Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 8 April 2008

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 8 April 2008, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order.

Reports

The Provost

The Provost had no formal report to give. Associate Provost Bev Diamond took a moment to welcome to the College and to introduce to the Senate Ray Barclay, Associate Vice President and Director of Institutional Research.

The Speaker

Speaker Kelly thanked Debbie Vaughn (Faculty Senate Webmaster), Brian McGee (Parliamentarian), and Terence Bowers (Faculty Secretary) for their service to the Faculty Senate this year.

The Speaker announced that President Benson would attend the Spring Faculty Meeting, but would not deliver a speech. Instead, he will give his speech to the entire college community at the State of the College address.

The Speaker reported that he had recently met with President Benson and Steve Osborne, Sr. Vice President of Business Affairs, to discuss various issues, including the resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate concerning the Faculty Compensation Report and the minimum raise for faculty meeting the merit threshold. The President, Speaker Kelly reported, conveyed surprise to find himself in an adversarial relationship with a good part of the faculty over the new merit-raise system. The President assured him that raises would be given to all deserving faculty, and that in a few years the concerns motivating resolutions would be addressed. The President also said that he would quit if faculty salaries don’t come to the level of faculty salaries at our peer institutions.

On the issue of the resolution on the modification of duties policy, the Speaker reported that the President told him that he was glad to be informed of developments on the issue, that he will have a cost analysis done of it, and that he was not hostile to the resolution.

With regard to the Vendor Code of Conduct that the Senate endorsed, the Speaker reported that Steve Osborne thought there might be a “sticking point” in the College’s joining one of the labor rights organizations mentioned in the motion passed by the Senate on November 13, 2008. The Speaker said that he would follow up with Mr. Osborne on this issue.

The Speaker also reported on the issue of spousal benefits (including unmarried spouses). He said that the Budget Control Board decides policy in this areas, and that he saw the goal of getting certain spousal benefits as a long-term battle,. He added that he would work with Mr.
Osborne and the Faculty Welfare Committee to find a long-term strategy to deal with this issue.

The Speaker also reported on the recently circulated ethics policy and the issue of accepting gifts, in particular honoraria. He brought up the issue at the Sr. Leadership meeting and was assured by Provost Jorgens that the policy did not cover modest honoraria earned by faculty.

**Brian McGee, chair of the Committee on By-Laws and the Fac/Admin. Manual**

In order to get through tonight’s crowded agenda, Mr. McGee said that he would circulate his report by email.

**Larry Krasnoff, chair of the ad hoc Steering Committee to Assess Faculty Governance**

In the interest of time due to the loaded agenda, Mr. Krasnoff kept his report to a minimum, but said that he would be happy to take questions and comments by email if Senators wished to discuss further the activities of the ad hoc Steering Committee to Assess Faculty Governance. He reminded the Senate of the survey sent out by his committee, stressed its importance, and hoped that many faculty would fill it out. He reported that his committee would also talk to other committees and get their views on faculty governance and each committee’s role in it.

**New Business**

**Election of Faculty Senate Committees (Budget, Academic Planning, By-Laws)**

Tom Kunkle, chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, told the Senate that the committee would accept additional nominations of faculty to serve on the Faculty Senate Committees (Budget, Academic Planning, By-Laws). No further nominations were made of any of the three committees. The Senate approved the slates presented by the Committee on Nominations and Elections for each of the Faculty Senate Committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Kasman</td>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>Acad Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess</td>
<td>Miner</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Acad Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>Acad Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Eichelberger</td>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>Acad Plan (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td>LIBR</td>
<td>Acad Plan (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Gonsalves</td>
<td>MGMT</td>
<td>Acad Plan (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>McNerney</td>
<td>THTR</td>
<td>Acad Plan (S)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Senate approved the following proposals without discussion:

**Archaeology**  
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor/Concentration – Archaeology

**Psychology/Biology**  
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor – Neuroscience; delete course PSYC 384 as elective  
Proposal to Change a Course – BIOL/PSYC 448 – Change Title  
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor – Neuroscience; change title of PSYC 448 to “Bachelor’s Essay in Neuroscience,” in the course listing

**Jewish Studies**  
New Course Proposal – JWST 210 Jewish History I  
New Course Proposal – JWST 215 Jewish History II  
New Course Proposal – JWST 230 The Holocaust

**Education**  
Proposal to Delete a Course – EDEE 401 Literacy Assessment  
New Course Proposal – EDEE 363 Introduction to Early Childhood Education  
New Course Proposal – EDEE 374 Elem Education – Balancing  
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – BS Early Childhood  
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – BS Elementary Education  
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – BS Middle Grades Education

The following proposals were next submitted for approval:
International and Intercultural Studies

New Course Proposal – HNDI 101 Elementary Hindi I
New Course Proposal – HNDI 102 Elementary Hindi II

Brian McGee (Communication) asked what the Department of International and Intercultural Studies was. David Cohen (guest) responded that International and Intercultural Studies does not refer to a department; it is a designation by which to assign and label courses. Mr. McGee then asked if there were FTEs involved and if they accrued to a home department. Mr. Cohen answered yes to both questions.

The Senate approved the two new course proposals.

The following cluster of proposals were next submitted for approval:

Economics and Finance

New Course Proposals
REAL 360 – Special Topics in Real Estate
REAL 420 – Real Estate Independent Study
REAL 444 – Real Estate Internship
REAL 499 – Real Estate Bachelor’s Essay

Proposals to Change a Course
FINC 375 – Principles of Real Estate
FINC 376 – Real Estate Market Analysis - Course Number Change to REAL 376
FINC 380 – Real Estate Investment Analysis - Course Number Change to REAL 380
FINC 381 – Real Estate Finance - Course Number Change to REAL 410

Change of Degree Requirements for Minor/Concentration - Finance

Proposal for a New Concentration - Real Estate

Richard Nunan (at-large) first commented on the proposal to delete PYSC 384, which had been approved earlier. He said that he had no problem with deleting it, but was struck by the rationale that it was being removed because there was no longer anyone to teach it. He said that it was a good idea to avoid approving courses that are so narrow that only one faculty member is qualified to teach them.

Mr. Nunan then said that he was unhappy with the Economics and Finance proposals. He said that real estate was an inappropriate major for a liberal arts institution. He thought that it was best to table the proposals until the faculty was ready to have a serious discussion about establishing such a major. Otherwise, what will happen is that when the proposal to establish a major in real estate comes up, supporters will say that the Senate has already approved the idea of the major because it has approved the courses. He also had questions about what the proposed internship was and how it counted as academic experience. He then moved to table the Economics and Finance proposals. The motion received a second.
Mike Morgan (guest) said that the Economics and Finance Department isn’t trying to pursue a real estate major. He said that this was the first time he had heard of such an idea, and that it has not been discussed in department meetings. He said that his department does not have the faculty to teach a major in real estate. Regarding the internship, he said that his department has a thorough process that the students go through. It’s not a question of students driving “For Sale” signs into lawns or selling houses. Students examine real estate markets, look at marketing models, study land use, and do other things of that sort. To table the proposals would be wrong, he said. His department, he argued, has followed Senate procedures, has funded the lines for the program, and is not asking for additional resources.

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) asked Mr. Nunan when he thought the issue of the real estate major might eventually come up given Mr. Morgan’s statement there are no plans for such a major. Mr. Nunan responded that it was more honest for the Senate to assume that there will be an effort to establish a major. Therefore, the Senate needs to discuss the appropriateness of a real estate major before we have real estate courses and everything else that a major has, except the name.

Mary Beth Heston (Art History) concurred and said that the curriculum proposals look like a “serious program-building effort.” Denis Keyes (at-large) asked if taking the courses in the program leads to a real estate license. Mr. Morgan said that it did not and insisted that a major was not in the works.

The Senate voted on the motion to table, which failed.

Mr. Krasnoff then asked about the acronym for the real estate courses. Do other concentrations have their own acronym, he asked. Cathy Boyd (Registrar and guest) answered “no.” Mr. Krasnoff pointed out that minors have their own acronyms, but not concentrations. The reason, he suggested, was that minors have a strong interdisciplinary component, but concentrations generally do not. In this sense, the real estate courses should really be Economics and Finance courses. The fact that they do not use the usual acronyms of the Economics and Finance Department raises suspicion about what the real estate concentration will become. Qualifying her previous response, Ms. Boyd added that there are some concentrations with their own course acronyms. Mr. Morgan also responded that he was told several years ago that CHE defined a minor and a concentration differently according to whether it was linked to Business Management or to Economics. The rationale for this distinction, he said, was not clear to him.

Jonathan Wiley (guest) said that he spent time putting together the concentration and that there was no intention to “pull something sneaky” or to create a major. He added that in order to create a real estate concentration in a liberal arts college, one had to be thoughtful and to select courses that were linked to liberal arts courses (e.g. in political science and environmental studies). The concentration in real estate at the College, he said, was different from the sort one might find in a typical business school.

George Hopkins (History) thought that this explanation from the faculty in the School of Business and the assurance that there would be no real estate major were adequate. Jennifer
McStotts (at-large) added that there is “nothing magical” about a prefix and the connection to a major.

The Senate voted and the curriculum proposals concerning the Economics and Finance Department were approved.

The Senate then approved the following curriculum proposals without discussion:

**Mathematics**
Proposal to Change a Course – MATH 103

**African American Studies**
New Course Proposal – AAST 300 Special Topics
New Course Proposal – AAST 381 African American Studies Internship
New Course Proposal – AAST 400 Independent Study

**Communication**
Proposal to Change a Course – COMM 335
Proposal to Delete a Course – COMM 325
New Course Proposal – COMM 314 Media History
New Course Proposal – COMM 337 Strategic Comm. Mgmt
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – Media Studies

**Geology**
Proposal to Change a Course – GEOL 441
New Course Proposal – GEOL 250 Introduction to Geochemistry
New Course Proposal – GEOL 250L Introduction to Geochemistry Lab
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – B.A. Geology
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – B.S. Geology

The following proposals were next submitted for approval:

**History**
New Course Proposal – HIST 250 Special Topics in Comparative/Transnational History
New Course Proposal – HIST 299 The Historian’s Craft
New Course Proposal – HIST 350 Special Topics in Comparative/Transnational History
New Course Proposal – HIST 450 Research Seminar in Comparative/Transnational History
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – B.A. History

Mr. Nunan asked if HIST 299 would increase the total number of hours for the major. Bill Olejniczak (History Department Chair and guest) said it would not. Mr. Nunan then asked why there were two courses with the same title and different numbers. Mr. Olejniczak said that this arrangement is not that unusual, that the two different special topics courses allow the
department to try experimental courses pitched at different skill levels, and that they help the
department deal with transfer credits involving courses that don’t quite fit into our categories.
David Gleeson (guest) said that the 400-level course requires that students do more reading
and writing, and prepares them for the capstone course.

The Senate approved the History Department proposals.

The Senate next approved the following curriculum proposals without discussion:

**Philosophy**

*New Course Proposals*
PHIL 207 – Ethics
PHIL 208 – Knowledge and Reality
PHIL 209 – Political Philosophy
PHIL 234 – Eastern Philosophy
PHIL 290 – Philosophy and the Cognitive Sciences

*Proposals to Change a Course*
PHIL 101 – Change Title and Catalog Description
PHIL 220 – Course Number Change to PHIL 201
PHIL 230 – Course Number Change to PHIL 202
PHIL 301 – Change Title and Catalog Description
PHIL 315 – Change Title and Catalog Description

*Proposal to Delete a Course*
PHIL 102 – Knowledge and Reality

Change of Degree Requirements for Major - Philosophy

**French and Francophone Studies**

*Proposals to Change a Course*
FREN 220: Special Assignment Abroad
FREN 370: Studies in French Film and Literature

*New Course Proposals*
FREN 320: A survey of Francophone Literature
FREN 321: A Survey of French Literature
FREN 326: A survey of Francophone Civilization
FREN 327: A Survey of French Civilization
FREN 495: Capstone Seminar: Contemporary France and the Francophone World

*Proposals to Delete a Course*
FREN 322: Delete course “Survey of French Literature I”
FREN 323: Delete course “Survey of French Literature II”
FREN 324: Delete course “French Civilization and Literature”
FREN 325: Delete course “French Civilization and Literature II”
FREN 343: Delete course “La France Contemporaine (Contemporary France)”
FREN 480: Delete course “History of the French Language”
FREN 483: Delete course “French Fairy Tales: Word and Image”
LTFR 350: Delete course “French Literature in English Translation”
LTFR 450: Delete course “French Literature in English Translation”
FREN 313C: Delete course “Advanced French Conversation”
FREN 314C: Delete course “Advanced French Conversation”
FREN 113: Delete course “Language Practicum I”
FREN 213: Delete course “Language Practicum II”

Change of Degree Requirements for Minor – French

The following proposals were next submitted for approval:

Honors College
- New Course Proposal – HONS 165 American Government
- New Course Proposal – HONS 166 Honors World Politics
- New Course Proposal – HONS 180 Honors Business and Consumer Ethics
- New Course Proposal – HONS 210 Honors Business Law
- New Course Proposal – HONS 214 Honors Business Statistics
- New Course Proposal – HONS 394 Honors Research Methods

Rohn England (Mathematics) said the HONS 214 affects the Mathematics Department, yet no consultation about the course was made with his department. Gerry Gonsalves (Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee) said that HONS 214 just replaces an earlier course. John Newell (Director of the Honors Program and guest) said that this course is an upgraded or accelerated version of another statistics course. Mr. England explained that the acceleration concerns his department and is why it needed to be consulted. Mr. Newell apologized for not consulting with the Mathematics Department.

Another Senator asked about what sort of course HONS 394 Honors Research Methods was. Mr. Newell said that it was business research methods course and was designed to help business majors prepare for the Bachelor’s Essay. Mr. Nunan asked if the course title could be changed to “Business Research Methods.” Mr. Newell said that he would accept such a change. The Speaker then asked for unanimous consent to make the change in title to HONS 394. Unanimous consent was granted.

The Senate then approved the new course proposals for the Honors Program.

The Senate next approved the following curriculum proposals without discussion:

Physics and Astronomy
- Proposal to Change a Course – PHYS 201, 201L, 202 and 202L
- Proposal to Change a Course – PHYS 330
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Concentration - Meteorology
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor - Meteorology
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor - Astronomy
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor/Concentration - Physics
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – B.A. Astronomy
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – B.A. Physics
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – B.S. Astrophysics
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major – B.S. Physics

Health and Human Performance

New Course Proposal – PEHD 352-L Physical Education Field Experience in Elementary Schools
New Course Proposal – PEHD 452-L Physical Education Field Experience in Middle/Secondary Schools
New Course Proposal – PEHD 457-L Field Experience in Adapted Physical Education
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Concentration - Physical Education Teacher Education

Computer Science, Mathematics

Proposal to Delete a Course – CSCI 130
Proposal to Delete a Course – DISC 201
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor/Concentration – Discovery Informatics

Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

The Senate approved the following curriculum proposals without discussion:

Proposals for a New Graduate Course – MS Accountancy
BLAW 509 – International Business Law
ACCT 542 – Taxation of Pass-Through Entities
ACCT 543 – Taxation of Corporations with Interstate and International Transactions
ACCT 555 – Information Technology Governance and Infrastructure Life-Cycle Management
ACCT 556 – Protection of Information Assets

Proposals to Change a Graduate Program
MS Accountancy
MA History

Proposals for a New Graduate Course – M Public Administration
PUBA 613 – Planning Law
PUBA 615 – Urban and Regional Development & Cross-listed as EVSS 695 – Special Topics
PUBA 616 – Local and Regional Economic Development: Policy and Practice & Cross-listed as EVSS 695 – Special Topics

Proposals to Change a Graduate Course – M Public Administration
PUBA 633 - Urban Planning to PUBA 612 – History and Theory of Urban Planning & Cross-listed as EVSS 633
PUBA 611 – Urban Policy - Course description change

Proposal for a New Graduate Certificate Program in Urban and Regional Planning
Within the Existing Masters in Public Administration

Faculty Welfare Committee
-- Resolution regarding the Modification of Duties Policy

Bethany Goodier (Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee) moved that the Senate adopt the following resolution:

Motion Regarding the Modification of Duties Policy
Approved by the
Faculty Welfare Committee March 27, 2008

WHEREAS, through the leadership of President Benson, President Higdon, and Provost Jorgens, the College of Charleston already has adopted a modification of duties procedure\(^1\) for new faculty parents; and,

WHEREAS, the University of South Carolina, including the Columbia campus and the regional campuses at Aiken, Beaufort, Lancaster, Salkehatchie, Sumter, Union, and Upstate, also has a modified duties procedure with a similar purpose (hereafter, “USC procedure”); and,

WHEREAS, the USC procedure allows for modification of duties in exceptional cases that cannot be anticipated by any established procedure; and,

WHEREAS, the USC procedure provides for the uniform treatment of all birth and adoption cases, without regard to birth date or date of adoption; and,

WHEREAS, the USC procedure eliminates most sources of uncertainty for Deans, Department Chairs, current faculty, and prospective faculty in the application of the modification of duties procedure and creates a simple process for the administration of the procedure, especially with regard to teaching and other on-site duties; and,

WHEREAS, especially in faculty recruitment, the College of Charleston should not have a procedure that places the College at a competitive disadvantage when

---

\(^1\) “Procedure: Modification of Duties for New Faculty Parents,” effective August 1, 2006; revised March 15, 2008. See the Academic Affairs Web site for the current version of this procedure.
compared with the University of South Carolina, including its Columbia campus and regional campuses, therefore,

RESOLVED, the College of Charleston should adopt a modification of duties procedure substantively identical to ACAF 1.60 (“Modified Duties Semester for New Faculty”), a procedure of the University of South Carolina, including its Columbia campus and regional campuses, and effective at the University of South Carolina since August 16, 2007.

Ms. Goodier said that she appreciated the fact the administration is responding to this issue. She stressed that the USC policy has a number of advantages: some of these are that it is clear, avoids ambiguity, and applies to emergencies (such as dealing with sick relatives) and goes beyond applying only to cases of childbirth. Also, the “USC Policy does not make time of birth the determining factor in setting precedent for how the policy is enacted, facilitating more uniform and fair application across campus.” It also doesn’t encourage faculty to teach extra courses or do extra service in order receive the benefit. The USC policy, she said, is more equitable than our policy and will help with the recruitment and retention of faculty.

Laura Turner (Theatre) asked if one’s leave time would be taken away or reduced in the event that one experienced a situation under the modified duties policy. Ms. Goodier said “no.” The two are separate issues.

Mr. Hopkins said that our current policy is well intentioned, but it is doesn’t really do the job in terms of what is desired and needed at the College. He urged that the Senate support the resolution. Meg Cormack (at-large) agreed. She said that anything we can do for members of our community we should try to do. The current policy, she added, was not clear or helpful.

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) said that it was hard to be against the resolution, but wondered if the budget analysis done by Steve Osborne (Sr. Vice President of Business Affairs) was available and had been looked at by the Welfare Committee. Ms. Goodier said that the Committee did not look at a budget analysis, but the key is to support a policy that is needed at the College.

Mr. Nunan said that in an ideal world we would have this kind of policy for all state employees, but we don’t live in such a world. Our current policy is elitist in that it applies only to faculty and not to staff. One could argue that you should settle for what you can get, but this policy reinforces different treatment for different types of employees. The USC policy, he added, is far more liberal than our own. For example, if two parents are faculty, the pregnant spouse can take a semester off and then the other spouse can take time off the next semester. He suggested that there are other ways to deal with the issue of parental leave for the birth of children, and warned that there might be “Hell to pay,” if this policy caught the attention of the newspapers and if certain legislators were to take note of it. They might accuse faculty of creating special privileges for themselves.

