The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, April 17, 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

The minutes from the March 27 meeting were approved.

Reports

The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens began her report by noting that the recent horrendous events at Virginia Tech have raised interest within the College community in addressing our own safety issues. Various safety plans have been developed over the years, Ms. Jorgens said, but a new task force has now been formed to re-examine these plans and to make sure that the College has a good crisis management plan in place. She asked Senators to reassure colleagues and students that the campus is actively addressing these issues.

Next, Ms. Jorgens noted that Sam Hines, a long-serving Dean at the College, is leaving to become Provost at the Citadel. An event to recognize Mr. Hines is in the planning stages, she added. This event is scheduled for May 10; faculty should look for an upcoming e-mail announcement. Mr. Hines’ departure raises a number of questions about the future of the newly-formed School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs but these are questions Ms. Jorgens said she couldn’t answer definitively today. She and President Benson had a meeting with a key donor this morning to talk about future plans for the School. Ms. Jorgens explained that she believes this is an appropriate time to step back and ask ourselves if the way we have put this new School together is the ideal way to do things. She will wait to launch a national search to replace Dean Hines until issues concerning the School have been studied more carefully. She also assured faculty members that the College is still very committed to moving forward with internationalizing goals.

Finally, Ms. Jorgens spoke about what she said some faculty members might be perceiving as “gaps” in the Office of Academic Affairs. Clara Hodges, who works in Academic Affairs, had heart surgery two weeks ago, is doing well, but probably won’t be back for another month. Assistant to the Provost Beth Murphy has also been out of the office this week. Sharon McKenzie from Legal Affairs has temporarily moved to Academic Affairs to help out. The Provost asked for faculty members to have patience with what has felt like a chaotic time in her office.

When the Provost finished her report, Glenn Lesses (guest, Philosophy) asked a question about rumors he’d been hearing about a proposal to institute differential pricing at the College (in which tuition for students enrolled in the School of Business and Economics would be more than for students enrolled in other Schools at the College). Mr. Lesses argued that such a model would undermine our shared goals and sense of identity as a liberal arts and sciences institution. Ms. Jorgens replied that the plan Mr. Lesses was referring to is a proposal from the School of Business and Economics. She is not sure what will be the result of this proposal. The Board of Trustees sets tuition prices. Mr. Lesses then asked whether President Benson and his senior staff would be bringing this proposal to the Board this week. Ms. Jogens replied that the proposal was going to the Board’s finance committee this week as a point of information only. No action will be taken on the proposal this week. The finance committee, in fact, won’t even see the proposal.
at this time, but they will be made aware that the proposal exists.

Jack Parson (Political Science) moved to suspend the rules to introduce a resolution he had prepared, noting that the only opportunity the Faculty Senate might have to talk about this issue is today. The Senate, by the required 2/3 majority, voted to suspend the rules.

Ms. Jorgens asked to make a comment before Mr. Parson actually introduced his resolution. She said that she was concerned that the Senate was going to discuss this issue and move a resolution without the School of Business Dean or other representative present. Mr. Parson then moved his resolution, which reads as follows:

The Faculty Senate registers its grave concern about the proposed surcharge. The proposal has implications of a fundamental nature related to the identity, mission and goals of the College of Charleston. Differential pricing for undergraduate programs has the potential to destroy our shared commitment to the common core liberal arts tradition and orientation of the College of Charleston. By imposing additional costs for some students and generating additional income for one school, the plan may undermine the College's mission to provide an excellent education for all of its students. The Faculty Senate strongly urges the Board of Trustees and its committees to defer any action on the proposal until an institution-wide conversation takes place and a consensus is achieved.

During discussion of the resolution, Mary Beth Heston (Art History) asked for some context on it. Ms. Jorgens replied that there has been a proposal from the School of Business and Economics to impose a course fee for non-business majors and a per-semester fee for business majors. This is a type of fee structure, she added, that has become increasingly common around the country. It is used not only in business schools, but in professional schools generally. This fee structure is instituted on the premise that it costs a lot more to hire a business professor than to hire, say, an art historian. Secondly, business students are more likely to get lucrative jobs when they graduate. Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) said that sometimes in science, they instituted broken glass fees, or lab fees of some sort. He wondered if these new fees would be analogous. Ms. Jorgens replied that, in a sense, they would. Revenue, however, would not go toward replacing beakers, it might go to hiring new faculty members. Mr. Wiseman then posed a rhetorical question, asking whether the Biology Department could also raise fees if they decided they wanted to hire top people in their field. Ms. Heston than asked whether art historians, who don’t command hire-paying salaries, could lower fees for their majors.

Norris Preyer (Physics) suggested that the alumni office should try to raise any needed additional money, that we shouldn’t raise fees for our students. Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) said that he was disturbed about the long-range implications of this proposal, that it is going forward to a committee of the Board without faculty consultation. Mick Norton (Mathematics) said that, as a dad, he has paid Clemson such a fee because his daughter is in the Clemson Business School. Yet, the unilateral aspect of the proposal disturbs him, the fact that one school would be allowed to raise fees. George Pothering (At-Large, Computer Science) asked whether the revenue generated by this differential pricing would go to the School of Business and Economics. Ms. Jorgens replied that it would, as the proposal is currently worded. Erin Beutel (Geology) then called the question on Mr. Parson’s resolution. The Senate, by the required 2/3 majority, voted in favor of calling the question.

The Senate unanimously approved Mr. Parson’s resolution.
Joe Kelly—BATTERY Project Survey

Speaker-elect Joe Kelly reminded Senators that they had been invited by Bob Cape, Chief Information Officer, to do an online readiness assessment concerning the BATTERY project (which will replace all administrative software systems on campus) back in January. Very few faculty members actually did this. Mr. Kelly said that, as a result, he was put on the BATTERY committee to represent faculty. He urged Senators to take the time to respond to the new BATTERY survey which we have recently received a couple of e-mails about. While acknowledging that the interface used in this survey is frustrating, Mr. Kelly emphasized that it is very important for faculty members to give input at this stage of the process. In the survey, we will be assessing actual functions that we use—faculty members will be telling the BATTERY Committee what’s important enough that we’d like to see it in the new system. He then briefly demonstrated how the survey interface worked and asked Senators if they had any questions.

Erin Beutel (Geology) asked whether the interface would remain the same when we go to the new software. Mr. Kelly replied that it would not. This interface is merely for gathering data. Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) asked where we could find information about student transcripts in the interface. Mr. Kelly replied that functions concerning transcripts could be found in the degree audit section of the interface. Jerry Boetje (Computer Science) commented that he thought the interface was very biased toward the way Internet Explorer operates, which he said was the least secure browser around. Mr. Kelly replied that he is using the browser Firefox to complete the survey. He is not sure how well it works with Safari. Mr. Boetje asked whether this bias presaged what the system itself was going to look like. Mr. Kelly replied that this survey could be Mr. Boetje’s opportunity to express his preferences in this regard. Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) asked whether there would be a chance for faculty members to test out these systems and trouble-shoot them before a final software decision is made. Jennifer Higgins, one of the consultants hired to work on the project, replied that this might be possible, depending on what procurement model the state decides to use for the purchase.

The Speaker

Speaker Bob Mignone began his report by commenting briefly about some dialogue that had taken place on the campus listserv concerning specially-called Senate meetings. Mr. Mignone reminded Senators that his role as speaker is to facilitate options. He chose particular meeting times because these times were available. The Senate, he said, has the option to adjourn before the times he set out—such a decision is in the Senate’s hands. In addition, Mr. Mignone pointed out that, in these meetings, we have misused the motion of laying on the table. Robert’s Rules of Order says that the motion to table items should be used only in cases of emergency. The correct motion to delay consideration of an agenda item is a motion to postpone to a definite time. A motion to postpone indefinitely should be used to end discussion altogether. These motions are debatable while laying on the table is not. Mr. Mignone added that we probably won’t get to a discussion of General Education at the April 24th meeting. He has called additional meetings for April 26th, May 3rd (which will start at 5:30 because of Sam Hines’ sherry hour), and the week of May 7th-11th. The May 7th meeting, however, will begin at 1:00 p.m., not 9:00 a.m. as originally scheduled because grades are due at noon that day.

Mr. Mignone also announced that the George Street construction project will include a new faculty dining room that will be slightly larger than the current one. This new dining room will
not be completely separate from the student dining area. Only a partial wall and fireplace will divide the two. Finally, Mr. Mignone concluded by announcing some figures from the Appropriations Bill that is currently under consideration in the State House and Senate.

**Old Business**

**Curriculum Committee—Management & Entrepreneurship Proposals (from March 27 Senate agenda)**

Gerry Gonsalves, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, moved that the Senate approve the following curriculum changes in the Department of Management & Entrepreneurship:

- Proposal to change a Course – MGMT 445 Seminar in Entrepreneurship
  - Change prerequisite and co-requisites
- New Course Proposal – MGMT 351 Minority Entrepreneurship
- New Course Proposal – ENTR 406 Not-for-profit Entrepreneurship
- New Concentration Proposal – Entrepreneurship

There was no discussion. The Senate voted to approve all of the motions.

**Graduate Curriculum Committee (from March 27 Senate agenda)**

Betsy Martin, Chair of the Committee on Graduate Education, introduced the following proposals:

- Proposal to Change a Course—ENGL 699 Independent Study
  - Change to variable credit
- New Course Proposal—Biology 690 Independent Study
- New Course Proposal—CSIS 631 Privacy and Security Issues
- New Course Proposal—CSIS 657 Embedded Systems Design

The Senate approved all of these proposals without discussion.

**Scott Peeples—Proposed Campus Sustainability Committee (from March 27 Senate agenda)**

Scott Peeples (English) moved that the Senate support the formation of a new Campus Environmental Sustainability Committee (please see Appendix 1 for a full copy of the motion). He then turned the floor over to Burton Callicott (guest, Library), who introduced the motion and explained the rationale behind it. Mr. Callicott explained that this would be a college committee that would supplant the current recycling committee. The current committee, he argued, has little influence. Much of what that committee wants to do requires working with other departments, such as physical plant or housekeeping. The new committee would bring more players to the table and hopefully have more administrative support. There is currently a campus group, called the Sustainable Campus Initiative, that has both called for a committee and that has asked that the College hire a sustainability coordinator. Currently, the recycling committee has five faculty members—the new committee spells out membership more clearly. Mr. Callicott
argued that the new committee could improve health, bring in grant money, get good publicity for the campus, and save money. The by-laws he has proposed for the committee are based on ones from a similar committee at Clemson University.

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) opened discussion by expressing his admiration for the proposal, but asking how it fits in with other structures at the College. A problem with the current recycling committee is that it only makes recommendations. He wondered if this committee would do more. Mr. Callicott replied that he was not sure, but he believes that if all the departments with a stake in environmental sustainability are represented on a committee, some real decisions can be made and some real support can be attained. Mr. Wilder then asked who the current recycling committee reports to. Mr. Callicott replied that this committee has given reports and recommendations to the president and to physical plant, but not much has been done as a result. Mr. Wilder suggested that Mr. Callicott might add something to the proposed committee by-laws laying out who the committee may consult with concerning their recommendations. If this is written into the by-laws, Mr. Wilder argued, it might give credence to the committee.

Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) argued that the crucial point seems to be obtaining a director. He asked whether other schools with sustainability programs have directors and he wondered what these directors were paid. Mr. Callicott said that several of the other colleges do have directors, but that he does not know their salary range.

Brian McGee (guest, Communication), suggesting that Mr. Callicott’s motion is a recommendation to strike and replace a committee at the college, pointed out that the portion of the Faculty Administration Manual (FAM) devoted to college committees is administratively controlled. The Senate can’t vote to strike and replace. What we would be doing, instead, he argued, would be passing a motion expressing the sentiments of the Senate to the administration. The by-laws in the proposal, he added, aren’t consistent with by-laws as listed for other committees in the FAM, so tweaking would be necessary.

George Hopkins (History) spoke in favor of the motion, arguing that this committee could bring coherence to the College’s sustainability efforts. He suggested adding language to the proposal that says the committee would report directly to the president. This was accepted by Mr. Callicott as a friendly amendment. Julia Eichelberger (English) said that she supports the proposed committee, but was confused about how membership would be determined. In one place, the proposal says members would be appointed, at another place it says membership would be elected. Jack Parson (Political Science) pointed out that Article VI of the proposed by-laws referred to election of officers, not of committee members. Mr. Callicott confirmed that officers would be elected but that committee members would be appointed. Darryl Phillips (Classics) suggested two friendly amendments, which were both accepted. First, he asked that the phrase “to replace the recycling committee” be added at the end of the sentence that expresses the original motion. Second, he suggested replacing “Environmental Science Department” with “Masters Program in Environmental Studies.”

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) said that she likes the idea for the committee, but that she is concerned that it requires fifty members (25 regular, 25 alternate—10 of whom are faculty). Even if we cut out the alternates, she argued, this would be a huge committee. She is also concerned that the Senate is discussing a proposal that doesn’t match our by-laws and other committee structures. She moved to remand the motion to the By-laws Committee, so that the language could be made to coincide more fully with the FAM. Hugh Wilder spoke against the
motion to remand, arguing that this is a good committee and that he thinks we can approve it without worrying about these by-laws. We are not creating a committee that reports to the Senate, he added. If this is approved, it will go into the portion of the FAM that the Senate does not control. Typically, by-laws of these committees are not included in the FAM at all, so the Senate doesn’t need to get into these details. If we vote yes, he added, we’ll be recommending this committee to the president.

Discussion ended, and the Senate voted against the motion to remand the proposal to the By-laws Committee. The Senate subsequently voted in favor of the recommendation.

New Business

Nominations for next year’s Committee on Nominations and Elections

Mr. Mignone requested that the Senate consider this issue first under “New Business” since it is time-sensitive. (The new Committee on Nominations and Elections needs to be elected at the full faculty meeting on April 23rd). He then opened the floor to nominations. The following faculty members were nominated to be on the slate:

Kathy DeHaan, Communication
Tom Kunkle, Mathematics
John Widholm, Psychology
Darryl Phillips, Classics
Glenn Lesses, Philosophy
Steve Jaume, Geology
George Pothering, Computer Science

Tenure and Promotion Committee—Proposed Changes to Faculty Administration Manual

Mr. Mignone announced that the Senate would consider the twelve changes to the FAM proposed by the Tenure and Promotion Committee one-by-one. The first motion concerns including in the evaluation packet Summary Ratings for all courses in the department as well as departmental Grade Distribution Reports. (Please see Appendix 2 for the full motion).

Steve Jaume, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, opened discussion by saying that his committee had a recommendation for changing Part 3 of this motion, which requires that departmental Grade Distribution Reports be included in evaluation packets as well as be distributed to all faculty in the pertinent department. Names and identifying information may or may not be removed. Mr. Jaume said that his committee preferred that identifying information be removed. Jane Clary, Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, said that what has happened in the past is that some department chairs have handed Grade Distribution Reports out to the entire department every semester, some never handed them out, and some handed them out sometimes. Candidates are being evaluated using these data that, in some cases, candidates might not even know about. Her committee wanted candidates to know where they stand in relation to the rest of their department as far as grade distributions go. But they also wanted to leave other decisions up to department chairs (how anonymous to make this information).

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) asked about the language in Part 3 that requires department chairs to
take action each semester independent of the T & P process (by providing Grade Distribution Reports to faculty members). He said that it seemed odd to put that requirement in this proposal. Ms. Clary replied that the reason is because those reports (or reference to them) show up in colleague letters anyway. Faculty should have a right to see them, and for more than just the year they’re up for tenure and promotion. David Kowal (Art History) said that he was disturbed that there might be an assumption that faculty members who give high grades and lots of them are not teaching correctly. He argued that the information contained in the Grade Distribution Reports is subjective and not statistically consistent. Therefore, he moved to remove Part 3 from the proposal.

Glenn Lesses (guest, Philosophy) said that his department distributes this information with identifying marks intact, and this has never been an issue. He doesn’t really understand the concerns being expressed; like all data, this information requires interpretation. He said that he doesn’t see a problem with distributing the reports. Darryl Phillips (At-Large, Classics) said that one of the benefits of cutting out this section is that saying the reports will be distributed to all faculty “within a department” isn’t very precise. Presumably then, program directors such as the director of Women’s and Gender Studies would have to give grade reports to departments to distribute. Why not just have a website that contains all grade distributions, he asked. Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) spoke against the amendment as a member of the T&P committee. Mr. Nunan argued that departments are currently evaluating people with respect to this information. Part of the intent of this change is an attempt to investigate whether comments made in colleague letters are reliable. The T&P Committee is nuanced in their evaluative process, he said, and wouldn’t be “ham-handed” about handling this information. The fact that the data is out there and being used and not available for the T&P Committee should be troubling. The Committee, anticipating potential concerns, decided to leave it up to departments to disseminate the reports as they choose—either with or without identifying marks.

Hugh Wilder said that he had found this data very interesting and important in his development as a teacher, but was still bothered by the T&P Committee’s instituting a global requirement that the reports be disseminated to all faculty members. He said that he was inclined to show respect for departments and chairs making their own decisions about this. George Hopkins (History) said that he opposed the amendment because one of the T&P Committee’s main tasks is to try to seek consistency across the College in terms of information used for evaluation. When committee members read assertions in colleague letters that someone is guilty of grade inflation, it is impossible for them to judge, without data, whether these comments are accurate. Erin Beutel (Geology) spoke in favor of the amendment. She said that Grade Distribution Reports are not used for evaluation in her department. Section 3 of this proposal, she argued, would force departments that currently don’t distribute this information to use it as a tool for evaluation.

Brian McGee (guest, Communication) asked whether the reference to “all faculty” is meant to include adjuncts and whether the reference to “each semester” is meant to include summer teaching. Ms. Clary replied that she doesn’t know if Grade Distribution Reports are generated in summer, but the committee’s intent is that when these reports are generated, faculty members have a right to see them. She said she wasn’t sure about the adjunct question.

Jack Parson (Political Science) said that he thinks we have a good policy right now. A lot of evidence is generated in regards to teaching, a very specific amount of which we mandate must be in candidates’ evaluation packets. The evidence contained in Grade Distribution Reports is
available to departments, but he does not want departments to think they have to use this information. He wondered if there were evidence to show a direct correlation between Grade Distribution Reports and quality teaching which might justify building these reports in as an absolute piece of evidence.

Bob Perkins (guest, Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education) said that he had received this information as a department chair but it has never been used for evaluation or T&P decisions in his department. He also pointed out that there is no way to remove identifying features of courses that have only one section. Mary Beth Heston (Art History) said that she was in favor of the amendment because she opposes legislating a review process that requires all departments to do this. Richard Nunan replied that we currently legislate other things that all departments must evaluate. We already have policies about what goes in the packet. He said he was puzzled by the assertion that distributing this data to faculty members would compel departments to use it. Departments might use it or they might not, he argued. Mr. Nunan also said that there seemed to be an assumption that the T&P Committee has a secret agenda to use this information, which is not true.

Mick Norton (Mathematics) said that many years ago, he had researched the potential correlation between teaching evaluations and grade distributions. Every possible combination happened—some teachers that gave high grades received high evaluations, some received low evaluations; likewise, teachers that gave low grades received both high and low teaching evaluations. Phil Jos (guest, Political Science) said that he had also served on the T&P Committee. He reiterated that assertions about grading rigor were cropping up in colleague letters. Sometimes Grade Distribution Reports were included in packets, sometimes not. He thinks we ought to be consistent and that faculty members have a right to see this data. He explained that the committee came up with this section because they wanted to give some wiggle-room to departments while being fair to candidates. Marty Perlmutter (Philosophy) argued that the T&P Committee should be able see all available information; they need evidence to support anecdotal information.

Jack Parson asked why the T&P Committee couldn’t come to specific departments when they need this data. If it’s required to be included in all evaluation packets, he argued, it will inevitably become a piece of information departments have to use in evaluation. Joy Vandervort-Cobb (Theatre) said that her department does not use this information, and she doesn’t want them to start using it. The T&P Committee, she argued, ought to clarify this section by stating that Grade Distribution Reports should be included in packets if they are one of the tools a department uses. Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) said that, over his years at the College, he could remember only once that an instructor was giving very high grades. His department, he says, never weighs this issue in their deliberations.

George Pothering (At-Large, Computer Science) then asked who sees these reports currently. Ms. Clary said that, presently, some department chairs share them with faculty, some don’t. Mr. Pothering then pointed out that he learned from a student recently that grade distributions for specific faculty members are now available on the internet. Terry Bowers (English) asked how frequently the T&P Committee receives comments about inflated grades. He asked whether the Committee could, in those instances, request more specific data from department chairs. Ms. Clary replied that the comments about grading were not always about grade inflation. Doing as Mr. Bowers suggests would require extra time and work. In addition, the Committee felt that
faculty members being evaluated have a right to know the evidence on which they’re being evaluated.

Hugh Wilder made a friendly amendment to strike language from Section 1 of the proposal that also addresses Grade Distribution Reports. The amendment was accepted.

Jaap Hillenius (Biology) then called the question on the amendment. The Senate voted to call the question called. Mr. Kowal’s amendment to strike Section 3 was approved. The Senate then voted to approve the main motion as amended.

The Senate adjourned at 7:00, not having completed all business on the agenda. The uncompleted items will be taken up at a continuation of this meeting, on Tuesday, April 24, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium.

Respectfully Submitted,
Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix 1.

Motion that the Faculty Senate Endorse the Formation of a Campus-Wide Environmental sustainability Committee

Motion: The Faculty Senate supports the adoption of a new campus committee, the College of Charleston Environmental Sustainability Committee, as constituted in the following by-laws.

College of Charleston Environmental Sustainability Committee By-Laws

Article 1 – Name

The organization shall be known as the College of Charleston Environmental Sustainability Committee (CCESC).

Article II – Mission

CCESC’s mission is to further an agenda that promotes campus-wide environmentally sound policies, practices, and initiatives by seeking ways to coordinate information, education, and research aimed at minimizing consumption of materials and energy, decreasing waste and environmental impact, and promoting environmental awareness and ethics amongst the campus and in the larger community.

Article III – Membership

Members will be appointed at the request of the CCESC Chair by the appropriate official. Appointees will come from positions where they have planning and/or functional operating responsibilities. Appointment terms will vary according to position, but should be no less than one academic year.

