to have a recommendation for a course in literature. In addition, he wondered why the requirements for a course in literature were so clearly specified in the Ad-Hoc Committee’s proposal. He suggested that specifying the requirements of such a course (number of texts, etc.) should be under the purview of the CAC Committee that this proposal calls for.

Brian McGee spoke against the amendment, arguing that literature has been associated with rhetorical instruction since the early Middle Ages. He added that we’ve done it this
way for a long time for quite good reasons. Leaving the literature requirement under the communication-intensive portion of the proposal, he argued, would be the elegant choice. Scott Peeples then asked whether the writing-intensive nature of this literature course would move along with it, if we transfer the course to meet a different goal. He expressed concern that we would lose an important writing-intensive course if we move it to a different section of the proposal. He understands that the Philosophy Department’s intent is not to gut the writing-intensive requirement, but he fears this would be the effect. Idee Winfield said that, in her view, if we move the course, we will not gut this requirement, we will broaden the possibilities for what counts as writing-intensive. Hugh Wilder reiterated that it was not the intent of his department to separate literature from a writing-intensive component. Mr. Peeples pointed out the course retaining its writing-intensive aspect is not currently part of the later amendment the Philosophy Department hopes to make. Mr. Wilder replied that the later amendment would get the issue on the table.

Melissa Hughes (Biology) said that she appreciates the long history that literature has played in teaching writing. But WAC programs recognize that language is used differently in the different disciplines. Therefore, she doesn’t understand why this should be a specifically literature class. Gary Harrison (Mathematics) said that, if we retain the literature requirement, we’d have two courses—freshman composition and a writing-intensive literature class—that focus specifically on composition. If we remove the requirement, we would have other courses whose primary goal is not writing but to teach some disciplinary content. We’d lose one course whose goal is primarily writing.

Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) asked if it would be possible to devise a course in biology where students read literature—say, Darwin and other scientists—to satisfy this requirement. Ms. Eichelberger replied that there would indeed be such a possibility. Any department could propose a course to meet these requirements. Paul Young (Mathematics) said that his earlier questions had not yet been answered. Why, he asked, is literature not mentioned in the defining characteristics of this sub-goal? Why is this section specifying what a literature course should contain when this should be the job of the CAC Committee? Ms. Eichelberger replied that she would expect the CAC Committee to modify this initial description of a literature course put together by the Ad-Hoc Committee. She added that using literature to focus on language and communications skills is quite standard. Literature can be a means to achieve the goals of the defining characteristics.

Richard Nunan pointed out that the literature course described in this section of the proposal could conceivably be taken in the second semester of a student’s senior year. So, no assurance exists that this course will be taken early. Mick Norton (Mathematics) then called the question on the amendment. The Senate voted to call the question.

A vote was then taken on the Philosophy Department’s amendment. The amendment failed.

At this point, the meeting adjourned. Discussion on the main motion will continue on
April 12, at the next special meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Respectfully Submitted,
Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix 2.

Sub-goal 2 Proposals: Effective writing and critical reading; oral and visual communication

I.2a. The General Education Committee proposes the following as the defining characteristics of the second sub-goal.

Effective writing and critical reading; oral and visual communication

a. Students should be able to
   • Understand, analyze, and interpret intellectually challenging written texts and oral and visual presentations
   • Use writing and speaking to increase their own understanding of a topic and to communicate their point of view persuasively
   • Strengthen written and spoken work through the process of drafting, revising, and editing
   • Create formal papers and public presentations that are appropriate for the situation and audience
   • Produce well-organized papers and public presentations that convey substantive information and that conform to the conventions of edited American English
   • Interpret visual images and employ images to communicate ideas and concepts

b. Students should complete rigorous writing and speaking assignments and receive significant feedback on their work in first-year courses and in other courses throughout their college career.

I.2b. The Committee proposes the formation of a faculty committee, known as the Communication Across the Curriculum Committee, to oversee this aspect of general education. This committee will be a subcommittee of the General Education Committee (see “Committee Proposal”).

1. Composition of the committee: 5 voting faculty. 3 are also members of the General Education committee; 2 are the chairs (or chairs’ designees) of the departments of English and Communication.

2. A Director (or co-directors) of Communication Across the Curriculum, appointed by the Provost, will serve as a non-voting, ex officio member of the committee. The director or directors must possess appropriate expertise in communication instruction and must be teaching writing-intensive or speaking-intensive courses.

3. Duties of the committee:
   a. Evaluate requests to designate a course or sequence as writing intensive (WI) or speaking intensive (SI).
   b. Initiate, review and recommend changes to CAC policies and programs.
   c. Work with the Assessment Committee and Office of Assessment to assess CAC program.
   d. Support and advise the Director of CAC in training faculty who teach writing-intensive (WI) and speaking-intensive (SI) courses, in guiding student mentors assigned to WI and SI courses, and in other areas of CAC administration.