Conseula Francis (English) said that we don’t have to wait to live in an ideal world to adopt good policies. The current C of C policy, she said, is a lawsuit waiting to happen. Now
faculty have to rely on the goodwill of their colleagues to work around the difficulties that occur when a child is born. She said that she was not afraid of the “newspaper test.” Most workplaces provide leave-time for new parents. People in the world recognize this practice as the right and humane thing to do. We should, she concluded, “step up” as a liberal arts institution and endorse the policy.

Alison Piepmeier (guest) also spoke in support of the resolution. She said that the policy isn’t doing something trailblazing; rather, it is bringing the C of C in line with other organizations. She added that having a good modification of duties policy is a recruitment and retention issue. It will be harder to attract and keep good faculty here without a good policy. Currently, many faculty are afraid to speak out on this issue and young faculty in particular would see the failure of implementing a good policy as having a major influence on retention.

Another faculty member said that she had a baby under the old policy and the current one. The first time she did not think to ask for time off and felt disempowered to ask. The second time, with the policy in place, she did see her chair, but was told that she had screwed up the timing and that it would have been better to have the baby during a sabbatical. Of course, that is not what sabbaticals are for, she pointed out. In defense of her chair, she said that he had no clear policy to rely on. We need, she stressed, a good, good uniform policy and urged the Senate to endorse the resolution.

Laura Turner (Theatre) said that she timed her pregnancy to happen at the end of the semester, but because she piled up extra-courses to gain leave time, she ended up suffering from preeclampsia. We need a policy that helps faculty avoid such situations and deal with the tremendous stress they experience in trying to do their jobs while pregnant and taking care of infants or sick relatives.

Jeffery Diamond (History) voiced support for the resolution and said that if legislators complained, we should get in front of the issue and say that they don’t support families.

At this point, a Senator called the question. The motion to call the question passed.

The Senate voted to endorse the resolution on the modification of duties policy.

Faculty Educational Technology Committee
--Motion to implement online course evaluations on an optional basis

Mark Hurd, chair of the Faculty Educational Technology Committee (FEC), made the following motion:

1. The FETC recommends that the Senate support the implementation of an online course evaluation system as an optional method for evaluating courses that may be used at faculty discretion.

2. Faculty may choose to offer students paper or online evaluations.
3. For the purposes of tenure and promotion or merit evaluation, online course evaluations have been shown to be equivalent based on pilot data collected in the fall of 2007.

4. This optional online course evaluation system will be implemented and reevaluated after one year by the Faculty Senate.

5. There will be no positive or negative incentives offered to students to complete the online evaluations.

Mr. Wilder mentioned that at the last regular Senate meeting, when Mr. Hurd reported on the pilot program, Mr. Hurd said that the pilot system did not allow faculty to control the time-window for when the evaluations were done. Mr. Hurd replied that that was correct, but that in the future such control of the time-window might be doable. Mr. Wilder thought that the inability to control the timing of the evaluations presented a problem. He pointed out that though he was not familiar with any research on the question of whether evaluations change when major assignments are returned, in the current paper evaluation system faculty do have some control over the timing of evaluations. He was concerned about that loss of control, especially for untenured faculty, even though the proposed system is optional.

John Huddlestun (Religious Studies) responded that if the time-window were a week and faculty knew about it well in advance, they could work around it with respect to when they returned major assignments. He also asked Mr. Hurd why there were no incentives in place for students to complete the online evaluations. Mr. Hurd replied that some institutions offer students extra-credit if the evaluations are completed, but some people object to such a policy. He added that the Provost is not particularly in favor of this approach; she also dislikes the idea of punishing students (such as withholding grades), if they don’t fill them out.

Mr. Diamond was worried that the optional online system might become permanent. He was also concerned that students might do them late at night after coming home from a bar. The low response rate of online evaluations also concerned him, and he referenced the Citadel where online evaluation response rates have been low. He asked, too, what made the current system so inadequate that it needed to be changed. Denis Keyes (at-large) responded that the current system is expensive. Mr. Hurd also pointed out that the current system is unwieldy and not secure (anonymity of responses is compromised), and that the written responses in online evaluations tend to be richer. With respect to the issue of low response rates, he said that research shows that rates tend to rebound and come up after the school has adopted the system for a few years. He added that the Citadel’s system was problematic from the start. It was imposed upon the faculty, who didn’t sell it to their students. If people don’t buy into and promote the system, it won’t work. He mentioned also that, contrary to what some people think, with online evaluations you don’t just get the worst and the best students responding.

Jack Parson (Political Science) said that he saw the online system as the future, but was concerned about the time-window issue, and brought up Mr. Huddlestun’s idea of narrowing the window to one week so that faculty could work around it. A two-week window he thought might be too large, and faculty would be able to say that bad evaluation results were caused by the fact that they had to return a test or papers during the evaluation period.
Mr. Hurd replied that he didn’t want to predetermine in the motion what the time-window should, and wished to provide the flexibility to make changes on that aspect of the system.

Another Senator thought it would be wise to limit the window and make it uniform. Doing so would make it easier to compare courses and data. Mr. Krasnoff said that he generally supports the FEC proposal, and that the next logical step after doing the pilot study is to approve the motion to make the online evaluation system optional. On the time-window issue, he advised that it not be too narrow during the first year or so because people would need time to get used to a new system. He liked the fact that comments in the online system tend to be richer, but was concerned about the interpretation of data. He wondered if each department could determine the time-window so that the interpretation of data is consistent.

Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism) praised Mr. Hurd and his committee for their work on the pilot study, in which he participated, but said that he couldn’t support the motion until the issue of response bias was addressed. He said that his evaluations in the pilot study were excellent, but thought they might have reflected the views of a narrow range of students. “I am not that good,” he said, referring to his evaluation scores. He thought that there needed to be an incentive to insure a near 100% response rate so that the views of all the students in each course were registered.

Von Bakanic (Sociology and Anthropology) said that she received no written comments from the online evaluations done for her course, which was a 100-level course. She wondered if the research showed whether there are more written responses in higher course levels. Mr. Hurd replied that he was not aware of any such research.

Mr. Parson asked for unanimous consent to include the following language in the FEC motion: “The window of opportunity to complete evaluations will be no longer than one week. The week of the evaluations will be announced before the beginning of the semester.” Unanimous consent was not granted.

Mr. Parson then moved to insert that language into the FEC proposal. His motion received a second.

Mr. Diamond was concerned about who would choose the week of the evaluation period and still saw problems with the whole idea of online course evaluations. Jaap Hillenius raised the issue of Maymester courses. Perhaps a week would be impractical for such a compressed semester?

The Senate then voted on Mr. Parson’s proposed amendment, which passed.

Discussion of the FEC motion resumed. Brian McGee (Communication) asked how the Tenure and Promotion Committee (T & P) would view packets with a mix of paper and online course evaluations, and wondered whether this might cause problems for those going up for tenure or promotion. Mr. Hopkins, who said that he has served on the T & P Committee, thought that candidates for tenure and promotion could address possible disparities between
their online and paper evaluations in their narratives. He did not think that this issue would be problem.

Mr. Wilder highlighted another difference between paper and online course evaluations. With the paper evaluations done in class, there are instructions given and the evaluations are administered by students. Research shows, he said, that comments by instructors are significant and can make a difference in results. With the online system, instructors lose some control in this area. Ms. Cormack responded, saying that she thinks faculty will do the something similar in the online evaluation system as they do now. They will make a statement about the evaluations during the week of evaluations.

Todd McNerney (Theatre) wondered about the possibility of students getting together to write evaluations that are hostile. This possibility is less likely in the current system, he suggested. Mr. Huddlestun and Mr. Diamond agreed. Mr. Diamond added that he was concerned about the context and shaping influences on students during the evaluation. He was concerned about these and other issues and thought they needed to be sorted out and studied further.

Mr. Hurd responded that his committee have already done what Mr. Diamond is asking for. They have approached the issues surrounding online course evaluations like scientists: they have studied the scholarly literature (some of which they have put on the FEC website) examined the Citadel’s experience with online evaluations, and done a pilot study in which they collected and analyzed data. He said that he was not sure what more they could do. He also pointed out that the online system is optional. Those who still want to use the paper system may do so.

Mr. Krasnoff said that the Senate needed to make a decision. The concerns that have been raised are not about what will happen, but about what might happen. He said that we should either try the new system, study it, and see how it works, or we end it here. He called the question. The motion to call the question passed.

The Senate voted on the FEC motion to make online course evaluations optional, and the motion passed.

**Academic Standards Committee**

--- *Resolution on the proposed Second Baccalaureate Degree Policy*

Mr. Krasnoff, chair of the Academic Standards Committee, presented the committee’s motion to establish a new policy for students earning a second baccalaureate degree. The current policy confuses a double major and a double degree and the new policy will distinguish them. The exact text of the motion is as follows:

*Resolved: That the College adopt the Registrar’s proposed new policy on second bachelor’s degrees.*
The text of the proposed Second Baccalaureate Degree policy is as follows:

A student who has previously earned a bachelor's degree from the College of Charleston and wishes to pursue further undergraduate work may either complete an additional major and have it noted on the permanent record (with date of completion)* or earn a second degree if it is different from the first (i.e., a B.A. if the first degree was a B.S. and vice versa**). This student must apply for re-admission for the second degree, and then:

- Must earn a minimum of 30 additional credit hours in residence at CofC.
- Meet all degree and College graduation requirements for the second degree program in the catalog under which he or she enters, or in a subsequent catalog.
- Meet all prerequisite and course requirements in the major field(s) for the second degree.

A CofC student may earn two different baccalaureate degrees (i.e., a B.A. and a B.S.**) concurrently at the College of Charleston, if he or she meets the following requirements:

- Earns a minimum of 152 credit hours, including a minimum of 62 hours in residence at CofC.
- Meets all degree and College graduation requirements for both degree programs.
- Meets all prerequisite and course requirements in two different major fields.

Students who hold a baccalaureate degree from another institution may earn a second baccalaureate degree at the College of Charleston by meeting the following requirements:

- Complete a minimum of 30 semester hours at the College of Charleston with at least 15 taken in the major field at the 200 level or above.
- Meet all prerequisite and course requirements in the major field and degree requirements for the second baccalaureate degree program.
- Earn a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 or higher in course work completed for the major and second baccalaureate degree programs.

*CofC students completing a major in the same degree program previously awarded will not receive a second diploma. However, the permanent record (transcript) will reflect the additional major. In the case of multiple majors in different degree programs, the student will choose the degree to be earned and posted on the diploma.

**Students earning an A.B. degree will earn that degree in place of the B.A. or B.S. normally earned with the major.

Proposed implementation is for undergraduate students entering under the 2008-2009 catalog.
Mr. Krasnoff then presented a brief summary of his written rationale, which is here provided in full:

“**Rationale:** The College’s current policy does not clearly distinguish dual degrees from dual majors. As things stand, a student completing two major programs, each leading to the B.A., will receive a single B.A. degree and a single diploma, reflecting both majors. Similarly, a student completing two major programs, each leading to the B.S., will receive a single B.S. degree and a single diploma, reflecting both majors. But a student completing two major programs, one leading to the B.A. and one leading to the B.S., will receive two degrees and two diplomas.

“Many majors offer both a B.A. and a B.S. option, with the B.S. requiring additional courses. A student who completes all the requirements for the B.S. before graduating will receive a single B.S. degree. But a student can also graduate with only a B.A., and then return to complete the additional B.S. requirements. Such a student will receive two degrees, the original B.A and then the B.S., even though that student has completed the same program as the first student, who received only one degree.

“Similarly, a student who completes one B.A. major before graduating, and then returns to complete a second B.A. major, will receive a second B.A. degree, even though a student who completes both majors before graduating will receive only one. (The same holds for students completing two B.S. majors in these different ways.) It makes little sense to treat these cases so differently. (All of our dual degrees are reported separately to the CHE, which means that we are also sending confusing or misleading information to the state.) The proposed new policy treats all double (and triple) majors as leading to a single bachelor’s degree. If a student wished to be awarded a second bachelor’s degree (as opposed to just a second major), they would have to complete an additional 30 hours. This change would bring our policy into line with the practices of most other institutions (see attachment). The new policy has been suggested by the Registrar and endorsed by the faculty committee on Academic Standards.”

Mr. Krasnoff next asked for unanimous consent to add as a parenthetical insertion the words “beyond the 122 hours required for a degree” in the text of the proposed policy—more specifically in the line marked by the first bullet point, after the phrase “30 additional credit hours.” Unanimous consent was granted.

The Senate vote on the motion and it passed.

**Motion on faculty participation in the commencement ceremony**

Marie D. Barnette made the following motion:

*Mr. Speaker, for all commencement exercises, I move that regular faculty members of the College of Charleston be permitted on stage to present degrees or diplomas to graduating students when those students are family members of the faculty colleague or have long-standing prior relationships with the faculty colleague, such as those relationships predating the matriculation of the student at the College.*
Darryl Phillips (at-large) said that he was willing to vote for the motion, but felt that it needed an extra provision, namely that the student approve the request to have a faculty member make the presentation of the diploma. He asked for unanimous consent to add this provision, but it was not granted.

Mr. Phillips then asked for unanimous consent that there be an added provision that the request come from the student (not the faculty member). Unanimous consent was granted.

Returning to the main motion, Lynn Cherry (guest) spoke against it, arguing that the current policy gives very clear guidelines regarding the privilege faculty have in presenting diplomas to relatives at the graduation ceremony. She said that as someone who receives many requests to present diplomas, she values the clear guidelines. This motion, she explained, opens up a whole new category of requests that will make the task of sorting through them and making decisions more difficult.

Mr. Nunan spoke in favor of the motion. He didn’t think that the difficulties would be so great. There is a bright line that clarifies what is a legitimate request and what is not: specifically, there must be a prior, longstanding relationship between the faculty member and the student. If it turns out that the passage of this motion creates a clogging effect, we an always rescind the privilege. Mr. Nunan added that if the Board of Trustees have this privilege, then the faculty should too, as they are more directly involved in education.

The question was then called, and the motion passed.

The motion on faculty participation in the commencement ceremony passed.

Constituents’ Concerns

Ms. Cherry urged the faculty to attend the commencement ceremony.

Mr. Krasnoff thanked the Speaker and Secretary for their efforts this year.

Having concluded its scheduled business, the Senate adjourned at around 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 11 March 2008

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 11 March 2008, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order.

Reports

The Speaker

The Speaker mentioned the SWOT survey/analysis that was being conducted across the College. He asked Senators to urge their colleagues to become involved. The SWOT analysis constitutes the best opportunity for the faculty to provide input about the state of the College, its future direction as an institution, and the strategies it must adopt to reach its goals.

Following up on the “Klaxon vote” (the vote on the resolution regarding the proposed emergency notification system) at the last regular Faculty Senate meeting, the Speaker reported that Associate Provost Susan Morrison is putting together a committee that will study the best type of alarm system to install before the deadline stated in the sunset clause that the Senate inserted into last month’s resolution.

Brian McGee, Chair of the Committee on By-Laws and the Fac./Admin. Manual

Mr. McGee reported that there would be a substantive revision of the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM). He said that there are many places in the FAM that need updating and asked Senators to let him know if they see anything that is obsolete or missing in it. He said, too, that the FAM’s current structure dates back to the early 1990s, and that some information is placed in inconvenient locations. Some re-organization of the document is therefore needed. A draft of the FAM with a different form of organization has been created as an alternative to the organizational scheme of the current FAM. Mr. McGee stressed that the draft does not attempt to change or add content that has not already been vetted. He added that his committee is not wedded to the draft, and that they would like feedback on it and suggestions for how it could be better organized. He also made clear that he was talking about the administrative portion of the FAM, not the section on by-laws, which requires faculty approval to change.

Mark Hurd, Chair of the Educational Technology Committee

Mr. Hurd reported his committee’s work on online course evaluations. He first thanked his committee members and his co-chair Jannette Finch. He then provided some background information on the issue. In spring 2005, the Faculty Educational Technology Committee (FEC) was charged with the task of looking into the feasibility of online course evaluations. In 2006, the committee reported to the Senate. In that meeting, Senators raised a number of concerns, which his committee has since tried to address.

Mr. Hurd then provided an overview of the current course evaluation system and some of its weaknesses. The current system
--is expensive, not secure, and slow,
--uses a lot of paper (70,000 forms are printed each year),
--requires a lot of labor to administer (205 hours to print, sort and deliver the
evaluations, and 16 hours to photocopy),
--and makes the process of analyzing data inconvenient and difficult.

Mr. Hurd then commented that the response rate in the current system is about 70%. In online
evaluations, the response rate is generally lower, especially when an online system is first
implemented; but the rate recovers somewhat after the system has been in use for three or four
years. He noted, however, that in some schools—e.g., medical schools where students are
typically required to respond—the response rate is very high.

Mr. Hurd next reported on a pilot study—involving both paper and online evaluations—that
his committee had conducted. Members of a group of departments from various schools of
the College volunteered to participate. In total the study involved 69 class sections and over
1900 students. Results of the evaluations were emailed to participating faculty right after
grades were submitted. The response rate for paper evaluations was 70%; for online
evaluations the rate was 39%. Some participating faculty reported that student comments in
the online evaluations were more articulate and less emotional. In that regard, Mr. Hurd
concluded that the higher quality of the responses compensated for the lower response rate.

His committee also analyzed the evaluations of eight courses in the Psychology Department,
where students did paper and online evaluations. That part of the pilot study showed that
there was no difference in results between the paper and online evaluations.

As part of the pilot study, the committee also surveyed the faculty who participated. Of the
participating faculty, 50% responded to the survey. Of those who responded, 64% were
satisfied with the online course evaluation system, and 36% were not satisfied, mainly
because of the low student response rate. Three suggestions emerged from the survey: (1)
that students be reminded more often to do the online evaluations; (2) that students be given
incentives to do them; and (3) that grades be withheld until the evaluations are completed. On
the question, “Would you sell this to other faculty?” 47% responded yes, 53% no. On the
question, “Would you participate again?” 74% responded yes, 26% no.

Mr. Hurd announced that more information about the study can be found at the website of the
Faculty Educational Technology Committee.

Richard Nunan (at-large) asked if he found different response rates according to department.
Mr. Hurd responded that the response rates in chemistry courses were high, that in
psychology courses the rate was 46%, and that overall it was 39% to 40%. In his courses, the
rate was between 50% and 60%, and he said that during the evaluation period he reminded his
students everyday to do the evaluations. He thought that for overall response rates to go up,
“a cultural shift” on campus would have to take place.

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) asked for specifics about the evaluation period. Mr. Hurd said that
the online evaluations took place during a two-week period. During that time, there were
exams, but it would be possible, he said, to work around exam periods. For example, the
evaluation period could be opened up for a time, then closed, and then opened up again. The
time of the day when one may fill out evaluations can also be controlled to avoid the scenario
of possibly inebriated students filling them out in the wee hours of the morning.