One representative plus one designated alternate will be appointed from each of the following areas:

- Each of the seven schools (including the Graduate School) and the library
- Environmental Science Department
- Campus Sustainability Initiatives (student group)
- Emergent Green Builders
- Alliance for Planet Earth (student group)
- Division of Marketing and Communication
- Procurement and Supply Services
- Physical Plant
- Dining Services
- Residence Life and Housing
- Facilities Planning
- Strategic Planning
- Athletics
- Sustainable Universities Initiative Liaison, Coordinator
Representative alternates will be voting members when the representative is not in attendance.

Article IV – Officers

A. The Committee will establish its own rules of procedure and will elect its own officers.
B. The Chair and Chair-elect shall serve for a one-year term. The Coordinator shall serve for a two-year term in the same office and can be reelected to a second term in the same office to afford continuity.
C. The duties of the officers shall be as follows:

1. The chair shall preside at all meetings of the CCESC. The Chair shall be the official spokesperson for the organization in matters relating to its goals, objectives, and official business as has been approved by the membership. The chair is the presiding officer of the CCESC and, as such, is responsible for the overall administration of affairs of the CCESC. The Chair shall appoint subcommittees as necessary. The Chair shall be an ex-officio member of all subcommittees.
2. The Chair-elect shall assume the duties of Chair in his/her absence or incapacity and will perform such duties as the Chair will delegate. The Chair-elect will automatically assume the position of Chair at the end of the fiscal year. The Chair-elect is responsible for briefing and guiding new members to the committee and shall encourage attendance by exiting members.
3. The Coordinator shall maintain a record of all meetings of the CCESC. The Coordinator shall distribute meeting notices and handle all correspondence of the CCESC under the direction of the Chair.

Article V – Meetings and Agenda

A. Meetings will be held monthly from September through May and at the call of the Chair.
B. Agenda items for consideration should be submitted to the Chair prior to meetings.
C. Meeting notices will be sent at least one week prior to the meeting.
D. To maintain fair and orderly meetings, proceedings will follow Roberts Rules of Order.

Article VI – Nomination and Elections

A. Nominating officers

The Chair shall appoint a nominating subcommittee of three members of the CCESC at least 30 days prior to the last meeting of the academic year. The slate will be distributed to the CCESC membership prior to the election. Additional nominations from the membership will be accepted if:

1. prior consent of the nominee has been obtained, and
2. the nomination is submitted to the Chair of the Nominating Subcommittee by a deadline set by that committee.
B. Election

Balloting will be by majority vote at the last meeting of the academic year. The nominating subcommittee will count votes. A majority will be defined as the greatest number of votes received. Officers shall resign/assume responsibilities at the beginning of each new fiscal year.

Article VII – Subcommittees

A. Subcommittees will be formed at the request of the Chair and should regularly address the following:
1. Campus Planning, Design, and Construction
   Role: oversee LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) initiatives, LEED certification, and master planning.
   2. Resource and Life Cycle:
      Role:
      a. monitor and advise recycling program and solid waste disposal
      b. track and report on energy consumption and water management issues
      c. evaluate and regularly examine hazardous product purchases and waste disposal

   3. Campus Public Relations Outreach
      Role: market, communicate, and educate the campus and community regarding CCESC activities, environmental issues, and energy saving practices.

4. Academic and Student Life
   Role: foster and facilitate the integration of environmental sustainability ideas in coursework across the curriculum.
   Coordinate environmental efforts among student groups and encourage student participation in environmental issues and awareness

5. Environmental Audit
   Role: conduct energy, waste, recycling audits at the College of Charleston

Article VIII – Attendance at CCESC Meetings

Every CCESC member or an alternate shall be expected to attend at least six meetings each year. Any member who fails to comply with this provision of the By-Laws, in any academic year, shall be considered resigned. Contact will subsequently be made with the appropriate official to provide a new representative.

Article IX – Amendments of By-Laws

These By-Laws may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of the CCESC membership present and voting at any regular or called meeting provided that the proposed Amendment(s) be distributed to all members at least ten days prior to the meeting at which a vote on such item is taken.
Appendix 2.

T& P COMMITTEE—RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FACULTY ADMINISTRATION MANUAL

I. Student Evaluations, Comments on Student Evaluations (Manual Change)

1. The Faculty Administration Manual (FAM) requires that student ratings from all courses are included as evidence. The FAM also states that the candidate and/or the department may choose to include the comments as evidence (J.1.b.(5)). We recommend that no changes be made in this policy. However, the statement regarding student evaluation forms in section M.6.c. conflicts with that in J.1.b.(5).

We recommend that the statement in M.6.c. be changed from

“All completed student evaluation forms for courses taught during the evaluation period. (Normally these are included by the candidate in the packet; they may be provided by the department chair in the event the candidate is unable to do so.)”

To

“Student Rating Averages from all courses evaluated, Summary Ratings for all courses in the department, and Grade Distribution Reports for the department. (Normally, course evaluation ratings are included by the candidate in the packet; however, some or all of these documents may be provided by the department chair in the event the candidate is unable to do so.)”

2. We recommend that:

The following statement be added to J.1.b.(5), calling this statement (5.b.), and making the current statement (5) become (5.a)

“The Summary Rating for All Courses in the Department for each semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder with the summary student evaluations. The summary ratings for the department will be distributed to the faculty in the department each semester.”
3. We recommend that:

The following statement be added to J.1.b.(5), calling this statement (5.c.).

“The Grade Distribution Report for the Department for each semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder. The Grade Distribution Report for the Department will be distributed to all faculty in the department each semester. Names and other identifying information may or may not be removed from the report at the Department Chair’s discretion. The complete data in the report for an individual faculty member will be distributed to that faculty member each year for every semester.”

Rationale: Both the Summary Rating for the department for student evaluations and the Grade Distribution Report for the department represent additional evidence for evaluating teaching in the context of the department norms. Further, the Grade Distribution Report is useful for individual faculty in determining how one compares with others in the same department. It is clear that these reports are being used to evaluate candidates at the department level and references to grade distributions are common in the departmental panel and colleague letters. There are presently no guidelines about the use of these reports for evaluative purposes in the Manual. There is likewise no campus policy for the distribution of these reports. Identifying information about specific faculty may or may not be removed at the Chair’s discretion. We believe that requiring the distribution of the reports to all faculty members leads to greater consistency and transparency and provides useful information to the faculty member.
Minutes of the March 27, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, March 27, 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone requested to suspend Senate rules in order to put Old Business after New Business on the agenda (so that we could discuss the General Education Proposals at the end of the meeting.) Mr. Mignone’s request met with no objection.

The minutes from the February 27 meeting were approved.

Reports

Mike Haskins & Brian McGee—Integrated Marketing Communications Committee

Mike Haskins and Brian McGee reported on the work of the Integrated Marketing Communications Committee, which has been meeting for several months to update the visual design of the College's marketing tools (logo, website, publications, etc.) They pointed out that the College is behind other schools in terms of best practices in this area. Institutions such as Vanderbilt and Emory have better, more consistent websites and marketing tools than we have at the College. The committee has been conducting research and assessment: they plan to launch a new, integrated "brand" for the College in Fall of 2007. Following the report, Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) asked how many people in the field of higher education marketing used the word “branding,” suggesting that “imaging” might have fewer negative connotations. Mr. Haskins replied that the term is commonly used, that it serves as a short-hand that people in marketing and education are used to. The brand will be used to recruit students, to aid in fund-raising, and to enhance the college’s reputation in general.

Kay Smith—SACS Accreditation

Because Provost Elise Jorgens was out of town and unable to make a report, Mr. Mignone called on Kay Smith, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, to report in the Provost’s place. Ms. Smith reported that the recent SACS accreditation visit was quite successful. The accreditation team praised the QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) involving the First-Year Experience in particular, making no recommendations for change in relation to this plan. The SACS team lauded the QEP for faculty involvement in developing and staffing the First-Year Experience, for its setting within the academic culture, for the fact that it provides multiple pathways (both First-Year Seminars and Learning Communities), and for a Learning Communities proposal that would link CofC students with students at Trident Technical College.

Tenure and Promotion Committee—Proposed Changes to the FAM (to be voted on at April 17 Senate meeting)

Jane Clary, Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, presented a series of proposals for changes to the Faculty Administration Manual (FAM) involving Tenure and Promotion procedures. While many of these changes involve minor updating of the FAM, some are more substantial, such as a proposal that untenured faculty members will no longer be required to write colleague letters and a proposal that department-wide course grade statistics be included in evaluation packets. The series of proposals has gone to the By-Laws Committee for
consideration and will be debated and voted on at the April 17 Senate meeting. (For a full list of the T & P Committee’s proposed changes, please see Appendix 1).

Several faculty members asked questions as Ms. Clary was presenting her report. Norris Preyer (Physics/Astronomy) asked about Proposal II, which recommends that the minimum sample size of letters from recent graduates be increased from 25 to 40. Mr. Preyer said that his department would have trouble getting 40 letters, because they have so few majors. Ms. Clary responded that the department would have to try to obtain 40 letters, and if they didn’t have enough majors, they could solicit non-majors for letters. Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) pointed out that the new rules would require at least 40 requests for letters be sent out, not that 40 letters actually be returned by students.

Mary Beth Heston (Art History) asked whether Proposal III.2, which requires only tenured members of a department to submit colleague letters, applied to only those undergoing third-year review, or to everyone being evaluated. Ms. Clary replied that this change refers to all evaluations (third-year, tenure, and promotion).

Ms. Heston then asked a question about Proposal IV, which involves the granting of prior credit toward tenure. She wondered why the amount of prior credit granted would be a decision of the T&P Committee. Ms. Clary replied that it is not; this is a decision determined by contract letter. The language of this proposal is simply intended to reflect current administrative practice, which is to grant a maximum of two years prior credit toward tenure. Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) then argued that such a policy might drive well-qualified candidates away. Brian McGee (guest, Communication) pointed out that a well-qualified faculty member could still pursue early tenure and promotion, which is allowed.

Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) said that she was opposed to the portion of Proposal IX that gives less calendar time for departmental panels to meet and make decisions concerning tenure and promotion. Ms. Caveny felt a two-week period was too short, especially for large departments that have numerous candidates and may have more than one meeting devoted to each candidate. Ms. Clary replied that the T&P Committee wanted the whole process moved up, and they would be willing to re-examine the calendar, and perhaps move packet due dates earlier.

Terry Bowers (English), also in reference to the proposed calendar, asked whether a candidate waiting for a verdict on a publication could still add this to the packet later in the semester. Ms. Clary replied that candidates could add items to the packet, but that the date for doing this would be moved up a short time.

Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance), in relation to Proposal X, which requires an alternate member of the T&P Committee—from the candidate’s school—to serve when no regular member comes from that school, asked how it would be determined which regular member of the T&P Committee would step down. Ms. Clary replied that this might be determined by committee members’ schedules or by volunteer.

Next, Mary Beth Heston thanked Ms. Clary for all her hard work on the committee, noting that T&P is one of the most time-consuming committees that faculty members serve on. Mark Lazzaro (guest, Biology) asked if there were a plan for how people would be grandfathered in, if these proposed changes pass. Ms. Clary replied that her committee did not see anything in the
proposals that would require people to be grandfathered in; none of these changes involve contract-letter issues. Brian McGee added that, of the eleven proposals, only one (Proposal X) is a by-laws change controlled by the Senate and the Senate process—the other ten changes occur in the administrative portion of the FAM and have been brought to the Senate as a courtesy to establish a consultative process. Mr. Mignone pointed out that there is a strong tradition at the College that any policies concerning T&P be made through administrative consultation with faculty. Pete Calcagno (Economics/Finance) then asked about the timeline for when these changes would take effect. Ms. Clary replied that the changes would go into effect for Fall 2007.

The Speaker

Mr. Mignone’s report was very brief. He reminded Senators that special meetings of the Senate to discuss the General Education Proposals would take place on April 10 and April 12, and if necessary, on April 26 and May 3. In addition, regular Senate meetings are scheduled for April 17 and April 24. All of these meetings will be at 5:00 p.m. in the Wachovia Auditorium.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

The Senate approved all of the curriculum proposals from the Departments of Computer Science, Mathematics, Religious Studies, Theatre, and Economics and Finance. (For a full list of these proposals, please see Appendix 2).

There was brief discussion concerning of few of the proposals. Mark Long (Political Science) asked why there were no required texts listed for the proposed new course THTR 391, Stage Combat. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) replied that no textbooks currently exist for this course; it’s a movement-oriented course, similar in certain ways to a dance course. Mr. Long replied that he had found ten textbooks on the Amazon website called stage combat. Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) asked whether the course involved jousting and dueling. Ms. Kattwinkel replied that it does, but that it also involves history, films, articles, etc. Jennifer McStotts (guest, School of Humanities and Social Sciences) said that she could attest to the volume of handouts that are used in the class because her husband has taken it.

In addition, Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) asked about the requirement change for the major in Economics, which is intended to reduce requirements and give students more elective choices. He was particularly sorry to see the course ECON 308, Evolution of Economic Doctrines, dropped as a requirement. Mr. Nunan also said that he was surprised to see in the proposal that less sequencing of courses is a national trend in Economics departments. Pete Calcagno (Economics/Finance) replied that most Economics majors will still take ECON 308 anyway, because available electives are limited. The course is no longer required to be taken at a specific time in a student’s career, however. Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) added that Economics is moving in the direction of being more like a science. Biologists, he argued, do not require students to take a course in the history of biology. Such courses could be counter-productive in any case since they would focus on outmoded biological ideas. Mr. Nunan replied that he thought this was an unfortunate attitude. Mr. Blackwell said that he would prefer to see students spend their time on more relevant courses.
First-Year Seminar, FYSM 101

The Senate then turned to another proposal from the Curriculum Committee, for a new First-Year Seminar course, FYSM 101. Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) introduced the proposal by offering a brief history of its inception. The course, he said, represents unfinished Senate business. In the spring of 2004, the Academic Planning Committee presented a motion to the Senate to approve a First-Year Seminar course. While the full proposal was not approved, the first page of the proposal was accepted as a concept for a First-Year Seminar, with the understanding that the details of the course would be worked out later. Now, three years later, we have a fully worked out proposal with details. In addition, the proposal for FYSM 101 is also a reaction to the SACS visit and the Quality Enhancement Plan, which focused on two curricular initiatives, Learning Communities and a new First-Year Seminar. Mr. Wilder chaired the committee working on the First-Year Seminar for SACS accreditation. The third impetus for this course is the work of the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education and the proposals this committee has come up with. On April 13, the Senate approved a proposal to require a First Year Experience for all entering students. One possibility for fulfilling that experience is the First-Year Seminar. This is the proposal we are considering today.

Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) next introduced an amendment to the proposal that would hold departments harmless in relation to workload target numbers if faculty members sign on to teach these seminars, which will have low enrollments. Mr. Nunan’s amendment reads as follows:

Amend section 10(b) (Address potential shifts in staffing of the department) of the Curriculum Committee’s FYSM 101 New Course Proposal to read as follows (addition in blue):

All sections will be taught by regular faculty. Because of their low enrollment ceilings, the enrollments of FYSM 101 courses will be double-counted with respect to departmental teaching workload target figures, or departments will be otherwise “held harmless” with respect to the potential effect of these courses on workload target figures. Staffing will vary by department. As noted in 11 below, some departments will have additional faculty to help staff the course. Departments may offer sections of FYSM 101 in lieu of offering other general education courses.

Amend section VI.C (Faculty – Training, Compensation, Workload) of the First Year Seminar Committee’s FYSM 101 New Course Proposal to read as follows (cf. bottom of p. 15 of the Curriculum Committee support document entitled ‘New Course Support Report Feb 07’):

Participation in the First-Year Seminar program is part of the faculty member’s regular teaching load. Because of their low enrollment ceilings, the enrollments of FYSM 101 courses will be double-counted with respect to departmental teaching workload target figures, or departments will be otherwise “held harmless” with respect to the potential effect of these courses on workload target figures. Documentation of teaching performance in FYSM 101 will be included in the evidence of teaching effectiveness…
Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) asked what effect Mr. Nunan expected this amendment to have. Mr. Nunan replied that we currently have target numbers for departments to meet in terms of average student load. If someone is teaching two sections of a freshman seminar with 20 students each, rather than, say, 70 students in two sections of a departmental introductory course, departmental workload numbers could drop significantly, especially if several faculty members from a single department participate in the seminars. Such changes in target numbers could affect hiring decisions, etc. In addition, Mr. Nunan pointed out that the Senate had already added similar language to the portions of the General Education proposals that were passed at the April 13 special meeting of the Senate. Mr. Blackwell said that he didn’t see how Mr. Nunan’s amendment would accomplish his goal, because this document doesn’t really exist in any official capacity—it’s simply a curriculum form. It might be better, he added, to have a general Senate resolution on the matter. Hugh Wilder replied that, as the First-Year Experience program gets more fully developed and implemented, the committee and director will be reading documents concerning this course. So, he thinks that by revising this form and the accompanying report, the people implementing this course will have it in writing that the Senate endorsed these changes. Mr. Wilder asked that Senators approve Mr. Nunan’s amendment, pointing out that it would be odd to endorse similar language in the General Education proposals, but not here.

Darryl Phillips (At-Large, Classics) then asked a procedural question. He wondered if we were debating and voting simply on the curriculum proposal or also on the lengthy 40-page report that came with it. Mr. Wilder replied that the two documents are integrated. On the curriculum committee form, in responses to a few of the questions, references are made to the full report. He added that he thinks it’s unavoidable that the Senate will be voting on the detailed report as well as the curriculum proposal.

After a few more questions from Senators, concerning where this report appears (with other documents on the Senate website), what the enrollment ceilings for the course are (20), and whether we have the power to pass this amendment (everything the Senate passes is a recommendation), Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) called the question on the amendment. The Senate voted in favor of calling the question. Mr. Nunan’s amendment passed on a voice vote.

At this point, discussion returned to the original motion. David Kowal (Art History) moved to table (postpone) the discussion. A vote was taken and the motion to table failed.

Larry Krasnoff (guest, Philosophy) then asked what he referred to as a record-keeping question. He wondered whether FYSM would be the acronym for the course used on student transcripts, and whether this would make it difficult for the course to count toward specific majors as well. Mr. Wilder replied that there would be a specific identifier for each section so that the course could toward other requirements. The committee that developed the course wanted it to have its own identity as a First-Year Seminar even though this may make record keeping a bit more difficult.

Darryl Phillips (At-Large, Classics) said that he was in favor of the seminar, that he likes the fact that roster faculty will teach it, but he was disappointed with the curricular proposal. He would much prefer the course to have departmental acronyms identifying it because setting it up as FYSM entails setting up a new department in the SIS system, which he believes creates several problems. All faculty members would have student evaluations generated by the FYSM...
department, which would go to the director of the First-Year Experience, not to department chairs. Percentile ratings for faculty evaluations would be compared against a group that is this new department. In addition, among other difficulties, an FYSM department would create problems tracking faculty workload. He would rather see the course created within existing departments than labeled with the FYSM moniker. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) replied that Mr. Phillip’s concerns had great merit and would have to be dealt with by an administrative body. Current courses (such as a Spoleto class she teaches) have acronyms that are not attached to a department. So, similar things are being done now, and they work. The General Education Committee was concerned that putting the course into existing departments might create a situation in which, over time, there would be creep toward these seminars becoming discipline-introductory classes, which is a model the General Education Committee does not want to follow.

Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) said that, while our new administrative computing system might be better, the SIS system we currently have would require that all double-counting of the FYSM 101 course would have to be done by hand, a painstaking process. Mr. Phillips, responding to Ms. Kattwinkel’s comments, argued that having a committee that approves or rejects First-Year Seminar courses on a regular basis would prevent the kind of disciplinary-creep the General Education Committee feared. One of the things the QEP was praised for during SACS accreditation, he added, was its being situated in an academic setting, and he can think of no better academic setting than a disciplinary department rather than an FYSM department. Mr. Phillips also wondered whether departments would have to give up classroom space that would be allocated to an FYSM department. Mr. Wilder said that his committee did consider some aspects of the questions raised by Mr. Phillips. They used the Honors College as a model for the acronym and the way it would be implemented. In addition, we have other examples of four letter acronyms at the College that are smaller than departmental units. He argued that it is not quite accurate to say we would be creating a department by adopting the FYSM acronym. These four-letter acronyms do not necessarily stand for departments. Again, his committee wants this course to have its own identity, not to be subsumed by departments.

Mick Norton (Mathematics) said that he would like to see something added to the proposal about incoming students learning they’re expected to work hard and hold up their end. Larry Krasnoff, returning to the acronym debate, said that labeling of the course was not really a substantive issue; it is basically a record-keeping issue. He would like to see the course kept in departments just because it would be simpler. He is unable to amend the motion because he is not a Senator, but he would like to see a Senator propose an amendment to change the acronym so we can vote it up or down. Kay Smith then argued that we need to think about incoming students. She believes we would send a stronger programmatic message to these students by using the FYSM acronym. Such a designator would indicate that this is a special experience, and that we have special expectations of it. Information can easily be shared between the director of the First-Year Experience and department chairs. A director would need to know, she added, how these courses are working as a group of courses.

After a few more comments about the possibility of packaging the courses in both ways (as FYSM courses and as departmental courses), Mr. Wilder said that he thought we were getting away from discussion of the course itself and into implementation issues. The director of the FYE and the FYE committee can work to develop publicity that will advertise the courses in a clear and helpful way. Students can also be advised about how the courses can double count.
Calvin Blackwell then pointed out that we haven’t created a separate designation for Learning Communities. He argued it might a good idea to pick one way or the other of designating courses. Since Learning Communities are designated within departments, he argued that we might as well use this practice for the FYSM courses as well. David Gentry (At-Large, Psychology) then asked how interdisciplinary FYSM courses would be accounted for if we use departmental acronyms. Deanna Caveny proposed that, as soon as our system allows it, the FYSM courses could be given multiple names.

Brian McGee said that he shares Mr. Phillip’s concerns, but that he’s taught similar courses at other institutions, and he can’t believe we won’t be able to solve problems they’ve solved in other places. Richard Nunan argued that specific departmental designators could be used in section numbers, and agreed with Mr. McGee that such problems can be worked out. He also said that he believes Learning Communities are quite different from freshman seminars and he would like to keep these courses separate. Doryjane Birrer (English) agreed that record-keeping can be worked out later, arguing that the Senate, as a body, has already endorsed shared General Education goals. She hopes we will take the opportunity to have a linguistic marker (FYSM) to indicate institutional cohesion, rather than reduce things back to departments.

Meg Cormack then offered an amendment that all courses would be labeled by department acronym. No one seconded the amendment. The question on the main motion was then called by Mick Norton. The Senate voted in favor of calling the question.