4. The Committee will forward all recommendations for course designations and for changes to the CAC program to the General Education committee and to the Faculty Senate.
1.2c The Committee proposes that each student be required to complete 4 communication-intensive courses or instructional sequences, as described below, to meet this sub-goal.

1. The CAC committee will use the defining characteristics of “effective writing and critical reading; oral and visual communication” (proposal 1.2a) to evaluate course proposals for writing-intensive (WI) and speaking-intensive (SI) courses. Since these criteria are still very general, the CAC committee will also develop more detailed criteria for WI and SI courses, according to the following suggested guidelines. These criteria must be approved by the General Education Committee and by the Faculty Senate.

   a. Assignments in WI or SI courses shall require students to demonstrate understanding of the course content and/or academic research; all such assignments have the dual goals of improving the students’ communication skills and of advancing the other learning objectives of the course.

   b. Students must generate a significant quantity of written communication or oral/visual communication. The amount of writing or speaking will be determined and published by the CAC committee.

   c. A WI- or SI-designated course must include several opportunities for individualized feedback by the instructor and revision by the student. Some of the writing or speaking may be informal in nature, but at least half of the assignments should be presented formally, in accordance with the conventions of an academic discipline, and/or in a format suitable for an academic or professional audience.

   d. A significant portion of the course grade (to be determined by the CAC committee) must be based on the quality of the student’s work in either writing or speaking.

2. Once these criteria have been established, courses may be approved as WI or SI if their department demonstrates that they meet the criteria. Departments will submit proposals for individual courses to the CAC committee, furnishing course descriptions and other evidence that this course meets the criteria.

3. The four required communication-intensive courses must include the following.

   a. During the student’s first year, one composition course (a writing-intensive course devoted to academic writing).

   b. At least one speaking-intensive course, which may also be a literature course (described in c, below) or a course in the student’s major.

   c. One course in literature, a rich and creative form of verbal communication. Courses satisfying this requirement must also be either writing-intensive or speaking-intensive. Courses must also explore a significant quantity of literary works (at least five full-length prose works or three volumes of verse), must analyze ways these texts employ language imaginatively and artistically to create multiple levels of meaning, and must explore the ways some of these texts have been interpreted by literary critics. Departments wishing to have courses approved for satisfying this requirement will submit proposals to the CAC committee, furnishing course descriptions and other evidence that the course fulfills these criteria for a literature course as well as the criteria for a communication-intensive course.
d. A third approved communication-intensive class in any discipline.

e. A fourth approved communication-intensive class or instructional sequence within the major. If departments choose, this course or sequence may be the same as the one in which students receive instruction in gathering and using information in the major (described in Proposal I.1).

f. An “instructional sequence” within a major may be composed of multiple courses that provide sufficient communication instruction to the student who takes them all. A set of linked courses (such as a Learning Community or a minor) may also be classified as communication-intensive if the combined courses provide enough instruction to satisfy the criteria.

g. Communication instruction within the major should include both writing and speaking instruction, although a department may emphasize one mode more than another.

4. Students will select two to four examples of work completed in these required courses to be uploaded within their online record (as described in “Online Record Proposal”). These work samples may be used for institutional assessment, and students may choose to display them when applying for employment or graduate school admission.

5. Writing- or speaking-intensive classes will have no more than 20 students, and departments offering such courses shall not be penalized for any adverse impact on their department’s Delaware Study target number. If a communication-intensive sequence is designed by a major department, the caps of 20 are not required for all courses in the sequence.

6. A course’s designation as WI or SI is dependent on the faculty member who teaches it as well as on its curriculum. For a section of a course to be so designated, its instructor must undergo formal training in communication instruction. If a previously-approved WI or SI course is later taught by another faculty member who has not received this training, that faculty member’s sections of the course will not satisfy a communication-intensive requirement.

7. Formal training in communication instruction for approved courses will be offered at a time convenient to faculty members (either during a summer institute or at some other convenient time), and faculty completing this training will receive a stipend for their time.

8. The College will provide additional support for faculty who teach WI and SI courses, such as pedagogical workshops during the academic year and, when appropriate, student mentors trained to provide supplemental instruction in particular courses.

Rationale: This new requirement recognizes that students need a higher level of research and communication skills than they can acquire through the current writing requirement (English 101 and 102 in the first year). The Ad Hoc Committee has heard this need expressed repeatedly by individual departments, by faculty participating in the 2005 Faculty Forum, and at many other meetings across campus. There is a clear consensus that many College of Charleston students still need further instruction in research, writing and speaking by the time they enroll in upper-level courses.

The present requirement of English 101 and 102, which focuses mainly on writing and not speaking, and which “front-loads” communication instruction in the first year, cannot equip
students with all the communication skills that they will need throughout college. Confining such instruction to a single department makes the problem worse, since students may construe writing and speaking as minimal, quantifiable skills (an ability to proofread written work, a willingness to speak in public) that they should “get out of the way” and never develop further. However, writing and speaking are complex intellectual tasks that require students to deploy many different skills at once. The more complex the course material becomes, the more challenging, and the more dependent on disciplinary conventions, the communication becomes. Interpreting aural and visual information also becomes more challenging as a student attempts to navigate more complex information and concepts.