Jack Parson (Political Science) thought that in general online evaluations were good, but he
was concerned about the time-window when students did them. For instance, if the time-
window of two-weeks at the end of the semester is slated as the evaluation period, many
professors hand back papers and exams during that time, which in turn may affect the
evaluations. He said that controlling the time-window is important for faculty (something
they have some control over with paper evaluations) because faculty will claim that the timing
caused bad results. Mr. Hurd responded that to address that concern each faculty member
would have to pick certain days for his/her course evaluations, but he was not sure whether
that type of fine tweaking of the system could be done. Meg Cormack (at-large) said whether
vendors providing the technology for the online evaluation system could make such timing
adjustments should in part determine which vendor the College chooses. Mr. Hurd added that
some vendors claim they can make such timing adjustments, but whether they really can or
how well they can remain questions.

Steve Litvin (Tourism and Hospitality) said that he participated in the pilot study and
remarked that the FEC did a great job. He thought getting rid of excessive paperwork was
good, but he was concerned about response bias. He said that he was lucky last semester
(during the pilot study) because no student hated him, and his evaluations were good because
those who liked him filled out the online evaluations, but the others did not. He likes the
system, but is worried about bias. Mr. Hurd responded that much work has been published on
the issue of response bias: the studies done using large samples show that there is no bias.

**Unfinished Business**

**Motion on Salary Increase for Faculty Meeting the Merit Threshold**

The Speaker reminded the Senate that at the last regular Faculty Senate meeting, a motion had
been approved to table a motion made by Tom Heeney (Communication) on the salary
increase for faculty meeting the merit threshold until after Presidents Benson’s open forum on
the new salary merit-raise system. The text of the motion is as follows:

> For any faculty member judged to meet the merit threshold as defined in
> Recommendation 3 of the Faculty Compensation Committee’s January 08
> “Recommendations on Merit/ Market Salary Increase Process,” the College of
> Charleston Faculty Senate recommends a minimum salary increase of 80% of the
> mandated average annual raise percentage authorized by the General Assembly for
> State employees for the coming year. Larger salary increases will be contingent on
> funds available, on level of meritorious performance, and on market factors, as judged
> appropriate.
Scott Peeples (English) began discussion on the issue by reading the following statement from his colleague Simon Lewis:

I’m sorry I’m not with you all in person this evening, but I think my family would consider I’d done enough unpaid overtime already this month. That comment may not sit well with all of you who’ve been doing similar unpaid overtime all year, and thereby, if the gods of fairness were on the ball, eating up all available merit pay raises available. Which is the point of this brief statement in favor of the Senate resolution to recommend a minimum salary increase of 80% of the mandated average annual raise percentage authorized by the General Assembly for State employees for the coming year. Personally I believe all who meet the minimum standard should get 100% of the mandated average annual raise, but let that pass for now. More importantly, what’s the rationale behind my support of this resolution? Because it seems self-evident that we should all get raises according to merit, doesn’t it? How can anyone who considers him or herself meritorious not support such a position?

Two reasons: first, as the Chair of the Vestry of my church said last Sunday when drumming up annual funds from us congregants: “A raise isn’t a raise when it’s less than the increase in the cost of living.” We all know what she means—especially those of us for whom -- for human, family reasons -- costs are increasing at the same time as the strains on our time are increasing (we’re starting a family, sending kids to college, caring for aged parents/spouses, etc.). So let’s not kid ourselves that this system is going to raise salaries—it’s just going to divide the salary pot differently, quite possibly dividing ourselves against each other in the process. Robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Second: this new system is not really based on merit, either—at least not in absolute, criterion-determined terms; it’s based on relative merit, a very nebulous concept where the amount of effort I put in will not necessarily be rewarded, since someone else may be putting in more than I am. In other words, no one will know what will get us the goodies and we’re all going to have to fight each other to prove not just our worth but our relative worth against each other. To put it really bluntly, it seems to me that this system is designed to get more free labor out of us, since we’re not necessarily going to be rewarded for meeting criteria of merit in the three designated areas, we’re going to be rewarded (assuming there is money available) for exceeding departmental norms—which probably means going way beyond any contractual obligation we are under. In my opinion, the College needs to honor its contractual obligations to us, among which I see the obligation to keep paying us at the level we were promised if we keep doing our job.

Finally, I have heard it said that the president considers any mitigation of the “merit-only” system to be likely to tie his hands in negotiations with the Board of Trustees. I contend that this argument is specious, in that the funds designated by the state for pay raises are not in the gift of the Board. In other words, passing this resolution is entirely harmless as far as the president’s negotiations with the board are concerned.
-- and hugely beneficial as far as demonstrating his commitment to and trust in his faculty is concerned.

Thanks, Scott, thanks, All.

Simon

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) next recalled a suggested amendment that he brought at the last regular Senate meeting regarding Mr. Heeney’s proposed resolution. He moved to amend the resolution by inserting the phrase “a publicly specified minimum percentage” in place of “80%.” The motion received a second. Mr. Krasnoff pointed out the amended resolution would make clear that faculty meeting the merit threshold should get a salary increase and that the amount of the increase would have to be made public by the College administration. At the same time, it would allow the administration some flexibility in how state funds granted for raises would be allocated and used.

Richard Nunan (Philosophy) spoke against the proposed amendment, arguing that it would not be an effective way of sending a message about minimum raises for meritorious faculty, and that it gave no guarantee of a minimum raise. Recalling what one Senator pointed out at the last meeting, the “specified percentage” could be zero. He added that he was worried about some of the things that President Benson said at the open forum, such as the statement that he (the President) thought a 3% raise was a good raise. That might, said Mr. Nunan, be a good raise for someone in the Business School where salaries have been high, but not for most other faculty, especially given the fact that the inflation rate has been about 2.5%. Mr. Nunan was also disturbed by the President’s comment that he regarded as the evaluation system at the Terry School of Business at the University of Georgia as ideal. That statement shows that the President’s looks at the world through a business school prism.

Another Senator thought that the Senate should send the strongest possible message by stating that the minimum salary raise should be 100% of “the mandated average annual raise percentage.”

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) spoke in favor of Mr. Krasnoff’s amendment. He stated that he had served as chair of his department when there was no money for raises. He thought that the 80% figure would tie the hands of chairs and not give them the adequate discretion they needed to address various equity issues, and would ultimately cause more unhappiness.

Mr. Heeney responded that the 80% figure is designed to provide some flexibility for chairs and administrators, but at the same time it is intended to make sure that some minimum amount, some concrete amount would go for raises so that faculty could keep up with rises in the cost of living. He added that for the last three years salaries and benefits have been going down, which shows that salaries and benefits have not been regarded as important by the College administration. The resolution is intended to make a statement about priorities.

George Hopkins (History), speaking against the proposed amendment, said that his experience as chair has been different from Mr. Wilder’s. In his view, the 80% figure provides chairs an appropriate degree of flexibility to deal with the various issues mentioned by Mr. Wilder.
Also, deans and the provost can, in cases of exceptionally meritorious faculty, come up with more money. Meg Cormack (at-large) agreed with Mr. Hopkins. She said that Provost Jorgens has said that extra funds are available for special situations. The 80% figure, she thought, struck an appropriate balance: it guaranteed a salary increase for faculty meeting the merit threshold and it provided some flexibility for chairs.

The Senate voted on Mr. Krasnoff’s amendment, and it was defeated.

The Senate then voted on Mr. Heeney’s motion, and it passed.

New Business

Faculty Curriculum Committee

The Senate without discussion approved the following proposals.

Computer Science
Proposal to Change a Course – CSCI 210 Game Programming

Religious Studies
New Course Proposal – RELS 120 Religion, Art and Culture

Music
New Course Proposal – MUSC 353 Wind Ensemble

English
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor – Film Studies

Psychology/Biology
Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor - Neuroscience

German and Slavic Studies
Proposal to Change a Course – LITR/RUSS 290 Special Topics
Proposal to Change a Course – LITR/RUSS 390 Special Topics

Mathematics
Proposal for a New Minor or Concentration – Statistics Concentration.

The following proposals were next submitted for approval:

History
New Course Proposal – HIST 218 The American West
New Course Proposal – HIST 219 Native Americans in Film

Mr. Nunan wondered if anyone in the History Department apart from Christophe Boucher could teach HIST 219. He said that he was concerned about approving courses that only one
person could teach. He wondered, too, if other departments or programs, such as Film Studies, were affected by the course proposals.

Christophe Boucher (guest) said that the proposed course focuses on content, not on the form or art of the film, as a film studies course might. So it is a different kind of course than what might be offered in other departments teaching film courses. On the other point, Mr. Boucher said that a lot of courses exist that only one person can teach. That’s in part why many of us here—to teach courses in our areas of specialty, which other faculty lack the expertise to teach. He didn’t see Mr. Nunan’s concern as a problem.

The Senate approved the history course proposals.

The following proposals were approved without discussion:

- **International and Intercultural Studies**
  - New Course Proposal – HNDI 101 Elementary Hindi I
  - New Course Proposal – HNDI 102 Elementary Hindi II

Constituents’ Concerns

Mr. Hopkins called attention to an ethics policy that was circulated recently. He said that the section on honoraria was unclear and would like the College administration to provide some clarity on that issue. Speaker Kelly said that he would look into the matter further.

With its scheduled business finished, the Senate adjourned at around 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 12 February 2008, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order.

Reports

The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens mentioned the faculty-generated resolutions regarding the new faculty merit-raise system, which were on this evening’s Senate agenda. She thought that the tenor of both resolutions was positive. She also announced that President Benson would hold a forum on the merit-raise system on February 20.

Provost Jorgens thanked the Senate for its efforts in the Gen-Ed reform process. She said that it was very important for our students and for SACS accreditation to put in place a strong Gen-Ed program. It is a difficult process, she acknowledged, but she encouraged the Senate not to give up and to press forward. She added that the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and many provosts across the country have been paying close attention to Gen Ed and the issue of assessing student learning.

She reported that the Federal Commission on Higher Education and AASCU have been involved in trying to develop standards that would apply to all colleges, and to which colleges would be accountable. These standards will allow parents and the general public to compare colleges. AASCU has set up a voluntary system and the College has been asked to participate. Winthrop and some other schools in the state have already signed on. The Provost reported that she would like to hold off from participation for a while to see how it works for other institutions. If the President sees that it’s a good idea, then the College will participate, and she will work with faculty to see how we might make best use of the assessment data generated by the system.

The Speaker

Speaker Kelly said that with respect to the special Gen-Ed meetings, he wanted to find ways to facilitate the Senate’s deliberations so as to make best use of the Senate’s time. To that end, he passed around a two-page abstract of Gen-Ed Proposal as well as the exact language of the pending amendment to goal 6. When Senators wish to make amendments to the Gen-Ed Proposal, he asked that they submit the exact wording of what will be changed in the goals, and that they provide information on how an amendment will impact other goals. He encouraged Senators to submit their amendments in advance so that they could be displayed on the screens. If Senators proposed amendments from the floor, he asked that they write down the amendment and hand it to Debbie Vaughn so that it could be typed up and displayed on the screen.

On a different matter, the Speaker reported that he had attended the Senior Leadership meeting, and that there had been a lively discussion about the merit raise resolution on
tonight’s Senate agenda. He said that Senators who desired more information about the meeting could contact Dean Cynthia Lowenthal and some other deans, who attended the meeting.

The Speaker also reported that with the help of Bob Cape (Battery Project leader), the Faculty Advisory Committee was being formed to address issues concerning the Battery Project, the switch from SIS to a different system, and other issues that fall outside the purview of the Faculty Educational Technology Committee (FEC). The deans have been asked to send IT representatives to explain technical changes. The FEC is also represented in this new group.

**New Business**

**Tom Heeney, Motions Concerning Faculty Raises and Compensation**

Tom Heeney (Communication) moved that the Senate endorse the Faculty Compensation Committee Report of 01/10/08. The exact wording of his motion is as follows:

>In the spirit of collegiality with the College’s new administrative leadership, and with the following qualifications, the Faculty Senate endorses the Faculty Compensation Committee’s January 08 “Recommendations on Merit/Market Salary Increase Process,” presented at the Jan 22nd regular Senate meeting.

(1) This endorsement, like the Faculty Compensation Committee’s recommendations, applies solely to the process governing the merit/market evaluation system. It does not speak to the question of the substance of any forthcoming salary increase distribution policies. Nor does it speak to the question of specific criteria that may be devised for establishing various merit thresholds. Nor does it speak to the wisdom of substituting this new process for the existing system of merit evaluation used in conjunction with the tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review processes, if that were to happen at some future date.

(2) Because the Faculty Compensation Committee’s recommended process represents a significant increase in the annual quantity of faculty evaluation, without any firm assurance of added value to be achieved through such a measure, the Senate reserves judgment on the long-term wisdom of replacing the current annual evaluation process with a new system.

Richard Nunan (at-large) seconded the motion. Mr. Heeney explained that the motion was offered in the spirit of collegiality, that it represents the thoughts of several faculty groups that have met informally, and that it affirms the tradition of shared governance at the College. He added that the faculty have had a month to process the Faculty Compensation Report and to reflect on it.

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) mentioned the potential problem of having two evaluation systems in place—an old one and new one. It is better, he stressed, to have one just one system, a new one that replaces the old one. The resolution, he thought, seemed to back away
from the one-system approach. Mr. Nunan responded that the language in the resolution is neutral on the issue of whether the two systems should merge or not. He pointed to the last sentence in statement #1. He added that it was not the intent of the resolution to preclude a single system.

The Senate voted on the motion, and it passed.

Mr. Heeney then read aloud the second motion on salary increases for faculty meeting the merit threshold:

For any faculty member judged to meet the merit threshold as defined in Recommendation 3 of the Faculty Compensation Committee’s January 08 “Recommendations on Merit/ Market Salary Increase Process,” the College of Charleston Faculty Senate recommends a minimum salary increase of 80% of the mandated average annual raise percentage authorized by the General Assembly for State employees for the coming year. Larger salary increases will be contingent on funds available, on level of meritorious performance, and on market factors, as judged appropriate.

The motion received a second. Mr. Heeney explained that this motion is not about process, but about criteria. It specifies what meeting a minimum merit threshold means financially for faculty, something not specified in other documents pertaining to the new merit-raise system.

Jack Parson (Political Science) said that state salary increases are often at or below the inflation rate. He would like the resolution to say that a salary increase will be 100% of the mandated average annual raise, if the state awards raises that are 3% or below 3% of what faculty currently earn, or that a salary increase will be 80%, if the state awards raises above 3% of what faculty earn.

Jason Coy (at-large) said that the Senate should weigh in on this issue, but he was concerned about the timing of the resolution. He said the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President has spent a lot of time expressing concerns about the new raise system. He thought it would be more appropriate to postpone a vote on the resolution until after the forum, where the President would respond to concerns about the new merit-raise system. Mr. Nunan said that he had no objection to Mr. Coy’s suggestion. He explained that when the resolution was circulated, no forum on the new raise system had been scheduled. He also found it troubling that it took so long for such a forum to be held.

Mark Long (political Science) asked where the 80% figure came from. Why 80% and not another percentage? Mr. Nunan replied that though the number is somewhat arbitrary, it comes from past practice: 80% has been treated as an across-the-board raise for faculty in the past. The rest has traditionally been used to address compression issues and other matters. He didn’t want to come up with a percentage that departed from what has been done in the past. Jeffery Diamond (History) agreed with Mr. Coy about the timing of the resolution. He also said that he had a problem with the 80% figure. Isn’t the whole approach of the new merit system to make us aware that we are in a competitive market? This resolution goes against that idea. He was
also concerned that the 80% figure could simply represent not a minimum for raises, but the typical level for most raises.

Calvin Blackwell (Economics and Finance) said that we (the Senate) could only advise on these matters; we have no power to enact changes. He thought the Senate should treat the salary issue as a negotiation, in which case the Senate should ask not for a low minimum, but for high minimum. He likened such a negotiation to buying a car: to get the best price, you don’t start with a high offer, but with a low offer. He also said that it bothered him to hear about raises that are below the inflation rate. If we are going to offer a recommendation on salaries, let’s start with a strong one. He also agreed with the view that the low minimum salary raise suggested in the resolution could become the norm for all raises.

Mr. Long asked for unanimous consent to amend the resolution and change 80% to 100%. Unanimous consent was not granted. He then made a motion to amend the resolution and change 80% to 100%. The motion received a second.

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy), speaking against the motion, argued that it would decrease the flexibility of department chairs, who have to decide how to divide up small amounts of money to address merit, market, and equity concerns when it comes to salary raises.

Mr. Nunan urged the Senate to think about the issue from the point of view of the President, who is trying to address serious salary deficiencies by a long-term policy. His intent is to loosen up the purse strings to give bigger increases for merit. To do that, he must go to the Board of Trustees for more money. If he goes to them with the Senate recommending the 100% figure, he has to say that the faculty wants to be treated as the staff is treated. This would send a message to the Board that the faculty is less serious about merit evaluations than the President.

Mr. Krasnoff suggested that perhaps the 100% figure might force the President to find money elsewhere for salary increases. In any event, he thought the debate over the issue was overheated, especially given the prevailing view that things won’t change much with regard to salary increases.

Brian McGee (Communication) agreed with Mr. Wilder’s comment. He said that as a department chair he needs flexibility to address equity issues and the problem of salary compression. Chairs also need a way to recognize significant disparities in performance among faculty. He would be reluctant to endorse any scheme that makes things more restrictive for chairs. Mr. Blackwell replied by pointing out that state mandated salary increases “are peanuts” and always will be. Why should we fight over that? It we’re only talking about such small sums, they aren’t worth fighting over. Mr. Long’s resolution would at least prevent that. He said that if raises are 3% or less, then we might as well divide it in an even, straightforward way. Mr. Nunan said that he understood Mr. Calvin’s annoyance with such quibbling over small amounts of money; nevertheless, chairs have to deal with situations year after year in which very little money is available. If you have faculty who were hired when no money was around and thus started with low salaries, yet who may be very good, those people get treated
unfairly and suffer greater financial hardship, if chairs have no discretion in how to distribute state money allotted for salary increases.

At this point, Dennis Keyes (at-large) called the question. The motion passed.

The Senate voted on Mr. Long’s motion to change 80% to 100% in the resolution. The motion failed.

Mr. Krasnoff then suggested altering the wording of Mr. Heeney’s proposed resolution. He suggested adding the phrase “publicly specified minimum percentage” in place of “80%.”

Scott Peeples (English) asked if the intent was that the minimum would be constant or that it would change? Mr. Krasnoff said that it would change. Mr. Blackwell pointed out that the minimum percentage could be zero. Recalling his car-buying analogy, he said that the Senate was merely willing “to pay sticker price” and not negotiating with any savvy. Mr. England replied that we are not yet at the negotiating stage. It’s not even clear what we are being sold. He added that he planned to make a motion to table Mr. Heeney’s motion. RoxAnn Stalvey (Computer Science) thought that the Senate should debate the issue when it had more information.

Ms. Stalvey next moved to table Mr. Heeney’s motion until the March meeting. After receiving a second, the motion passed.

Faculty Curriculum Committee

The following proposal from the Curriculum Committee were approved without discussion:

**Accounting and Legal Studies**
New Course Proposal – ACCT 444 Accounting Internship.

**Mathematics**
New Course Proposal – MATH 475 Statistical Consulting.

**Communications**
Proposal to change a Course – COMM 301 Communication Research Methods.
Proposal to change a Course – COMM 326 Organizational Communication. Change in Prerequisites to “COMM 210 or permission of the instructor.”

Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

All proposals submitted by the Committee on Graduate Education were approved without discussion.