The Senate approved the proposal for a new FYSM 101 class.

The Senate adjourned at 7:00. New business that we didn't get to at this meeting included curriculum proposals from the Department of Management and Entrepreneurship, proposals from the Graduate Education Committee, a proposed amendment to the FAM by the Nominations and Elections Committee, and a proposed campus-wide Committee on Environmental Sustainability. Except for the Nominations issue, which will be taken up at the special Senate meeting on April 10 (because of election timelines), the remaining issues will be taken up at the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate, on April 17.

Respectfully Submitted,
Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix 1.

T & P Committee: Recommendations for Changes to the Faculty Administration Manual

I. Student Evaluations, Comments on Student Evaluations (Manual Change)

1. The Faculty Administration Manual (FAM) requires that student ratings from all courses are included as evidence. The FAM also states that the candidate and/or the department may choose to include the comments as evidence (J.1.b.(5)). We recommend that no changes be made in this policy. However, the statement regarding student evaluation forms in section M.6.c. conflicts with that in J.1.b.(5).

We recommend that the statement in M.6.c. be changed from

“All completed student evaluation forms for courses taught during the evaluation period. (Normally these are included by the candidate in the packet; they may be provided by the department chair in the event the candidate is unable to do so.)”

To

“Student Rating Averages from all courses evaluated, Summary Ratings for all courses in the department, and Grade Distribution Reports for the department. (Normally, course evaluation ratings are included by the candidate in the packet; however, some or all of these documents may be provided by the department chair in the event the candidate is unable to do so.)”

2. We recommend that:

The following statement be added to J.1.b.(5), calling this statement (5.b.), and making the current statement (5) become (5.a)

“The Summary Rating for All Courses in the Department for each semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder with the summary student evaluations. The summary ratings for the department will be distributed to the faculty in the department each semester.”

3. We recommend that:

The following statement be added to J.1.b.(5), calling this statement (5.c.).

“The Grade Distribution Report for the Department for each semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder. The Grade Distribution Report for the Department will be distributed to all faculty in the department each semester. Names and other identifying information may or may not be removed from the report at the Department Chair’s discretion. The complete data in the report for an individual faculty member will be distributed to that faculty member each year for every semester.”
Rationale: Both the Summary Rating for the department for student evaluations and the Grade Distribution Report for the department represent additional evidence for evaluating teaching in the context of the department norms. Further, the Grade Distribution Report is useful for individual faculty in determining how one compares with others in the same department. It is clear that these reports are being used to evaluate candidates at the department level and references to grade distributions are common in the departmental panel and colleague letters. There are presently no guidelines about the use of these reports for evaluative purposes in the Manual. There is likewise no campus policy for the distribution of these reports. Identifying information about specific faculty may or may not be removed at the Chair’s discretion. We believe that requiring the distribution of the reports to all faculty members leads to greater consistency and transparency and provides useful information to the faculty member.

II. Letters from Recent Graduates (Manual Change)

We recommend that:

1. The minimum sample size be increased from 25 to 40 in J.1.b.(4) in line 2 and in line 15.

2. Each Department’s graduate evaluation form will include a section that contains information and questions which will be used campus wide. This part of the form will be distributed by the Office of Academic Affairs each year.

3. Solicitation of Recent Graduate Evaluations for Third-Year Review cases be optional.

Add the following statement to J.1.b.(4) and to M.6.f.

“Recent Graduate Evaluations are optional for Third-Year Review.”

Rationale: We recommend increasing the size of the sample in order to receive a larger number of responses. We recommend using a common part as part of the evaluation form so that at least some of the information received is consistent across departments. We recommend that departments supplement the common form if a department needs to have additional information specific to a department. We recommend not requiring letters for third-year review because most third-year review candidates will not have taught a significant number of recent graduates.

III. Department Colleague Letters/ Extra-departmental Colleague Letters (Manual Change)

We recommend that:

1. No extra-departmental colleague letters be required for third-year evaluation.

Add the following statement to M.6.d.

“Extra-departmental colleague letters are optional for third-year review.”
the requirement specifying who in the department is required to write colleague evaluation letters be changed:

M.6.b. the current statement,

“Normally, only those faculty members who have more than two (2) full years of service within the department shall provide colleague evaluation letters; however, any member of the department may submit a colleague letter.”

Be changed to:

“Normally, all tenured faculty members in a department, including the department chair, must provide colleague evaluation letters; however, any member of the department may submit a colleague letter.”

Rationale:

1. We recommend that colleague letters written by College of Charleston faculty outside of the department not be required for third-year evaluation. In many cases, the faculty member being evaluated does not have significant service and other activities outside the department to merit requiring these extra-departmental evaluation letters. However, a person may request such extra-departmental letters if one so chooses.

2. We recommend that only tenured members of a department be required to write colleague evaluation letters. Some untenured faculty members may not feel comfortable writing evaluative letters for senior members in a department, and requiring untenured faculty members to evaluate senior faculty in the department could place the untenured faculty in a precarious position. For these reasons, the majority of the committee feel that un-tenured faculty members should therefore not be required to write colleague evaluation letters. We recognize, however, that in many cases, untenured faculty provide very thoughtful and useful information, especially in the area of research, and that these junior faculty might be better able to put the candidate’s contribution in perspective. An untenured faculty member in a department may write a colleague evaluation letter if he/she chooses to do so.

IV. Prior Credit

The current practice at the College, as we understand, is that normally, no more than two years of credit for prior experience is granted toward tenure. The FAM makes reference to cases in which up to three years of credit is granted.

We recommend that:

1. All references to ‘three (3) years of prior credit’ be changed to ‘two (2)’ for both instructional faculty and for library faculty in all sections of the FAM.

The final sentence in the first paragraph, M.1., should be deleted (In the case of faculty members hired with three years of credit toward tenure, the tenure review will replace the third year evaluation.)

2. The current practice and policy in the FAM is that faculty members with two years of credit will be evaluated during the spring semester of the
second year (after 3 semesters completed at the College) instead of during the fall semester of the third year (after 4 semesters) and that the Provost’s Office will develop a special calendar for these candidates.

We recommend that this be changed:

From the Current statement, M.1. Introduction, paragraph 1,

“For a faculty member with two years of credit toward tenure, an evaluation will take place in the spring semester of the second year instead of the fall semester of the third year. (Each year as needed the Provost’s Office will develop a special calendar for candidates with two years credit toward tenure who require third year review.)”

To:

“For a faculty member with two years of credit toward tenure, a third-year evaluation will take place in the fall semester of the third year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place in the fall of the fourth year. For a faculty member with one year of credit toward tenure, a third-year evaluation will take place in the fall semester of the third year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place in the fall of the fifth year.”

3. The final sentence in section 4, J. Introduction, paragraph 4,

“A person receiving the maximum of three years credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the third year at the College.”

should be changed to:

“A person receiving the maximum of two years credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fourth year at the College.”

AND the following sentence should be added:

“A person receiving one year of credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fifth year at the College.”

Rationale: Most of these changes are made to reflect current practice. The substantive change (2) is for consistency, so that all third-year evaluations take place in the fall. In all cases, the initial contract letter will stipulate when reviews are to take place. Also, current language in contract letters affords candidates the option of reverting to a tenure decision in the sixth year.

V. Mid-Year Hires (Manual Change – new information)

The FAM makes no mention of when candidates hired at mid-year are evaluated for tenure and promotion. The FAM gives no guidance concerning faculty hired at mid-year. We recommend:

1. For candidates hired at **mid-year with no prior credit**, the third-year evaluation will take place during the fall semester of the third year (after 3 semesters completed at the College) and the evaluation for tenure will take place during the fall semester of the sixth year (after 9 semesters completed).
2. For candidates hired at mid-year with one year of prior credit, the third-year evaluation will take place during the fall semester of the third year (after 3 semester completed at the College) and the evaluation for tenure will take place during the fall semester of the fifth year (after 7 semesters completed at the College).

3. For candidates hired at mid-year with two years of credit, the third-year evaluation will take place during the fall of the third year (after 3 semesters completed at the College) and the evaluation for tenure will take place during the fall semester of the fourth year (after 5 semesters completed at the College).

Given these recommendations, the following statement would be added to the introduction, **M.1.**

“Candidates hired at mid-year will undergo the third-year review during the fall semester of the third academic year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place during the fall semester of the sixth academic year. The evaluations for third-year review and for tenure will be adjusted accordingly for candidates hired at mid-year and granted credit for prior experience.”

Rationale: No mention of mid-year hires is made in the FAM. Because faculty must be evaluated for tenure during the sixth year, we recommend that those faculty hired at mid-year (January) be evaluated on the same calendar as those faculty hired in August of the previous year. This policy gives those faculty hired at mid-year one semester less time in service before being evaluated for tenure. These changes, in large part, reflect current practice and will now be specified in the Manual.

**VI. External Review of Research (Manual Change/Clarification)**

1. We recommend that no changes be made concerning the requirement for External Reviews of Research – that they remain optional.

2. We recommend that the current statement in **M.6.d.**

“Letters of evaluation from extra-departmental colleagues assessing the faculty member’s contribution during the evaluation period.”

be changed to:

“Letters of evaluation from extra-departmental College of Charleston colleagues and, where appropriate, from colleagues at other institutions familiar with the candidate’s teaching, and/or research and professional development, and/or service; these letters are solicited by the department chair at the request of the candidate.

An independent external review of the candidate’s scholarly work by experts in the candidate’s field of work is optional, and the required protocol for this review is included in section J.2.b.(2).”

3. We recommend that the current statement in **J.2.b.(2)** be changed:
From

“Both internal and external colleague statements on research and professional activities.”

To

“(2) i. Departmental colleague letters evaluating research and professional development are required.

ii. Optional evaluation of research and professional development includes:
   • letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions evaluating research and professional development

and

• independent external reviews of research. Departments which choose to conduct such external reviews must follow the process outlined here.”

4. We recommend that the instructions for External Reviews of Research which are included in the Memo be included in the FAM in J.2.b.2. immediately following the statement in (2) above.

5. We recommend that the current statement in J.1.b.(2) be changed:

From

“Internal and/or external colleague statements on teaching.”

To

“(2) i. Departmental colleague letters evaluating teaching are required.

ii. Letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions evaluating teaching are optional.”

6. We recommend that the current statement in J.3.b.(2) be changed:

From

“Internal and/or external colleague statements on service activities.”

To

“(2) i. Departmental colleague letters evaluating service are required.”
ii. **Letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions evaluating service are required.**

Rationale: External review of research is being conducted more often in evaluations, and we recommend that the instructions for conducting these reviews be included in the FAM as required instructions instead of as recommended instructions. Presently, when the selection process for external reviewers is not specified or is inappropriate, the Advisory Committee is unable to use the information contained in the letters. The other recommendations for change are for clarification and consistency.

VII. **Lists of Evidence for Teaching, Research and Professional Development, and Service (J.1.b.; J.2.b.; J.3.b.)** should be edited to reflect any changes and current practice, and the lists might be re-ordered. Language should also be edited to reflect the use of the Executive Binder and the Supplemental Binder as necessary.

Rationale: The lists of evidence in each category is, in some cases, outdated and not in line with current practice. For example, under evidence for Research and Professional Development, section 4, evidence of scholarship, “research grants” might be changed to “funded research grants” and this item might be moved “up” in order of importance. Also, workbooks and study guides might be considered evidence of teaching, not as evidence of research and professional development, and might be moved to the section on teaching.

VIII. Insert statement passed by the Senate (2003-04) regarding “exemplary performance in at least one area” in the specific list of criteria for each rank:

J.4.a.; J.4.b.; J.4.c. Include the statement below at the end of the introductory paragraph in each a, b, and c.

“Evidence of exemplary performance is required in at least one of the specified professional competency areas.”

Rationale: These statements have been passed by the Senate and have not been added to the Manual.

IX. **Calendar**

Dates Stipulated in the Manual are marked with *.

We recommend the following date changes:

**August 15**
Chairs confirm tenure list to Academic Dean, etc.....
(Changed from September 15*)

**October 1**
Candidates submit packets (Executive and Supplemental Binders) to the Chair
(Changed from October 15)

**No later than Oct 15**
Panel Chairs assure that all evaluation data have been collected and Panels convene
(Changed from October 27)
Nov 1*  Panel Chairs present results to the Dean
(Changed from Dec 1*)

Dec 1*  Deans forward their recommendations to the Provost. Deans forward panel recommendations to the Provost. Deans forward all packet information to the Provost
(Changed from Dec 15* (panel recommendation and packets) and from Jan 15 (Dean’s recommendation))

Rationale: The calendar above allows for the evaluation at the department level and at the School level to be completed before the end of the fall semester; it further allows for the work of the Advisory Committee to begin earlier.

X. Membership on the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review (By-Laws Change)

We recommend that the Faculty Nominating Committee include as either regular members or as alternate members at least one person from each of the Schools.

Rationale: At the request of the Provost, the Committee very carefully considered various proposals to change the method of selecting the members of the Faculty Advisory Committee for Third-Year Review, Tenure, and Promotion. Four options were considered:

1) selection based on nomination by each Dean, thereby increasing the number of members from five to seven
2) selection based on faculty vote by school, thereby increasing the number of members from five to seven
3) selection based on the deliberations of the Faculty Nominating Committee (current practice) but increasing the number of members to seven.
4) selection based on the deliberations of the Faculty nominating Committee (current practice) but no changes to the number of committee members.

We have concluded that increasing the number of members on the committee would make the tasks of scheduling, of finding alternates, and of finding sufficient time to carefully review the packets prohibitively difficult. It is our view that proposals 1 and 2 change the nature of the committee from a “faculty voice” to a “school voice”. We feel that having the T&P Committee chosen by the Faculty Nominating Committee balances the T&P Committee not only by selecting members from the different schools, but also by selecting faculty members with different ranks and by ensuring that a few of the members – but not all of the members – have served previously on the T&P Committee. In particular, the membership of the T&P Committee typically includes at least one member who has served on the committee the previous year. This committee “memory” helps to consistently maintain the standards for tenure and promotion from year to year. Selection of the committee members by direct vote or by direct appointment eliminates the ability to balance the membership of the committee by anything other than school. We recognize, however, that, if at all possible, candidates deserve to have a voice from their school on the voting panel. We have therefore offered this compromise to proposals 1-4 above: the Nominations Committee will ensure that, among the 5 regular and the 5 alternate members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review, all schools are represented. In cases where a candidate’s school is not represented by the membership of the regular members of the committee, the alternate from the candidate’s school will be called in to replace one of the regular voting members, if possible.
XI. Process Clarification on Faculty Committee Action, M.10. (Manual Change)

We recommend that the following statements be added (insertions in italics)

The Provost will make packets of all candidates for tenure and promotion available to the members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review. **The Advisory Committee will review all of the evidence, including the evidence presented in the Executive Binder, the Supplemental Binder, and the recommendation of the Dean. The Advisory Committee will make an independent assessment of each case and may interview the candidate, the Department Chair, the Departmental Panel Chair, faculty members in the Department, the Dean, and others as necessary. The Faculty Advisory Committee will make a written recommendation to the President. The Faculty Advisory Committee will notify each candidate, Departmental Panel Chair, and the appropriate Dean in writing of its recommendation.**

The Committee will also review third-year candidates on all ….

XII. Process Clarification on Reporting Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel, Section M.7. (Manual Change)

We recommend that the current statement in M.7. be changed:

From

“The chair of the departmental panel will meet with the faculty member being evaluated to inform him/her of the panel’s written recommendation, which will include actual vote splits. Third year candidates will sign the panel’s evaluation.”

To

“**The chair of the departmental panel will meet with the faculty member being evaluated to inform him/her of the panel’s recommendation, including the actual vote splits. A copy of the panel’s written recommendation will be provided to the candidate. The candidate will sign the panel’s written recommendation.**”

Rationale: In some cases department chairs share the panel’s written recommendation with the candidate for promotion and tenure and in other cases the department chair only relates the vote of the panel to the candidate. The Committee recommends that a consistent policy for all departments be in place.

The current statement in the FAM is vague, and the Committee recommends that a more specific policy be included in the Manual.

The Committee believes that candidates have the right to know the issues raised in the panel recommendation. The committee also recognizes that the candor of the panel letter might be compromised if the candidate is allowed to have a copy of the letter, and this concern has been discussed at length. The committee has concluded that the right of the candidate to have the information included in the panel’s recommendation outweighs the potential danger(s), such as a lack of candor in the panel letter.
Appendix 2.

Faculty Curriculum Committee
Proposals for March 27 Senate Meeting

A. **Computer Science**
   Proposal to change a Course – CSCI 199 Special Topics in Computing (*Proposal online*)
   Remove the prerequisite

B. **Mathematics**
   Proposal to change a Course – MATH 207 Discrete Structures I (*Proposal online*)
   Proposal to change a Course – MATH 307 Discrete Structures II (*Proposal online*)
   Both proposals to revise Catalog description, support letter from Computer Science

C. **Religious Studies**
   Proposal to change a Course – RELS 301 Mysticism & Religious Experience (*Proposal online*)
   Proposal to change a Course – RELS 350 Phenomenology of Religions (*Proposal online*)
   Drop RELS 105 prerequisite for both RELS 301 and RELS 350
   New Course Proposal – RELS 335 Western Esotericism (*Proposal & Syllabus online*)

D. **Theatre**
   New Course Proposal – THTR 315 Feminist Theatre (*Proposal & Syllabus online*)
   New Course Proposal – THTR 318 History of Fashion & Manners (*Proposal & Syllabus online*)
   New Course Proposal – THTR 391 Stage Combat (*Proposal & Syllabus online*)
   *Note: Cover letter explaining the three proposals, and two support letters are also online*

E. **Economics and Finance**
   Proposal to change a Course – ECON 400 Senior Seminar in Economics (*Proposal online*)
   Remove the prerequisite ECON 305
   Proposal to change a Course – ECON 201 Principles of Macroeconomics (*Proposal online*)
   Proposal to change a Course – ECON 202 Principles of Microeconomics (*Proposal online*)
   *Note: Cover letter and note online to explain Change in Sequence and renumbering of ECON 201 and 202.*
   Proposal to Change Requirements for Major – Economics (*Proposal, reference, two support letters*)

F. **First Year Seminar FYSM 101**
   New Course Proposal - FYSM 101 First Year Seminar (*Proposal & Syllabus online*)
   *Note: Also online is a supporting document based on the Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan Committee on the First Year Seminar.*
G. Management & Entrepreneurship (M&E)

Proposal to change a Course – MGMT 445 Seminar in Entrepreneurship (Proposal online)
Change prerequisite and co-requisites

New Course Proposal – MGMT 351 Minority Entrepreneurship (Proposal & Syllabus and two supporting letters are online)

New Course Proposal – ENTR 406 Not-for-profit Entrepreneurship (Proposal & Syllabus online)

*Note: Also online is a sheet explaining the three proposals above.*

New Concentration Proposal – Entrepreneurship (Proposal with Reference, and support letter online)
Minutes of the February 27, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, February 27, 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

The minutes from the January 30, 2007 Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

The President

New College of Charleston President, George Benson, described his first month here as being “like drinking out of a fire hose.” He has been trying to meet as many people as he can and learn as much as he can as rapidly as possible. He would like to start a strategic planning process later in the year (in October or November). This process will be an open one, with input from many sources, including the legislature. Mr. Benson also plans to hold open meetings in different cities in the state as part of the strategic plan process.

Next, Mr. Benson said that he and his wife Jane are delighted to be here and that he finds the College a remarkable institution with great possibilities. As soon as he gets to know the campus better, he will focus on fundraising, which he said is perhaps the one black mark in the College’s record. Our endowment is low—only 43 million dollars, when it should be in the hundreds of millions. Mr. Benson noted that there are numerous reasons for this. In 1970, when the institution became public, we had only 500 students. As the number of students increased, the College received increasing revenue from tuition dollars. In addition, the state used to contribute more generously to the College than it does now. Because we have a good faculty/student ratio right now, the College is not going to increase the number of students to bring in revenue. Instead, we need to work on fundraising. Mr. Benson pointed out that previous president, Lee Higdon, used debt effectively, got fundraising started, and made good progress in recent years. But we still have a long way to go. He said that he had been warned that fundraising in Charleston is difficult. The city does not have a long history of giving at the levels that people are used to in the Northeast or even in Atlanta. But we can develop that culture. We do have a very young alumni group—whose average age is in the early 30’s or late 20’s—which is a negative in terms of fundraising. Because of this, we have to take good care of the parents and cultivate them. There is a great deal of wealth in Charleston, and new wealth comes to the city on a daily basis. Mr. Benson added that he enjoys fundraising and expects to be away from campus a good deal on this mission. We’ll see more of him in and around campus now than we might 6-8 months from now. He’ll be available, though not as much as some people might like. Fund-raising requires something of a trade-off in availability, but he said he would try to balance the need to travel and fundraise with campus availability as best he could.

Mr. Benson also announced that he had recently given out a list of his expectations to his administrative leadership team. He highlighted a few of these expectations.

1) First, he wishes to nurture an environment of openness, transparency and trust. Mr. Benson said that he won’t have any hidden agendas, ever. He doesn’t operate that way.

2) He plans to treat faculty and programs as valuable assets, but also as having unique needs and strengths. Mr. Benson mentioned that, as Dean of the Terry School of Business at Georgia, he instituted a policy whereby every individual faculty member had a specific
contract with his or her department head that laid out expectations and responsibilities.

3) In hiring, he believes in reaching as high as our resources will permit. He believes it is extremely important to perform “careful and thorough due diligence” before making an offer. He is not pleased with current faculty and administrative salaries, however, which he believes are inadequate.

4) He wants everyone at the College to be entrepreneurial, to strive to develop programs that pay for themselves (not only in a financial sense). Mr. Benson referred to himself as a risk-taker, someone who is willing to invest in programs that might not pay for themselves initially, but will eventually.

5) He expects us to strive for diversity in the staff and student body.

6) He urged faculty to never hesitate to share good news or bad news with the President’s Office. He wants to be informed.

7) He believes that fundraising is a team sport. Everyone should be involved. Good fundraising begins with the development of deep and lasting relationships. We should begin by asking potential donors for their time, talent, inspiration, and ideas in order that they might form an emotional attachment to the College.

8) He urged faculty members not to be intimidated by limits. He wants to “take the College of Charleston to the world.”

The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens announced that her office has been making good progress on appointing an Associate Provost. She hopes to make an announcement by the end of the week. In addition, Academic Affairs has been busy with tenure and promotion reviews. The college-wide T&P committee has been working very hard. She sits in on deliberations of this committee, although she doesn’t actively take part in them. Since she’s been doing this, she has been extraordinarily impressed by the quality of faculty at the college.