Students will learn and retain more of a course’s content through doing more and better writing and speaking on this material; moreover, students who do more of this writing and speaking over their whole college career will have more lasting, or “transferable,” abilities and intellectual perspectives after they finish here. Strong communication skills are a hallmark of a liberal arts and sciences education, and they make our graduates more effective in absolutely any field.

While some departments are already delivering excellent research and communication instruction to their majors and in their General Education courses, other faculty are less familiar with teaching these skills and may not yet be able to deliver this labor-intensive instruction alongside other teaching demands. Therefore we recognize that the following requirements can only be implemented over a period of time and that they will be more expensive to staff. We recommend forming a CAC committee as soon as possible to develop a strategic plan for developing and approving communication-intensive courses.
Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate, March 13

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, March 13, 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115 to begin discussion of the proposals on General Education submitted by the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education.

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone recognized Julia Eichelberger, Chair of the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education. Ms. Eichelberger, in turn, invited brief comments from student Lauren Rushing of the Student Government Association (SGA) Academic Affairs Committee and from Provost Elise Jorgens. Ms. Rushing reported that on January 20, by unanimous consent, the SGA supported the proposals currently on the floor. She added that students are excited about the plan. Provost Jorgens said she’s very pleased about the Senate having reached this moment, when we’re ready to take action on general education. She was gratified to see the amount of interest these proposals have generated across campus, and she argued that such dialogues can do nothing but good. Ms. Jorgens applauded the Senate’s efforts, and said she looks forward to whatever may come out of our discussion this evening.

The Senate then turned to the actual motions proposed by the Ad-Hoc Committee.

Proposal for Online Record of Students’ Academic and Professional Development

Ms. Eichelberger introduced this proposal by pointing out that our current degree audit system, Cougar Trail, is going to change in the future (as a result of the Battery project). Faculty members should have a say about how these changes turn out, she argued. Many colleges currently use a graphic degree auditing system, which is what this proposal offers. The online record is designed to help students and faculty quickly identify requirements and see the courses that students have already taken.

Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) spoke next, pointing out that the several amendments he had circulated previous to the meeting represent an attempt to streamline the proposal as it currently exists. Some aspects of the proposal appeal to him—especially opportunities the proposal offers to make the College’s general education requirements more flexible. Some of his amendments, Mr. Nunan added, attempt to make the requirements even more flexible. The other major problem with the proposal in its current form, he argued, is that it is very bureaucratic. He has tried, through his amendments, to suggest ways to reduce bureaucracy. Finally, Mr. Nunan thanked the Ad-Hoc Committee for its hard work on the proposals, and urged Senators to take the proposals seriously and work through them carefully.

The first specific amendment Mr. Nunan offered would delete passages in the proposal that make it mandatory for students to post writing samples to the online record as well as passages that state the College will implement a system of verification of student participation in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities. Chris Hope, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, said that her committee supports Mr. Nunan’s amendment. Her committee thought the portions of the original motion deleted by Mr. Nunan’s amendment would be burdensome and serve no greater purpose. Carol Toris
Ms. Eichelberger responded to these comments by explaining that members of the Ad-Hoc Committee wanted to require the posting of writing samples because they felt it would be a healthy thing for students to have several samples of their work which they could revisit if they wanted, and for advisors to have access to students’ written work. In addition, these samples could be used for assessment purposes. If we don’t use this tool, she argued, information for assessment will have to be gathered in some other way. In addition, many other schools require e-portfolios. Clemson, for instance, requires a far more elaborate one. The committee, she concluded, feels the requirement is reasonable and that students will benefit from it. Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) asked who would have access to these writing samples in addition to students and advisors. Ms. Eichelberger replied that all the details have not been put in place yet. At other schools, usually students and advisors and anyone else the students gives access to can read e-portfolios. At the College, we could give access to all faculty members as we currently do with Cougar Trail, but this would have to be decided. Terry Bowers (English) asked what Clemson’s experience has been like in implementing their e-portfolio system. He wondered if they had found it unwieldy. Ms. Eichelberger replied that she wasn’t sure. Clemson’s e-portfolio system is only its second or third year of operation. Clemson’s case is different from the current proposal, as well, because at Clemson someone actually assesses the portfolio, and students take a 2-hour class associated with it.