1. New Course Proposals
Proposals for a New Graduate Course: MA in Teaching in Performing Arts
MUSE 611: Middle and Secondary Choral Methods
MUSE 702: Graduate Conducting Style and Analysis II
MUSE 704: Trends and Critical Issues in Music Education

2. Course Change

Proposal to Change a Graduate Course: MEd in Science and Mathematics SMFT 645: Physics of Force and Motion

3. Proposal to Change a Graduate Program

MA Bilingual Legal Interpreting Program:

Course Changes - MA Bilingual Legal Interpreting
INTR 502: Legal Processes & Procedures (Title Change)
INTR 515: Fundamentals of Interpreting (Description Change)
INTR 601: Fundamentals of Written & Sight Translation (Title & Description Change)
INTR 602: Law & the Legal System of the United States (Title Change)
INTR 615: Consecutive Interpretation (Description Change)
INTR 725: Internship in Legal Interpreting (Description Change)

Course Deletions: MA Bilingual Legal Interpreting
INTR 514: Fundamentals of Medical Interpreting
INTR 613: Consecutive Interpreting in Health Care
INTR 625: Practicum in Legal Settings

Constituents’ Concerns

No issues or concerns were raised.

The Senate, having finished its business, adjourned a little after 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 22 January 2008

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 22 January 2008, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, the minutes from the Senate meeting of 23 October 2007 were approved.

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Kelly announced that Bertie Mack, long-time faculty secretariat, had retired. He thanked her for her 29 years of service, and said that a search to find her replacement would begin soon.

The Speaker recalled that at the previous meeting, which was devoted exclusively to Gen Ed, Rohn England (Mathematics) had requested that the Gen-Ed Proposal be formatted as it might appear in the C of C catalog. The Speaker announced that he was ruling against this request and said that the Senate will vote on the Gen-Ed Proposals as they appear in their current format. He pointed out that it is the standard and traditional practice at the College for the Senate to vote on curricular issues and for others to “translate” it into catalog form. It was not appropriate, he said, for the Senate to define the catalog form.

Mr. England remarked that one of his main concerns was that bullet points might replace words in the catalog form or that some changes might occur resulting in a “mistranslation.” Cathy Boyd (Registrar and guest) said that if the Senate wished, it could review catalog pages before they went into print. Calvin Blackwell (Economics and Finance) took issue with the Speaker’s ruling, saying that the Senate does say “exactly” what goes into the catalog, and that its language should not be translated.

The Speaker replied that the specifics of any Gen-Ed changes will be accurate when they go into the catalog. He pointed out, too, that the Senate votes on curricular issues, not on specific pages of the catalog. He assured the Senate that it could rely on procedures that have been in place and generally worked well.

Ms. Boyd added that the Office of the Registrar typically takes language verbatim from documents approved by the Senate, and department chairs and faculty review catalog pages before they are printed. She said that her office can’t put language into the faculty catalog that has not been approved by the Senate, and that she has sent memoranda to her colleagues reminding them of this policy. When asked by the Speaker who actually writes the catalog, Ms. Boyd said that typically an editor is hired to do the job.

Speaker Kelly remarked that sometimes the catalog has contained language on curricular issues not approved by the Senate, but that we are now making efforts to avoid this and eliminate such occurrences. He said that if the Senate desired, a process could be set up in which the Senate could review catalog pages.
The Provost

As Provost Jorgens was out of town, Associate Provost Bev Diamond took her place. Since the Faculty Compensation Committee was reporting today, she decided to update the Senate on other efforts related to the faculty compensation issue and wished to highlight points in a memorandum that the Provost’s Office circulated regarding merit increases.

She reported that many meetings have taken place, and that the Provost gave the deans instructions to work with department chairs to develop a merit instrument for salary increases. The Academic Forum has been working on different approaches, she said, and some uniform criteria have emerged. All merit raises will be a mix of merit and market factors. Faculty will have to meet a minimum merit threshold for a raise. This year will be a transition year, in which each school will develop its own plan. Most schools, she said, will be asking faculty to provide a one- or two-page narrative of activities and accomplishments and a c.v. that covers three or four years. All chairs have been asked to do evaluations for untenured faculty; for other faculty some flexibility is allowed. Ms. Diamond also said that the Faculty Compensation Committee will perform a new study to obtain more data on market factors with regard to salaries.

At this point, Ms. Diamond asked if Senators had any questions. Mary Beth Heston (Art History) asked what the funding source was for salary increases. The Associate Provost responded that money would come from whatever the state grants for salary increases and from whatever the Board of Trustees allows for tuition increases. Decisions on tuition increases are generally made by the Board in June, she added, and the President submits his budget request in April.

Hugh Wilder, Chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee

Mr. Wilder commented on various points of the report entitled “Recommendations on Merit/Market Salary Increase Process,” which had been circulated to Senators and the general faculty prior to tonight’s meeting. He emphasized that the recommendations focus on criteria and procedures, and said that Deans and the Provost have in principle endorsed the Committee’s recommendations. What follows is a summary of his comments on various recommendations contained in the report.

--Annual Evaluation: Mr. Wilder said that annual evaluation of all regular faculty is important, if the President is going to make an argument to the Board that faculty deserve raises.
--Merit Threshold: There have been a lot of meetings about this, Mr. Wilder reported, and he thanked Bev Diamond for her help and input on this issue. To be eligible to receive a raise, faculty must demonstrate professional competence in three key areas—teaching, professional development, and service—according to criteria established by individual schools and departments.
--Annual Evaluation Criteria and Standards: Deans and chairs have so far had more input here than faculty, Mr. Wilder reported. Faculty must participate in the development of
evaluation standards and criteria, and once they are developed, they must be published and made available to all faculty.

--Annual Evaluation Process: This will vary by rank, school, and department, but there will be some uniform standards that apply to all faculty. He said that it was likely that more documentation would be required for annual evaluations of untenured faculty and for tenured faculty seeking promotion in the year prior to the tenure/promotion year.

--Salary Increases: The President’s plan is that salary increases will be based on faculty meeting the merit threshold. Annual evaluations will be used to help determine salary increases.

--Market Factors: collecting data on faculty salaries in other institutions and doing comparative studies of those data will determine these.

--Major Evaluations: No change is anticipated in the procedures for conducting the major evaluations of faculty (third-year review, tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, and renewal as Sr. Instructor).

--Annual Evaluation for Those Undergoing Major Evaluations: With regard to those going up for tenure, promotion, and other major evaluations, in addition to undergoing the major review, they will also go through the annual evaluation process for the purpose of determining possible salary raises.

--Tenure and Promotion Awards: The Committee recommends that these continue as well as the salary increases that go with them. Those increases should be added to the faculty member’s new base salary after whatever merit increase has been added.

--Post-Tenure Review: This will probably be reviewed and changed, Mr. Wilder reported. Thought will have to be given to see how the annual review process can streamline the post-tenure review process. He said, too, that since annual evaluations of all faculty will now be required, rollovers of annual evaluations from one year to the next will likely end.

--Faculty-Administration Manual (FAM): Given the new process of determining salary increases, the FAM will need to be revised.

Richard Nunan (at-large) raised an issue from his perspective as a member of the Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year-Review Committee (T & P Committee). He noted that the T& P Committee has traditionally relied heavily on annual evaluations, which were fairly uniform from school to school. But now that the annual evaluations are going to be more “laissez-faire”—that is, now that they are going to vary from school to school and be based on different criteria—he was worried about the effect on the T & P process and the ability of the T & P Committee to do its job properly. He said that he was specifically concerned that there will be an inclination to move to minimum types of evaluations, especially given the added number of evaluations that are being heaped upon faculty, and that this will not be good for untenured faculty, who need to go through thorough evaluations.

Ms. Diamond replied that each school’s plan will be sent to the T & P Committee for comment and input. She assured Mr. Nunan that the T & P Committee will have a say. She added that the deans have said that they want an evaluation process for all ranks; the T & P Committee will have an opportunity to provide the deans with feedback.
Mr. Wilder said that Pam Riggs-Gelasco, chair of this year’s T & P Committee, has been invited to meetings on the issue, and that the Committee has been kept in the loop. He added that the former Provost, Andy Abrams, started a pilot program in which schools adopted their own annual evaluations. So the existence of different evaluation systems in some sense already exists. He urged the Senate to trust deans and chairs to work out appropriate evaluations plans for each school.

Doryjane Birrer (English) asked if the market part of the new salary plan would address the issue of salary compression. Mr. Wilder replied that it would and pointed to item #9 of his report, where the issue is brought up. Dennis Keyes (at-large) said that his department is looking at situations where assistant professors make more than associate professors, and he wondered if the salary plan would address that problem. Mr. Wilder said that it would as long as the associate professors meet the merit threshold.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) remarked that in point #5 of the Compensation Report (“Annual Evaluation Process”), the rationale was unconvincing for why those going up for promotion should provide more documentation the year before. Why provide extra documentation the year before and the year of the promotion process? Why go through that process twice? Mr. Wilder replied that Mr. Phillips may be right on that issue. If it is the wisdom of your school, he said, that big evaluation packets the year before are not needed, then such packets probably won’t be required. Mr. Nunan pointed out that the reason for extra documentation and a thorough evaluation the year prior to promotion was to provide a “heads-up” to the chair so that he or she could discuss potential problems with the faculty member. He added that with regard to this issue, he was less concerned about tenured faculty going up for promotion than he was about untenured faculty going up for tenure.

Speaking to a different issue, Ms. Diamond commented on the language used to define levels of merit. “Professional competence” is the phrase used for the minimum threshold. “High professional competence” defines the next level of merit. She added that this phrase is already in the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM), and that a stronger performance in one of three areas (teaching, professional development, service) can compensate for a weaker performance in another. The third level is “exceptional professional performance.”

Thomas Ross (Psychology) brought up an issue related to item #10 of the Compensation Report (“Distribution to Schools”), which mentions how funds for salary increases will be distributed to various schools of the College. He wondered whether determining the funding will be data driven or whether other factors will be taken into consideration, such as cost of living and inequities in salaries that currently exist among different schools. Ms. Diamond responded that cost of living factors were not being addressed in the salary plan. As for the distribution of funds, she said that a mechanism will be used that the Faculty Compensation Committee developed a few years ago. The President will look at the distribution of funds once he sees how much money he has and what the evaluations are that come from deans and chairs. Mr. Wilder added that one extreme solution has been ruled out, namely the distribution of funds based on current salary pools. That formula, he noted, would simply make the rich richer and the poor poorer.
Gary Harrison (Mathematics) said that in his department salary increases were linked to how specific areas of the annual evaluation (teaching, research, service) were weighted. He wondered if that method of determining salary raises can still be used. Ms. Diamond said that departments can still use it, but for salary increases faculty will still have to meet the necessary threshold in all areas.

Jeffery Diamond (History) asked if there would be pressure on chairs to ensure that not all faculty meet the merit threshold. Ms. Diamond responded that there will not be a quota system, but that chairs will have to prove that their faculty are meeting the standard. She also pointed out that deans will scrutinize chairs’ decisions. Following up, Mr. Diamond asked if chairs and deans will have to agree, and Ms. Diamond said that there will be oversight at all stages. Again following up, Mr. Diamond asked if faculty will be able to view the oversight process. Probably not, Ms. Diamond answered. But faculty will be informed about judgments made, though the specifics of certain conversations between chairs and deans can’t be divulged. She added that all the details of the procedures for oversight have not been worked out.

Jack Parson (Political Science) asked what would happen if certain schools found that all their faculty were reaching a high standard, while other schools had different results. How will we know that standards are uniform across schools? Ms. Diamond responded that such scenarios have been discussed. She assured the Senate that there is a desire to have some uniform standards across schools. Mr. Parson then asked if they will be published, and Ms. Diamond said that they would be.

**New Business**

**Election of members of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance**

Michael Phillips, chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, conducted the election of members of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance. Mr. Phillips presented the following slate of nominated candidates.

Alison Smith: LCWA/Instructor
Linda Fitzharris: ED
Bill Barfield: ED
James Williams: LIBR
Todd McNerney: ARTS
Laura Turner: ARTS
Bob Mignone: SSM
Wendy Cory: SSM
Merissa Ferrara: HSS
Larry Krasnoff: HSS
Kelly Shaver: BUS

Mr. Phillips asked Senators if they wished to make additional nominations. None was made. The Senate voted and approved the entire slate.
Recommendation to Establish a Classroom Emergency Notification System

Mark Hurd, chair of Faculty Educational Technology Committee, presented his committee’s recommendation for the establishment of a classroom emergency notification system. He explained that a sub-committee was formed (consisting of himself and Vince Benigni of Communication Dept.) to address the issue because some members of the committee did not feel that they had expertise to deal with it. What follows is the text of the sub-committee’s recommendation:

*It is recommended that the Senate support the use of cell phones within the classroom for notification of campus emergencies.*

We recommend that if faculty members require that all students have their cell phones powered off or in silent mode while in the classroom, that they consider the following options:

1. The instructor should have access to a cell phone (registered in CougarTrail) that can receive emergency notifications.

2. The instructor should designate one student to have their cell phone on for the duration of the class. Again, this cell phone must be registered in CougarTrail to receive emergency notifications.

Alternatively we recommend that faculty consider asking students set their cell phones on vibrate mode for emergency notification within the classroom.

Mr. Hurd added that the proposed system was tested and that it worked.

At this point, Speaker Kelly explained that the recommendation was not officially coming from the Faculty Educational Technology Committee. For the Senate to vote on the recommendation, a Senator would have to make motion to endorse it and the motion would require a second. He added that he asked Mr. Hurd to deal with the emergency-notification issue and to offer a recommendation. He thanked Mr. Hurd for his efforts.

A Senator moved to endorse the recommendation and the motion received a second. Discussion on the motion ensued.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) asked why there couldn’t be an alarm sounded in buildings that would alert people to an emergency. Doing so would remove the problem of students checking their cell phones. Mr. Hurd replied that that suggestion was brought up, but the problem is that it is more expensive to implement than the cell-phone solution and would take more time. His sub-committee’s proposal can be implemented now. He added, however, that this solution need not be permanent and can be altered.

Mr. Diamond noted that there is already a problem with cell phones in classrooms and pointed out that a person designated to receive emergency notifications might receive ten or fifteen other messages during a class. Given the annoyance created by increased cell phone usage in
the classroom, and given the slim chance of a major emergency happening, he wondered if the proposed plan was the best solution.

Mr. England, contesting the claim that an alarm system would be expensive, said that his parents were poor farmers in the Midwest, but they had Klaxons in place to warn about tornadoes. Such a system, he insisted, was not expensive. Mr. Hurd replied that he was told that an alarm system would be expensive.

Susan Morrison (Associate Provost and guest) pointed out that alarm systems are somewhat ambiguous. If an alarm sounds, does it mean evacuate, check your cell phone, or something else? While she also has some concerns about the using cell phones for classroom emergency notification, she found that messages can be sent to designated students unobtrusively.

Seaton Brown (SGA President and guest) supported the proposed emergency notification system and said that he thought an alarm system would be expensive and unnecessary. He added that he checks text messages sent to him during class, though he usually doesn’t respond to them. Most students, he thought, have their cell phones on in class, whether they are asked to have them turned off or not.

Sorinel Oprisan (Physics and Astronomy) said that in some classrooms in the science building, he receives no cell-phone signal.

Mr. England insisted that an alarm system would work well and be cheap and clear. If a message is so important that it needs to be sent to classrooms during class time, then it’s important enough to make a noise. Installing Klaxons would not be expensive or difficult.

James Williams (Library) said that we should think of the emergency notification system as not just consisting of one element, but as layered system.

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) added that the motion to endorse the proposed emergency notification mechanism was not an either/or issue. We can have this mechanism for now and something else later. He said, however, that he was uncomfortable with voting for the proposal without any time limit placed upon it, or without some assurance that something better will be implemented later.

David Kowal (Art History) asked what the alert would say. He said the proposed method of emergency notification might also be a blunt instrument. Ms. Morrison said that it would instruct folks to consult email and voice mail messages. Mr. Williams asked for unanimous consent that the motion indicate that three students be designated in each class to receive emergency notification messages, but unanimous consent was not granted.

Mr. Parson noted that the Klaxon idea would do pretty much the same thing as what the emergency notification proposal would do. If an alarm sounds, people will check their cell phones. He added that he was worried about things outside the classroom eating into the classroom space. Already cell phones intrude upon the classroom, and the proposed emergency notification system would only add to the intrusiveness. He questioned, too, how
needed the proposed system was. How many times in the past have we needed such a system?

Mr. Nunan proposed that the Senate endorse the proposed recommendation with the condition that it be valid only through 2008. He thus moved to amend the motion by adding at the end of the proposed recommendation the following statement: “This is approved by the Senate through the summer of 2008.”

George Hopkins (History) said that he was in favor of the amendment, but suggested that additional language be added to clarify that the emergency notification proposal was an interim measure designed to take care of perceived need now until a better system was found.

The Senate voted on Mr. Nunan’s motion, which passed.

Picking up on Mr. Hopkins’ idea Meg Cormack (at-large) moved that the Senate add the following sentence: “The Senate urges the administration to purchase and install three Klaxons before the end of Summer 2008.” After the motion received a second, Mr. Wilder asked if the sub-committee would continue to meet to work on the problem. Ms. Morrison said that her office could ask its members to continue working on the issue. Mr. Wilder then stated that he felt Ms. Cormack’s motion was too specific and that the Senate could offer a more productive form of guidance. Mr. Overby wondered what the city would say about installing Klaxons. Mr. Krasnoff then asked for unanimous consent to change the last part of Ms. Cormack motion to read “alarms and/or Klaxons,” but unanimous consent was not granted.

Jerry Boetje (Computer Science) remarked that it was not the Senate’s job to tell the administration exactly how to deal with the emergency notification issue. Let’s throw it back to them,” he suggested, “to devise a better plan. We can’t solve this problem tonight.” Mr. England agreed, and said that the word “Klaxon” is archaic and that some kind of alarm system is needed. Mr. Diamond then suggested that the motion be reworded to read, “The Senate urges the administration to find an alternative alarm system before August 15.” He asked for unanimous consent that the change be accepted, and unanimous consent was granted.

The Senate then voted on Ms. Cormack’s revised motion, and it passed.

Debate returned to the original motion to endorse the emergency notification proposal. Mr. Overby called the question, and his motion passed.

The Senate voted on FEC motion to endorse the emergency notification proposal, which passed.

Curriculum Committee

The following proposal from the Curriculum Committee passed without discussion:
Women’s and Gender Studies

New Course Proposal – WGST 350 Gender and Violence

The following proposals were next submitted for approval:

Sociology and Anthropology

New Course Proposal – CRLS 200 Crime, Law and Society Field Experience
New Course Proposal – CRLS 401 Crime, Law and Society Advanced Field Experience

Mr. Nunan asked what the substantive difference was between the two courses. Maureen Hays (Sociology and Anthropology) replied that each course embodies different levels of expectation and are paired with different courses at different levels (the CRLS 401 course can be paired with 200- and 300-level courses, CRLS 200 can be paired with 100-level courses).

The Senate approve the two curriculum proposals.

The following proposals were next submitted for approval:

Economics and Finance

New Course Proposal – ECON 444 Economics Internship
New Course Proposal – FINC 444 Finance Internship

Proposal to change a Course – FINC 382 International Financial Markets (Change in Prerequisites to, “Junior Standing, ECON 201, ECON 202, and FINC 303”)

Classics

Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Major (A.B. Degree and B.A. Degree in Classics). Add new courses CLAS 221 and CLAS 222 as “Approved Classics Courses”

Mr. Nunan asked what the difference was between ECON 444 and FINC 444. A member of the School Business responded that in FINC 444 students are involved in portfolio analysis, whereas in ECON 444 students will deal with other economic issues and may also do some work for the city.