Ms. Jorgens also reported that she attended the AASCU (American Association of State Colleges and Universities) provosts’ meeting earlier this month. She has been quite favorably impressed by these conferences and has returned to the College with many ideas, materials, and suggestions.

Vice President for Business Affairs, Steve Osborne

Mr. Osborne began his report by saying that he has been at the College since November 1. Parking was one of the first issues he had to deal with upon arrival because of both short-range and long-range problems. Over the past year, we have lost 102 employee parking permits due to expansion of facilities. In addition, we will soon be starting construction of a new science center. The 260 parking permits assigned to the K-Lot will disappear in fall of 2007. His office is working to find new parking places for all of us. Mr. Osborne added that the College will continue to use seniority in the state system as the basis for parking reassignment. In addition, because of lost revenue from the K-Lot and other sites, and because state law requires that auxiliary services be self-supporting, the College must increase parking fees.

Mr. Osborne stated that faculty and staff will continue to be given priority over students in parking matters. The new CARTA Express program might help ease parking problems. Also, the College will start offering block passes in the fall that allow faculty and staff to park in the
St. Philip or Wentworth garages for half price. These passes will have no expiration date. The College will continue to offer evening and weekend permits, which will cost 80 dollars per year.

Another problem is that numerous students use the K-Lot after hours, especially to go to the library. There will be a new lot behind Addlestone, open to anyone who has a permit on evenings and weekends. The St. Philip Street garage is another option for students coming after hours. A privately owned garage that is part of the George Street project will come on line in the fall as well. College officials have been discussing with the owners the possibility of College permitting for this garage. In addition, there will be 600 spaces in the aquarium garage in the fall, which has shuttle service with CARTA. The College has a contract with the city to use those spaces until 2012, when we expect to lose them because of the city’s plan to develop that property. Mr. Osborne said the College is aggressively seeking to find new parking to replace these spots.

The floor was then opened to questions. Chip Voorneveld (Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education) asked what the College was doing about compliance with the Federal Disabilities Act. Students with disabilities have been told they have to arrive at 6 am for an 8 am class in order to find parking. Mr. Voorneveld asked what accommodations were being made to better comply with the spirit as well as the letter of the law. Mr. Osborne replied that he was unaware of the particular situation Mr. Voorneveld described. He said his office would review the number of spots the College has designated for disabled people. Janice Wright (Hispanic Studies) spoke next, pointing out that she is handicapped and has to arrive at 6:15 to find a place to park on St. Philip Street. She said that she thinks the office of auxiliary services is just ignoring the problem of handicapped parking. Bob Mignone stepped in at this point and offered to help set up a meeting with relevant people to discuss this issue further.

Idee Winfield (Sociology and Anthropology) then asked whether the College could consider some kind of payroll deduction plan for block passes. Mr. Osborne said he would investigate the possibility. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) asked whether there were plans being made to boost the shuttle service to the aquarium garage, particularly in the evening. Jan Brewton (Auxiliary Services) responded that her office would look into it. Norris Preyer (Physics and Astronomy) pointed out that MUSC has surface lots away from campus, which they run frequent shuttles to. He wondered if that would be a possibility at the College. Mr. Osborne replied that his office has been considering a similar arrangement, possibly by using parking around Riley Stadium. Jaap Hillenius (Biology) asked whether any methods to enhance carpooling were being considered. Mr. Osborne replied that his office has been discussing such a possibility. They plan to hold focus groups on parking for the long-term. However, the College has no specific cost break for carpooling right now. Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) then pointed out that the City of Charleston has a plan to retrofit the West Ashley bridge to build a bicycle lane. He wondered what the College and MUSC have planned in regard to bicycle travel. Mike Gomez (Hispanic Studies) asked whether the aquarium parking garage would continue to be a safe bet for faculty members, or whether there was a possibility that it would be full when someone requested it. Jan Brewton replied that she would assign any faculty member who wants to park in the aquarium to be in the aquarium, pointing out that students are willing to pay for closer garages. Terry Bowers (English) urged Mr. Osborne to find arrangements for students to park near the library, pointing out that it’s essential students be able to get there in the evenings. Tom Ross (Psychology) asked whether there would be any parking at the new science center when it’s complete. Provost Jorgens replied that plans for the science center are already slightly over its
maximum allowed fifty-foot height. We can’t afford to give up space to build parking over it. In addition, the city Board of Architectural Review required a certain amount of green space around the building. Thus, there will be no parking at the science center when it is complete.

The Speaker

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone reminded Senators of the special meeting of the Senate, to discuss General Education proposals, on March 13, at 5:00 in Beatty Center 115. He then thanked all faculty and staff who participated in the MLK Challenge, including John Peters (Biology), Lisa Thomson Ross (Psychology), Cal Morrison (Alum/Chas Youth Leadership Council), Gabriel Magwood (Chas Youth Leadership Council), Merissa Ferrara (Communication), Justin Benefield (Finance), Dinesh Sarvate (Math), Tracey Hughes (Service Learning), Scott Peeples (English), Jocelyn Evans (Economics), Lauren Scott (Admissions), Rhonda Swickert (Psychology), Alex Kasman (Math), Bruce Fleming (HSS/LCWA), Mike Duvall (English), Fouchina Kirkendoll (Youth Build Charter School), Allura Henderson (Development), Marcia Snyder (Econ/Finance), Lil Maughan (English), Kristen Wing (CofC Bookstore), Bethany Laplante (Student Life), Carolyn Morales (Diversity), Ned Hartley (Art History), Catherine Veninga (Political Science), Andrew Lewis (Education), Garrett Mitchener (Math), and Alexa Thacker (President’s Office).

Mr. Mignone also congratulated Joe Kelly on his election as new Speaker of the Faculty and Terry Bowers as Faculty Secretary. He thanked Larry Krasnoff and Robin Bowers for being willing to serve as Speaker and for running for the office. Finally, Mr. Mignone congratulated the nine newly elected at-large senators.

New Business

Academic Standards Committee—Resolution About Showing Films in Class

The Speaker recognized Larry Krasnoff, Chair of the Academic Standards Committee, who introduced the following resolution:

**Motion:** So that students receive the full 150 minutes of classroom instruction per week, the regular screening of feature-length films (approximately 70 minutes or more) for classes should be scheduled outside regularly scheduled class hours. The Registrar’s Office will work with instructors in these classes to arrange extra hours for film screenings when courses are first scheduled.

**Rationale:** In courses where film is the primary focus, required films are treated as texts. The teaching methodology of such courses must take into account that, as texts, required films should be viewed outside of the regularly scheduled 150 minutes, which are reserved for lecture and/or discussion. The planning for a course in which film is the primary focus should parallel that typical in other disciplines for which students are expected to be familiar with course readings in advance. The Registrar's Office is willing to work with professors in affected courses to schedule times for outside screenings.

The floor was opened to discussion. Idee Winfield (Sociology/Anthropology) said that students often feel that attending scheduled events outside of classroom time is beyond the bounds of
what they have to do. She would like to see classes that schedule out-of-class time for films carry some kind of special designation so that students would know what the course entailed when they signed up. Cathy Boyd, College Registrar, said such sections would show up on Cougar Trail as an extra meeting of the class.

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) said that her theatre colleagues strongly disliked the motion. They argue that it is a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of film that you can view film independently. The department also offers a screenwriting class that shows many films in class which students discuss as they are viewing them. In general, it would be problematic to schedule extra time for theater classes since many of them already meet double-time as it is. Joy Vandervort-Cobb (Theatre) added that she shows two films in her African American theater class each semester. They’re not films her students are prepared to see alone; reaction from peers is important. Because of evening rehearsals, she simply doesn’t have time to take her entire class to another place and view the films. Larry Krasnoff replied that the premise of the resolution is not to make students watch films alone (by checking out DVDs from the library, for instance). In addition, the resolution does not necessarily refer to a class in which only two films are viewed. “Regular screening” might not apply to this situation.

Chris Boucher (History) asked about Maymester classes, pointing out that it would be extremely difficult to expect students to watch films outside of class along with the reading that is expected of them and the papers they must write in the limited time they have during this very short semester.

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) said that he was sympathetic to the motion as it applies to many film courses that exist at the college. He understands that the standard model for film studies is to conduct regular showings outside of class and to hold discussion in class, but he worried that one size might not fill all in this respect. Mr. Wilder added that, while this may be a very good motion for film studies-style courses, the showing of films in other types of courses might better be handled by department chairs, who can be sensitive to the sort of problems that have been pointed out in this conversation. John Bruns, Director of the Film Studies Minor, argued that it is important that the same guidelines applied to film studies courses should apply to courses where the object of study is not film itself.

Jerry Boetje (Computer Science) argued that the value of the resolution lies in the fact that it provides a mechanism for scheduling screenings outside of regular class time. This is a good thing that is available if a professor wants to use it. But Mr. Boetje added that the resolution itself is too prescriptive. Richard Nunan (Philosophy) spoke along the same lines, pointing out that he has taught a philosophy and film class, and that he sees a “hortatory quality” about the resolution that is a good thing. It provides a guideline that we should aspire to in ideal circumstances. But he suggested adding the word “normally” to the motion as a friendly amendment. (The first sentence would then read: “So that students receive the full 150 minutes of classroom instruction per week, the regular screening of feature-length films [approximately 70 minutes or more] for classes should normally be scheduled outside regularly scheduled class hours.”) Mr. Krasnoff accepted Mr. Nunan’s suggestion as a friendly amendment.

Next, several Senators, including Susan Kattwinkel, David Maves (Music), Meg Cormack (Religious Studies), Darryl Phillips (Classics), Mick Norton (Math), and Jaap Hillenius
(Biology) spoke against the need for such a resolution, arguing variously that it violates academic freedom, that a professor’s common sense and training in his or her discipline should be trusted, and that there are other mechanisms in place, such as annual evaluations and the college-wide curriculum committee, to check irresponsible teaching. Mr. Krasnoff replied that the curriculum committee vets course content when it approves new courses, but has no input about when the viewing of films would actually take place. He added that he’s not sure department chairs are considering such issues in annual evaluations.

The discussion then turned back to the film studies minor in particular. Scott Peeples (English) asked Mr. Bruns if he were concerned that the practice of showing films in class compromises the film studies minor because he is forced to include courses that are taught in ways that film studies people believe is illegitimate. Mr. Bruns replied that he believed showing films in class undermined the entire undergraduate curriculum. Hugh Wilder asked about the process whereby new courses are approved for the minor. Mr. Bruns replied that only one person has approached him about adding a course to the minor; he rejected it on precisely these terms. Mr. Wilder then suggested the possibility that the minor institute a requirement that courses approved for film studies follow this recommendation (rather than the resolution being applied to all classes in general).

Carol Toris (Psychology) then called the question. The motion to call the question was seconded by Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance). The Senate voted in favor of calling the question.

A voice vote was then taken, and the motion failed.

**Faculty Welfare Committee—Resolution Concerning Fall Break**

Steve Jaume, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee introduced the following resolution concerning fall break:

- Whereas, during the 2006-07 calendar year the College has returned to having a November fall break in conjunction with Election Day; and
- Whereas, students and faculty are in need of a time of rest and regeneration prior to this time; and
- Whereas, the Thanksgiving break is just two weeks after fall break when taken in conjunction with Election Day; and
- Whereas, Election Day is an optional state holiday and faculty, staff and students can exercise their right to vote within the allotted polling times or by making use of absentee voting,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty of the College of Charleston urge that a return be made to scheduling fall break every year during the month of October and that Election Day not be taken as a holiday.

The floor was opened to discussion. Mary Beth Heston (Art History) spoke in favor of the motion, reminding faculty members about the opportunity for absentee voting. Mr. Jaume added that his committee investigated whether students need election day off to return home to vote.
Their research, however, showed that students tended not to go home on election day. Since Thanksgiving is so close, they wait to go home until then.

Discussion ended, and the motion passed on a voice vote.

**Academic Planning Committee—Recommendation on Online Course Delivery**

Chris Hope, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, introduced the following recommendation about online course delivery:

> Whereas online courses for undergraduates fail to fulfill the self-proclaimed mission of the College of Charleston to be a traditional Liberal Arts and Sciences college emphasizing a close relationship between faculty and students fostered through one-on-one interaction and group learning experiences, and

> Whereas online courses fail to provide for education of the whole student promoted by the College of Charleston by limiting the creativity, spontaneity, shared understanding, use of all the senses, and face-to-face contact with class members from diverse backgrounds that live meetings can produce, and

> Whereas online courses fail to provide the human connection and on campus experience necessary to develop a personal relationship between the school and the student critical to the college’s goal of improving student retention and

> Whereas online courses fail to develop interpersonal, oral, and group communication skills in students specified by the College of Charleston general education guidelines and

> Whereas online courses make it more difficult to ensure that student work was actually done by the student submitting the work, thus undermining the high personal integrity standards the College of Charleston holds students to, and

> Whereas the College would need to make a considerable budgetary investment to guarantee the necessary technology support for online coursework and

> Whereas online coursework requires considerable faculty investment in terms of preparation and delivery and, once invested, individual faculty and departments might feel compelled to further expand such offerings and

> Whereas online courses increase the commodification of knowledge, the corporatization of higher education, and the deprofessionalization of the faculty

The Academic Planning Committee recommends against instituting online courses for undergraduates at the College of Charleston. While we recognize there are certain problems that such courses might help alleviate, we believe that online course delivery significantly compromises the mission of the undergraduate program and should thus be avoided. Because the mission of the Graduate School differs from that of the undergraduate program, graduate online courses may be appropriate under special circumstances.

The floor was opened to discussion. Mike Gomez (Hispanic Studies) asked about the definition of online courses. Ms. Hope replied that her committee defined these as courses in which what would normally take place in a class happens online. This recommendation is not intended to speak to supplemental material course material being provided online.
Provost Jorgens, stating that she doesn’t usually speak to motions on the Senate floor, and
doesn’t like to do so, nevertheless urged Senators not to support the recommendation. While she
is not an advocate of online course delivery, she believes the resolution is not a good idea at this
point, partly because there is already an existing committee (chaired by Deb Vaughn) on
alternative course delivery methods. This is not a Senate committee, but it does have mostly
faculty members on it. She is troubled that this committee seems to have been by-passed. In
addition, Ms. Jorgens argued that the proposal is too broad, that it is too definitive in that it says
that online course delivery is never acceptable for any one of us. Finally, she urged holding off
on such a motion until our new president, Mr. Benson, has had adequate time to learn the college
and to be able to make an informed decision about the resolution.

Mike Gomez added that the recommendation makes assumptions about what can and cannot
happen in online courses, that it is a “one-size fits all” kind of statement. He believes we need to
be more open-minded in developing curriculum. Jerry Boetje (Computer Science) said that
online courses have been around for ten years. The market is only now finding out what kind of
courses work online and what don’t. He argued that a blanket refusal of online courses at this
time would cut course development off before we have solid answers about what works. In
addition, the Legislature is about to give out money for developing online courses. Therefore, it
would be foolish of us to pass this recommendation at this point. Finally, he argued the Southern
Association of Colleges and Schools currently defines an “online course” as a course which
offers at least 50% of its content online.

Chip Voorneveld (Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education) then said that approximately
60% of his students have already taken online courses in high school. He argued that some types
of courses are appropriate for online delivery, while other courses, particularly “process courses”
are not. Jerry Boetje added that students are very comfortable doing a lot of things online that
people his age aren’t comfortable doing. It sends a bad message to tell them we’ll never develop
online courses.

Darryl Phillips (Classics) pointed out that the College does accept transfer credit of on-line
courses, so we’d need to be consistent. Brian McGee (Communication) added that it is
impossible to tell, from transfer credit evaluations, whether a course has been taught online or
not, so “the genie is already out of the bottle.” He thought the resolution was too restrictive, and
he pointed out that it doesn’t deal with many distance education courses that have been taught for
years, but that are not online courses.

Idee Winfield (Sociology/Anthropology) spoke in favor of the motion, pointing out worries
about a two-tiered education system in which some students will get classroom experience and
some won’t. As a public liberal arts college, we want to be part of the tier that is not the
technical school, job-training model of education. Skip Godow (Dean of the North Campus)
disagreed, arguing that there is much literature to show that a variety of courses can foster
interaction among students. While he agrees with Ms. Winfield’s stated model of a liberal arts
institution, he thinks this motion is overly restrictive. Sylvia Gamboa (Dean of Summer School)
added that, in a survey concerning summer school, 40% of our students said they’d be very
interested in taking an online course in the summer and 23% would be somewhat interested.

Scott Peeples (English) then spoke in favor of the recommendation. He asked whether anyone
could think of an example of a course in which the professor and students never gather in the same space that would be consistent with the College’s mission. He has difficulty in doing this. Several people, including the Provost and Deanna Caveny (Math) responded, providing examples of professors who happened to be out of the country, high school teachers who work during the day and cannot attend upper-division classes offered only once a year or so, and students who may wish to work cooperatively with students in other countries. Ms. Hope replied that her committee anticipated there might be exceptions like those mentioned, and they didn’t want to preclude them. Mr. Peeples added that the committee’s intent was that the College shouldn’t be actively pursuing online courses, shouldn’t be “scheming about how to make money on them.” But there might be small exceptions. Mr. Boetje argued that everyone is on the same page about what we want the College to look like, that there would be a rebellion if the president said we need to do lots of online courses, but he believes the best this recommendation could do for us is nothing and that it might in fact have a negative impact.

Erin Beutel called the question. Her motion was seconded by Joy Vandervort-Cobb. The Senate approved called the question.

A vote was then taken, and the motion failed on a show of hands.

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

Michael Phillips, Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, introduced the following proposed amendment to the Faculty/Administration Manual:

> On page 38 of the current FAM under Section 3. Standing College Committees, add a phrase and a second sentence such that letter A now reads the following: Members of standing College committees are nominated by March 15 by the Committee on Nominations and Elections and are elected by members of the faculty (as defined in Article I Section1) at the April faculty meeting, with the exception of the Committee on Nominations and Elections and any contested Standing committees. These slates will be presented at the spring faculty meeting for an electronic election which will begin the day after this meeting and conclude on the Friday of that week.

**Rationale:**
There is currently no prescribed method in the FAM for holding elections of contested committees. It is expected that participation in the election of contested committees and the election of the Nominations Committee will increase if these elections are held electronically over a period of days rather than at a single meeting of the faculty.

This amendment will go to the Faculty By-laws Committee for consideration. The By-Laws Committee will make a report at the next Senate meeting, and the proposed amendment will be voted on at that time.

**Curriculum Committee**

The Senate considered the entire slate of curriculum proposals as one package. In discussion, Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy), pointed out that the document proposing to add FINC 375: Principles of Real Estate to the list of approved electives for the major in Hospitality and Tourism Management was missing in the online Senate documents. The Secretary confirmed
that Gerry Gonsalves, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, had indeed sent her the proposal, so the error was hers, not his. The Senate went ahead with a vote on the bundle of proposals in any case.

All curriculum proposals passed. (Please see Appendix 1 for a complete list of the proposals.)

**Graduate Curriculum Committee**

All of the proposals brought by the Graduate Education Committee passed without discussion. (Please see Appendix 2 for a complete list of these proposals.)

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

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix 1.

College of Charleston
Faculty Curriculum Committee
Proposals for February 27, 2007 Senate Meeting

A. Hospitality and Tourism Management (HTMT)
Proposal to Change Requirements for Major – HTMT
  • Add FINC 375: Principles of Real Estate to the list of approved electives

B. Religious Studies
Proposal to Change a Course—RELS 110: Approaches to Religion
  • Change Course Number to RELS 101
Proposal to Change Requirements for Minor—Religious Studies

C. Management and Entrepreneurship (M&E)
New Course Proposal—ENTR 320: Principles of Entrepreneurship
New Course Proposal—ENTR 321: New Venture Planning
Proposal to Change a Course—MGMT 405: Small Business Management
  • Change “MGMT” to “ENTR” and add prerequisite, ENTR 320: Principles of Entrepreneurship

D. Management and Entrepreneurship (M&E)
Proposal to Change Requirements for Concentration—Leadership, Change etc.
  • Changes to correct mistake. Incorrect version (see ref. last 5 pages) approved by Senate in February 2006.
Appendix 2.

College of Charleston Committee on Graduate Education, 
Continuing Education, and Special Programs 
Proposals for February 27, 2007 Senate Meeting

A. **Science and Math for Teachers**
   
   Proposal to Change a Course—SMFT 647, Spectroscopy: The Interaction of Light and Matter

B. **M.S. in Accountancy**

   1. Graduate Program Change proposal

   2. New courses proposals
      
      ACCT 510 – Internal Audit and Forensic Accounting
      ACCT 551 – Corporate Transactional Data Management
      ACCT 552 – Quantitative Analysis for Accountants
      ACCT 553 – Advanced Corporate Transactional Data Management
      ACCT 554 – Advanced Quantitative Analysis for Accountants

   3. Course Change proposals
      
      ACCT 500 – Theory and Financial Reporting (title change)
      ACCT 509 – Professional Auditing Concepts (title and course description change)
      ACCT 513 – Current Issues in Accounting (title and course description change)
      ACCT 545 – Taxation of Estate/Gift Transfers & Deferred Compensation (title and course description change)
Minutes of the January 30, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, January 30, 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

The minutes from the December 5, 2006 Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens began her report by talking about problems with the new desks in Maybank Hall, which have made classrooms overcrowded. Her office has been receiving 6-8 e-mails a day about the situation, so she has decided that we need a systematic investigation into it. She has asked Associate Vice-President of Enrollment, Don Burkard, to look into the issue and see if we can come to a resolution that has a rationale to it. She hopes to report back to us on this issue by the next Senate meeting. Another, related problem, is the number of times that smart classrooms are left open and the potential damage that may occur to equipment. Mr. Burkard will investigate this issue as well.

Terry Bowers (English) then asked Ms. Jorgens whether any short-term relief was in sight for over-crowded rooms. Provost Jorgens replied that one possibility might be bringing back the old classroom furniture. But she emphasized that Mr. Burkard will move quickly and should report back to her soon. She’ll know more about the answers to such questions at that time. Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) asked that Mr. Burkard explore the desk and chair situation in classrooms in other buildings as well. Ms. Jorgens replied that he would.