David Kowal (Art History) said that he agreed with Mr. Nunan’s amendment that students not be required to post documents online. He then asked a procedural question, pointing out that part of Mr. Nunan’s amendment calls for us to deal specifically with proposals related to goals, which are not to be voted on until later in the meeting. He wondered if we were going to vote on this amendment without having first gone through the proposals listed under Goal 5, which would be affected by the amendment. Mr. Nunan replied that this was a general problem—several of the amendments he has proposed could affect what we do in other cases. What we could do, if we decide to keep the proposals associated with Goal 5 later on, is to revisit this amendment and amend some of his deletions back in. Bob Mignone then pointed out that Mr. Kowal’s question touches on a larger procedural issue of items in the proposal having to be reconciled and made consistent. Mr. Mignone said that he believed such reconciliation would be part of the implementation phase of whatever proposals are approved. Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) asked whether there was a parliamentary way to bring back a previous matter we had resolved. If we approve the amendment on the floor, then later approve recommendations under Goal 5, could we then revisit what we had already done? George Pothering, Senate Parliamentarian, replied that a motion to amend something previously adopted could be evoked. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) argued that Mr. Nunan’s amendment did not mention any specific actions under Goal 5. The goals themselves have already been approved by the Senate, she argued, so these concerns may be irrelevant. Mr. Nunan replied that he does think his amendment is related to the
implementation proposal of Goal 5 since the passage his amendment strikes says, “The College will implement a system of verification of student participation.”

Larry Krasnoff (guest, Philosophy) said that he liked Mr. Nunan’s amendment because he does not think faculty members should get into the business of judging and evaluating student activities. Mr. Krasnoff added that he thinks we can get most of the advantages Ms. Eichelberger mentioned when introducing the motion, even if the amendment not to require student posting of documents is approved. Individual departments or schools can still require students to post writing samples if they so wish. Finally, Mr. Krasnoff said that it seemed unlikely to him that assessment mechanisms that look closely at student writing would be developed. Ms. Eichelberger replied that measures are being introduced nationwide in which schools do assess qualitative criteria and goals. Work sample evaluations are a very common way to do this. Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) and Kay Smith, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience both supported Ms. Eichelberger’s statement with specific examples.

Scott Peeples (English) then asked whether courses designated as communication-intensive would be the only ones that required the uploading of documents. He pointed out that how people vote on this issue may be related to how many courses it affects. Ms. Eichelberger confirmed that only communication-intensive courses would be affected.

Betsy Martin (guest, Chemistry) asked how we would verify that the documents posted are really the work of the student who posted them. Ms. Eichelberger replied that her committee had discussed various methods. For instance, students could submit papers to faculty members, who would then post them. These details will have to be worked out. Pam Niesslein, Associate Dean of Assessment and Planning, pointed out that most systems that currently use e-portfolios have a system of checks and balances. David Kowal then asked whether commented-on papers or clean papers would be posted. Ms. Eichelberger replied that, most likely, these would be clean papers since they would be in electronic form. There is no requirement that these should be graded papers. Mary Beth Heston (Art History) argued that the whole point of a writing-intensive course is that a final paper can be revised and incorporate a professor’s comments. So the objective here might be to represent the end of the process, after students have made changes. Ms. Eichelberger added that students sometime take writing more seriously when it is made public.

Frank Morris (At-Large, Classics) asked Ms. Eichelberger for clarification about the statement in the motion that the College will “create a mechanism” for requiring documents to be uploaded. He wondered whether the committee was referring to policy or to actual software. Ms. Eichelberger replied that the committee meant software. This is something the General Education Committee will not do itself. Pam Niesslen pointed out that there are already mechanisms available that would communicate with the student information system.

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) said that, after hearing the comments, he wanted to speak in favor of Mr. Nunan’s amendment. He especially supports striking the requirement that
students upload work samples, he said, adding that this is a matter of one size not fitting all. Striking this requirement wouldn’t prevent instructors, departments, or certain types of courses from requiring that documents be uploaded. Ms. Eichelberger asked Mr. Wilder what kind of students he thought this wouldn’t be an appropriate requirement for. Mr. Wilder replied that requiring work samples would not be appropriate for students who don’t want to use this mechanism for employment potential. It should be available for students who want it, he argued, but it should not be required. Mr. Wilder added that he believes we’ll get enough material for assessment in any case. If the mechanism is there, enough documents will be posted. Ms. Eichelberger replied that, if posting work samples is an institutional requirement, coursework would be honored in a different way. Such a requirement would give a stronger motivation to students in first year writing course who don’t want to be there.

Joe Kelly (guest, English), pointing out that he would like to hear from the students themselves about whether they would find this requirement burdensome, asked student SGA representative Lauren Rushing to comment on whether she would find such a requirement overbearing and paternalistic. Ms. Rushing replied that she thought students looking back on the requirement would feel that the advantages were greater than the slight burden of posting. In addition, she added that students might not know when they’re at the College if they are going to need writing samples in the future. If everyone were required to have them, using these samples would be there as an option.

Melissa Hughes (Biology) suggested that we start by making the posting of writing samples optional, then, if it turns out to be a useful resource, we could make it mandatory. At this point, discussion on the amendment came to a close.

Mr. Nunan’s amendment passed on a voice vote.