The Senate approve the above curriculum proposals.

Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

(A) Proposals from the Committee
Environmental Studies Program

New Course Proposal -- EVSS 630 Natural Resources Law and Policy (with permission to cross-list with PUBA 630 Natural Resources Law and Policy)

The Senate approved the proposal.

(B) Report

A representative of the Graduate Committee reported to the Senate three changes that the Committee had made to the Policies and Procedures for Graduate Certificate Programs.

--First, in the title of the document, the “University of Charleston” is now referred to as the “Graduate School of the College of Charleston.”

--Second, section c.4 formerly stated that the credit requirements for graduate certificate programs could “range from 9 to 15 graduate credit hours.” Now it states that the “number of graduate credits may not be less than 12 and no more than 18 credits.”

--Third, section d.5 has been changed. Formerly, it stated that a “maximum of 40% of the credit hours towards any certificate program may be accepted as transfer credit.” Now it states that a “maximum of 6 credit hours towards any certificate program may be accepted as transfer credit.”

Constituents’ Concerns

Mr. Parson remarked that recently a policy had been promulgated about political activity on campus. He said that his department, Political Science, had a strong reaction to this policy. His colleagues were surprised that such an important policy could be implemented in such a manner and that it comes from the marketing division of the college administration. He would like the person who wrote the policy to come before the Senate and explain it.

Speaker Kelly said that he would take the blame for this situation, and that he should have consulted others before the announcement of the policy. He said that he was sure that the administration would be happy to solicit feedback from the Senate, and that he would make an effort to ensure that the policy safeguards free speech rights.

With its scheduled business complete, the Senate adjourned at around 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 4 December 2007

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 4 December 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order.

Reports

The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens reported that the College is part of Institutional Missions and Academic Programs and Planning Advisory Group (which is part of the Higher Education Study Committee), and that she is representing the College in meetings of this group, whose members include South Carolina’s comprehensive institutions of higher education (Clemson, Converse, Lander, Midlands Tech, USC). The purpose of the group is to determine where the state’s comprehensive institutions of higher education rank with respect to innovation, workforce development, and educational services. The Group will put together a report on these issues and develop a strategic plan for higher education in South Carolina. The Provost said that she had some concerns about the Group’s plan and purpose, but thought that it was nonetheless important that the College be represented in it.

The Speaker

Speaker Kelly reported that he followed up on an issue that arose in last meeting’s discussion of the C of C’s Vendor Code of Conduct, concerning the lack of an official anti-discrimination statement with regard to sexual orientation. He said that he met with the Provost about the issue and that she will bring it to the attention of the President. The Speaker said that he would also get more information about spousal benefits.

Susan Kattwinkel, Director of the First-Year Experience

Ms. Kattwinkel first provided a brief history of recent events regarding the First-Year Experience (FYE). She said that the Senate approved the FYE on March 27, 2007, that a director (herself) had been hired in July 2007, and that a First-Year Experience ad hoc committee had been formed in Fall 2007. Its members are

Susan Kattwinkel (FYE Director and Dept. of Theatre)
Kay Smith (Assoc.VP Acad. Exp. and Dept. of English)
Mindy Miley (Asst.VP New Student Programs)
Julie Davis (Dept. of Communication)
Marie Fitzwilliam (Dept. of English)
Hollis France (Dept. of Political Science)
Isaac Green (Dept. of Computer Science)
Jack Parson (Dept. of Political Science)
John Peters (Dept. of Biology)
Howard Rudd (Dept. of Management and Entrepreneurship).
Ms. Kattwinkel mentioned that key staff members are Kay Smith (Assoc. VP for the Academic Experience), Mindy Miley (Asst. VP for New Student Programs), and Page Keller (Director of Student Support Services).

Ms. Kattwinkel reported that this semester (fall) there were ten Learning Communities (each of which consists of two or more courses linked around a common interdisciplinary theme or issue). These ten Learning Communities have involved 230 students and thirteen peer facilitators. The FYE Office has also supported this year a dozen out-of-class activities. For next year, fourteen learning communities have been approved and nineteen First-Year Seminars (FYSM), involving 49 faculty and some 700 students. First-Year Seminars will begin for the first time next year. The long-term goal is that FYSMs will serve one-half of freshmen with the other half being served by Learning Communities. Ms. Kattwinkel announced that training for new faculty participating in the FYE is scheduled for May 2008, and that faculty will receive stipends for attending the training sessions. She added that feedback on previous training sessions has been positive.

Addressing a different topic, Ms. Kattwinkel said that a way needs to be found to link FYSMs to departments in our computer systems, in particular so as not to undermine a student in progressing efficiently toward meeting the Gen-Ed requirements. (For example, if a student takes a Philosophy FYSM, and later takes two more Philosophy courses to satisfy the humanities Gen-Ed requirement, only two of those three courses would count toward that requirement.) A way of tagging courses by department thus needs to be found. She said that currently the computer system can’t tag individual FYSM sections to indicate which Gen-Ed requirements they meet. A patch is therefore needed to mend the problem, and to allow one to track Gen-Ed credits and to credit faculty for teaching FYSM. The patch she has been developing consists of a series of FYSM numbers that will be linked to departments. Each department will be given two numbers in the event that they offer sections of the FYSM that count toward different Gen-Ed requirements: one number will be used by the department to indicate that certain sections count for one Gen-Ed requirement, the other number will be used to indicate that other sections count for a different Gen-Ed requirement.

Mr. Phillips (at-large) said that a patch is not an elegant long-term solution. Last year he proposed that department acronyms be used rather than the FYSM acronym, and that there be a designated number that would indicate which courses offered by departments are FYSM. Let the number be the designator for FYSM, not for the department, he urged. This way students will link the FYSM to the department.

Ms. Kattwinkel responded that this solution would not work because there is no 100-level number that has not already been used for something by some department. Using numbers below 100 or above 199 opens up other problems: 099, for example, won’t work because it is seen as a remedial course. Also, Ms. Kattwinkel thought that it was important that students see the FYSM as its own independent entity, rather than as something that belonged to a department.

Bill Manaris (guest) said that you could use the FYSM acronym to designate the course, assign a course number to indicate which department is offering a particular
section of the First Year Seminar, and then use the section number to designate which Gen-Ed requirement a particular section meets.

Brian McGee, chair of Committee on By-Laws and Fac./Admin. Manual

Mr. McGee reported that his committee received no comments on the proposal to remove sections V and VII from the FAM, which, he reminded the Senate, are in the administratively controlled portions of the document. He also reminded the Senate that those sections are either out of date or better suited for publication in other documents or institutional Websites, and that his committee recommends that those sections be removed from the FAM.

Next, Mr. McGee reported that the By-Laws required his committee to further study the recommendation the committee made at the last Senate meeting regarding an amendment to the Faculty By-Laws concerning the name and description of the Honors Program Committee. His committee, he said, has nothing to add to the recommendation, which proposes the following changes to Art. V., Sect. 3.B.13.

13. Honors Program College Committee

   a. Composition: Five faculty members, three of whom shall be teaching in the Honors College and a student representative and alternate both elected by the Honors Program Student Association (or any successor student organization recognized by the Honors College). The Honors Program Director, Dean of the Honors College (or the Dean’s designee) is an ex-officio, non-voting member of this committee.

   b. Duties:

      (1) To review student applications and select students for admission into the Honors Program College.

      (2) To review faculty course proposals and select Honors Program College courses.

      (3) To receive and act upon written requests from students, faculty, schools or departments for exceptions from Honors Program College regulations and requirements, changes in the curriculum, and changes in Honors Program College regulations and policies.

      (4) To review and make policy decisions concerning the Honors Program College curriculum, admission and
 retention standards, course selection procedures, and faculty stipends.

(5) To review information from the Director of the Honors College concerning Honors Program admissions, retention, curriculum, etc.

Mr. McGee, on behalf of the By-Laws and Fac./Admin. Manual, moved that the above changes to FAM be made. The Senate voted and approved the motion.

Unfinished Business

Discussion resumed of the motion made by Calvin Blackwell (Economics and Finance) at the previous Senate meeting that a two-thirds majority of the Faculty Senate be required for any changes to the Gen-Ed requirements. Here is exact wording of the motion: “I move we adopt the following Special Rule of Order for the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston: All changes to the Liberal Arts and Sciences General Education Requirements of College of Charleston shall require a two-thirds vote of the Faculty Senate.”

George Pothering (guest) spoke against the motion both from his perspective as chair of the ad hoc Gen-Ed Committee and from the perspective of a parliamentarian. As chair of the ad hoc Gen-Ed Committee, he said that under the current motion any course that crossed a disciplinary boundary would require a two-third majority. New programs would also require a two-thirds majority because they will affect Gen Ed. He thought that the motion, if it passed, would create a number of problems, and saw nothing wrong with a simple majority as a proper threshold for changes to Gen Ed. He noted that to go to war—a serious matter, if ever there was one—required a simple majority in Congress. As a Parliamentarian, he noted that Robert’s Rules of Order discourages the sort of maneuver proposed by Mr. Blackwell. Two-thirds majorities are used for changes in by-laws, not for ordinary business.

Pete Calcagno (Economics and Finance) spoke in favor of the amendment, noting that since the approval of the Standing Committee on Gen Ed requires a two-thirds majority, problems would result if the Gen-Ed Proposal passed by a simple majority, but approval of the Gen-Ed Standing Committee failed. If the Standing Committee requires a two-thirds majority, then so too should the Gen-Ed Proposal, which is of so much greater consequence. He agreed with the view that it was not good that a small majority could bring about such a huge change.

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) spoke against the motion and observed that there are generally two reasons for why a deliberative body would require a two-thirds majority: (1) to slow people down and to make them think; and (2) to freeze the status quo, when the status quo is generally perceived as needed and desirable (some Southern states, he said, have a two-thirds majority requirement for raising taxes). The second reason doesn’t apply to the Gen-Ed situation, he said, because our current Gen-Ed system does not enjoy great support and is not widely perceived as particularly good. The first reason also does not apply because we have gone slowly. In fact, some people might be frustrated because they think the process has
moved too slowly. Many people, he noted, have worked hard on and thought a great deal about the state of Gen Ed at the College.

Nadia Avendano (Hispanic Studies), speaking in support of the amendment, remarked that Alexis de Tocqueville, who wrote about the tyranny of the majority, said that super-majorities protect minorities. The Gen-Ed proposal, if implemented, will affect many programs in ways that are not clear. If 52% of the Senate voted in favor of the Proposal, would such a slim majority really be adequate. If we can’t reach a 60% threshold, then we aren’t doing well.

George Hopkins (History) said that a simple majority is enough to change a new course, create a new program, and so on. It is adequate. He added that change is not always easy, and that a two-thirds majority requirement would put up a roadblock preventing any change. He said, too, that the two-thirds requirement was not democratic.

Mr. Blackwell, in response to Mr. Krasnoff’s earlier comment, said that he accepted a job at the College in part because he liked the curriculum; therefore, he suggested that there was at least some agreement about the value of the current Gen-Ed system. He also thought that 67% was a good level of consensus that should be required for any changes of the kind that the Senate is considering with Gen-Ed. We need more than the minimum majority of 50% plus one. He thought that 67% was a fair compromise between 75% and 50% plus one.

In response to Mr. Hopkins, Mr. Calcagno said that there was a big difference in scale between a course proposal and the Gen-Ed Proposal. He also said that there is a difference in process: course proposals start from the department level and go up, whereas the Gen-Ed Proposal has been a top-down process. Mr. Calcagno also urged that the Senate go slowly in making changes.

Reid Wiseman (guest) asked if he faculty as a whole was going to vote on the Gen-Ed Proposal. Parliamentarian Brian McGee said that a petition from the faculty would have to be generated in order for the whole faculty to vote on the Proposal.

Mr. Pothering, referring back to Mr. Blackwell’s motion, observed that the wording of the motion refers to “All changes to the Liberal Arts and Sciences General Education Requirements.” If the motion passes, he said, then in the future much time will be spent arguing about specific courses because they might appear to change Gen Ed.

Richard Nunan (at-large), speaking against the motion, said that there are entrenched interests in keeping the status quo, and that the last attempt to reform Gen Ed, which failed, showed this. He noted that the tone of that discussion was on how the reform would affect certain interests. There will always be a group that will vote for the status quo for parochial, narrow-minded reasons; therefore, a simple majority, he thought, would indicate a significant level of consensus for change.

Rohn England (Mathematics) said he was not sure that Mr. Nunan’s characterization of the last Gen-Ed reform was accurate. He added that if the Senate votes for the reform and is
wrong, then the bad effects of the changes will be visited upon many. He therefore thought that a super-majority would more likely prevent such large-scale mistakes.

Paul Young (Mathematics) said that the motion exposes an illusion about democracy, showing that a majority can be attained by a single extra vote (beyond 50%), which in the case of the Gen-Ed Proposal will affect many people beyond the Senate for years. However, he also said that the motion, if passed, would make it harder for this and future Senates to fix things or make any changes. He thus thought that the Senate shouldn’t try to change the process and should vote against the motion.

Mr. Krasnoff agreed with the claim that the Gen-Ed Proposal, if approved, would amount to a big change, but it’s in line with what we have been doing all along. It’s not just one big change; it’s a series of smaller detailed changes that have been discussed. Some of the changes will later need to be changed again, and to make that possible, the Senate, he urged, needs to stick with its current procedures.

Jerry Boetje (Computer Science) said that Gen Ed is important, but not that important. It does not involve a structural change like joining two schools. It’s like a kitchen remodel, he said, and not like adding a second story. The two-thirds majority should be used for something structural, not for Gen-Ed reform.

The Senate voted on Mr. Blackwell’s motion that a two-thirds majority of the Faculty Senate be required for any changes to the Gen-Ed requirements, and the motion failed.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

The following proposals from the Curriculum Committee passed without discussion:

English
Proposal to change a Course – ENGL 201 Major British Writers I
Change the Title to “British Literature to 1800”
Proposal to change a Course – ENGL 202 Major British Writers II
Change the Title to “British Literature since 1800”

Computer Science
New Course Proposal – CSCI 180 Computers, Music and Art
New Course Proposal – CSCI 210 Game Programming

Classics
New Course Proposals
CLAS 221:  Field Methods in Classical Archaeology I
CLAS 222:  Field Methods in Classical Archaeology II
GREK 321:  Greek Oratory
GREK 322:  Homer
GREK 323:  Greek Historiography
GREK 324:  Greek Comedy
GREK 325:  Greek Tragedy
GREK 326:  Plato

The following group of proposals, all involving courses in the Classics Department, were next submitted for approval:

Classics

Proposals to Change a Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Change Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAS 254</td>
<td>Change course title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS 255</td>
<td>Change course title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREK 101</td>
<td>Change catalog description and course title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREK 102</td>
<td>Change catalog description and course title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREK 201</td>
<td>Change catalog description and course title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREK 202</td>
<td>Change catalog description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATN 102</td>
<td>Change catalog description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATN 201</td>
<td>Change catalog description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATN 202</td>
<td>Change catalog description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Todd McNerney (at-large) remarked that the word “Classical” was being removed from CLAS 254 and CLAS 255 (in 254 the title would change from “Classical Drama: Tragedy” to “Tragedy”; and in 255 the title would change from “Classical Drama: Comedy” to “Comedy”). He said that he would like to keep the term “Classical” in the titles. Darryl Phillips (at-large Senator and chair of the Classics Dept.) said that the issue raised by Mr. McNerney was discussed in his department: his colleagues thought that the titles of these courses should be consistent with the titles of other courses in the department. It was a matter of internal consistency.

The Senate voted on the above curriculum proposals, and they were approved.

The following proposals from the Curriculum Committee passed without discussion:
Classics

Proposals to Delete a Course
GREK 204: Delete course “New Testament Greek”
GREK 205: Delete course “Homeric Greek”

Proposals to Change a Course
LATN 305: Remove course as prerequisite for other 300-level LATN courses

Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor (Classics)
Add new courses CLAS 221 and CLAS 222 as “Approved Classics Courses”

(Note: a proposal to change the degree requirements for a major in Classics was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting.)

With its scheduled business complete, the Senate adjourned at around 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 13 November 2007

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 13 November 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, and the minutes of the 9 October 2007 Senate Meeting were approved.

Reports

The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens reported that applications for admission to the College were up by 35%. Why such an increase has occurred was not clear, she said, but it was good news. A lot of the applications, she added, were for early admission.

The Provost next mentioned the “Palmetto Promise,” which is a guarantee that all Palmetto Fellows as well as valedictorians of South Carolina high schools entering as freshmen will receive $2,000 in the form of a Presidential Scholarship.

The Provost announced that Sandy Hall is developing a “suggestion box” for the Provost’s office. Her office is also working on an electronic bulletin board that will publicly post information on matters concerning Academic Affairs.

The Speaker

The Speaker reported that he has met with the President and Hugh Wilder, chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee, about the development of the new system for determining faculty salary raises. He reported that the President wanted the instrument for evaluating faculty for merit increases to be developed at the departmental level. Deans will refine and make uniform what departments do for their schools. The Deans and the Provost will make sure that there are common standards that apply to all schools.

The Committee on By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual

Brian McGee (committee chair) first reported that the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual has consulted with the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review on various issues, including some in today’s report.

Mr. McGee next reported on the policy concerning emeritus/emerita faculty. His committee reviewed the policy at the request of Vice President Sandy Powers. Before making recommendations, the Committee received background information from Provost Jorgens, met with Professor Hugh Wilder, who chaired a committee that had also made some recommendations on the issue and looked at the policies of other institutions. Mr. McGee’s committee was also asked to revise the FAM so that the emeritus/emerita rank would not be automatically granted to retiring faculty, but would be an honor conferred upon deserving faculty who have met an appropriate standard. Accordingly, the By-Laws and FAM Committee made the following recommendations:

--that “a history of exemplary service” become the standard for achieving the rank
--that the word “Emerita” be used when applied to females, and “Emeritus” when applied to males
--that the standard use of the term by individuals, departments, and programs be clearly spelled out
--that Sr. Instructors and Asst. Professors be eligible for the rank
--that the President be allowed to make exceptions in granting certain faculty the emeritus rank
--that the College be allowed, but not obligated to give special benefits to those awarded the emeritus rank.

Mr. McGee noted that when his committee surveyed the policies of ten other institutions, it found that polices varied widely. He advised the Senate to decide on a policy that works best for the College of Charleston. He reminded the Senate, too, that the emeritus policy is in the administratively controlled section of the FAM, not the faculty controlled section. The administration ultimately makes the decisions on emeritus matters. Finally, he urged Senators to express recommendations to his committee, if they had any to offer.

Meg Cormack (at-large) commented that she had no complaint about the Committee’s recommendations; however, she would like “service” to mean not just having sat on many committees, but having served well. Mr. Wilder (Philosophy) asked for confirmation that the issue would not come back to the Senate for its endorsement, and Mr. McGee confirmed that it would not return to the Senate. Mr. Wilder then commented that he would like to suggest wording in the FAM that reflects Ms. Cormack’s interpretation of the word “service.”

Frank Cossa (Art History) asked if the recommended changes mean that faculty will have to produce a packet that demonstrates their service. Bev Diamond (guest and Associate Provost) responded that chairs will be well aware of the performance of faculty in the area of service and so packets won’t be needed. Provost Jorgens added that in the past chairs and deans have made recommendations with respect to conferring the emeritus rank. Chairs and deans will in the future determine the service contributions of faculty, eliminating any need for the creation of packets. The emeritus rank is an honorific status, she reminded the Senate.