Secondly, Ms. Jorgens briefly mentioned the BATTERY project, an undertaking to replace all administrative software programs on campus. Chief Information Officer Bob Cape, she said, would talk more with us about this. Ms. Jorgens pointed out that she had had productive discussions with Mr. Cape about how to continue administrative work while the new systems are being introduced. Implementation of the project will proceed in phases.

Finally, Ms. Jorgens reminded faculty members that the College’s new president, George Benson, would officially be starting his new position on February 1. She is looking forward to working with President Benson, and they have already had several very productive exchanges. She hoped that all faculty would come out for the various welcoming receptions. Mr. Benson has already put in place an ambitious schedule for getting to know the campus; he will spend much of his time his first few months here meeting with deans, department chairs, and faculty members.

Speaker
Mr. Mignone was unable to report because he had lost his voice. He promised to give Faculty Senators a written report later and invited CIO Bob Cape to speak in his place.

**Bob Cape—Chief Information Officer**

College of Charleston Chief Information Officer Bob Cape spoke about the BATTERY Project and readiness assessment. Early in January, he reported, an outside organization called Collegiate Project Services (CPS) began work with the College on replacing our existing administrative software with one, integrated system. This project will be finished by late 2010 or early 2011. CPS has been instrumental in giving us a timeline of what we need to do and in what order we need to do it. CPS is currently working to prepare a readiness assessment of the College. They are getting to know the College better by using a web program called Decision Director. Every Faculty Senator is invited to participate in this process, by using Decision Director to share our knowledge about the College. Faculty are invited to attend a ½ hour-long optional orientation session to learn more about Decision Director. These sessions will begin January 31 and last through February 8. Faculty members have until February 14 to go to the Decision Director website and respond to the dialogue presented to us. Mr. Cape very much encouraged Senators to participate in this project.

**Michelle Emerson—CARTA**

Michelle Emerson from CARTA spoke briefly to faculty members about the new CARTA Express service, in which riders can park in remote lots in West Ashley, James Island, North Charleston, and Mt. Pleasant and ride express buses downtown. Riders from CofC, from MUSC, and from the Charleston community at large have sent numerous e-mails praising the service since it was instituted. Ridership, in fact, has been well beyond what CARTA expected initially, although they have no official numbers as yet. Ms. Emerson also reminded faculty members that this service is absolutely free to faculty, staff, and students at the College.

Idee Winfield (Sociology) asked that Ms. Emerson remind all bus drivers about the fact that the service is free for the College of Charleston community. When she rode CARTA Express, her driver thought CofC students and employees had to pay 75 cents and that MUSC was free. Ms. Emerson replied that CARTA is working hard to make sure all employees understand the price structure. Anyone who wishes is welcome to e-mail her with questions and comments about the service at askcarta@ridecarta.com. CofC faculty were also reminded that they must have their college i.d. card with them to ride for free.

**Julia Eichelberger—Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education**

The Speaker then recognized Julia Eichelberger, Chair of the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education, who began her report by announcing that all Faculty Senators should have received a package containing the proposals put forth by the Ad-Hoc Committee. These proposals, she reminded Senators, are revised from earlier draft proposals. The Ad-Hoc Committee is now formally presenting these to Senate. Although no vote was to be
taken at this meeting, Ms. Eichelberger said that she wanted to very briefly introduce the proposals and show Senators the website where we can read more about them (http://www.cofc.edu/~oap/gened/index.html). This website also contains archives of the committee’s previous work. If any of these proposals are approved, the Ad-Hoc Committee will then start working on more specific ways to implement them. The various proposals include:

- Proposal to form a General Education Committee
- Proposal for an on-line record of students’ academic and professional development (a sample form can be found at http://www.cofc.edu/~oap/gened/record/)
- Proposal for a First-Year Experience
- Curricular Proposals

In addition, the website contains a blog where faculty at large can post comments about any of the proposals. Ms. Eichelberger suggested that it would be a good idea not to post to the blog anonymously, since it might be useful to see whether certain types of concerns were shared by entire departments or even schools. She emphasized that the Ad-Hoc Committee has worked hard to listen to faculty and put together a proposal that will reasonably accomplish the education goals approved by the Senate. Committee members hope these proposals will strengthen our identity as a liberal arts college. But now it’s up to faculty members to alter the document as they see fit, she added. Ad-Hoc Committee members will be facilitators of these discussions, but the document is in the hands of the faculty. This proposal, she noted, should be viewed as a starting point for discussion. There will be a special meeting of the Faculty Senate on Tuesday, March 13 at 5:00 to discuss and vote on the proposal.

Provost Jorgens asked everybody to thank the committee before attacking the proposal. The Senate obligingly gave a round of applause. Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) then asked who would decide whether a particular course fills a particular requirement. Ms. Eichelberger replied that that would be the job of a standing General Education Committee. The list of defining characteristics for each of the goals would be a rubric that the committee would use. Terry Bowers (English) asked whether proposals would be voted on individually or as a whole. Ms. Eichelberger said she expected that each proposal would be voted on individually. The Ad-Hoc Committee has separated the proposals out so that faculty can vote to retain what they like, without the “whole ship” going down. Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) asked in what order the proposals would be presented. He stressed that some proposals, such as the structure of a standing General Education Committee, are contingent to some degree on what other components get passed. Therefore, it might be worth thinking about how to sequence the vote. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) added that whatever order is finally used, the contingency problem Mr. Nunan pointed out is likely to be an issue. For the sake of voting, we will probably need to add in some kind of language to address such contingencies. Bob Mignone noted that amendments to any proposals would pose a similar challenge: if an amendment is made to one proposal that affects other parts, this will have to be worked out. Mr. Nunan then pointed out that the Senate has never voted on the defining characteristics attached to each goal. Ms. Eichelberger replied that the defining characteristics would be the first
thing we discuss in each segment we vote on. George Pothering then added, as a follow up, that, since a standing General Education Committee would be using defining characteristics to assess courses, these would have to be voted on. Ms. Eichelberger agreed. Mr. Mignone ended the discussion by reminding Senators about the Tuesday, March 13 special Senate meeting (all faculty are welcome, but only Senators may vote). We will have two hours to conduct business; if we don’t finish, we’ll continue the meeting at a later date.

**New Business**

**Committee on Nominations and Elections/Faculty By-Laws Committee—Amendments to the Faculty/Administration Manual**

Brian McGee, Chair of the By-Laws Committee, presented a report on the five amendments to the Faculty/Administration Manual that had originally been presented to the Senate at our December 5 meeting by Michael Phillips, Chair of the Nominations Committee. Mr. McGee reported that his committee approved of the intent of all the amendments. They suggested a few relatively minor changes in wording, however. (For Mr. McGee’s full report, please see Appendix 1.)

The Speaker then opened the floor to discussion. Daryl Phillips (At-Large, Classics) asked, as a point of clarification on proposed Amendment 5, if an At-Large Senator who had served for four years could then serve as a department Senator. Michael Phillips replied in the negative, pointing out that Senate practice has been not to distinguish between At-Large and departmental Senators when determining eligibility and terms served.

All of the proposed amendments passed on voice votes.

**Faculty Welfare Committee—Resolution Concerning Fall Break**

The fall break proposal put forth by the Faculty Welfare Committee (which appeared on the Senate agenda) was withdrawn by the committee for further study.

**Curriculum Committee**

Mr. Mignone recognized Gerry Gonsalves, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, who submitted several proposals. (Please see Appendix 2 for a full list of these proposals.)

The proposal to change requirements for the Minor in Finance as well as the proposal to change requirements for the Minor in Hospitality and Tourism Management passed without discussion.

Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) asked about budget considerations for the new
Minor in Geography. Mark Long, of the Political Science Department, said that there would be a start-up budget to secure maps, etc., which would be the main expense. Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) asked why the computer software GIS was not a component of the minor. Mr. Long replied that there is a GIS class taught currently at the College, but it is oversold at present. Adding additional sections would require a heavy investment in software and technology, which they hope to be able to do in the future, but which they are not asking for at this point in the process. Finally, Terry Bowers (English) asked about signatures on the forms, which did not appear on the electronic copies posted to the Senate website. Mr. Gonsalves assured him that all the forms did indeed have the required signatures, which he checks carefully. The Faculty Secretary explained that MicroSoft Word documents (which don’t show all the collected signatures) have been posted to the web lately because they are much easier to read than the PDF files (scanned versions of the signed forms) that were formerly posted.

The Proposal Package for a New Minor in Geography passed on a voice vote.

**Graduate Curriculum Committee**

The Speaker recognized Betsy Martin, who introduced a proposal for an MAT in Performing Arts. Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) asked for more information about the program’s budget. He wondered specifically if the proposal would involve additional faculty or significant expenses. Jennifer McStotts of the Faculty Budget Committee replied that three new faculty lines would be added over the first five years of the program. The Budget Committee, Ms. McStotts added, was satisfied with the proposed budget for the program. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) asked in which departments these new faculty lines would be added. Ms. McStotts replied that there would be one line in music, one in theater, and one in dance. Hugh Wilder (Philosophy), pointing out that he assumed there were several new courses yet to be proposed, wondered why there was a course in dance aesthetics but not in music or theatre aesthetics. He was told that each concentration has a separate accrediting body with different requirements. Finally, Bob Mignone confirmed with Chris Hope that the Academic Planning Committee had approved the proposal.

Discussion ended, and the Senate approved the proposal.

5. Constituents’ Concerns

Michael Phillips, Chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee, reminded faculty members to send in committee request forms by the end of the week. He also thanked the Senate for its support of electronic balloting, which he expects will make the logistics of running elections much easier.

Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) again protested against the use of overly-large envelopes to send out Senate materials.
With no further business, the Senate adjourned at 6:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix 1.

Report to the Faculty Senate
Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
College of Charleston
January 30, 2007

Faculty Members: Brian McGee (Committee Chair), William Barfield (Senator), Doryjane Birrer (Senator)

Committee Duties: ôTo review on a continuing basis the Faculty By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual; to propose changes for the improvement of the documents and to forward the recommended changes to the administration and/or the Faculty Senate as appropriate; to incorporate any revisions to or interpretations of either document in new editions of the documentsô (Faculty By-Laws, Art. V, Sect. 2.B.3(b)).

Five motions to amend the Faculty By-Laws were offered at the December 5, 2006, meeting of the Faculty Senate. As required by Article VI of the By-Laws, we offer here our recommendations to the Senate regarding these motions. The original motions are available on the Faculty Senate Web site. All motions were offered by C. Michael Phillips, chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections.

In this report, we reproduce these motions to amend as we recommend they be adopted by the Faculty Senate and the College Faculty, should the Senate and Faculty be favorably disposed to these amendments. For example, in all cases we recommend use of AP style, which consistently is used in the administratively controlled portions of the Faculty/Administration Manual. The motions as originally proposed have been modified to conform to AP style and to our previous recommendation that all proper nouns, including titles, be capitalized in the Faculty/Administration Manual. In motion language, we always recommend the use of ÔshallÕ rather than Ôwill,Ó a standard practice in parliamentary law.

Proposed Amendment One. We have nothing to add regarding this motion to amend. Please see the original rationale for this amendment, as supplied by the Committee on Nominations and Elections.

Proposed Amendment Two. For this motion to amend, we have no concerns about what we perceive to be the intent of the motion. However, we recommend the addition of the words Ôand/or in some other medium or media as designated by the Faculty SenateÔ to the new By-Laws language proposed in the motion. Our concern is that newer media eventually might or will supplant the use of Web site posting as the optimal medium for making this material accessible to faculty and other institutional audiences. Our goal is to make the Faculty By-Laws flexible enough to meet future needs without requiring another amendment to the By-Laws.

Proposed Amendment Three. For this motion to amend, the Committee on
Nominations and Elections asks that a slightly different motion be considered than the one initially provided in December. This new version of the motion would treat first- and second-year at-large replacement in the same fashion and would require the College Faculty to elect the replacement Senator in all cases.

Our committee has no concerns regarding the new version of this amendment, which still would address the goal of the original motion to amend as we understand that goal. The revised motion to amend also would take full advantage of any future electronic balloting system to allow direct election of these replacements by the College Faculty. As noted in an e-mail message written by C. Michael Phillips, this revised version of Amendment Three would allow all at-large replacements to be "elected more efficiently by their appropriate electorate, the faculty." Ó

**Proposed Amendment Four.** We have nothing to add regarding this motion to amend. Please see the original rationale for this amendment, as supplied by the Committee on Nominations and Elections.

**Proposed Amendment Five.** This amendment would efficiently resolve an issue on which the Committee on Nominations and Elections and the Faculty Senate have not been consistent in the past.

We do note that this amendment does not set a minimum time period (e.g., six months) between terms of service as a Faculty Senator. As a result, it is possible that a Faculty Senator could resign her or his office even a day between the end of one term and prior to the start of another term in order to avoid a problem with the four-year maximum period of continuous service. Such action would clearly be inconsistent with the intent of the amendment but is not necessarily prevented by the current form of the amendment. We do not necessarily recommend this measure, but the following additional sentence would address the concern, if added to the Faculty By-Laws: "A minimum of 180 calendar days must pass between the conclusion of one period of continuous service as a Faculty Senator and the beginning of another period of service." Ó

The five motions to amend appear below. In all cases, language proposed for insertion is in italics. Language to be deleted has been marked accordingly. All rationales are supplied in the original document provided by the Committee on Nominations and Elections.

---

**Proposed Amendment 1**

Faculty By-Laws, Art. V, Sect. 3.A.
Strike Òby April 1.Ó Insert Òat the spring faculty meeting.Ó

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 faculty (as defined in Article 1 Section 1) by April 1 at the spring faculty meeting.

**Proposed Amendment 2**

Faculty By-Laws, Art. III, Sect. 2.G.

Insert the following clause at the end of the last sentence of the paragraph: Ò, including maintenance of the Faculty Senate roster on the Faculty Senate Web site and/or in some other medium or media as designated by the Faculty Senate.Ó

G. Duties: The Faculty Secretary acts as secretary for all meetings of the College faculty and of the Faculty Senate. With the assistance of the Secretariat, this officer distributes College and Senate meeting agendas, prepares and distributes to all faculty members detailed minutes of all College and Senate meetings, and distributes minutes of the College Board of Trustees meetings to all Senators. The Faculty Secretary performs other duties normally associated with the office, including maintenance of the Faculty Senate roster on the Faculty Senate Web site and/or in some other medium or media as designated by the Faculty Senate.

**Proposed Amendment 3**

Faculty By-Laws, Art. IV, Sect. 2.F.

Strike the current third sentence and insert as a new, third sentence of the paragraph: ÒIf an At-Large Senator needs to be replaced, the faculty shall elect the replacement by ballot.Ó

F. Vacancies due to resignation, recall or any other reason may be filled by a special election by the appropriate electorate. Senators elected in such special elections will serve out the term of the Senators they replace. If an At-Large Senator needs to be replaced in the second year of a term, the Senate will elect the replacement by written ballot. If an At-Large Senator needs to be replaced, the faculty shall elect the replacement by ballot. The Committee on Nominations will provide a slate of at least two candidates circulated to the faculty at least two weeks before the Senate meeting. Additional nominations from the faculty may be sent to the Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections at least ten days before the Senate meeting.

**Proposed Amendment 4**
Faculty By-Laws, Art. IV, Sect. 2.F.

Strike “at least ten days before the Senate meeting.” Insert “at least one week before the Senate meeting.”

F. Vacancies due to resignation, recall or any other reason may be filled by a special election by the appropriate electorate. Senators elected in such special elections will serve out the term of the Senators they replace. If an At-Large Senator needs to be replaced in the second year of a term the Senate will elect the replacement by written ballot. The Committee on Nominations will provide a slate of at least two candidates circulated to the faculty at least two weeks before the Senate meeting. Additional nominations from the faculty may be sent to the Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections at least ten days before the Senate meeting at least one week before the Senate meeting.

Faculty By-Laws, Art. V, Sect. 2.B.1(b)

Strike “submission in writing to the Speaker at least 10 days.” Insert “submission in writing to the Speaker at least one week.”

1. Committee on Nominations and Elections

b. Election: Nominations may be made by faculty either at the April Senate meeting or by submission in writing to the Speaker at least 10 days submission in writing to the Speaker at least one week prior to the April faculty meeting.

Proposed Amendment 5

Faculty By-Laws, Art. IV, Sect. 2.F.

Insert as a new sentence at the conclusion of the paragraph: “No Senator, including replacement Senators, shall serve for more than four consecutive years.”

F. Vacancies due to resignation, recall or any other reason may be filled by a special election by the appropriate electorate. Senators elected in such special elections will serve out the term of the Senators they replace. If an At-Large Senator needs to be replaced in the second year of a term the Senate will elect the replacement by written ballot. The Committee on Nominations will provide a slate of at least two candidates circulated to the faculty at least two weeks before the Senate meeting. Additional nominations from the faculty may be sent to the Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections at least ten days before the Senate meeting. No Senator, including replacement Senators, shall serve for more than four consecutive years.
Appendix 2.

College of Charleston
Faculty Curriculum Committee
Proposals

A. Economics and Finance
Proposal to Change Requirements for Minor/Concentration – Finance
  • Delete ECON 350 (Financial Markets in the U.S. Economy) from the list of approved electives
  • Modify the list of electives (see details in the proposal)

B. Hospitality & Tourism Management (HTMT)
Proposal to Change Requirements for Minor – HTMT

C. Political Science
Proposal Package for a New Minor in Geography
  • New Minor Proposal, Geography
  • List of courses, requirements for minor, Memorandum of Understanding, and a Budget
  • New Course Proposals for the minor (with selected syllabi):
    • GEOG 219 Reading the Lowcountry Landscape
    • GEOG 301 Special Topics In Geography
    • POLS 311 Environmental Change and Management in the American West
    • POLS 336 Geographies and Politics of Food
    • POLS 337 Geographies and Politics of the U.S. and Canada
    • POLS 396 Race, Ethnicity and the City
    • GEOG 401 Reading and Independent Study in Geography
  • Proposal to change a Course POLS 310 – Political Ecology
Minutes of the December 5, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting

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

The minutes from the November 14, 2006 Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens announced that she did not have a specific report to make. She has been busy meeting with departments, reviewing personnel issues, etc. She asked Senators if anyone had specific questions for her at that time, and no one did.

The Speaker

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone began his report by announcing the creation of a new certificate program in Arts Management within the Master’s of Public Administration Program. The Senate does not vote on certificate programs, so this announcement was for informational purposes only. David Kowal (Art History) asked Mr. Mignone why this program was not housed in the School of the Arts. Provost Jorgens replied that the certificate is offered through the program in Public Administration as one of their available tracks. Public Administration worked with the Arts Management Program to develop it. Courses will be offered through Arts Management, but administered by the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) then pointed out that the College has a history of certificate programs becoming degree requirements. Mr. Wilder wished to go on record as stating that Senate debate on the program will still be required if the certificate becomes a degree program in the future.

Mr. Mignone then reminded faculty members about the College’s Holiday party, to be held on Friday, December 8. He reminded faculty as well of the MLK challenge on January 15 and asked for faculty volunteers to work with student teams during this event.

Finally, Mr. Mignone ended his report by pointing out that this was the last Senate meeting of Fall, 2006. He thanked Conrad Festa for his service as interim president, praising Mr. Festa’s leadership, which resulted in a very “tranquil” semester.

New Business

Faculty Welfare Committee—Pet Policy

Steven Jaume, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, introduced a revised pet policy to the Senate. Mr. Jaume explained that the previous version of the policy, received from the administration, banned all pets. His committee investigated to see if there was a specific incident that the administration’s pet policy was responding to. They could find only one incident, involving a student’s guide dog, which wouldn’t be prevented by the policy anyway. So, the committee concluded that the administration’s policy was too rigid and suggested what they
consider a more reasonable policy. The policy as put forward by the Faculty Welfare Committee reads as follows:

**COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON PET POLICY**

**Buildings and Offices**
Pets are not normally permitted inside any building owned/leased by the College of Charleston. Employees may seek exemption from this policy by appealing to the head of their administrative unit. At no time is a pet that is a health hazard or a nuisance allowed on campus. This policy is not intended to conflict with any employee’s individual rental/lease agreement with the College, nor is it intended to supercede any pet policy established for students in residence halls.

**College Grounds**
Pets brought on campus grounds are the sole responsibility of the owner, including the immediate clean up of waste or incidental damage caused by the pet. The College is not liable for any injuries and/or damage resulting from, or to, the pet. This policy conforms to the City’s leash laws, which can be found in Chapter 5 of the Charleston City Code.

**Service Animals**
This policy does not apply to service animals (i.e., guide dogs) as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

The revised policy passed with no discussion.

**Committee on Nominations and Elections—Amendments to the Faculty Administration Manual**

The Speaker then recognized Michael Phillips, Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections. Mr. Phillips introduced five amendments to the Faculty Administration Manual which will be voted on at the next Senate meeting (January 30). See Appendix I for a full list of the amendments. Mr. Phillips noted that the FAM amendment to permit electronic voting, introduced at the previous Senate meeting (November 14), would be presented by the By-Laws Committee.

**Faculty By-Laws Committee—Amendments to the Faculty By-Laws**

Brian McGee, Chair of the Faculty By-Laws Committee, presented a report on the two amendments to the by-laws proposed by his own committee at the November 14 Senate meeting (to allow for a Provost designee to serve as an ex-officio member of the By-Laws Committee and to allow the Committee to make non-substantive, grammatical changes to the Faculty Administration Manual without going through the usual amendment process), as well as the proposal to amend the Faculty Administration Manual to allow for electronic balloting. Not surprisingly, the committee’s view of their own by-laws amendments was positive. The committee did, however, suggest some changes to the electronic voting amendment proposed by the Nominations Committee. See Appendix 2 for the full text of the committee’s report.
The Senate first considered By-Laws Amendment 1, which allows for a designee of the Provost to serve in place of the Provost as an *ex-officio* member of the By-Laws Committee. This amendment passed with the required super majority (2/3) vote.

The Speaker then opened the floor to discussion of By-Laws Amendment 2, which allows the By-Laws Committee to make non-substantive, stylistic changes to the Faculty Administration Manual without having to treat such changes as an amendment to the FAM. Jack Parson (Political Science), pointing out that he’s given this issue a great deal of thought, argued that when it comes to by-laws, there are no non-substantive changes. Mr. Parson said that he was constitutionally opposed to handing over authority even when there are safeguards, adding that it doesn’t take up that much of the Senate’s time to make amendments to the FAM. Brian McGee replied that he understood Mr. Parson’s concerns and explained that this proposal came out of the FAM revision process. His committee has built in safeguards so that significant changes cannot be made without Senate approval. Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) spoke next, offering the friendly amendment to delete the word “unintended” from item 4 under Committee duties, since he does not believe that any grammatical errors would be intended. The friendly amendment was accepted.