The Senate then returned to discussion of the entire motion (as amended). Mark Long (Political Science) asked for an estimated timeline of how long the portfolio would be available to potential employers. Ms. Eichelberger replied that these documents would not stay online forever, but maybe for five or ten years. Different schools that use electronic portfolios do it in different ways.

The amended motion passed on a voice vote. (Please see Appendix 1 to read the amended motion in its entirety.)

Proposal for Using the Online Record for Required Advising

Ms. Eichelberger introduced this motion by pointing out that many departments are already doing the kind of advising advocated in this motion—not just helping students select courses, but helping them plan for their careers in the major. She added that we’ve said we want to be a liberal arts and sciences institution, yet we’re much larger than most liberal arts and science colleges, so this “modest proposal” would be a first step in guiding students, a step toward becoming more of the kind of institution we’d like to be.
Required advising would demonstrate to students that we believe the courses they take here are going to make them more successful in whatever path they choose.

Mark Lazzaro, Chair of the Biology Department, pointed out that Biology has 800 majors and does not have required advising. He wondered how the logistics of instituting required advising would work in such a large department. He feared such a requirement would overburden both faculty members and the department chair. Ms. Eichelberger replied that the Ad-Hoc Committee’s proposal does not advocate a registration hold for students each semester—a hold would occur only once in a student’s career. Not all students would be juniors at the same time, when the registration hold would be in place. Jack Parson (Political Science) pointed out that his department has half the number of majors of the Biology Department, but also has half the faculty. Each semester, Political Science faculty members see every major, and this is not a burden. Mr. Parsons added that such mandatory advising often catches students who haven’t been thinking out their programs fully, even good students. Mary Beth Heston said that Art History also requires advising. Rather than letting the onus for students who miss the 2-week period of advising fall entirely on the department chair, however, Art History places the burden on students, requiring them to schedule an appointment during the professor’s regular office hours.

Melissa Hughes (Biology) argued that she found the notion of required advising to be paternalistic. She said that we should make students responsible for their own education and that we shouldn’t make every student jump through a hoop. Darryl Phillips (At-Large, Classics) argued that the proposal was also paternalistic to departments. The option to require advising is available right now to each individual department. While mandatory advising might be a great idea for undeclared students, he would like to see individual departments set up their own advising programs.

Richard Nunan asked how many times a student would have to meet an advisor. The first sentence of the proposal says 3 times. He wondered whether this meant a major advisor or any advisor at all. If an undeclared student gets advised in the general advising pool, would this count? Ms. Eichelberger replied that the proposal requires 3 advising sessions altogether, wherever the advising might be done. Mr. Nunan replied that he believes elements of this proposal are unenforceable.

Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics), pointing out that the discussion seemed to be going all in the same direction, called the question.

The Senate voted in favor of calling the question.

The motion failed on a show of hands.

Proposal for a Required First-Year Experience

I. Entering students be required to complete a First-Year Experience (FYE), whether in a First-Year Seminar (FYSR) or a Learning Community (LC).
Ms. Eichelberger introduced the motion by announcing that the Ad-Hoc Committee would accept Hugh Wilder’s amendment (distributed before the meeting) to delete language from the fourth bullet point of the proposal (“small class size for at least one of the classes in each Learning Community), as friendly. The fourth bullet point will now read “Small class size for all sections of FYSR.”

Mr. Wilder said he would like to speak strongly in favor of this motion. First-Year Experiences have been on the faculty and administration agenda for years. Part of this proposal might revise the First-Year Seminar we currently have. He added that he also regards Learning Communities as important. Gerry Gonsalves, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, said that his committee has approved a stand-alone First-Year Seminar proposal which will be presented at the next Senate meeting.

Mary Beth Heston said that she was concerned about the estimated cost of this proposal, the resources it would take to implement, and the effect it would have on every other initiative at the College. Ms. Eichelberger replied that, in relation to the entire college’s budget, the resources that will be devoted to the First-Year Seminar are not as big a piece of the pie as they may first appear. There is already a Quality Enhancement Project (QEP) dealing with the First-Year Experience, which is going forward, regardless. The Senate is being asked whether such an experience should be a requirement for all students or not.

Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) asked how a typical freshman’s schedule would differ if we required such an experience. He wondered how the proposal would affect students’ ability to fit needed courses into their schedules. Ms. Eichelberger replied that registration for entering students might be easier than it currently is, because so many First-Year Experience courses would be offered. Entering freshmen will not be competing with already-enrolled students for these classes, as they might when they enroll for, say, SPAN 101. Joe Kelly then pointed out that he had talked to Mindy Miley about Learning Communities and discovered that students will already be enrolled in these classes before they come to the College.