Finally, Mr. McGee reported on the Committee’s recommendations to make changes in the FAM regarding the title of the Honors College. It used to be called the Honors Program, but is now called the Honors College, and alterations to the relevant pages of the Faculty By-Laws need to be made to reflect that change in name.

The Academic Standards Committee

Credit Overload Requests. Larry Krasnoff (committee chair) reported that Lynn Cherry, Director of the Office of Undergraduate Academic Services, asked the Academic Standards Committee to consider the credit overload policy. Ms. Cherry, he said, used to decide all such requests, but now chairs make the decision, and she was concerned about uniformity and the need for standard criteria that could be applied to all those making overload requests. His committee revamped a form that is sometimes used for credit overload requests. The new form lays out the various criteria that chairs would need to consider before making decisions on such requests. Mr. Krasnoff presented a draft of the form and explained that it doesn’t set any strict limits or requirements, but does make chairs go through a deliberative process when dealing with
overload requests. He added that the form is recommended for use, but that no policy changes are being proposed.

Ms. Cormack asked if athletic participation should be a category of consideration. Todd McNerney (at-large) thought that was a terrific idea and said it would give guidance to chairs. On a different topic, Mr. Krasnoff noted that students often don’t take the full overload of hours granted to them, and instead use it as strategy to get certain courses. Mr. McNerney said that if such abuses of overload requests were occurring, they should be investigated.

Speaker Kelly then requested that Senators send further comments and suggestions to Mr. Krasnoff.

Proposed Policy about Baccalaureate Degrees: an additional thirty hours required for a second degree. Cathy Boyd (guest and Registrar) explained that the policy issue about additional degrees arose when some students who were double-majors requested two diplomas, one for each major (the current practice is that double-majors receive one diploma that has both majors printed on it). Double majors are not allowed to receive two diplomas at graduation; however, if double-majors graduate twice in different semesters, they do receive two diplomas, and some students have taken advantage of this loophole to earn two degrees. Ms. Boyd said that President Benson asked her to look into the matter. Our current policy, she explained, says that students who wish to earn two degrees just need to complete the requirements for two majors, whereas most other institutions—such as Winthrop, Clemson, and University of South Carolina—have more stringent standards and require students to take another 24 to 30 hours to earn another degree. The College is thus out of line with most of its peer institutions and those it is seeking to emulate. After reporting her findings to the Academic Council, the Council asked Ms. Boyd to come up with a policy on this issue. Accordingly, her office has proposed that students take 30 addition hours for a second major to earn another degree.

Mr. Krasnoff added that the Academic Affairs Committee broadly supports the proposal and suggests that it go to SGA for their input. Alex Bodley (guest and representative of SGA) said that SGA would offer suggestions.

In order to be certain about the policy, Mr. Nunan said that for a student to earn another degree, he or she would have to put in another thirty hours and fulfill the requirements for a second major. Ms. Boyd answered “yes.”

At this point, the Speaker asked that Senators send further comments and suggestions to Mr. Krasnoff.

Unfinished Business

Latin Honors at Graduation

On behalf of the Academic Standards Committee, Mr. Krasnoff presented new data to support a motion that would change the GPA standard for Latin honors at graduation. (This motion, which had been originally made at the September 11 Faculty Senate meeting, was remanded to the Academic Standards Committee with the charge of finding additional data to support the
The motion stipulated that the minimum requirements for Latin honors at graduation be changed from

- 3.60 *cum laude*
- 3.80 *magna cum laude*
- 3.95 *summa cum laude*

...to

- 3.50 *cum laude*
- 3.75 *magna cum laude*
- 3.90 *summa cum laude*

as soon as the Provost deems the change to be feasible.

The rationale for the motion was that the recent changes to our grading scale, which include the introduction of minus grades, have made it more difficult for students to achieve the standard for honors, and that some adjustment of the standard was therefore needed. The data presented included a comparison of the GPA requirements for Latin honors of many institutions, a comparison of the percentage of students graduating with Latin honors at the College with the percentage of students graduating with Latin honors at other institutions, the percentage of students graduating with Latin honors at the College since 2003, and statistics on GPAs of various categories of students at the College since 2003.

Mr. Nunan thought the motion was reasonable, but said that he didn’t like the first sentence of the rationale, which states that it’s harder to achieve the Latin honors because of the recent change in the grading scale. That idea, he said, hasn’t been proved, and is thus just rumor, which ought not to be spread. He thought the other rationale was fine, namely that our standards are out of line with other institutions and should therefore be brought in line with them.

Jason Overby (Chemistry and Biochemistry) asked how long the current honors standards have been in place. John Newell (guest and Dean of the Honors School) said “since 1979.” Phil Dustan (Biology) said that he had talked with some graduates about this issue, who said they felt insulted because they thought the change in standard “dumbed down” the honors they had earned. Mr. Newell responded by saying that in the past one could earn four B+ grades and the rest A grades, but that now a student can only get two B+ grades. (He added that with the proposed revised standard a student could perhaps get five B+ grades and the rest A grades and still earn Latin honors.) He thought it was harder to earn the Latin honors in the new grading system and that the proposed change for the honor standard was not a “dumbing down” of the honor. A member of the SGA said that the SGA supported the motion.

The Senate then voted on the motion to change the standard for Latin honors, which passed.

Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review

Proposed Changes to the Faculty/Administration Manual: Pam Riggs-Gelasco (committee chair), after summarizing changes that had been approved by the Senate last spring, took up the remaining proposed amendments to the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM), which all concerned tenure, promotion, and third-year review procedures. (These proposed amendments had been on the Senate agenda last spring, but the Senate did not have time to deliberate on all of them.)
The first proposed amendment—Recommendation XI in the total list of recommended changes proposed by the Committee—concerned section IV.M10 of the FAM. This recommendation would add more detail about the Faculty Advisory Committee Action and separate the discussion of the protocols of review into two groups, a group “a” dealing with reviews for tenure, promotion and retention of Senior Instructors, and a group “b” dealing with the third-year review. The rationale for the change was that because the protocol for review of third-year-review cases was sufficiently different from that for tenure and promotion cases, a separate discussion was warranted for each. Specifically, the proposed amendment would change language in the FAM from

10. Faculty Advisory Committee Action

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 Reappointment. The Faculty Advisory Committee will notify each candidate in writing of its recommendation. The Committee will also review third-year candidates on all negative departmental recommendations or if requested to do so by the candidate, any member of the departmental panel, the appropriate Dean or the Provost.

In cases where the Dean’s decision is different from the departmental evaluation panel or the departmental evaluation panel vote is negative, he/she will refer the case to the Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee for their recommendations. The Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee will interview each candidate for third-year reappointment when the departmental panel or the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries recommendation is different from the departmental evaluation panel or the departmental evaluation panel vote is negative. The Provost’s and the Faculty Advisory Committee’s recommendation will be submitted in writing to the President.

to

10. Faculty Advisory Committee Action

a. Reviews for Tenure, Promotion and Retention as Senior Instructor

The Provost will make packets of all candidates for tenure, promotion, and retention as Senior Instructor available to the members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review. The Advisory Committee will review all of the evidence and make an independent assessment of each case. The Advisory Committee 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, Department Chair, and the appropriate Dean in writing of its recommendation.

b. Third Year Review

The Committee will only review third-year candidates if there is a negative recommendation from the Dean or the Department, or if requested to do so by the candidate, any member of the departmental panel, the appropriate Dean or the Provost.
The Advisory Committee will review all of the evidence and make an independent assessment of such a case. The Advisory Committee will interview the candidate and may interview the Department Chair, the Departmental Panel Chair, faculty members in the Department, the Dean, and others as necessary. The Provost’s and the Faculty Advisory Committee’s written recommendation will be submitted to the President. The candidate, the appropriate Dean, and the Department Chair will also be notified of the committee’s recommendation.

Gerry Gonsalves (Management and Entrepreneurship) wondered about the wording in groups “a” and “b,” observing that in “a” the word “may” is used (“The Advisory Committee may interview the candidate. . . .”) which means the interview is not a requirement, whereas in “b” the word “will is used throughout, which means everything in the section is a requirement.

At this point, the Senate voted on Recommendation XI, which passed.

Ms. Riggs-Gelasco then moved that Recommendation XII be approved, which would change the reporting procedures of departmental review panels. Specifically, the amendment would change language in section IV.M.7 of the FAM 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 copy of the panel’s written recommendation included in the packet.

Rationale: In some departments, 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.

Ms. Riggs-Gelasco added that the Committee felt that more was needed in the reporting procedures. Candidates need to see the letters of panels so that they can properly defend themselves. Most peer institutions (about 77%), she continued, already do what the Committee proposes; and though some other peer institutions have another process, the candidates still receive a written summary of problems (with the exception of two schools, which give verbal reviews that provide detailed information to candidates.) The Committee, Ms. Riggs-Gelasco concluded, would like the College to be more in line with other institutions.

Glenn Lesses (guest) offered the Faculty Welfare Committee’s report on Recommendation XII. Last year’s Welfare Committee, he said, was asked to review the recommendation and the Committee had some problems with it. While the Committee thought that transparency was good, it also thought that confidentiality was especially important. This year’s Welfare Committee is also opposed to the recommendation. It is
crucial that confidentiality be assured at the departmental level and other levels. He was worried, for example, that the reports of external reviewers would show up in panel reports and undermine the confidentiality accorded to them. The Committee, he added, also reviewed the handbooks of other institutions and found some notable schools that do not require written departmental panel reviews. At William and Mary, for instance, the Dean issues a report to the candidate, not the departmental panel. Mr. Lesses also remarked that the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in a court brief came down on the side of confidentiality. He urged that wide discretion be given to faculty to protect confidentiality. He concluded by noting that more transparency is needed at the level of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, which ought to provide a report.

Meg Cormack (at-large) observed that at Smith College candidates are allowed to see all documents. She said that she was in favor of confidentiality, but remarked that confidentiality is not a serious issue with external reviewers because candidates will know anyway if the verdict is negative.

David Gentry (at-large) asked Mr. Lesses about third-year review. Do the same concerns about confidentiality apply? Mr. Lesses replied that third-year review was different.

Brian McGee (Communication) remarked that in the Communication Department panel letters are given to candidates, and though they are blunt, the sources of views expressed is not specified. Faculty are protected, and external reviewers are similarly protected. It is important, he added, to create a culture of candor on campus. Senior faculty must provide a clear and honest assessment of their views. Fran Welch (guest and Dean of the School of Education) said that the practice described by Mr. McGee is also used in the School of Education.

Paul Young (Mathematics) said that if confidentiality is the key consideration, then it would have to apply to graduate letters too. Darryl Phillips (Classics) noted that if the rationale for the motion is to provide candidates with information, then the panel interview should provide that. Jack Parson (Political Science) was not convinced by that argument and remarked that discussion among the panel when the candidate leaves is generally more frank. He added that confidentiality will be maintained, if the recommendation passes because panel letters will hide the sources of specific statements. Confidentially, he thought was not a major issue.

The Senate voted on Recommendation XII, which passed.

Ms. Riggs-Gelasco then moved that Recommendation XIII, which pertains to section K.1.b.4 of the FAM, be approved. This recommendation would change the sample size of graduate letters for those being reviewed for tenure, promotion, or third-year review from 25 to 40. The rationale was that a larger sample was needed to judge more accurately the teaching impact of faculty on students who have graduated.

Phil Dustan (Biology) asked for a clarification about whether forty letters must be sent out to graduates or forty received from graduates. Ms. Riggs-Gelasco said that the recommendation stipulated that forty letter would be sent out. Mr. Gonsalves wondered why a second wave of letters wouldn’t be sent out, if the panel felt that the response rate
from graduates was inadequate. Ms. Riggs-Gelasco said that she couldn’t speak to that question because departments handle that situation in different ways. Mr. McGee remarked that his department does what Mr. Gonsalves suggested: it sends out a second wave of letters, if the response rate to the first wave is low.

The Senate voted on Recommendation XIII, which passed.

Ms. Riggs-Gelasco then moved that Recommendation XIV, which pertains to the advising requirement for promotion to Senior Instructor in section IV.K.b of the FAM, be approved. This recommendation would require those wishing to be promoted to Senior Instructor to be active in departmental advising only, and not college-wide advising. The reason for this change is that the existence of the Advising Center, which handles college-wide general education advising, eliminates the necessity for other faculty to do college-wide advising. The motion to approve Recommendation XIV passed.

Ms. Riggs-Gelasco then moved that Recommendation XV, which pertains to the promotion requirements for librarians in sections L.4.a.(1), L.4.b.(1), and L.4.c.(1) of the FAM, be approved. This motion would change the phrase “sustained effectiveness in the area of professional competency” to “exemplary performance in the area of professional competency.” (For L.4.c.(1), which concerns promotion to the rank of Librarian III, the phrase “exemplary performance and” would be inserted in front of the phrase “significant effectiveness in the area of professional competency.”) This proposed language accords with the language used in other areas of section L of the FAM regarding third-Year Review, tenure and promotion of the library faculty, where the term “exemplary” is used in talking about professional competence. The motion to approve Recommendation XV passed.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

The following proposals from the Curriculum Committee passed without discussion:

Psychology
Proposal to Change Requirements for Minor – Neuroscience

Biology
New Course Proposal – BIOL 449 Biology of Coral Reefs (permission also to cross list)

English
New Course Proposal – ENGL 190 Introductory Special Topics

Political Science
New Course Proposal - POLS 119 Special Topics in Politics

Geology and Environmental Geosciences
Proposal to change a Course – GEOL 290 Special Topics (change number to GEOL 240)

Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

The following set of new courses were submitted for approval:
HSPV 859 – Terminal Project
HSPV 619 – Investigation, Documentation and Conservation
HSPV 833 – Cultural Landscapes
HSPV 823 – Historic Interiors
HSPV 890 – Independent Directed Study

Jack Parson (Political Science) asked if HSPV 859 was a substitute for a thesis essay, and a Senator who was familiar with the proposal said “yes.” He also asked if it was graded as pass/fail, and Jennifer McStotts (at-large) said that it was. The Senate then voted, and approved all the proposed courses.

Next the following course changes were approved by the Senate:

- HSPV 520 – Preservation Law and Economics (re-numbered from 520 to 620)
- HSPF 611 – Research Methods in Historic Preservation (re-named from Documentation in Historic Preservation).

The Senate then approved the following graduate program: Joint MSHP Program.

Motion to Elect an Ad Hoc Steering Committee to Assess Faculty governance

Mr. Parson proposed the following motion:

The Senate shall elect an *ad hoc* Steering Committee to

1. assess the present state and need of faculty governance, including but not limited to
   a) the efficacy of all committees;
   b) the relationship between the Senate and the schools; and
   c) the composition of the Senate;

2. suggest how the Senate might conduct needed reform.

The committee shall be constituted by eleven regular faculty members and the Speaker of the Faculty. Each school must be represented by at least one member. In determining a slate of candidates, the Committee on Nominations and Elections shall attempt to achieve a balance of rank. Academic Affairs and the Office of the President shall each be invited to appoint a liaison to the committee, who shall enjoy all privileges but voting privileges.

Mr. Parson explained that it’s been many years since the current faculty governance structure was put in place, that there have been many changes to the College during those years, and that now was a good time to reflect on that governance structure in light of those changes. The motion, he explained, seeks to form a committee that will examine possible problems in the current structure and practices of faculty governance, recommend changes, and suggest a process for how such changes might be implemented.

The motion passed.

*Report and Recommendations from the ad hoc Vendor Code of Conduct Committee*
Scott Peeples (English and committee chair) first provided some background information. He explained how the Faculty Senate had approved the creation of the Committee in October 2006 after students in the C of C Amnesty International organization, who were concerned about the College’s vending contract with Coca-Cola, had created awareness of the need for a Vendor Code of Conduct. The Committee, which is comprised of faculty, students, and Business Affairs staff, met several times and was ready to offer a report and two motions. He added that after some investigation, the Committee discovered it is unlawful to exclude some vendors. However, the College can spell out the values and conduct guidelines that vendors are expected to follow. Moreover, the College can do things to minimize the chance that College of Charleston apparel and other licensed products will be manufactured in “sweatshops,” where the majority of human rights abuses occur. Mr. Peeples also reported that the Committee has been in touch with Steve Osborne, Sr. VP of Business Affairs, and Andy Abrams, former legal counsel of the College, who said that there are no legal problems with what the Committee is proposing. He said, too, that it would be a good time to let Mr. Osborne know that the Senate supports the proposed code.

Debate then ensued on the Committee’s first motion that a values statement, entitled “College of Charleston Vendor Code of Conduct,” be attached to the "Vendor Guide for Doing Business with the C of C."

Mr. Nunan asked if the policy was merely hortatory and without “teeth.” Mr. Peeples responded that it was, that vendors would not be legally bound to obey us, and that violations would not automatically trigger a suspension of business. However, the code would give the College some backing, if the College wished to suspend business with vendors not abiding by the code. Mr. Nunan then asked what Mr. Osborne could do, if a vendor wasn’t compliant with the code, but was the lowest bidder? Mr. Peeples replied that the values statement does not dictate to Mr. Osborne whom he can and can’t do business with. George Hopkins (History) said that the reason vendors are the lowest bidders is because they engage in labor abuses. Jerry Boetje (Computer Science) added that we have idealistic students, who would probably boycott companies that committed such abuses.

A Senator asked how the College would differentiate between a corporation’s practices and policies and those of its affiliates and business partners. Mr. Peeples said that Mr. Osborne feels that there are some grey areas. A Senator stated that the College should make sure that it doesn’t fairly punish some companies because some problems may be out their control. Mr. Hopkins responded that the Senator’s concern was the reason for the Committee’s second motion to urge the College join the Fair Labor Association and the Worker Rights Consortium. These organizations, he said, will monitor conditions and circumstances and put companies on notice about problems so that they can respond to them.

Idee Winfield (Sociology) asked whether the College was obligated to accept the lowest bid? Jan Brewton (guest and Director of Auxiliary Services) said that the College must make clear how it makes decisions on bids.

In looking at the Code of Conduct, Mr. Krasnoff had several questions. He wondered why just women’s rights were singled out (why not, say, religious rights too?) and what the term “freedom of . . . collective bargain” implied: did imply the right to engage in collective bargaining or did it mean that collective bargaining must occur in labor negotiations? If the
latter was meant, then that would be a major requirement. He also wondered about the process of independent monitoring. Mr. Peeples said that with regard to the first question, the Committee took its language from similar documents used by other organizations, but that the Senate could certainly make changes. And as for the statement on collective bargaining, it meant that workers have a right to do that, but not that they must.

Peter Calcagno (Economics and Finance) was curious about what was involved in joining the Fair Labor Association. Picking up on an earlier comment made about how some companies may be unfairly punished for circumstances beyond their control, Gerry Gonsalves (Marketing and Chain Supply Management) said that sometimes companies are victims of prejudice and misrepresentation in certain countries, where it can be hard to find accurate, unbiased information about their business practices.