On a show of hands, the motion passed with the required super majority (2/3) vote.

Next under discussion were the changes to the FAM to allow for electronic balloting. David Gentry (At-Large, Psychology) asked a question about paragraph C of the By-Laws Committee report, which originally read: “If an At-Large Senator needs to be replaced in the second year of a term, the Senate will elect the replacement by *written electronic* ballot.” Mr. Gentry was concerned about elections actually conducted during Senate meetings. Will Senators have to bring in laptops? Mr. Gentry also pointed out that paragraph C requires Senate attendance in order to vote. He sees no reason for electronic voting for this type of election. Brian McGee responded that Mr. Gentry’s concern is one reason why the By-laws Committee suggested the Senate consider using the term “ballot” rather than “electronic ballot” as a more flexible option in the proposed amendment. Mike Phillips, Chair of the Nominations Committee spoke next, pointing out that his committee really wants to stick with the phrase “electronic ballot.” He would like to see an agreement from the Senate and from the faculty about what kind of ballot to use. Julia Eichelberger proposed a friendly amendment to strike out the word “electronic” in paragraph C of the proposal and leave it simply as “ballot.” Mr. McGee accepted the amendment as a friendly one.

The proposed amendment to allow for electronic balloting passed on a voice vote with the required super majority (2/3) of Senators.

**Curriculum Committee**

The Chair then recognized Gerry Gonsalves, who made several motions on behalf of the Curriculum Committee. Please see Appendix 3 for a complete list of these motions.

All of the English proposals passed with no discussion.
All of the Archaeology proposals passed with no discussion.

The new course proposal for SPAN 401-Internship passed with no discussion. Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) raised a question about the new course proposal for SPAN 459: Chicano/a Literature, however. Mr. Nunan first asked if this course was to be taught in Spanish. Mr. Gonsalves replied in the affirmative. Mr. Nunan then pointed out that the course could be listed as an elective for the Comparative Literature Minor. He believes that the Hispanic Studies Department should have solicited letters of support for the course from the Comp Lit Minor and the English Department, which also has a stake in the teaching of literature. Sarah Owens (Hispanic Studies) replied that the course involves literature written in Spanish and is taught in Spanish; therefore, it is not relevant to the English Department. She does not think her department would have any problem listing the course as a possible elective for the Comp Lit Minor. Mr. Nunan replied that a letter should still have been solicited from Comp Lit. When such matters arise, proper procedures should be followed. Discussion then ended, and the new course proposal for SPAN 459 passed on a voice vote.

The prefix changes for the Physics and Astronomy courses passed with no discussion, as did the proposal to change the requirements for the Physics major and minor. Richard Nunan wondered what the purpose was for the name change of PHYS 340-Photonics, which replaces PHYS 306-Physical Optics. Jon Hakkila, Chair of the Physics Department, replied that the course material has changed. “Phototonics” is the standard term for the material now covered. Joe Kelly (At-Large, English) then raised a question about credit hours and hours worked per week in relation to the new course proposal for PHYS 381-Internship. Mr. Kelly pointed out that the course was listed as supplying 1-4 credit hours and requiring 10-40 hours worked per week, which seems inconsistent with the statement that “At least 40 hours of work is required for each 1 credit hour awarded for the course,” which also appears in the proposal. Mr. Hakkila said that there must be a typo in the proposal. Brian McGee then pointed out that 120 supervised intern hours for 3 credit hours is consistent with national norms. Mr. Kelly pointed out that, regardless of that point, the wording is still inconsistent. Both new course proposals (PHYS 340 and PHYS 381), as well as the motion to delete PHYS 306, passed on a voice vote.

Constituents’ Concerns

The Speaker recognized Scott Peeples (English), who said that a member of his department wanted him to ask if the real estate program discussed in a recent issue of the Charleston Post and Courier had gone through the curriculum committee and the Senate before being approved. This person expressed concern that issues about curriculum were being made without faculty consultation. Provost Jorgens replied to Mr. Peeples that a program in real estate does not exist at the College at this point. Nor has the College made a commitment to the donor to develop such a program, she added.

George Hopkins (History) asked about the possibility of a raise in adjunct pay. He would like to see the Faculty Welfare Committee discuss the issue. Deanna Caveny, as past chair of the Compensation Committee, spoke next, pointing out that her committee had discussed adjunct pay, but hadn’t make a proposal. Provost Jorgens then added that, in her most recent budget
proposal, she has put in a request for an increase in adjunct salaries. She doesn’t know, however, whether that request will be successful.

The speaker then recognized Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) who, on behalf of Lynne Ford and Kay Smith, reminded faculty members that the deadline for proposals for learning communities for the fall semester of 2007 was coming up. Ms. Caveny encouraged faculty to submit proposals.

Gerry Gonsalves (Management and Entrepreneurship) pointed out an error in the Senate agenda that had been sent around—the deadline for the April 17 Senate meeting should be April 5, not 15th.

Finally, Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) asked about the necessity of using large envelopes to send out Senate agendas and materials. He’d prefer that the material just be folded and stapled, to save paper. Mr. Mignone agreed to discuss the issue with the faculty secretariat.

With no further business, the Senate adjourned at 6:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary

Spring 2007 Senate Meeting Schedule
(All meetings at 5:00 pm in Beatty Center 115)

January 30; agenda deadline Thursday, January 18, 3:00 p.m.
February 27; agenda deadline Thursday, February 15, 3:00 p.m.
March 27; agenda deadline Thursday, March 15, 3:00 p.m.
April 17**; agenda deadline Thursday, April 5, 3:00 p.m.
**Continued April 24 if necessary
Appendix I. Committee on Nominations and Elections

The Committee on Nominations and Elections proposes the following five amendments to the current Faculty Administration Manual:

One
On page 38 of the current FAM under Section 3 - Standing College Committees, please change the election date from by April 1 to at the spring faculty meeting.

Rationale: It's the current practice. Most spring faculty meetings occur in April, but it’s doubtful if one has ever occurred on April 1st.

Two
On page 31 of the current FAM under item G, please add maintenance of the senate roster at the faculty senate website to the list of faculty secretary duties.

Rationale: Although this duty is currently performed by the faculty secretary, it should be stated as a specific duty since the Committee on Nominations and Elections uses this roster to help determine the apportionment of senators for each academic unit. (This specific duty of the Committee on Nominations and Elections is stated on page 39 of the current FAM at item 9.)

Three
On page 33 of the current FAM at item F, please insert the following as the third sentence of that paragraph: If an at-large senator needs to be replaced in the first year of a term, the faculty will elect the replacement by ballot.

Rationale: Clarity. The first sentence of item F doesn't directly describe the process for a first year replacement.

Four
In the current FAM, at the top paragraph of page 34 and on page 38 at item B. 1.b, please change "at least 10 days before the senate meeting" and "submissions in writing to the speaker at least 10 days" to at least one week before the senate meeting and submissions in writing to the speaker at least one week respectively.

Rationale: Uniformity. At the top paragraph of page 40, according to a 1999 revision, additional nominations for speaker, secretary, and all committees can be made until one week before the election.

Five
On top of page 34 of the current FAM, please insert the following at the end of the incomplete paragraph: No senator, including replacement senators, shall serve for more than four consecutive years.

Rationale: Clarity. The eligibility for replacement senators has been listed for a period of more than four consecutive years on previous senate rosters.
Appendix 2. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty Administration Manual
(*two friendly amendments made at the Senate meeting are reflected in this report)

Report to the Faculty Senate
Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
College of Charleston
December 5, 2006

Faculty Members: Brian McGee (Committee Chair), William Barfield (Senator), Doryjane Birrer (Senator)

Committee Duties: “To review on a continuing basis the Faculty By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual; to propose changes for the improvement of the documents and to forward the recommended changes to the administration and/or the Faculty Senate as appropriate; to incorporate any revisions to or interpretations of either document in new editions of the documents” (Faculty By-Laws, Art. V, Sect. 2.B.3(b)).

Three motions to amend the Faculty By-Laws were offered at the November 14, 2006, meeting of the Faculty Senate. As required by Article VI of the By-Laws, we offer here our recommendations to the Senate regarding these motions. The motions are attached to this report.

Proposed Amendments One and Two. Those motions were offered by our own committee. We have no additional thoughts to offer concerning these motions beyond the rationales we already have provided. We cannot identify any procedural or substantive defects in these motions.

Proposed Amendment Three. This omnibus motion was offered by the Committee on Nominations and Elections. The rationale for this motion was supplied by the chair of the committee, C. Michael Phillips, during the November meeting.

For clarity and consistency, we have revised the form in which this motion was made. This single motion is in four parts. Parts a, c, and d strike the adjectives “written” or “mail” and insert “electronic.” Part b was recast by our own committee to eliminate references to voting process obviously not germane to electronic ballots. This work by our committee does not substantively change the motion to amend.

We offer two observations regarding the substance of this motion. First, the motion moves the By-Laws from specifying one form of voting to specifying another. There might be advantages to requiring merely that the Committee on Nominations and Elections construct ballots and administer elections, rather than limiting the committee to a single type of ballot. We understand the advantages of electronic balloting, however, and do not see this concern as justifying a delay in considering the current amendment.

Second, this motion was accompanied at the November meeting by a demonstration of an electronic voting system by Andrew Bergstrom of Student Affairs. Our committee recently contacted Mr. Bergstrom to ask if the elections software could be modified to print a paper report of the vote tally in each election, complete with a required time and date imprint. Mr. Bergstrom
indicated the software could be modified in this fashion. As a procedural matter, we recommend that any electronic vote tally be accompanied by a paper report as described here and that the first paper report so generated remain on file in a secure fashion in the offices of the Faculty Senate.

The three motions to amend appear below. In all cases, language proposed for insertion is in italics. Language to be deleted has been marked accordingly.

---

**Proposed Amendment 1**

Faculty By-Laws, Art. V, Sect. 2.B.3(a)

Insert “(or Provost’s designee)” following “Provost”:

3. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual

   a. Composition: Three faculty members. Ex officio members are the Speaker of the Faculty, the Faculty Secretary, the Provost *(or Provost's designee)*, and the Vice President for Legal Affairs.

**Rationale**: This amendment gives the Provost the flexibility to appoint a representative to this committee to represent the interests of the Office of the Provost/Office of Academic Affairs. Such language is frequently found in the governance documents of other universities.

**Proposed Amendment 2**

Faculty By-Laws, Art. V, Sect. 2.B.3(b)

Enumerate the duties of the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, change the article “the” to “these” and insert an additional duty concerning editorial corrections:

3. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual

   b. Duties:

   *(1)* To review on a continuing basis the Faculty By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual;
(2) To propose changes for the improvement of the documents and to forward the recommended changes to the administration and/or the faculty Senate as appropriate;

(3) To incorporate any revisions to or interpretations of either document in new editions of the documents; and

(4) To make non-substantive changes to the Faculty By-Laws to correct grammatical and spelling errors and to address minor problems of stylistic consistency. Such a non-substantive change shall not constitute an amendment to or repeal of the Faculty By-Laws. Such changes shall be made only when unanimously approved by the Committee. Notice in writing shall be given to the Faculty Senate within 60 calendar days of such changes being approved by the Committee. Such changes shall be repealed if an appropriate motion to amend something previously adopted is approved by a simple majority of the Committee, the Faculty Senate, or the College Faculty.

**Rationale:** This amendment will reduce the work required of the Senate in making non-substantive corrections to the By-Laws while simultaneously protecting the rights of the Faculty Senate and the College Faculty.

The Speaker of the Faculty and the Faculty Secretary are *ex officio* members of the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. Ample discussion and full disclosure of non-substantive changes should be the norm.

**Proposed Amendment 3**

Strike words and phrases specifying written or mail ballots. Insert “electronic” before ballot as appropriate.

a. Faculty By-Laws, Art. IV, Sect. 2.C.2

No later than February 15, vacancies from the group of at-large Senate seats will be filled by means of an election conducted among the eligible faculty (as defined in Section 1 above) through a *mail electronic* ballot.

b. Faculty By-Laws, Art. IV, Sect. 2.C.5

All elections for at-large Senate seats shall be conducted by secret *mail electronic* ballot. Each elector shall be provided with a ballot paper and ballot envelope neither of which will identify the elector. Each elector shall also be provided with an envelope identifying the elector into which the sealed ballot envelope shall be placed. Upon the receipt of a vote, the Committee on Nominations and Elections shall first of all separate the ballot envelope from the envelope in
which it was sent using the latter only to ensure that the vote was cast by an eligible voter. In case of a tie vote, the election is decided by lot.

c. Faculty By-Laws, Art. IV, Sect. 2.F.

If an At-Large Senator needs to be replaced in the second year of a term, the Senate will elect the replacement by written ballot.

d. Faculty By-Laws, Art. VI, Sect. 1.A.

Approved motions must then be ratified by a simple majority of regular faculty members voting by a mail electronic ballot on the motion.

**Rationale and Scope of the Motion to Amend** (as supplied by the Committee on Nominations and Elections): Secure electronic voting can fill the intended functions of the paper mail ballot process prescribed by the *Faculty/Administration Manual*. Hence, the Committee on Nominations and Elections proposes to amend the By-Laws to permit electronic voting for the following elections and processes: election of a Speaker of the Faculty, election of Faculty Secretary, election of at-large Senators, in the first year of a term, faculty ratification of amended B-Laws, and election of contested committees.
Appendix 3. Curriculum Proposals

A. **English**
   - Proposal to Change a Course ENGL 495 – Field Internship
   - Proposal to Change Requirements for Major – B.A. English
     - Delete Requirement – student currently required to take ENGL 301 or ENGL 302
     - Add Requirement – student must take a second pre-1700, British literature course at the 300 level

B. **Archaeology**
   - Proposal to Change Requirements for Minor – Archaeology
     - Add ARTH 220 - Greek and Roman Art - to list of elective courses in the Humanities and Arts
   - Proposal to Change Requirements for Minor – Archaeology
     - Add ARTH 350 - Early Christian and Byzantine Art - to list of elective courses in the Humanities and Arts

C. **Hispanic Studies**
   - New Course Proposal – SPAN 401 - Internship
   - New Course Proposal – SPAN 459 - Chicano/a Literature

D. **Physics and Astronomy**
   - Proposal to Change a Course – Prefix Change PHYS to ASTR, 10 Courses
     - PHYS129 Astronomy I – ASTR129
     - PHYS129L Astronomy I Laboratory – ASTR129L
     - PHYS130 Astronomy II – ASTR130
     - PHYS130L Astronomy II Laboratory – ASTR130L
     - PHYS205 Intelligent Life in the Universe – ASTR205
     - PHYS206 Planetary Astronomy – ASTR206
     - PHYS311 Stellar Astronomy and Astrophysics – ASTR311
     - PHYS312 Galactic and Extragalactic Astronomy – ASTR312
     - PHYS377 Experimental Astronomy – ASTR377
     - PHYS413 Astrophysics – ASTR413
   - New Course Proposal – PHYS 340 - Photonics
   - Proposal to Delete a Course – PHYS 306 - Physical Optics
   - New Course Proposal – PHYS 381 – Internship
   - Proposal to Change Requirements for Major – B.S. and B.A. Physics
     - Add PHYS 381 – Internship – to credit limit for non-classroom experiences that may apply to the Major
   - Proposal to Change a Minor/Concentration – Physics Studies
Minutes of the November 14, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, November 14, 2006, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

The minutes from the October 10, 2006 Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens began her report by noting that a new President would be coming to the College in the beginning of February. She expects Mr. Benson to come in and get going very quickly. She also announced that she had held her third coffee time that morning, and she encouraged more faculty to attend these gatherings since discussions have been useful and lively. Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology), noting that he had class during the coffee hour, asked what major concerns had been discussed. Ms. Jorgens replied that these are not necessarily complaint sessions; sometimes they are just chats in which she gets to know the faculty better. But some of the issues discussed include developing additional policies for management of animal facilities, the College’s workload policy, and minority recruitment and retention. Sometimes people from different departments have met at these gatherings and discovered overlapping research concerns which might provoke fruitful collaborations. She concluded by saying that she would schedule an afternoon coffee hour this semester, in the hopes that fewer faculty members are teaching then.

Next, Ms. Jorgens discussed workload issues at the College. Noting that concerns about workload policy had been raised at a recent Senate meeting, Ms. Jorgens said that she has done a lot of thinking about this issue. She announced that she will post the report submitted some time ago by the College's Ad-Hoc Workload Committee on Cougar Trail, where the compensation report currently is. She asked that faculty members keep in mind, as they read the report, that she ultimately had to reject it, because she does not believe a "one size fits all" workload policy is best for the College (the report recommended an across-campus workload of three courses per semester). While Ms. Jorgens said she does not wish to micromanage our newly instituted workload policy, she is quite willing to look at ways of adjusting workload as we fine tune. The benefit of the new policy (based on departmental target numbers) is that it gives a great deal of flexibility to departments. While it may be subject to abuse, the old policy was as well. Finally, Ms. Jorgens emphasized that there’s no effort on her part to alter the philosophy of the College with respect to teaching. We have a strong and deep-seated commitment to teaching that she expects to be maintained, and which the new workload policy will not interfere with at all.

Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy) then suggested that the Provost add a few comments about why she rejected the report when she posts it, so that all faculty can have access to the views she just expressed in the Senate. Ms. Jorgens agreed to do so.
**Speaker**

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone began his report by announcing that the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education had recently held faculty forums on the Gen Ed proposal. Committee members are currently processing and responding to comments made at the forums and rewriting and modifying the proposal as necessary. A revised proposal will be coming forward soon in a series of separate motions before the Senate.

In addition, Mr. Mignone thanked those who attended the presidential interviews and sent comments to the Board of Trustees. He added that President Festa is currently recuperating from hip surgery and seems to be doing well.

Finally, on behalf of Phil Paradise, Chair of Academic Affairs for the Student Government Association, Mr. Mignone asked faculty members to turn in their spring book orders if they haven't yet done so. This has a profound effect on students’ ability to sell their textbooks.

**Mike Haskins, Vice President for Marketing**

The Speaker then recognized Mike Haskins, Vice President for Marketing at the College. Mr. Haskins began his report by explaining that he wants to talk about what he’s been doing since he’s been here as well as plans for future marketing. He hoped we all had a chance to look at the power point presentation that was e-mailed to faculty and staff last week. Mr. Haskins said that he is “not the guy who’s going to tell us who we are.” This is a decision that must be arrived at collectively. The faculty forum on college identity held last spring (which was one of his first meetings at the college) was valuable to him in understanding the College’s identity and what makes this a unique place. His role is to help the College effectively communicate its identity in order to enhance outreach efforts in recruiting students, in fundraising, etc. In the marketing world, Mr. Haskins pointed out, institutional identity is referred to as a “brand.” While branding can have negative connotations and may not be the best word, it’s the word we have. To him, a brand means one thing: the promise we make as an institution to all the people who engage with us about the kind of experience they can expect. This promise needs to be true, and it needs to be unique. We need to completely understand ourselves in order to define exactly what this promise is. The definition of integrated marketing, according to Mr. Haskins, is all of us working together to communicate our identity or brand.

To this end, Mr. Haskins has put together an Integrated Marketing Communications Task Force that includes around 30 people from all over campus. This group will collaborate to discuss a coordinated marketing plan for the College. The task force’s first step is to collect some qualitative research. Members of the task force will interview at least 2 dozen faculty members concerning their thoughts about the College now and where it should go in the future. The idea behind this process is to get at the heart of what’s unique about the College. The task force will take this qualitative information, along with quantitative research, to make a strategic marketing plan for the college.
Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) asked Mr. Haskins what he thought the present perception of the College was. Mr. Haskins replied that we’d have to see what comes out of the process, although he does have some initial thoughts—one thing he believes that makes the College unique is that students receive personal attention and know faculty members well, something that is not always true at an institution of this size. But uniqueness is not one thing, Mr. Haskins added, it is a mix of things. Mr. Wiseman then asked how many young people were applying to the college these days. Provost Jorgens replied that we accepted 1900 freshmen out of something like 14,000 that applied. We get twice as many out-of-state as in-state applicants. Mr. Haskins added that we need to look at in-state vs. out-state applicants as we think about marketing, because students from the two places have different views of the College.

Tim Giblin (Physics/Astronomy) asked at what level Mr. Haskins’ office would be involved with the marketing efforts of individual departments. Mr. Haskins replied that they would be involved to the extent that resources allow. He hopes to be involved in designing brochures for majors, school-level initiatives, etc. His office just hired a person dedicated to the academic areas of the College, so they have been able to help at least a bit with brochures, logos, and things like that. He would also like to be able to provide tools to departments—templates and such—that could help departments with their own marketing efforts.

**Nominations Committee**—on-line voting demonstration

Michael Phillips, Chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee, outlined several reasons why his committee believes the Faculty Senate should adopt an on-line voting system. The Student Government already uses on-line voting, and thus is ahead of the faculty in this respect. In addition, Mr. Phillips emphasized that the system currently in use by the SGA is accessed via Cougar Trail, a secure interface. With this system, voting can be anonymous as well. We have 564 voting faculty now, Mr. Phillips added, and his committee believes that electronic voting is MUCH needed.

Next, Andrew Bergstrom, Technology Coordinator for Student Affairs, demonstrated the on-line voting system currently in use by the SGA.

Finally, Mr. Phillips presented a proposed amendment to the by-laws to allow for on-line voting. This amendment will be voted on at the December Senate meeting.

**Brian McGee—By-Laws Committee**

The Speaker next recognized Brian McGee, of the Faculty By-Laws Committee, who asked for faculty assistance in identifying older, “orphan” versions of the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM) that might appear on department websites, etc. All of the College’s web materials need to point to only one FAM, the correct one. Mr. McGee also reported that there will be another revision of the FAM posted no later than January. Finally, his committee will be proposing two amendments to the Faculty By-
Laws which will be voted on at the December Senate meeting. (Please see Appendix I for a full version of Mr. McGee’s report.)

**New Business**

*Curriculum Committee*

The Speaker then introduced Gerry Gonsalves, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, who introduced several motions. All of the proposals put forward by the Curriculum Committee passed with no discussion. (Please see Appendix 2 for a complete listing of the Curriculum Committee proposals.)

*Committee on Graduate Education*

The Speaker recognized Betsy Martin, Chair of the Committee on Graduate Education, who moved that the Senate approve several new course proposals in Communication as well as three course change proposals. (Please see Appendix 3 for a listing of all the Graduate Education Committee proposals).