Melissa Hughes then returned to the issue of resources. The Senate, she pointed out, doesn’t have a say over the College’s budget. She wondered whether there would be any guarantee these courses would actually be funded if we approved this motion, or if we would simply end up with an unbudgeted mandate. Provost Jorgens replied to Ms. Hughes, pointing out that, while no one may be able to guarantee an exact number of dollars right now, she could nevertheless confirm that President Benson has seen the proposal, has seen its budget, and didn’t “pass out.” Mr. Benson understands the benefits such a requirement will bring for students and recognizes that this First-Year Experience will offer other kinds of payback to the College. Ms. Jorgens affirmed that the administration will stand behind this proposal. It might not have every bell and whistle, but it will be funded. Further, she doesn’t believe that funding the First-Year Experience will rob resources from other programs. Part of the SACS accreditation process requires that we put money into improvements. So resources will be required in any case.
Jennifer McStottts, Chair of the Senate Budget Committee, said that she has not seen a budget for the Quality Enhancement Project (QEP), but she has seen a budget for the proposed First-Year Seminar courses. Ms McStottts argued this budget was clear, reasonable, and well-justified.

Discussion ended, and the motion passed on a voice vote. (Please see Appendix 2 to read the entire motion, as amended.)

II. Conditions for Faculty Teaching FYE courses

The next motion introduced by the Ad-Hoc Committee proposed that First-Year Seminar (FSYR) courses be taught by roster faculty, that faculty members undergo a summer training session (for which they will receive a stipend) the first time they teach such a course, and that faculty members be provided resources to encourage informal contact with students outside of class.

Darryl Phillips (At-Large, Classics) said that he was concerned about faculty endorsing policies in which faculty members are paid to undergo training. He would rather see money go to raises to reward performance after the fact than to stipends awarded here and there. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) responded by arguing that the Ad-Hoc Committee believes these training sessions are very important. Faculty members are not under contract in the summer, so this is essentially time paid. Mr. Phillips replied that he’s very much in favor of training faculty, but that all faculty members conduct activities when off contract, whether course preparation or research. He is opposed to paying for one and not for another. He suggested a friendly amendment to strike out the words “for which they will receive a stipend” from the proposal. After conferring briefly with the Ad-Hoc Committee, Ms. Eichelberger did not accept the amendment as friendly.

Denis Keyes (Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education) then proposed changing the phrase “will receive a stipend” to “may receive a stipend.” This proposal was not accepted as a friendly amendment either. Mr. Keyes then moved his proposal as an (unfriendly) amendment. Discussion turned to Mr. Keyes’ proposed amendment. Terry Bowers (English) said that while he largely agrees with Mr. Phillips’ larger point about stipends, he feels that, until faculty members get the type of raises Mr. Phillips would like to see, it makes sense to take the money offered. George Hopkins (History) then spoke against Mr. Keyes’ amendment, pointing out the unfortunate implication that it could allow for some faculty members to be paid for summer training and others not to be.

Mr. Keyes’ amendment failed on a voice vote, and discussion turned back to the main motion.

Paul Young (Mathematics) asked who would provide the training that the proposal requires. Ms. Eichelberger replied that the sessions would most likely be set up by the Director of the First-Year Experience and the First-Year Experience Committee. Kay Smith, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, added that the training
would be a joint effort by everyone who has worked to develop the QEP plan. The sessions most likely will address writing, interdisciplinarity, etc.

Jim Newhard (Classics) next offered a friendly amendment to strike “summer” from the language used to describe these training sessions, arguing that many faculty members have research and travel obligations in the summer, and the training might have to occur at a different time. Ms. Eichelberger, on behalf of the Ad-Hoc Committee, accepted Mr. Newhard’s amendment as friendly.

Melissa Hughes (Biology) expressed concern that the proposal requires these courses to be taught by roster faculty. She argued that the proposal would force departments to use roster faculty members in ways they might not wish to. Hugh Wilder replied that he agrees that faculty resources are an important issue. This proposal represents a shifting of priority to focus roster faculty resources on first year students in ways we haven’t done in the past. This will be easier for some departments than for others. But, Mr. Wilder added that, with this proposal, new lines would come to departments to address a variety of needs, including the issues raised by Ms. Hughes. No one expects an equal contribution toward teaching these FYE courses from every department.

David Gentry (At-Large, Psychology) asked if it would be burdensome to those departments who do contribute to the FYE courses, if we don’t expect all departments to contribute equally. Mr. Wilder predicted that such a contribution would not be burdensome, pointing out that departments contribute differently to our current general education curriculum, but they have the resources to do this. The same sort of support should be available for the First-Year Experience proposal. Mr. Gentry then asked what the proposal would do to upper-level class sizes. Mr. Wilder replied that he hopes it will do nothing to sizes of other classes. The administration will have to take these issues into account.

Calvin Blackwell said that his department, Economics/Finance, does not currently teach freshman courses. He wondered if faculty members in his department would be required to teach the proposed FYE courses. Provost Jorgens replied that they would not. Mr. Blackwell then moved to amend the motion by striking the second bullet point (concerning summer training sessions) completely. After the motion to amend was seconded, Senate discussion turned to the amendment. Doryjane Bierrer (English) spoke against removing the bullet point, arguing that the College is a teaching institution, and it’s important that faculty members get paid for training to teach a new kind of course they haven’t taught before. Mary Beth Heston (Art History) agreed, arguing that if the Senate approves these courses, we will need training.