Mr. Wilder suggested replacing “women’s rights” with a fuller statement specifying non-discriminatory practices and policies with respect to race, gender, sexual orientation, and religion. Tim Carens (English) suggested that the Senate might wish to add before any list of non-discriminatory practices the phrase “included but not limited to” so as not to exclude other kinds of anti-discrimination practices from the list.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) said that it was odd to pass this particular code of conduct with the suggested amended language given that we (the College) would be holding vendors to a higher standard than the one to which we hold ourselves. He mentioned as an example that we have no policy prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation. Denis Keyes (at-large) said that there is language in the Faculty/Administration Manual that addresses the issue of discrimination based on sexual orientation, but there is no policy at the state level. Speaker Kelly said that he would look into matter regarding such a policy at the College. Mr. Nunan also noted that at the College we have freedom of association (another item listed in the Code of Conduct), but not freedom of collective bargaining. However, even though there may be some cognitive dissonance created by the Code of Conduct, he said that the values it lists are “ideals to shoot for.” In that regard, Code of Conduct is valuable. Mr. Peeples echoed that point and said that the Code of Conduct articulates values that will be made public.

Mr. Dustan said that the Free Labor Association [the organization mentioned in the second motion] lays out a list of anti-discriminatory practices. Another Senator suggested that that list be incorporated into the motion. The Senate gave its unanimous consent to do so. Mr. Krasnoff asked for unanimous consent to add the words “right to” before the words collective bargaining, and unanimous consent was granted. He also asked for unanimous consent to add the words “willingness to submit to” before the words “independent monitoring,” and unanimous consent was granted.

The Senate voted on the motion to endorse the values statement and attach it to the "Vendor Guide for Doing Business with the C of C." The motion passed. Below is the edited text of the College of Charleston Vendor Code of Conduct

College of Charleston is committed to conducting its business affairs in a socially responsible and ethical manner consistent with its educational and public service mission, and to protecting and preserving the global environment. This Code is
intended as an instrument for productive change, created through the cooperation and input from students, faculty and staff, and is established as a working document to guide vendors and institutional purchasers.

The College understands that vendors are independent entities, but the business practices and actions of a vendor may significantly impact and/or reflect upon us, our reputation and our brand, which is one of our most important assets. Therefore, College of Charleston expects a deep commitment to legal compliance and ethical business practices by all of its vendors and licensees.

College of Charleston recognizes the following cardinal principles as the basis for effective performance under this Code of Conduct:

- Safe working conditions
- Commitment to fair wages
- No forced labor
- No child labor
- Women’s rights: *No person shall be subject to any discrimination in employment, including hiring, salary, benefits, advancement, discipline, termination or retirement, on the basis of gender, race, religion, age, disability, sexual orientation, nationality, political opinion, or social or ethnic origin.*
- Freedom of association and right to collective bargaining
- Full public disclosure of factory addresses
- Willingness to submit to independent monitoring
- Compliance with all applicable anti-corruption laws
- Compliance with all applicable environmental laws
- Honesty and truth in discussions with regulatory agency representatives and government officials

College of Charleston expects affiliated vendors and institutional purchasers to conduct their business in a manner consistent with these principles, and to follow workplace standards that adhere to this Code of Conduct.

The Senate next began debate on the second motion made by the *ad hoc* Vendor Code of Conduct Committee: this motion, which combined items 2 and 3 presented to the Senate (see below), would endorse the proposal that the College join the Worker Rights Consortium and the Fair Labor Association, and that the Collegiate Licensing Company, which manages the C of C brand, include the C of C in its list of schools that require suppliers to meet certain workplace standards. The exact wording of the motion is as follows:

1. The College of Charleston should join the Fair Labor Association and the Worker Rights Consortium.

The Fair Labor Association (FLA) and Worker Rights Consortium (WRC) are the two leading monitoring groups who are trying to improve the working conditions in (mostly) garment factories that provide licensed apparel to colleges and universities. They operate differently from each other, in ways that we regard as
complementary; moreover, many colleges belong to both. (See Appendix 2.) The dues for each organization are 1% of our licensing revenue, which Auxiliary Services has agreed to pay out of their revenues.

2. The Collegiate Licensing Company (which manages the C of C “brand”) should add the College of Charleston to their lists of schools that require their licensed products be obtained from suppliers that meet workplace standards in specific areas: wages and benefits, working hours, overtime compensation, child labor, forced labor, health and safety, nondiscrimination, harassment or abuse, freedom of association and collective bargaining, and women’s rights.

Calvin Blackwell (Economics and Finance), noting that the dues for each organization are 1% of our licensing revenue, asked how much 1% amounts to. Mr. Peeples said it was $2,118 per year.

The Senate voted on the motion, which passed.

**Motion to Require a Super-Majority to Change Gen-Ed Requirements**

Mr. Blackwell read his motion that would require a two-thirds majority of the Faculty Senate for any changes to the Gen-Ed requirements: “I move we adopt the following Special Rule of Order for the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston: All changes to the Liberal Arts and Sciences General Education Requirements of College of Charleston shall require a two-thirds vote of the Faculty Senate.” The motion then received a second.

Speaker Kelly then informed the Senate that Mr. Blackwell’s motion, consistent with Robert’s Rules of Order, would require a two-thirds majority for it to pass.

Mr. Blackwell explained why he brought this motion before the Senate. He referred to the C of C catalog and said that p. 11 outlines the rules by which our students live. If we are going to change these rules, he said, then we should require a two-thirds vote. (Adding courses would not, however, require a two-thirds vote were his motion to pass.) In explaining his reasons for the motion, he began by saying that he found last year’s Gen-Ed discussion confusing, and thought that things would be clear by this year, but such has not turned out to be the case. He thought that the Senate should first have discussed the reasons for changing the current Gen-Ed system. He said, too, that he was concerned about process, noting that if wanted to add a class to the catalog he would have to follow a process that involves various committees as well as the Senate. But with the current Gen-Ed reform any Senator can make a motion on the floor of the Senate, which, if approved, could drastically change the Gen-Ed system. He found it troubling that such fundamental changes that would affect many people could be made by a small majority of the Senate. Fifty percent of the Senate plus one, he said, was not a sufficient level of consensus for making such potentially drastic changes. Two-thirds of the Senate would be a sufficient level. He concluded by saying that he wants to avoid a situation in which a new Gen-Ed system might fail by one vote short of a majority. That would be as bad as if it passed by one vote above fifty percent: more consensus, he stressed, is needed for such major changes.

Ms. Cormack said that she agreed with Mr. Blackwell. Mr. Parson said that he strenuously opposed Mr. Blackwell’s motion. What we have been doing, he said, is going through a process, a long process. He couldn’t imagine how we could make it any more deliberative. He argued,
too, that a simple majority is sufficient for changing Gen Ed. Any changes to Gen Ed will always meet with some opposition, and what the motion does is give too much power to a small minority to block change.

Mr. Nunan agreed with Mr. Parson, saying that if we pass the Gen-Ed proposals, the faculty can still vote them down: that’s an adequate check on the Senate. If the vote is close, then that will be a message to the Gen-Ed Committee to proceed cautiously—that’s another check. If we go to a two-thirds majority vote, we will never change Gen Ed.

Mr. Hopkins, speaking against the motion, said that significant change is difficult. He noted that we have gone through a lengthy and strenuous process, but that it has been a good one. A two-thirds vote, he said, gives too much power to a small group to kill change, and it is undemocratic. All have been welcome to participate in the Gen-Ed reform process, but Mr. Blackwell’s motion tries to change the rules in the middle of process. In response, Mr. Phillips said that a two-thirds vote is required for approval of the Gen-Ed Steering Committee, and that this fact was presented to the Senate last spring as a decision for or against the Gen-Ed reform package; therefore, in that respect, Mr. Blackwell’s motion doesn’t change the rules in the middle of the process.

It was now 7 p.m., the scheduled end of the meeting. The Senate adjourned. Debate on Mr. Blackwell’s motion is scheduled to resume at the next regular faculty meeting on 4 December.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 9 October 2007

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 9 October 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, and the minutes of the 11 September 2007 Senate were approved.

Reports

Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens reported that Associate Provost Beverly Diamond has been looking into faculty salary issues and begun comparing salaries of College of Charleston faculty in all disciplines with the salaries of faculty at other institutions. The Provost added that Ms. Diamond has been working with Steve Osborne, VP of Business Affairs, and that they have been making progress and are looking for more sources for their analysis. She also affirmed that President Benson is committed to addressing issues pertaining to faculty salary compensation.

The Provost next mentioned the upcoming Major/Minor Fair to be held on October 10 in Physicians Promenade and encouraged faculty and students to attend. She said that she was disappointed with last year’s turnout, but that students are excited about this year’s event and that she hopes for better participation.

The Provost announced that yesterday she held her first “Conversation-with-the-Provost” meeting of the term, that she met with six faculty, and that they had a good conversation. She encourages all faculty to attend one of the meetings at some point in the term and to discuss any problems or issues on their mind.

Next the Provost said that the Gen-Ed discussions are very important, that she gives the Senate her best wishes in its deliberations, that she wants the best result for the sake of our students and hopes the process does not become bogged down. She concluded by wishing everyone a pleasant fall break.

Speaker

Speaker Kelly first reported on the current state of Strategic Plan. He said that he has generated a list of names for the Strategic Plan Steering Committee, and so too has the Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. The names generated will serve as recommendations for possible Steering Committee members. Once formed, the Steering Committee will ask faculty and staff to serve on sub-committees. The Speaker noted that the President is especially keen on making use of study groups; however, the whole process of how the Strategic Plan will be conducted has not yet been defined; those details will be provided after the Steering Committee has been established.
The Speaker reminded the Senate that because the President is very committed to fund-raising, he will be away a lot. Therefore, the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President will be doing some serious work and be used by the President as a conduit for input.

Lauren Collier, Service-Learning Director

Ms. Collier wished to make the Senate aware of the upcoming event “Building Cougar Pride Homecoming: Habitat for Humanity Blitz Build,” which is an effort to create pride in the Charleston community and to show a commitment to the community. Ms. Collier remarked that the “Habitat for Humanity Blitz” addresses a big issue: the problem of affordable housing for people of low income. She reported that students have gotten behind the project and that she seeks input and help from the faculty. Two thousand volunteers and $60,000 are needed. Some 150 C of C clubs are involved and many faculty and departments need to be involved too. Ms. Collier also hopes that faculty will incorporate into their classes, when appropriate, the investigation of issues pertaining to affordable housing, discrimination, and social justice. She also said that there are currently being trained “Habitat Diplomats,” who will go to clubs, classes, and department meetings to provide information about the project. She encouraged Senators to invite these “Diplomats” to their classes and meetings. Ms. Collier also said that she hopes people from diverse backgrounds will form teams and work together on the project. Finally, she announced that future updates on the project will be provided (mainly by email) and asked faculty to contact her office if they wished to incorporate service-learning activities—especially those pertaining to Habitat for Humanity—into their courses.

Hugh Wilder, Chair of the Faculty Salary Compensation Committee

In reporting on what the Faculty Compensation Committee has been doing, Mr. Wilder began by noting that the issue of faculty salary compensation is on President Benson’s agenda, and that his committee has met with the past committee chair (Deanna Caveny) and the Provost. Mr. Wilder then announced the members of the committee—who include Calvin Blackwell (Associate Professor, Economics/Finance), William Danaher (Associate Professor, Sociology/Anthropology), Michelle Futrell (Senior Instructor, PE & Health), Antony Harold (Associate Professor, Biology), Laura Turner (Associate Professor, Theatre), Katherine White (Assistant Professor, Psychology)—and noted that the committee membership broadly represents the College in terms of schools and rank.

Mr. Wilder then presented and commented on three tables that summarize the Committee’s findings thus far. The first (see Appendix) compares 2006—2007 averages of C of C faculty salaries with faculty salaries of 20 current peer institutions, which include selected schools from COPLAC, South Carolina senior public colleges and universities, the Southern Conference, and the top five public schools (based on the rankings found in US News and World Report) in four geographical areas. Mr. Wilder explained that the ad hoc Faculty Compensation Committee formed by President Higdon established the parameters for selecting “current peer institutions”: they had to be public schools, have students with SAT scores comparable to those of entering C of C students, have overall undergraduate enrollment numbers comparable to ours, have student-faculty ratios similar to those of the C
of C, and have roughly the same percentage of faculty with terminal degrees as we have. Mr. Wilder remarked that no single school offers an exact match to us or a perfect point of comparison, but that collectively the schools give us a good benchmark for comparisons. He then pointed out that the table showed that in terms of mean salaries (which were not broken down by discipline), the C of C was near the bottom, and that it would cost $2.2 million to catch up to the average of all the other schools. President Higdon, Mr. Wilder explained, had a two-phase plan: phase one would bring up our salaries to the level of our current peer institutions; phase two would bring up our salaries to the level of a new group of aspirational peers.

The second table (see Appendix) that Mr. Wilder presented compared the C of C with other schools that directly compete with us for students. As the table shows, we rank at the bottom.

The third table (see Appendix) compares our salaries with research-intensive universities. President Benson asked for this comparison because he comes from a research university and is familiar with such institutions. Again, as the table shows, we rank at the bottom.

Mr. Wilder reported that Associate Provost Beverly Diamond has collected data on starting salaries (asst. professor rank) for all disciplines, which has been a particular concern of the Provost. In terms of starting salaries, some departments look good, but others need more funds to catch up.

Mr. Wilder then reported on what his committee has been doing. They have met with Ms. Diamond, and Mr. Wilder thanked her and the Office of Academic Affairs for their work. Mr. Wilder has also met with President Benson and discussed his merit/market-based plan for addressing salaries increases. He reported that the President would like the details of how merit is to be assessed to come from faculty in their department meetings. Mr. Wilder also said that he met with the Academic Forum, and that his committee has recommended that a new study be undertaken modeled on the study that President Higdon initiated with the ad hoc Faculty Compensation Committee. Mr. Wilder added that the summaries of two previous studies are on Cougar Trail under “Faculty Reports,” and that the Provost has approved a new study. Data from the new study will be used to help determine the market-based portion of future salary increases.

Mr. Wilder then reported on what he has learned about the President’s merit/market-based salary raise system. He said that it will include annual reviews of all faculty. However, the format and process of the review will vary and departments will help determine these. Mr. Wilder invited Senators to contact the committee if they have any ideas about the annual review. Merit, he continued, will be determined from the data from the reviews as well as from CVs and evaluations by chairs. The market value of each faculty will, as noted above, be determined by an analysis of the data from the new study to be done by the committee.

Mr. Wilder next reported that his committee has been discussing three questions that have concerned faculty. First, what funds will be available for salary increases? Traditionally, it has only been 2% to 3% of what the faculty have been making. This creates the possibility of faculty competing with their colleagues for small sums of money for raises. Mr. Wilder said
that the President understands that the new system will work best when more money is made available for salary increases. Second, how will the new evaluation process mesh with the current evaluation system? Will it replace or be added to the current system? Third, what will be the process and standards for annual merit review? Mr. Wilder said that the President envisions some variation among schools and departments. He added that his committee is concerned about how fairness will be maintained across the College.

Idee Winfield (Sociology) then asked whether Mr. Wilder’s committee has discussed the issue of salary compression. Mr. Wilder replied that the new study will reveal what the compression problem is and its extent, but that he is not sure how the problem will be addressed.

Unfinished Business

By-Laws

Brian McGee (Communication), chair of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM) began by reporting on a proposal to remove certain sections from the FAM. These sections are not in the by-laws part of the FAM, but in the administratively controlled part, and pertain to Article V (Benefits and Privileges of Faculty and Administrators) and Article VII (College Facilities and Services). Mr. McGee explained that much of the material in these Articles is outdated or inaccurate and tends to be regularly updated on various institutional Web sites. The committee is considering the proposal to remove these sections from the FAM and welcomes input on this matter from the Senate.

Mr. McGee then presented the committee’s report on the motion to alter the wording in Art. III, Sect. 1.I.6 of the Faculty By-Laws, which would redefine the selection and service of the Parliamentarian as follows:

6. The Speaker will shall appoint a Parliamentarian to the Faculty at the first Senate meeting of the academic year from among the Senators who shall serve at the pleasure of the Speaker. The Parliamentarian will shall advise the Speaker or other presiding officer, and the faculty and Senate, concerning parliamentary procedure. The Parliamentarian will shall perform other duties normally associated with such an office. If the Parliamentarian is unable or unavailable to perform those duties during a meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Speaker may appoint an Acting Parliamentarian to the Faculty until such time as the Parliamentarian shall return to service

Mr. McGee explained that the changes would give the Speaker more flexibility in selecting a Parliamentarian and allow for the appointment of an Acting Parliamentarian when needed.

The Senate voted and the proposed amendment passed.

Next Mr. McGee announced that his committee would be reviewing sections in the by-laws pertaining to professors emeriti, and that this issue would be brought before the Senate in the future.
New Business

Faculty Curriculum Committee

Committee chair, Gerald Gonsalves (Management and Entrepreneurship) submitted the following curriculum proposals for approval.

Biology
Proposal to Change Course Title – BIOL 337 Invertebrate Zoology (to “Biology of Invertebrates”)

Accounting and Legal Studies
New Course Proposal – BLAW 309 Legal Environment of International Business

Economics and Finance
New Course Proposal – FINC 376 Real Estate Market Analysis

Psychology
New Course Proposal – PSYC 356 Introduction to Behavioral Genetics

Sociology and Anthropology
New Course Proposal - SOCY 109 Special Topics in Sociology

Management and Entrepreneurship (M&E)
New Course Proposal – MGMT 210 Career Development
New Course Proposal – ENTR 335 Funding New Ventures
New Course Proposal – ENTR 375 Research in Entrepreneurship

Hospitality and Tourism Management (HTMT)
New Course Proposal – HTMT 370 Foodservice Enterprise – Design & Dev
New Course Proposal – HTMT 372 Foodservice Operations Analysis

All curriculum proposals concerning Biology and Psychology passed without discussion. The following proposals elicited some debate.

BLAW 309: Richard Nunan (at large) asked why BLAW 205 is not a prerequisite for BLAW 309. A member of the faculty of Accounting and Legal Studies answered that BLAW 205 was not made a prerequisite in order to allow Business majors easier access to the course. If Business majors were first required to take BLAW 205, it is unlikely that they would take BLAW 309. The Senate voted on the course proposal, which passed.

FINC 376: Mr. Nunan objected to the proposed course. He said that when the Hospitality and Tourism major was proposed a few years, he was concerned that it was not good fit for a liberal arts institution, and he said that a number of its courses amount to trade-school courses. He said that he had the same view of the real estate course (FINC 376), that it does not belong in a liberal arts college and should therefore be rejected. Though we have approved, he
continued, the Hospitality and Tourism major, we have not approved a real estate major. He said he would not like to see such a program established at the College. John Wilely (guest) responded that he doesn’t view the course as a trade course. He argued that a trade course teaches students how to be real estate appraisers, but that the proposed course does more. It offers a general way of thinking about real estate and teaches students how to value real estate using financial tools and economic theory. The new course Proposal—FINC 376 Real Estate Market Analysis—was approved.

SOCY 109: Denis Keyes (at large) asked why this special topics course was pitched at the 100 level, when typically special topics courses are upper-level courses. Idee Winfield (Sociology) said that most 100-level Sociology courses are service courses for non-majors; this new course was an opportunity to try different courses at the 100-level. Mr. Nunan was curious about the reference to the First Year Experience in the supporting documents. Ms. Winfield replied that the Special Topics category was a way for the department to try out courses that might eventually work well as First-Year-Experience courses. The new course Proposal—SOCY 109—was approved.