All of the new course proposals passed with no discussion.

There was, however, some discussion of the course change proposals. Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) asked whether any prerequisites were required for COMM 501: Quantitative Research Methods. Brian McGee, Chair of the Communication Department, replied that the department’s preference is that students have some statistical background. But the department will provide the necessary quantitative background if students do not have it. So, no prerequisites are listed. It was also pointed out that there was an error in one of the courses as listed in the Senate documents. COMM 507 should be called “Issues in Communication Management,” not “Problems in Communication Management.”

The three course change proposals passed on a voice vote.

*Constituents’ Concerns*

Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) said that he had attended one of the general education forums, but was disappointed that there were 20 or fewer faculty members present. He believes that this doesn’t augur well for faculty participation in this process. Participation, in fact, seemed anemic.

With no further business, the Senate adjourned at 6:15 pm.
Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix 1.

Report to the Faculty Senate
Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
College of Charleston
November 14, 2006

Faculty Members: Brian McGee (Committee Chair), William Barfield (Senator),
Doryjane Birrer (Senator)

Committee Duties: “To review on a continuing basis the Faculty By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual; to propose changes for the improvement of the documents and to forward the recommended changes to the administration and/or the Faculty Senate as appropriate; to incorporate any revisions to or interpretations of either document in new editions of the documents” (Faculty By-Laws, Art. V, Sect. 2.B.3(b)).

Previous Editions of the Faculty/Administration Manual. We have learned that previous, “orphan” editions of the Manual appeared at various College of Charleston URLs. Associate Vice President Sandy Powers has made every reasonable effort to have these unauthorized editions removed, as the only updated and official version of the Manual is available on the Office of Academic Affairs Web site at http://www.cofc.edu/academicaffairs/manuals/fac-manual.pdf.

Please help us identify and remove any other editions of the Manual and any incorrect Web addresses for the Manual from the College of Charleston Web site.

New Edition of the Faculty/Administration Manual. A revised version of the Manual is being prepared. This revised version will make a series of non-substantive editorial changes to the administrative portions of the Manual, include previously ratified amendments to the Faculty By-Laws that have not yet been incorporated in the Manual, and add new administratively approved materials relevant to joint faculty appointments and faculty appointments outside academic departments. With administrative approval, the new Manual will be made available on the Office of Academic Affairs Web site no later than mid-January. All faculty and staff will be notified via e-mail when the new Manual is posted, and a summary of the changes to the Manual will be provided.

Proposed Amendments to the Faculty By-Laws. The committee proposes the following two amendments to the Faculty By-Laws. Once these amendments are offered, the By-Laws require study of these amendments by our committee. We will offer a report on these amendments at the December Faculty Senate meeting, when action on the amendments presumably would be appropriate.

In all cases, language proposed for insertion is in italics.
**Proposed Amendment 1**

Faculty By-Laws, Art. V, Sect. 2.B.3(a)

Insert “(or Provost’s designee)” following “Provost”:

3. Committee on the By-Laws and the *Faculty/Administration Manual*

   a. Composition: Three faculty members. Ex officio members are the Speaker of the Faculty, the Faculty Secretary, the Provost *(or Provost’s designee)*, and the Vice President for Legal Affairs.

**Rationale:** This amendment gives the Provost the flexibility to appoint a representative to this committee to represent the interests of the Office of the Provost/Office of Academic Affairs. Such language is frequently found in the governance documents of other universities.

**Proposed Amendment 2**

Faculty By-Laws, Art. V, Sect. 2.B.3(b)

Enumerate the duties of the Committee on the By-Laws and the *Faculty/Administration Manual*, change the article “the” to “these” and insert an additional duty concerning editorial corrections:

3. Committee on the By-Laws and the *Faculty/Administration Manual*

b. Duties:

   (1) To review on a continuing basis the Faculty By-Laws and the *Faculty/Administration Manual*;

   (2) To propose changes for the improvement of the these documents and to forward the recommended changes to the administration and/or the faculty Senate as appropriate;

   (3) To incorporate any revisions to or interpretations of either document in new editions of the documents; and

   (4) To make non-substantive changes to the Faculty By-Laws to correct unintended grammatical and spelling errors and to address minor problems of stylistic consistency. Such a non-substantive change shall not constitute an
amendment to or repeal of the Faculty By-Laws. Such changes shall be made only when unanimously approved by the Committee. Notice in writing shall be given to the Faculty Senate within 60 calendar days of such changes being approved by the Committee. Such changes shall be repealed if an appropriate motion to amend something previously adopted is approved by a simple majority of the Committee, the Faculty Senate, or the College Faculty.

**Rationale**: This amendment will reduce the work required of the Senate in making non-substantive corrections to the By-Laws while simultaneously protecting the rights of the Faculty Senate and the College Faculty.

The Speaker of the Faculty and the Faculty Secretary are *ex officio* (and, therefore, voting) members of the Committee on the By-Laws and the *Faculty/Administration Manual*. Ample discussion and full disclosure of non-substantive changes should be the norm.
Appendix 2.

COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON
FACULTY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

A. Elementary & Early Childhood Education
   --Proposal to delete a Course EDEE 450 – Student Teaching

B. Psychology
   --New Course Proposal PSYC 349/SGMT377 Psychology of Entrepreneurship

C. Economics and Finance
   --Proposal to change a Course ECON 400 – Senior Seminar in Economics
       (Prerequisites Changed – Remove requirement for entrance examination)

D. Physical Education and Health
   --Proposal to change a Course – Prefix Change PEHD to ATEP, 12 Courses
   --Prefix Change to ATEP for PEHD 245, 245L, 345, 345L, 346, 346L, 365, 375, 430, 430L, 437, 437L
   --Proposal to change a Course – PEHD 433 Title Change
       (Current Title: Research Methods and Design in Health and Exercise Science
        Proposed Title: Research Design and Analysis)

E. German and Slavic Studies
   --New Course Proposal – LTRS 210 - 19th Century Russian Literature
   --New Course Proposal – LTRS 220 - 20th Century Russian Literature
   --Proposal to change a Minor/Concentration – Russian Studies

F. English
   --Proposal to change a Course – ENGL 223 Title Change
       (Current Title: Writing Fiction
        Proposed Title: Fiction Writing I)
   --Proposal to change a Course – ENGL 378 Title Change (Proposal attached)
       (Current Title: Advanced Fiction Writing
        Proposed Title: Fiction Writing II)
Appendix 3.

College of Charleston
Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

New Course Proposals
COMM 502 Qualitative Research Methods
COMM 521 Seminar in Small Group Communication
COMM 522 International and Intercultural Communication
COMM 524 Speechwriting in Public Communication
COMM 525 Executive Communication
COMM 561 Identity and Impression Management
COMM 584 Contemporary Problems in Communication Ethics
COMM 681 Classical Rhetorical Theory
COMM 682 Modern and Contemporary Rhetorical Theory
COMM 698 Tutorial
COMM 699 Independent Study
COMM 701-702 Master's Thesis
COMM 795 Internship

Course Change Proposals
COMM 501 Quantitative Research Methods
COMM 507 Problems in Communication Management
COMM 580 Seminar in Organizational Communication
Minutes of the October 10, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, October 10, 2006, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

The minutes from the September 12, 2006 Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

Speaker

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone reminded faculty members that the five candidates for College of Charleston President will be on campus the week of October 16. He encouraged as many faculty members as possible to meet with the candidates. Mr. Mignone, along with Marvin Dulaney and Deanna Caveny, the other faculty representatives on the presidential search committee, will compile faculty feedback concerning the candidates, and Mr. Mignone will present this information to the Board of Trustees on Saturday afternoon, October 21.

Mr. Mignone then announced that a draft version of a proposal from the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education has been circulated via e-mail and is also available on the web (at http://www.cofc.edu/~oap/gened/proposal100606.pdf). He asked the committee’s chair, Julia Eichelberger, to briefly explain the timeline for discussing and voting on the proposal. Ms. Eichelberger announced that the proposal had been sent to all faculty members on Friday, October 6 and that her committee is currently accepting responses and suggestions concerning the proposal. The Ad-Hoc Committee will wait until Monday October 16, the deadline for departmental input on the proposal (that they solicited several weeks ago) before they make the next round of revisions. After this round of revisions, they will send the draft proposal to the Academic Planning Committee for review. We may begin discussing the revised proposal in the Senate while Academic Planning still has it. Ms. Eichelberger did point out, however, that her committee couldn’t predict exactly when we’ll begin Senate discussion of the proposal—it could be at the November or December Senate meeting. Ms. Eichelberger also emphasized that the proposal is still open for input. The General Education committee wants to know what departments like about the proposal as well as what they would like to see changed.

Mr. Mignone closed his report by mentioning a retreat that will be held Monday, October 16 for some faculty, staff, and alumni who will discuss President Festa’s proposal to increase underrepresented minorities on campus. The idea behind the retreat is to generate ideas, to brainstorm about ways to improve minority representation. He will report back to us about the results of this retreat at the November Senate meeting.

The Provost

The Speaker then recognized Provost Elise Jorgens, who began her report by
commending and thanking Chair of the Political Science Department Lynne Ford for her work with the recent initiative on student voter registration, which is part of an AASCU (American Association of State Colleges and Universities) project. The College of Charleston submitted 590 valid SC registration forms during this initiative—106% of our goal.

Provost Jorgens also spoke of the importance of the current presidential search, reinforcing Mr. Mignone’s plea that faculty participate in this process.

Finally, Ms. Jorgens announced that the College is beginning a budget and planning process that has not taken place for several years. This is not a strategic planning process, but a catch-up project that is an attempt to answer the following questions: Where do we stand financially? Do we have a huge backlog of financial needs that haven’t been met? Are we doing fairly well? Ms. Jorgens told faculty members that we should expect to hear more about this process from our chairs.

JoAnn Diaz—College Ombuds Officer

Next, the speaker recognized College Ombuds Officer JoAnn Diaz, who gave a report on her duties. Ms. Diaz informed faculty that her office is located in Randolph Hall and that her objective is to supply an informal resolution for complaints at the College. She does not get involved in the formal process of grievance; she cannot testify for any litigation or formal grievance hearing. But if a faculty member wishes to talk over complaints or issues or to get advice, the Ombuds Office is the place to go. The four main tenets of her position are neutrality, independence, confidentiality, and informality. She doesn’t speak with supervisors about faculty visits. She reports directly to the president, to whom she gives an overview of problems on campus without revealing specific names or issues.

The chair then recognized Mick Norton (Mathematics) who asked if Ms. Diaz could describe in a general way the types of issues that are brought to her. Ms. Diaz replied that she’d listened to problems concerning tenure and harassment as well as complaints about supervisors. Provost Jorgens then asked whether the Ombuds Office had seen a lot of traffic. Ms. Diaz responded, “absolutely.” Even without advertising, many people have utilized her services. Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) then asked whether staff and students could use Ombuds services, along with faculty. She replied that the Ombuds Office is there to help anyone at the college. Terry Bowers (English) asked if her office deals with academic issues. Ms. Diaz replied that she would discuss academic issues if they came up, determine what processes exists to resolve such issues, and try to mediate problems between specific people.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

The Speaker then introduced Gerry Gonsalves, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, who
introduced several motions. A proposal to change degree requirements for the Minor in Crime, Law and Society, and to add as electives POLS 221, POLS 352, and POLS 353 or POLS 354, passed without discussion.

The next proposal was a motion to change degree requirements for the Minors in Italian and Italian Studies. Jim Newhard (Classics) pointed out that, according to the proposals, 18 hours must be taken above ITAL 202 or 250. He suggested a friendly amendment that this be erased because of conflicts with the requirement that students must complete a course in LTIT, which has a different designation. He explained that the line he wanted to delete was simply copied erroneously from old requirements and amounted to a clerical error. Mr. Newhard himself is a representative from the department that submitted the proposal, and thus was able to accept his own friendly amendment.

The proposal passed on a voice vote.

Next up were two new course proposals, LTIT 270 and LTIT 370, as well as a proposal to delete a course—ITAL 370. Richard Nunan (Philosophy) pointed out that the explanation for deleting ITAL 370 is that the title is “Studies in Italian Film and Literature” and thus, the course replicates one of the new course proposals. Yet, the new course proposal focuses only on film. Mr. Nunan wondered if there was a separate course for studies in Italian literature that would still be on the books. Jim Newhard (Classics) replied that the last few times the course has been offered, it has focused almost entirely on cinema, so the new course more clearly reflects the actual content that is being taught. Mr. Nunan asked if there was any sense of loss in the study of literature being deleted. Mr. Newhard replied there wasn’t, since literature hadn’t customarily been included anyway. Finally, Mr. Nunan pointed out that there was a reference to a letter from John Bruns, Director of the Film Studies Minor, in the description of the two new courses, but he didn’t see the actual letter in the packet of information distributed to Senators. Other Senators confirmed that the packet did not contain the letter.

At this point, discussion ended. The two new course proposals, LTIT 270 and 370, as well as the deletion of ITAL 370 passed on a voice vote.

The next curriculum items discussed were two new course proposals in psychology, PSYC 250 and PSYC 397. Mr. Nunan, pointing out that the justification for PSYC 250 argues in favor of combining psychological statistics and research methods in a single course, asked why two current courses that separate these things out will continue to be offered. David Gentry (Psychology) explained that the new course is intended to be accelerated. Not all students are prepared to go at that pace.

Both new courses, PSYC 250 and PSYC 397, passed on a voice vote.

Committee on Graduate Education

The Speaker recognized Betsy Martin, Chair of the Committee on Graduate Education, who moved that the Senate approve a new graduate course: FREN 614. Richard Nunan
(Philosophy) opened the discussion by pointing out that the course description is illegible as it appears on the computer screen. Ms. Martin then read the course description out loud to the Senate. Mr. Nunan said that he would like to avoid the situation of the Senate being presented with an illegible course description in the future.

The new course proposal FREN 614 passed on a voice vote.

**Scott Peeples—Motion to form an Ad-Hoc Committee to Draft a Vendor Code of Conduct**

Mr. Mignone next recognized Scott Peeples (English) who moved the following proposal:

**Motion:** That the Senate appoint an ad-hoc committee to draft a vendor code of conduct in consultation with Procurement/Supply and Business/Auxiliary Services; and that at least two students be invited to serve on this committee.

**Rationale:** We affirmed in the resolution passed last spring that "as educators at a liberal arts and sciences institution, College of Charleston faculty are deeply committed to protecting human rights and promoting environmental responsibility," but the College lacks a vendor code of conduct to support that commitment in regard to business decisions. The resolution singled out one company on the basis of alleged human rights abuses, but as a number of faculty members and students pointed out, the case involving Coca-Cola highlights the need for a consistent, written policy that would apply to any vendor who contracts with the College. The SGA wrote a vendor code of conduct into their resolution, but the specifics of the code weren't debated. The students who sponsored the SGA resolution would like to work with the faculty and business offices to craft a code that's workable and meaningful for our campus.

Mr. Peeples pointed out that numerous colleges have vendor codes of conduct. He thought it would be a good idea to have a committee look at this issue, write a specific code, and bring it back to the Senate for action. The motion was seconded by Julia Eichelberger (At-Large, English).

Mick Norton opened the discussion by asking how such a policy would be enforced. Mr. Peeples replied that questions such as this are one reason he wants to form a committee. The committee could address such issues. Mr. Norton then expressed his concern that such a committee, working in isolation, could make a decision on the basis that it seemed fashionable to do so. Mr. Peeples replied that a couple of students who had worked on the Coca Cola campaign had met with Jan Brewton, Director of Auxiliary Services, and talked through some of these issues. It became clear during this conversation that an Ad-Hoc Committee would need to combine faculty, staff, and students.

Gerry Gonsalves (Management and Entrepreneurship) then asked how committee membership would be decided. Mr. Peeples replied that he assumed the Nominations Committee would determine this. Norris Preyer (Physics) asked how many people Mr.
Peeples expected would serve on the committee. Mr. Peeples replied that he did not have a definite number in mind, but expected there would be 3-4 faculty members, 3-4 students, and someone from Procurement, as well as from Auxiliary Services. Next followed a brief conversation in which Bob Mignone confirmed that the usual practice in such cases was for the Nominations Committee to nominate faculty members, for the Student Government Association to nominate student members, and for the specific administrative areas to nominate their representatives.

Chip Voorneveld (Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education) then asked if this issue were politically driven and how far-ranging it would be. Mr. Peeples reiterated that the issue had started with the Amnesty International students’ Coca Cola campaign. During the Senate discussion of that issue, a number of people complained that the College was unfairly singling out Coca Cola, and it was suggested that we need some kind of broad vendor corporate responsibility policy. Mr. Peeples added that he was bringing this motion on his own behalf, prompted by the constituent concern that George Hopkins (History) expressed at the last Senate meeting. In answer to how far-ranging the policy would be, Mr. Peeples pointed out that most colleges with such policies focus on merchandise with college logos. But he would like to leave the range of the policy up to the committee to decide. Personally, he would like to see the policy begin and end with companies that have violated human rights, discriminated, and tried to stop union activity.

George Hopkins spoke next, pointing out that this motion represents an effort to get a consistent policy and set of criteria against which various companies can be measured. Corporate social responsibility is a major issue in the country as well as on campuses.

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) then asked a two-part question. First, she wondered about the necessity of having a college attorney approve the policy. Second, she asked whether the Senate could appoint an ad-hoc committee that has staff and administrative personnel on it. Bob Mignone replied that the Senate can order a committee of faculty members and can recommend that it include members from outside the faculty.

Joe Kelly (At-Large, English) spoke next, recommending that we spell out committee membership more precisely. After some discussion with Michael Phillips, Chair of the Nominations Committee, it was determined that the committee would consist of 3 faculty members, 3 students, a representative from Procurement/Supply and a representative from Business/Auxiliary Services, for a total of 8 members. Mr. Peeples agreed to serve as one of the faculty representatives to the committee.

Richard Nunan (Philosophy) then asked, as a follow-up to part of Susan Kattwinkel’s previous question, whether CofC currently has a college attorney. Mr. Mignone replied that the College is searching for a full-time attorney, but currently has only someone consulting in that role. Provost Jorgens added that the issue of having an attorney on the committee would need to be negotiated because of fees.

Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism) then asked about which members of the
committee would have a vote, arguing that if students and faculty are voting members, administrative representatives should be as well. Mr. Peeples replied that he doesn’t have an objection to administrative representatives being voting members of the committee. He didn’t hammer out these details because he wasn’t sure what the preferences of people like Jan Brewton would be, what role they would want. RoxAnn Stalvey (computer science) pointed out that administrative support would be essential to developing a policy of corporate responsibility, adding that if members of the administration are voting members of the committee, they might be more likely to support the policy. After some discussion concerning customary practices when administrative personnel serve on faculty committees, Jack Parson (Political Science) pointed out that people in administrative offices operate within a different hierarchy than faculty members. They may not be able to cast a vote without consulting a supervisor. Thus, making them voting members might slow things down and make the committee’s work more difficult. Mr. Parson advocated that administrative personnel not be voting members. Mr. Peeples replied that he would like to have directors from administrative offices on the committee so that they have authority to vote with confidence.

David Gentry (Psychology) then returned to the issue of needing a lawyer to contribute to the policy, pointing out that state law in purchasing is very rigid. Mike Skinner (Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education) argued that a lawyer needn’t be an actual member of the committee, but that a lawyer could look at the proposal the committee comes up with. It would be better to have a lawyer vet the proposal than actually serve on the committee.

At this point, discussion ended, and Mr. Peeples’ proposal passed on a voice vote.

Constituents’ Concerns

Deanna Caveny (At-Large, Mathematics) requested that, in the future, titles be added to course numbers in the brief outline of curriculum business that is distributed to Senators before meetings. Gerry Gonsalves of the Curriculum Committee agreed to do this.

With no further business, the Senate adjourned at 6:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the September 12, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, September 12, 2006, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

The minutes from the April 11 and April 25, 2006 Senate meetings were approved.

George Pothering (At-Large, Computer Science) nominated Susan Kattwinkel to be Speaker of the Faculty Pro-Tem. Ms. Kattwinkel was elected in a voice vote.

Reports

Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens welcomed faculty members back to the College and said that the semester was off to a great start. She announced that the College hired 61 new faculty members this year, and that we are currently recruiting 43 new faculty members for next year. This number might increase a bit as the year goes on. Ms. Jorgens encouraged all faculty to be involved in recruiting and said that she was very pleased with the excellent faculty members the College has been able to hire recently.

Next, Provost Jorgens noted that enrollments have been strong at the College this year. Though incoming students are a bit below the projected number, this is not a problem; the College is staying where it wants to be with enrollment figures. The big unknown this semester was the new drop-for-non-payment policy. But Ms. Jorgens said that this process has gone extremely smoothly. We only have about 60 students currently who have still not paid, and most of these have indicated they are transferring. These numbers are quite normal for this time of year. Ms. Jorgens thanked faculty members for helping this new policy run so smoothly.

Ms. Jorgens briefly mentioned the revisions to the Faculty/Administration Manual that have been taking place. She complimented Brian McGee, Chair of the Faculty By-Laws Committee, for his hard work. The first round of changes to the manual mostly involved adding updates that had already been approved but never made their way into the manual. She noted that the process of revision is ongoing, and the eventual goal of this process is to make the manual more accurate and more accessible.

Finally, Ms. Jorgens reiterated the announcement she made at the Fall Faculty Meeting—that she plans to meet with each academic department this semester. She asked departments to call the Academic Affairs office to schedule these meetings if they haven’t done so already. In addition, Ms. Jorgens will hold twice-monthly coffee drop-ins at the Faculty House, beginning in October. These will be sessions that allow faculty members to bring their concerns to the Provost; the agenda for the meetings will be entirely determined by faculty. We should soon receive a schedule listing when these coffee drop-ins will take place.
Speaker

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone began his report by thanking Senate Parliamentarian George Pothering, Faculty Secretary Susan Farrell, and Faculty Speaker Pro-Tem Susan Kattwinkel for their service. He noted that the presidential search is going well. He expects candidates to be on campus in mid-October, and he encouraged faculty members to be involved in the interview process.

Mr. Mignone also noted that, at a recent Senior Staff meeting, he was given a new pet policy that the administration plans to institute at the College. Mr. Mignone read the following announcement about pets to the faculty:

The College of Charleston recognizes the important role pets play in the lives of our employees and students. However, the College is committed to protect the safety and ensure the comfort of its employees, students, and visitors on campus. While many pets are well-behaved, many people suffer animal-related fears, which could interfere with an employee’s work experience or a student’s academic experience should pets be permitted inside campus facilities. Additionally, pets could pose a threat to the health and safety of employees, students, and visitors, as well as to a healthful environment (through allergies, excessive noise, animal bites, and disease transmission via fleas, ticks, parasites, viruses, bacteria, etc.).

The College would like to remind its employees and students that pets/animals of any kind are not and have never been permitted inside any of its campus facilities. With that being said, the College has established a formal policy to provide for the health and safety of its employees, students, and visitors; for the protection, efficient use, and enjoyment of the College's property; and for the responsible management and operation of the College.

Service animals (i.e., guide dogs) are exempt from this policy.

Mr. Mignone added that he has passed the new pet policy onto the Faculty Welfare Committee, who will decide how to act upon it. Any faculty member may send their comments about the policy to the Welfare Committee.

Mr. Mignone concluded his report by announcing that he has asked the Academic Planning Committee to explore the issue of on-line delivery of academic courses. A course can currently be approved by the Curriculum Committee (or the Graduate Education Committee) and the Senate without its delivery method ever being discussed. Mr. Mignone believes this is an issue we have not yet looked at closely, but that faculty members should have a say in.

Ropert Cape
Mr. Mignone then introduced Robert Cape, the College’s new Vice President for Technology and Chief Information Officer. Mr. Cape noted that his position is a brand-new one at the College and that he serves as a member of the President’s Senior Staff. He believes this position signals the emerging importance of Information Technology at the College. His own work experience has taken place in university settings and he is pleased to create a new Information Technology division at the College, which will be made up of the former Academic Computing and ACTS (Administrative Computing and Telecommunications Services) units. This new IT division will involve a complete restructuring and will be made up of five major groups:

1) teaching and learning technology group (former academic liaisons)
2) systems and servers group
3) administrative computing group
4) networking group
5) service group (former helpdesk and labs and classroom support)

One of the early efforts of this new division will be to create an inventory of services—who does what, how to obtain services, etc. Another early effort will be to look at software the College supports. Mr. Cape wants to create a small governance group to recommend what software to support and what not to support. This group will solicit faculty input.

Next, Mr. Cape discussed the BATTERY (best administrative technology that ever rocked you) project. Formerly known as the Swampfox Project, this is a multi-year, multi-million dollar project to replace all administrative application systems currently in place at the College, including SIS, HR, finances, payroll, etc. The new IT division will look at all the ways the College conducts its business and will be choosing an application suite from one vendor that will replace our old systems. The benefits of such an overhaul will be a highly integrated data base system that contains more up-to-date and better quality information. One of the compelling reasons we must conduct this overhaul is because some of our current administrative applications are so dated that a vendor is discontinuing support of them in 2011. The BATTERY team includes members from all across campus. Faculty can send their input on the BATTERY project to Academic Affairs, which has four of its staff members on the team. In addition, the IT division will be conducting multiple forums to answer questions and accept input concerning the project.

Finally, Mr. Cape reported that he hopes, within a matter of weeks, to tell us about a major overhaul of the college web pages. The revised site will provide tools and content management capability that will be useful to faculty members.

Brian McGee

The Speaker then introduced Brian McGee, Chair of the Faculty By-Laws Committee, who reported briefly on the work his committee is doing to update the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM). The full text of Mr. McGee’s report can be
found in Appendix I of these minutes.

When Mr. McGee finished his report, Mick Norton (Mathematics) asked where the procedures for post-tenure review can be found. Mr. McGee replied that these are not currently in the FAM, but are located on the Academic Affairs website, under “Policies and Procedures.” Both Mr. McGee and the Provost assured Mr. Norton that the procedures for post-tenure review will go into the FAM during the revision process.

New Business

Committee on Academic Standards—Proposal to Increase Language Requirements for Entering Students

Larry Krasnoff, Chair of this year’s Academic Standards Committee, introduced a proposal to increase the language requirements for entering students at the College. This proposal was actually approved by last year’s committee, but not in time for Senate consideration. The proposal reads as follows:

The Office of Admissions recommends a change to our freshmen admissions standards requiring entering students to have completed 3 years of foreign language in high school. College of Charleston currently conforms to the SC Commission on Higher Education requirement that all South Carolina students entering a 4-year, public college or University must complete a minimum of 2 years. However, CHE provides institutions with the flexibility for setting higher standards. Clemson and USC require 3 years and our Office of Admissions and Honors College believe it to be in our best interest to also require 3 years since the College of Charleston has the higher language requirement for graduation. No only does this send the appropriate message back to the high schools, it also might lessen the current pressures on our language sections as well as improve retention. This change has received overwhelming endorsement from the Academic Deans Council. FCAS supports this proposal and recommends implementation starting in Fall 2008.

In the discussion that followed, Paul Young (Mathematics) asked what percentage of our prospective applicants have 2 years of a foreign language, but not 3. Don Burkard of Academic Affairs replied that 85.7% of our current entering freshmen have at least 3 years of a foreign language.

Discussion ended, and the proposal passed on a voice vote.

Ad-Hoc General Education Committee—New Name for General Education

Julia Eichelberger, Chair of the Ad-Hoc Committee on General Education, next introduced two motions on behalf of her committee. The first asked that the Senate endorse a new name for our future general education requirements. The motion and its accompanying rationale read as follows:
Motion: We move that the term “General Education” be replaced. The new name for the requirements for earning a Bachelor’s degree at the College of Charleston shall become “The College of Charleston Commons.” This new name will not be used for the existing General Education requirements, but will designate a revised version of these requirements, if such changes are approved by the faculty.

Rationale: “General Education” is an unsatisfactory designation for our required curriculum, since it does not suggest the rigor of college-level work. In addition, the Committee believes the curriculum’s name should suggest something about the purpose of these requirements and the distinctiveness of the College of Charleston. We thought the historic and contemporary connotations of “Commons” expressed our goals for the new General Education curriculum. This name, which suggests a shared space or endeavor, also sounds a bit archaic, which seems to suit an institution that boasts of being centuries old. We believe “Commons” suggests the shared experience that students at the College undergo and the kinds of learning that we provide to every student, regardless of major. A commons is also an open area where people may move about freely, which is another feature we would like students to associate with their education here. Despite the fact that there are a good many requirements for our degree, we want students to exercise as much choice as possible in fulfilling them. In addition to these reasons for the name, we like the way it seems to invoke one of our institutional icons, Randolph Hall, which has a semi-pastoral green space that all students enter when they arrive (at Convocation) and depart from at May Commencement.

Mr. Mignone then opened the floor for discussion. Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) said that he thought “The Commons” was a beautiful metaphor for what we’re all about at the College. Richard Nunan (Philosophy), however, said he wasn’t “crazy about” the name, pointing out that, because of its other connotations, the term “The Commons” might be confusing to students. Mr. Nunan argued that the proposed name does not make the rationale of the general education curriculum clear. Ms. Eichelberger responded that she expects other things the Ad-Hoc Committee will propose will help make the rationale for the curriculum clear to students. The name alone isn’t designed to do that.

David Kowal (Art History) said that he appreciates the name, but that the first thing that comes to mind when he hears “The Commons” is “lowest common denominator.” Mike Skinner (Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education) spoke up next, agreeing with Mr. Nunan and Mr. Kowal in criticizing the proposed name. Mr. Skinner said that “The Commons” sounds awkward to him. While he understands the rationale, he believes we could come up with a better name. Jack Parson (Political Science) said he understood the point that was being made by the last few speakers, but he wondered if anyone had thought of anything better than “The Commons.” He argued that nothing is worse than the name “Gen Ed,” and added that “The Commons” was the best alternative he’d heard so far. Mr. Skinner replied that he didn’t have a better name in mind, but argued that that was still no reason to vote for this one. Mr. Nunan then suggested we consider a more
“prosaic” name, such as “curriculum distribution requirements.” Ms. Eichelberger replied that she didn’t think such a name would resonate any better with students than “The Commons.”

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) also argued against “The Commons,” pointing out that students will be researching schools on the internet before they make decisions about where to go. Ms. Cormack believes that we shouldn’t use a term that is so different from terms used at other colleges or we might confuse students. Liz Jurisich (Mathematics) agreed, arguing that “The Commons” implies a set of common courses, which we don’t actually have at the College. We have a distribution requirement, not a common curriculum, she said. Ms. Eichelberger replied that the reason the Ad-Hoc Committee settled on “The Commons” is that this term dramatizes the notion of students entering the College, lingering here, standing on a commons, beings in proximity to other people, but not doing exactly the same thing. This metaphor may be too subtle for students, but she likes to think they’re capable of understanding it.

Jack Parson then asked what other names the Committee had considered and rejected. Ms. Eichelberger mentioned several possibilities: “Charleston Curriculum,” “Charleston Core,” and “College of Charleston Curriculum of Courses” (which could be shortened to the CofC CofC). Mr. Skinner said that he has a daughter currently applying to the College, among other places. The names they’ve encountered so far have been functional and explanatory. He suggested that maybe the Gen Ed Curriculum should be revised first, and a new name decided later.

Next, Idee Winfield (Sociology/Anthropology) asked if the name “Foundations” had been considered. Ms. Eichelberger replied that it had, but that the Ad-Hoc Committee did not like the implication that general education comes first, and doesn’t last all the way through a student’s college career.

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) said that if the name “The Commons” is voted down, he hopes the Ad-Hoc Committee will return to the task of choosing a different name than “Gen Ed.” He likes the idea of a name that distinguishes the CofC curriculum, and he pointed out that such names are increasingly common across the country. Mr. Wilder added that he likes the effort of the Ad-Hoc Committee to find such a name, he likes the name “The Commons,” and he hopes the Ad-Hoc Committee will not simply accept a generic name if “The Commons” is voted down.

Finally, Reid Wiseman said he thought that the University of South Carolina has a general education track, a four-year program that students can choose to take. He argued that CofC students might find the term “Gen Ed” pejorative if it reminds them of something at USC.

Discussion then came to an end. The proposal to replace the name “General Education” with “The Commons” was defeated upon a show of hands.

Ad-Hoc General Education Committee—Statement of Purpose for General
Education

Ms. Eichelberger then introduced a second motion on behalf of the Ad-Hoc General Education Committee. She asked that the Senate endorse a slightly modified Statement of Purpose for General Education from the version passed by the Senate in January, 2006. (The January 2006 version, along with the committee’s proposed revision, both appear in Appendix II of these minutes).

Jack Parson (Political Science) opened the discussion by proposing two friendly amendments to slightly change the language of the two items appearing under Goal #4 of the Statement. He wished to change the first item (“International and global perspectives”), which he thought awkwardly repeated the language of the goal itself, to “Knowledge of international and global contexts.” He also suggested adding the word “using” to the second item under Goal #4, so that the item would read “Experiencing, understanding, and using multiple cultural perspectives.” After a brief discussion led by Scott Peeples and Doryjane Birrer, both of the English Department, as to whether one could use a perspective, both amendments were accepted as friendly.

Next, Jack Parson suggested changing the word “communal” in the third item under Goal #5 (“Moral and ethical responsibility; communal and global citizenship”) to “community.” After some discussion by Mr. Parson, Annette Godow (PEHD) and George Hopkins (History) about the connotations of the terms “communal” versus “community,” the amendment was accepted by Ms. Eichelberger as a friendly one.

The motion, as amended, passed on a voice vote. The new Statement of Purpose for General Education, as passed by the Senate, reads as follows:

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

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

I. Research and Communication in Multiple Media and Languages, including proficiency in
   Gathering and using information
   Effective writing and critical reading;
   Oral and visual communication
   Foreign language
II. Analytical and Critical Reasoning, including
Mathematical and scientific reasoning and analysis
Social and cultural analysis
Interdisciplinary analysis and creative problem-solving

III. Historical, Cultural, and Intellectual Perspectives, including knowledge of
Human history and the natural world
Artistic, cultural, and intellectual achievements
Human behavior and social interaction
Perspectives and contributions of academic disciplines

IV. International and Intercultural Perspectives, gained by
Knowledge of international and global contexts
Experiencing, understanding, and using multiple cultural perspectives

V. Personal and Ethical Perspectives, including experiences that promote
Self-understanding, curiosity and creativity
Personal, academic, and professional integrity
Moral and ethical responsibility; community and global citizenship

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

Constituent Concerns

The Speaker recognized Darryl Phillips (Classics) who read a statement expressing his concern about faculty workload and the system of using target numbers to assign workload. He fears that departments will raise enrollments in classes while reducing actual faculty/student contact hours, thus changing the nature of the College. Such a practice, he argued, has already begun to occur. (The complete text of Mr. Phillips’ statement appears in Appendix III of these minutes.) While the Provost said she was not prepared to give a full report on workload at the present time, since she didn’t know this issue was going to come up, she did say that workload policies would be addressed in the revision of the Faculty/Administration Manual. She is concerned about addressing this issue in a way that might bring adverse publicity to the College. Joy Vandervort-Cobb (Theatre) then asked whether a workload policy change would come before the Senate. The Provost replied that it would, and that any policy change would have to become before the Board of Trustees as well. Mr Phillips then noted that he believed the time for talking about a policy had already passed us by. We should have had a policy in place before we started making changes in practice. David Kowal (Art History) ended the discussion by noting that his department has been teaching 6 contact hours with large enrollments this semester not as a matter of policy, but as a matter of practicality, because of limited space.
Next, Reid Wiseman (Biology) asked that the college ombudsman be invited to address the Senate at its next meeting so that faculty members can gain a better understanding of what she does. Mr. Mignone replied that he would ask the ombudsman to speak to the Senate at our October meeting.

Jack Parson (Political Science) voiced concern about the overly large furniture and subsequent crowded condition of Maybank Hall classrooms. The Provost replied to Mr. Parson, assuring him that 6-8 desks would be removed from each classroom.

Finally, George Hopkins (History) asked that the Speaker invite someone from the administration to speak to the Senate about whether or not the College has a corporate responsibility policy. The Speaker agreed to do so.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix I.

Report to the Faculty Senate
Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
College of Charleston
September 12, 2006

Faculty Members: Brian McGee (Committee Chair), William Barfield (Senator), Doryjane Birrer (Senator)

Committee Duties: “To review on a continuing basis the Faculty By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual; to propose changes for the improvement of the documents and to forward the recommended changes to the administration and/or the Faculty Senate as appropriate; to incorporate any revisions to or interpretations of either document in new editions of the documents” (Faculty By-Laws, Art. V, Sect. 2.B.3(b)).

In consultation with Provost Jorgens, Speaker Mignone, and Faculty Senate Secretary Farrell, the committee’s ex-officio members, the committee has addressed or will be addressing the following issues during the current academic year:

Editorial Review and Correction of the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. With the support of Provost Jorgens, a professional editor was engaged to address problems with the electronic file containing the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual and to correct obvious editorial mistakes in the administrative portions of the Faculty/Administration Manual (e.g., repeated words and prepositional phrases). This editorial work included the insertion of the reaffirmed mission statement for the College of Charleston, recognition that the institution now has six schools, the inclusion of the appendices whenever possible, and an updated version of the institution’s harassment policy. This updated version of the Faculty/Administration Manual is now posted on the Web site of the Office of Academic Affairs. While we are aware of three minor errors in the text of this version of the Faculty/Administration Manual, this version of the Manual will be used for our upcoming SACS review.

Continuing Editorial Review. The professional editor has made 108 suggestions for editorial changes in the Faculty/Administration Manual, which would require administrative approval or amendment of the Faculty By-Laws. None of these changes would adjust the content of these documents in a meaningful way. Our committee will consider these suggestions and make recommendations as appropriate.

Past Amendments to the By-Laws. In consultation with Speaker Mignone, Secretary Farrell, the Committee on Nominations and Elections, and the Office of Academic Affairs, our committee is attempting to determine if and when amendments to the By-Laws have been approved and ratified but have not yet been incorporated in the By-Laws.
Future Amendment Possibilities. Several faculty colleagues and administrators have suggested possibilities for amending the By-Laws. Our committee will study and make reports to the Faculty Senate concerning such recommendations (or motions to amend the By-Laws, if applicable).

Recommendations for Future Administrative Changes to the Manual. Several faculty colleagues and administrators have suggested possibilities for changing the administrative portions of the Manual. Our committee will study and make reports to the administration and to the Faculty Senate concerning such recommendations.

Changes in By-Laws and Manual Format. Several institutions have moved to a searchable, Web-based version of their policy documents like the Faculty/Administration Manual. Our committee will discuss such possibilities with the Office of Academic Affairs for future versions of the Manual and will report on this issue to the Faculty Senate.

Note: Provost Jorgens has asked that the committee work with Vice President Powers as the Provost’s representative to the committee. We thank Vice President Powers for her diligence and support in the work of the committee to date.
Statement of Purpose for the Common Requirements of the College of Charleston’s Undergraduate Curriculum

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

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

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

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

IV. Interdisciplinary and Intercultural Perspectives, gained by
   This becomes International and Intercultural Perspectives
   - Using multiple approaches to interpret complex phenomena
     Interdisciplinary analysis becomes part of Goal II
   - Experiencing and understanding multiple cultural perspectives

V. Personal and Ethical Perspectives, including experiences that promote
   - Self-understanding
   - Curiosity and creativity First two sub-goals are combined into one
   - Personal, academic, and professional integrity
   - Moral and ethical responsibility
   - Communal and global responsibility Fourth and fifth sub-goals combined into one

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

Statement of Purpose: Graduates of the College of Charleston complete a challenging course of study that will prepare them to function intelligently, responsibly, creatively, and compassionately in a multifaceted, interconnected world. While their work in the major of their choice will give students specialized knowledge and skills in that discipline or profession, the common graduation requirements will equip each student, regardless of major, with crucial intellectual skills in analysis, research, and communication. The Commons will offer students a broad perspective on the natural world and the human condition, and will encourage them to examine their own lives and make useful contributions to their own time and place. Over the course of their undergraduate careers, all College of Charleston students will develop the following intellectual skills, areas of knowledge, and dispositions:

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

II. Analytical and Critical Reasoning, including
   - Mathematical and scientific reasoning and analysis
   - Social and cultural analysis
   - Interdisciplinary analysis and creative problem-solving

III. Historical, Cultural, and Intellectual Perspectives, including knowledge of
   - Human history and the natural world
   - Artistic, cultural, and intellectual achievements
   - Human behavior and social interaction
   - Perspectives and contributions of academic disciplines

IV. International and Intercultural Perspectives, gained by
   - International and global perspectives
   - Experiencing and understanding multiple cultural perspectives

V. Personal and Ethical Perspectives, including experiences that promote
   - Self-understanding, curiosity and creativity
   - Personal, academic, and professional integrity
   - Moral and ethical responsibility; communal and global citizenship

VI. Advanced Knowledge and Skills in Major Area of Study, consisting of
   - Skills and knowledge of the discipline
   - Sequence of coursework that fosters intellectual growth
   - Coursework that extends and builds upon knowledge and skills gained from the core curriculum
   - The ability to transfer the skills and knowledge of the major into another setting
Appendix III. Statement read by Darryl Phillips during Constituents’ Concerns

I’m here this evening to share with the Senate my concerns about Faculty Workload.

As many of you know, following the mandate of the strategic plan, in Spring 2003 I was appointed by President Higdon to chair an Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Workload.

8 faculty members, drawn from all schools, and the director of Institutional Research served.

We worked for a year and a half arriving at consensus on:

- A recommended new statement of faculty workload
- A recommended detailed policy and philosophy, including a full discussion of the issues and a detailed rationale for the changes
- And a new procedure for calculating the workload for every faculty member on campus

We submitted the report in Fall 2004 to the President and Provost.

Faculty were naturally interested in what happened to this report.

Joe Kelly asked the Provost about the Report at a Senate meeting last February.

Provost Jorgens replied that the report would not be made public, adding, off the record, that the report called for changing the stated workload for faculty from 12 contact hours per week to 9 contact hours per week, and that this change was, for various reasons, unacceptable.

During the past year, the Provost’s office has introduced a new calculation of student credit hours, reducing the issue of faculty workload to a number for each department— their workload target.

Indeed, the “target” appears to be inspired in part by the committee’s recommendation. What concerns me is not the “target”, but rather the lack of a new workload policy, the lack of a revised statement and written philosophy, and the lack of discussion and rationale to accompany the number.

A target number is not, I think, a good substitute for a comprehensive policy.

Working with the “target”, one clever department has already realized that there is no longer a need for faculty to teach 12 contact hours a week, or even 9 contact hours a week. This department realized that by raising the enrollment limits in courses, most faculty members, including one instructor, could spend just 6 hours each week in the classroom. Their schedules for this year reflect this new practice.
This concerns me greatly.

Other departments are certain to quickly follow, limited only by the physical capacity of the classrooms themselves.

By not wishing to change our stated workload policy from 12 contact hours to 9 contact hours, we are quickly heading towards an actual practice of 6 contact hours.

This will have a profound effect on the educational experiences of our students.

The reputation of the College of Charleston has been shaped by the close relationship between professors and students. This will change quickly if we continue the move towards professors spending less time in the classroom each week while the classes themselves double in size.

Our identity and mission are being changed.

My intention in bring this issue forward is not to find fault with a particular department, but rather to point out what I consider to be a serious problem with the system that led to this result.

How did we end up with this situation—with faculty members in a department teaching just 6 hours each week?

I see two possible explanations.

The first explanation is that this was the intended, or at least an acceptable, outcome of the Provost’s new workload target number. If this is the case, I am gravely concerned, for as a faculty member and as a senator for the past 4 years, I was not given the opportunity to discuss this important change to our identity and mission. If this outcome was the Provost’s intention, the faculty must take action now and weigh in on this important matter.

The second explanation is that this drastic reduction in contact hours is an unintended and unacceptable outcome of the new workload target number. Indeed, perhaps this outcome was not foreseen by the Provost’s Office.

If this is the case, I am again distressed, for it means that the workload committee’s report on which we labored for 18 months, was not give due consideration. For that report contains recommendations for minimum workloads that are consistent with our stated mission and identity as an institution. Indeed, the committee foresaw this very issue, and addressed it in our proposed policy.

If the current situation was not the intent of the workload target and is unacceptable, I urge the Senate to ask that the Provost release and perhaps even act upon the Workload
committee’s report so that we can have a well thought-out policy, a philosophy of workload, a detailed discussion and rationale to accompany the “target number” that academic affairs has produced. We deserve, and we clearly need, a comprehensive faculty workload policy.