Pete Calcagno (Economics/Finance) asked exactly what the training would involve, pointing out that all faculty members already have areas of expertise, we all teach. Mr. Calcagno wondered what the sessions would train us to do differently. Kay Smith replied that the training sessions would focus on how to elicit qualities such as academic rigor, etc. that we want students to experience in an FYE. Calvin Blackwell said that he does all of those things in his classes already, adding that he finds it insulting that he would be
required to take a class in how to teach a class. He said that he has yet to hear anything to convince him that what he would teach in an FYE course would be different than what he teaches in his other classes. Larry Krasnoff (guest, Philosophy) replied that he believes the reason for the training is to focus on core, common content that would be shared by all of the FYE classes, a content that would bind them together and distinguish them from other classes. Mr. Wilder agreed with Mr. Krasnoff’s comments, adding that there really is something unique to these courses that is different from introductory courses he’s taught in the past. Every student will be a first year student. He’s learned that there’s a body of literature about how to teach first year students as first year students. These students have different needs and interests than other students in our introductory courses.

Mr. Blackwell’s amendment was voted down on a voice vote.

The Senate then turned back to the main motion, which was approved on a voice vote. (Please see Appendix 3 to read the entire motion, as amended).

III. Structure for the Administration of FYE Courses

The discussion began with a lengthy amendment from the By-Laws Committee concerning the composition, duties, and implementation of the Advisory Committee on the First-Year Experience. Ms. Eichelberger announced that the Ad-Hoc General Education Committee would like to accept this as a friendly amendment, which would substitute for items 1-4 in the original General Education proposal. In addition, the Ad-Hoc Committee would accept Richard Nunan’s amendment concerning item 6 of this proposal as a friendly amendment. Mr. Nunan’s amendment adds language to item 6, which reads, “But because of their low enrollment ceilings, the enrollments of FYSR courses will be double-counted with respect to teaching workload target figures, or departments will otherwise be “held harmless” with respect to the potential effect of these courses on workload target figures.” Mr. Nunan withdrew his other amendment relating to the administration of FYE courses because the issues it takes up are addressed by the amendment proposed by the By-Laws Committee.

Discussion then turned to the main motion, as altered by the friendly amendments. Larry Krasnoff, saying that he thinks it is crucial to offer students smaller classes, spoke in support of the proposal, especially in light of Mr. Nunan’s friendly amendment. Melissa Hughes asked why it would be necessary to form a committee to meet the goals of the proposal. She said that she saw the need for a director, but was concerned about the creeping committee structure at the College. Susan Kattwinkel replied that, even though the director will come from the faculty, there has been great concern about faculty oversight of the First-Year Experience and fear that this will become an administrative effort rather than a faculty effort. Darryl Phillips asked for clarification on the difference between the proposed Director of the First-Year Experience and the Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience. He wondered how the duties of these two positions would differ. Kay Smith replied that the Director of the First-Year Experience would report to her, but have wide latitude. She argued that it is important that programs
like these have faculty very much involved in directing them. She has other duties, including advising and orientation that involve a similar reporting structure. Melissa Hughes then asked why we would need a committee if we have a faculty director and faculty teaching in the program. Idee Winfield (Sociology/Anthropology) said that part of the committee’s duties would be curricular. They would be required to approve courses, much like the Faculty Curriculum Committee currently does.

Discussion ended, and the motion passed on voice vote. (Please see Appendix 4 to read the entire motion, as amended).

At this point, it was 7:00 p.m., and the meeting ended. This discussion will continue at the next regular Senate meeting, on March 27.

Respectfully Submitted,
Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix 1. Motion for Online Record of Students’ Academic and Professional Development (as amended by the Senate).

R.1) The College will work with the General Education Committee to create a web-based system that records students’ completion of their graduation requirements, with the following features.
   i. The online record will display each general education requirement next to the goal or sub-goal that it satisfies.
   ii. This interface will be linked to lists of existing Gen Ed courses that have been approved to meet each requirement. Each sub-goal will be a portal to a list of courses that have been approved for satisfying it.
   iii. The online record will display individual students’ coursework. The interface will have a mechanism for recognizing any course that has been approved for satisfying a particular requirement. When a student submits a list of courses that he or she has completed, the interface will display an individualized version of the goals and requirements, placing the student’s completed coursework next to the requirement each course has satisfied.
   iv. Students will store the most recent version of their online record on the College server, and may access it just as they are able to access their financial information, transcript, registration status, etc.

R.2) The College will integrate this online record with the Registrar’s office so that this interface may serve as a degree audit. Students will be required to run such a degree audit at least 3 times in their College career.

R.3) The Registrar will enable students to use the interface as a portal for registration.

R.4) The College will enable students to use this interface as an archive of selected work samples.
   i. The College will create space for storing documents that students have uploaded.
   ii. The College will display a link to these stored documents beside the relevant sub-goal.
   iii. The College will create a mechanism for allowing students or faculty to upload the documents.

R.6) The College will implement a system enabling students to give others (employers, graduate schools) access to their online record as a summary of their learning in college. The College will implement a system that can export this information into a word-processing document in the form of a resume.

R.7) The online record will not replace or supersede the academic transcript, which will maintain its status as the official record of a students’ academic coursework and grades.
Appendix 2. Motion that every entering student be required to complete a First-Year Experience (FYE), whether in a First-Year Seminar (FYSR) or a Learning Community (LC) (as amended)

I. The General Education Committee proposes that every entering student be required to complete a First-Year Experience (FYE) in a First-Year Seminar (FYSR) or Learning Community (LC), and that the following qualities should characterize every student’s First-Year Experience:

- Academic rigor
- High expectations within a course designed for entering students
- Assignments that require students to demonstrate understanding of course material through writing, research, and presentations
- Small class size for all sections of FYSR
- Each FYSR, and at least one course in any LC, will require writing and speaking appropriate to the discipline, and will provide students with feedback and opportunities for revision.
- FYE provides research experience that focuses on information literacy.
- FYE includes class discussion and collaborative learning.
- FYE gives students experience in some type of oral presentation.
- FYE is taught by a roster faculty member with specialized training in content area who introduces students to the discipline and to its connections with other disciplines; course objectives are explicitly connected to Gen Ed curriculum as a whole.
Appendix 3. Conditions for Faculty Teaching FYE courses (as amended)

II. The Committee proposes the following conditions for faculty teaching FYE courses:

- FYSR Courses are to be taught by roster faculty. For Learning Communities, at least one class will be taught by roster faculty.
- All faculty teaching FYSR and LC courses will undergo a training session before the first time they participate in the program, for which they will receive a stipend.
- Faculty teaching FYE courses will be provided with resources that encourage contact with their students on campus outside of formal classroom settings.
Appendix 4. Structure for the Administration of FYE Courses (as amended)

• Faculty By-Laws, Art. IV, Sect. 3.

Insert a new Standing College Committee, the Advisory Committee on the First-Year Experience.

a. Composition: Seven regular faculty members, at least three of whom shall be teaching in the First-Year Experience program (i.e., teaching either a First-Year Seminar or a Learning Communities Course) during the relevant academic year or have taught in the First-Year Experience program during the preceding academic year. Preferably, each academic school should be represented on the committee. The committee shall have one voting student member selected by the Student Government Association. The Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience (or other administrator designated by the Provost), the Assistant Vice President for New Student Programs (or other administrator designated by the Provost), the Dean of Students, and the Director of the First-Year Experience program are ex officio, non-voting members.

b. Duties:

(1) In consultation with the relevant administrators, to support and advise the First-Year Experience program on all matters relevant to the program, including program development, budget requests, and other issues germane to program support;

(2) In consultation with the Director of the First-Year Experience program, to review and assess the First-Year Experience program and to make non-binding recommendations for revisions to the program;

(3) To request and review proposals for First-Year Experience courses (sections of FYSM 101 and Learning Communities); and

(4) To assist the Director of the First-Year Experience program in recruiting students for First-Year Experience courses and to recruit and plan the training for new First-Year Experience faculty and peer facilitators for Learning Communities.

c. Implementation: The Advisory Committee on the First-Year Experience shall be constituted only if the Provost and the Speaker of the Faculty certify in a written notice addressed to the members of the Faculty Senate that a coordinated, comprehensive, and unified First-Year Experience program has received the necessary approvals and shall be implemented in a timely fashion. Such written notice shall be supplied no later than August 15, 2009, or the ratification for which Art. VI, Section 1.A. provides shall be null and void and this committee description shall be removed from the Faculty By-Laws.

• Students fulfill the FYE requirement through successful completion of either a FYSR
or an approved LC. The credit hours for either FYE (3 hours or more) will count towards the 122 hours required for the degree, and in many instances, will also fulfill other General Education requirements pending approval by the Faculty Senate. Individual courses within LCs, like any other College course, may be approved for General Education credit through the normal approval process. If the FYE committee believes that a FYSR course should receive General Education credit, it will forward a proposal for that course to the General Education Committee, who will send its recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

- First-Year Seminar courses will be designated FYSR (not the designation of the home department of the faculty member). Additional designation may be required for the Registrar – to determine which General Education requirements may also be met, and to adhere to college rules such as the prohibition of taking more than two Humanities classes based in one department. For the purposes of faculty administration, the course will be counted as if it were designated in the faculty member’s home department. But because of their low enrollment ceilings, the enrollments of FYSR courses will be double-counted with respect to teaching workload target figures, or departments will otherwise be “held harmless” with respect to the potential effect of these courses on workload target figures.