MGMT 210, ENTR 335, and ENTR 375: Mr. Wilder asked about MGMT 210. Since the College already has an office of career development, he wondered whether the course simply duplicated something that was already done. Isn’t this sort of work, he asked, more appropriate for that office? Kelly Shaver (guest) said that he is a parent and doesn’t want this kids to move back home after college. They will need to find a job. Not every student, he added, will go to career services. Also, this is a more general course that covers more than finding a job. Jason Overby (Chemistry and Biochemistry) asked if the course was required. Mr. Shaver responded “no.” Mr. Nunan said that he doesn’t think it is an academic course and should thus be rejected. Marty Markowitz (guest), who will teach the course, said that the course was developed out of a request from Career Services, which tends to help just seniors. This course will teach students how to market themselves. He then referred to an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education that reported on a number of schools that have developed courses similar to the proposed one. He concluded by saying that we need to teach students how to find jobs to support themselves. Scooter Barnette (Health & Human Performance), who expressed support for the course, then asked if it would be open to non-majors. The answer given was “yes.” The new course proposals MGMT 210, ENTR 335, and ENTR 375 were all approved.

HTMT 370 and HTMT 372: Mr. Nunan declared that “these really are trade-school courses.” However, he could not in good conscience vote against them because the Senate has already approved the major, of which these will be a part; yet he couldn’t vote for them because he didn’t think they belong in a liberal arts college. Tom Heeney (Communication) asked if these courses are typical of courses taught at Trident Technical College. Bob Frash (guest) replied that the course should only be taught from a managerial perspective, not a culinary one as is typical in two-year institutions such as Trident. He then mentioned the conceptual approaches taken in the courses. One focuses on the food industry at large and its impact on society; the other focuses on issues pertaining to operational analysis. He noted that most food businesses have a high rate of failure and that the courses teach students how to avoid the problems that lead to failure. He then showed a publication from the national Restaurant
Association that Trident Tech uses, and said that it amounts to a vocational workbook. By contrast, he has assembled his own readings, which are much more comprehensive. Next, John Crotts (guest) said that he was very sensitive to the liberal arts tradition, and that as past chair of the Department of Hospitality and Tourism he has recruited faculty who are open to this tradition and want to contribute to it. His own background, he said, was in social psychology and that his field is essentially a form of applied psychology. He added that he was attracted to the College because it is a liberal arts institution. He then gave a brief history of the major, reminding the Senate that when he helped create the major, he assured the Senate no in-house funds would be used for it. The new course proposals HTMT 370 and HTMT 372 were approved.

Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

The following proposals from the committee were all approved by the Senate:

- BIOL 619 and EVSS 619 - Biology of Coral Reefs (to be cross-listed with BIOL 449)
- SPAN 671 – Youth Literature in Spain
- EDFS 674 - Linguistics for ESOL Teachers
- EDFS 676 - ESOL for Non-ESOL Teachers

Constituents’ Concerns

Michael Phillips (at large) asked that Senators circulate proposed amendments to their colleagues before meetings for the sake of collegiality, fairness, and the facilitation of thoughtful deliberations.

The Senate adjourned at around 6:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 11 Sept. 2007

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, September 11, 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, and the minutes of the 17 April 2007 Senate meeting and its continuation on April 24 were approved.

Reports

Provost

The Provost announced that her meetings called “Conversation with the Provost” would continue this academic year and welcomed faculty participation. She reported that she has had some good discussions with faculty the previous year.

The Provost also reported that she would be meeting with Steve Osborne (Business Affairs) and the President regularly this year, which will give her a voice on budget and policy issues.

The staffing at the Provost’s office is almost complete. The Provost reported that Bev Diamond has been recently appointed as an Associate Provost and will be working on refining the hiring procedures and the faculty activity system and be involved in budget issues.

The Provost also announced that the Faculty Compensation Committee will begin a new study on the issue of faculty compensation and that the President is committed to addressing salary inequities.

The Provost reiterated her continued support for the General Education Proposal and urged the Senate to put in place a strong new general education program at the College. It is something, she stressed, that is in the great interest of the institution.

The Speaker

Speaker Joe Kelly announced that he has appointed Brian McGee (Communication) as Parliamentarian. He then reported that the administration has officially declared that it philosophically supports the First Year Experience program (FYE) and will monetarily support it (a budget has been approved), and he produced a letter from the Provost that officially certifies such support. He also reported that Susan Kattwinkel has been appointed as Director of the program.

George Pothering (guest) then asked the Speaker if this certification included a commitment to funding faculty lines. The Provost responded that eight lines will be added and funded over the next five years. Susan Kattwinkel added that about 300 students are currently enrolled in the FYE, which is about a sixth of all freshmen, and that next year about 40% of all freshmen are expected to enroll in the FYE.
The Speaker next reported that he has formed an informal committee to look at faculty governance and shared governance. The committee consists mainly of former Speakers of the Faculty and includes Bev Diamond, Trisha Folds-Bennett, Larry Krasnoff, Bob Mignone, Jack Parson, George Pothering, and Hugh Wilder. The Speaker wants to open up a larger discussion on faculty governance and wants the committee to identify problems and put together a plan to address them. He expects that a report from the committee will be ready by next semester.

The Speaker also reported that a committee, headed by Cathy Boyd (Registrar’s Office), has been formed to look into classroom management issues and various problems faculty have experienced involving the conditions and scheduling of classrooms.

The Speaker next announced that there is a new content management system under development that will change the way the catalog is revised.

Finally, the Speaker reported that after the Senate voted not to allow special tuition fees to be charged for students in certain schools, the Board of Trustees decided not to move on this issue. Any final decision on the matter will be delayed until the strategic plan has been completed.

**George Pothering** (Computer Science), chair of the *Ad Hoc* General Education Committee

Mr. Pothering first warmly thanked former chair of the Committee, Julia Eichelberger for all her work on the Committee and the Senate expressed its thanks with applause.

He next noted that all Senators should have a copy of the New General Education Proposal and explained four key changes in it.

--First, it has been re-organized and reformatted for a more streamlined presentation. Each goal includes a list of defining characteristics, requirements, and approval criteria.

--Second, much of the document has been re-worded in consultation with various departments.

--Third, the structure of the proposed Standing Committee on General Education has been clarified and streamlined. The current proposal would make this committee more similar to other faculty committees.

--Fourth, an analysis of 43 transcripts of graduates has been done to see what courses they had taken to satisfy their general education requirements and to see if those courses would fit under the new Gen-Ed requirements. The results of the study seem to indicate that the new requirements will have relatively little impact in terms of increasing the number of hours a student must take to meet the requirements.
Mr. Pothering also presented a revised schedule printed on colored paper for easy identification. He also said that each of the two Committee proposals—the Gen Ed Curriculum Proposal and the Proposal for the Gen-Ed Standing Committee—would be presented individually. His intention was to have the Senate review each proposal section by section, during which time it could offer amendments. At the end of that section-by-section review, the entirety of each proposal would be subject again to further amendment and the whole proposal voted on.

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) asked whether the sections of the Gen-Ed proposal voted on by last year’s Senate would also be subject to further amendment by the Senate. The Speaker answered that those sections could only be reconsidered with the current proposals through a special parliamentary procedure, which he would explain later. Mr. Wilder also asked for confirmation that the procedure this year was different from last year’s, in that this year the Senate will be able to vote up or down on the document as whole at the end of the amendment process, and in that the Senate would not be voting on approving each section of the document. Mr. Pothering and the Speaker both verified that what Mr. Wilder had said was correct.

Richard Nunan (Philosophy) asked whether the First Year Experience and the General Education Proposals would be reconsidered as a whole. He thought they were separate entities and should stay separate. He also thought that the procedure from last year was that the whole Gen-Ed document would be considered as a whole at the end of the amendment process. If such was the case, then he thought that the Gen-Ed items voted on last year should be reconsidered at the end of the amendment process this year.

Mr. Pothering then said that what was voted on last year has been formally accepted by the Senate, but that the rest of the proposal “died” and must now be formally re-introduced and considered as a separate entity. Mr. Nunan responded that he thought there was an obligation to re-consider the earlier parts of the Gen-Ed proposal voted on last year in light of what the current proposals end up being after this term’s amendment process. Speaker Kelly said that a way could be found to do this and that he would consult with the Parliamentarian.

Darryl Phillips (at large) then noted that his understanding was that that all items of the Gen Ed proposal passed by last year’s Senate were dependent on the Senate’s approval of a Standing Committee on General Education; so nothing is a done deal until the Senate approves the Standing Committee, which has not yet happened.

At this point, the Speaker announced that at the next meeting he will entertain a motion that the Senate set a time limit of half an hour for discussion of each page of the Gen-Ed proposals, and that we will not move ahead of the announced schedule in order to allow faculty (who are not Senators) to attend meetings in order to speak to specific aspects of the proposal that are of special concern to them.
Mr. Hurd wished to update the Senate on the possibility of moving to online course evaluations, something that the Educational Technology Committee started to look into in 2005. After a report to the Senate last year, when the Senate expressed some concerns about online course evaluations, the Committee tried to address those concerns as it investigated the merits of online course evaluation systems.

Mr. Hurd next reviewed some of the disadvantages of the current course evaluation system:

--it involves a lot of paper, many thousands of forms to handle and archive, and a fair amount of money to print
--it takes many hours of labor of the staff of many departments to process
--it has security problems (the evaluation forms pass through many hands and some are incorrectly administered or not given at all)
--anonymity is sometimes compromised (professors can identify the handwriting of some students)
--the feedback loop is slow (faculty receive the data from evaluations weeks or months after the courses are over)
--some class time is lost administering the evaluations
--the participation rate by students is not particularly high (67%).

Mr. Hurd then enumerated some of the advantages of an online evaluation system:

--the feedback is faster
--the comments remain more securely anonymous
--data can be extracted and plotted more easily
--it offers more flexibility in terms of administering the evaluations
--it is less expensive to administer
--it doesn’t take up class time
--it allows more space for written comments
--it is possible and easier to tailor specific evaluation forms for specific classes.

Mr. Hurd also pointed out one can control the time (hours during the day and the number of days) when students can fill out evaluations. This is an important point because it answers the fear—raised by the Senate the previous year—that students might decide to fill out the forms when they are least thoughtful. (Here the scenario of drunken students filling out evaluation forms at 2 AM was evoked.)

Mr. Hurd noted that other institutions have been moving to online course evaluations. Though the literature on the topic shows that response rates decline when the move to online evaluations is made, he said that he found in his discussions with other universities that response rates have increased. One can also force participation, he noted, by withholding grades from students who haven’t done the evaluations. Some challenges in
making online evaluations work are that students need to be persuaded that there is value in doing the evaluations, and that faculty must also “buy into it.”

Currently, Mr. Hurd reported, the administrative computing staff has too much work on its hands to develop a pilot study, so a third party vendor has to set it up. One vendor, Digital Measures, has agreed to do the study for free and has already started. Some departments and some tenured faculty have volunteered to participate.

Mr. Hurd said he would like Senate approval to continue the pilot study.

At this point Mr. Hurd fielded questions from the Senate. Richard Nunan, wondering about incentives for students to participate, asked whether data from the evaluations should be made available to students as an incentive. Mr. Hurd answered that other sources, such as Pick-A-Prof, already provide some, and that withholding grades is the most prominent form of incentive.

Phil Dustan (Biology) asked whether the questions in the online form would be the same as the ones used in the paper form. Mr. Hurd said they would be the same. Mr. Skinner (EDFS) noted that the response rate goes down with online evaluations because usually only the best and worst students (or those who really like or dislike the professor) are motivated to respond. He noted that a system is needed that gets close to 100% participation rate to avoid getting skewed results. Mr. Hurd asserted that the research in the literature doesn’t support that view.

George Pothering (Computer Science) asked Mr. Hurd how the 67% participation rate of our current system was determined. Mr. Hurd responded that he got the figure from Pam Niesslein’s office (Accountability, Accreditation, Assessment, and Planning). Mr. Pothering wondered whether students who had dropped from classes were counted among the non-participants. If so, that would help explain what seems to be a low participation rate.

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) observed that currently faculty can now control when evaluations are given. Picking up on this thought, Hugh Wilder remarked that during the two-week period when course evaluations can now be given, and when tests are given and papers are due, faculty have some control over when to administer evaluations, but the online course system doesn’t allow for this control. Mr. Hurd responded that the parameters could be tailored for individual courses with respect to the timing of when the evaluations are done. Jennifer McStottts (at large) asked if in the pilot study students would fill out both sets of evaluations or just the online ones. Mr. Hurd responded it would all be done online. Laura Turner (Theatre) asked if the pilot study would try to evaluate and do different things. Mr. Hurd said that it depended on the volunteers and what they wanted to look at or evaluate.
Brian McGee (Communication), chair of the Committee presented a proposed amendment to the Faculty By-Laws, Art. III, Sect. 1.I.6. The amendment would strike certain passages and insert new language concerning the selection and service of the Parliamentarian.

6. The Speaker will shall appoint a Parliamentarian to the Faculty, at the first Senate meeting of the academic year from among the Senators who shall serve at the pleasure of the Speaker. The Parliamentarian will shall advise the Speaker or other presiding officer, and the faculty and Senate, concerning parliamentary procedure. The Parliamentarian will shall perform other duties normally associated with such an office. If the Parliamentarian is unable or unavailable to perform those duties during a meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Speaker may appoint an Acting Parliamentarian to the Faculty until such time as the Parliamentarian shall return to service.

Mr. McGee explained that currently the Faculty By-Laws require the Parliamentarian to be a Senator, but Parliamentary authorities, such as Robert’s Rules of Order, recommend that the Parliamentarian not be a member of the deliberative assembly that he or she advises. The amendment would thus better align our Faculty Senate practices with standard Parliamentary practices. It would also allow the Speaker greater flexibility in appointing a Parliamentarian. The amendment also allows for the appointment of an Acting Parliamentarian (something not possible under the current by-laws), thus giving the Speaker greater flexibility in obtaining parliamentary advice. Finally, the amendment regularizes some inconsistencies in capitalization and substitutes “shall” for “will,” which is consistent with parliamentary language on this subject.

Because the Faculty By-Laws requires that the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual make a report on all proposed changes to the by-laws, Mr. McGee announced that his Committee would present a report and recommendation at the next meeting on its own proposed amendment.

Hugh Wilder then thanked Mr. McGee for all the excellent work that he and the Committee have done over on the past year on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, which “we all live by.”

New Business

Election of Speaker Pro Tempore

Scott Peeples (English) nominated George Hopkins (History) as Speaker Pro Tempore. The nomination was seconded and Mr. Hopkins was elected.
(1) **Transfer Credit: 60-Hour Limit**

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy), chair of the Committee, addressed an issue that was brought to the Committee by the Registrar, Cathy Boyd. The issue concerned the number of hours of transfer credit a student may receive from two-year institutions. Apparently, a number of students have in the past successfully petitioned the College to receive more than 60 hours of transfer credit, which the catalog states to be the limit. Mr. Krasnoff explained that since the Academic Standards Committee rules on interpretations of the College catalog, it has the authority to address this issue, and the Committee wondered what the principle might be that would allow such petitions to be granted. The catalog contains no language indicating that exceptions beyond the 60-hour limit are permissible. Therefore the Committee affirmed that the catalog already offers a clear and firm rule on the 60-hour limit, which should not be broken. Mr. Krasnoff added that Don Burkhard (VP of Enrollment Management) verified that sticking to the rule as stated in the catalog will not affect the recruitment of students.

One Senator asked if there were state regulations requiring that we accept all the credits of transfer students. Cathy Boyd (Registrar’s Office) responded that there is no such regulation, and that what credits we do accept must apply to the state articulation agreement. She added the 60-hour rule exists because faculty traditionally have not wanted College of Charleston graduates to earn more than half their hours from another institution.

(2) **Latin Honors Requirements**

The Academic Standards Committee moved that the minimum requirements for Latin honors at graduation be changed from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.60</td>
<td><em>cum laude</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.80</td>
<td><em>magna cum laude</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.95</td>
<td><em>summa cum laude</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...as soon as the Provost deems the change to be feasible.

Mr. Krasnoff explained that the recent changes to our grading scale, which include the introduction of minus grades, have made it more difficult for students to achieve these honors. At the request of the Provost and the Board of Trustees, John Newell, the Dean of the Honors College, conducted a survey comparing our requirements to those of other institutions. (A spread-sheet illustrating these comparisons was projected onto the auditorium screen.) His report concluded that these new requirements would better...
reflect the realities of our new grading scale and the requirements of both our peers and our aspirational peers.

Hugh Wilder said he was undecided about the issue and wanted to know more about the rationale for the change. He asked if the data support the claim that the recent change in our grading scale has affected the GPAs of our students. He also said that a key statistic is the percentage of students receiving honors awards, and was wondering if there were data on that. John Newell (Dean of the Honors College) responded that Institutional Research can’t easily retrieve some of the data that Mr. Wilder mentioned, and that the data for the percentage of students who receive honors awards from other institutions are hard to come by (he looked at 100 institutions and could only find this kind of data for twelve). Based on the data he did collect in his survey, Mr. Newell proposed to adjust the Latin honors GPA requirement to be at or above the median of the other institutions in his survey.

Paul Young (Mathematics) asked how long the current standards have been in place. Mr. Newell replied that they have been in place many years, at least as long he has been at the College. He also noted that the Board of Trustees was concerned that our standards were too high compared to other schools and that they were putting our students at a disadvantage. He shares this concern and said that our standards need to be even with our peers. He also added that the slight lowering of the honors standard would help attract more top students who are motivated to pursue such honors. Jamie Schafer (SGA) said that her conversations with students indicate overwhelming support for the amendment.

Phil Dustan (Biology) wondered about the premise of the amendment, namely that the new grading scale will make it more difficult for students to reach the honors standards. Isn’t the new grading scale supposed to be fairer and even out grades overall, keeping GPAs level? Mr. Newell responded that that may be so for some students earning grades below “A”s, but such is probably not the case for those seeking the top honors, especially summa honors, because some of the “A”s that students previously earned will be “A-”s and because there is no “A+” in the grading scale that students can earn to compensate for “A-” grades.

Brian McGee then moved that the Senate postpone deciding on the amendment until data are made available to the Senate.

The motion was seconded and discussion of the motion ensued. Scott Peeples (English) then asked about the time required for the collection of data; he and some other Senators were concerned that the search for data could be too open-ended and could end up killing the Academic Standards Committee’s motion. Brian McGee assured the Senate that his motion was not an effort to defeat the Academic Standards Committee’s motion; the intent of his motion is to allow the Senate to make a more thoughtful decision on whether to change the honors standards.
Laura Turner asked if data could be obtained on the percentage of students earning honors awards here and elsewhere. There was some question here as to what data the Committee needed to gather and present, and the Speaker consulted the Secretary, who said that the types of data that had been discussed and that the motion seemed to indicate were the following: data on the GPAs of students receiving honors awards at other institutions, percentage of students receiving honors here and at aspirational institutions, and, if possible, data on the impact of our new grading scale on GPAs.

John Newell pointed out that it would be hard to get more of some of this data (e.g. find data on the percentage of students earning honors awards at other institutions). Mr. Krasnoff asked whether the College could make public its studies on student GPAs, and the Provost responded that it could. Mr. Krasnoff said that we should focus on the top end of students when looking at how the new grading scale effects GPAs, and that it might be useful to look at whether the percentage of students receiving honors awards has changed this year since the implementation of the new grading scale. Kay Smith (Office the Academic Experience) said that we really need another four years to measure the affects of the new grading on GPAs. Mr. Krasnoff then pointed out that though it is good to find and look at more data, this is a “time-sensitive” issue that affects a number of students now.

The Senate then voted on Mr. McGee’s motion, which passed.

No constituent concerns were brought up and no issues of the Good of the Order were raised. The Senate adjourned at around 6:45.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary