Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 21 April 2009

In a continuation of the April 7 meeting, the Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 21 April 2009, at 5:00 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium to complete the unfinished business from April 7th.

After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order he asked the Senate for unanimous consent to add to the agenda a report from the Faculty Compensation Committee. Unanimous consent was granted.

Reports

Hugh Wilder, member of the Faculty Compensation Committee

Mr. Wilder said that the main reason for his report stemmed from the recent publication of faculty salary data by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Given the College’s merit evaluation plans, he thought it was important to summarize some of the committee’s findings in studying the AAUP data. He cautioned, however, that the analysis is preliminary. He added that the AAUP reports average salaries by rank, but not by discipline, and that not all institutions report data to AAUP, though many do.

He began by saying that average salaries at the College are as follows: $80,500 (professors), $65,400 (assoc. professors), $59,400 (asst. professors), and $47,800 (instructors), with an overall average of $64,700. With respect to our peer institutions, we are eighteenth on the list. Western Washington University is the only one that moved ahead of us. This news, Mr. Wilder said, was frustrating, especially in light of the fact that President Benson increased salaries 3.9% last year at the College, for which he deserves credit. In terms of the percentage of salary increases, we rank number one in the state and number 6 among 20 peer institutions. The increase is particularly significant among assistant professors, who as a group enjoyed a 6.3% average increase. Mr. Wilder said that Associate Provost Bev Diamond deserves credit for these salary boosts. In the South Atlantic region, the C of C’s average salary of $64,700 equals 97.6% of the current overall average, up from 96.3%. For assistant professors the average equals 101.5%. Mr. Wilder thanked President Benson and Associate Provost Bev Diamond and said that the committee will work on recommendations that will be forwarded to the administration.

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) said that it should be noted that Western Washington, whose faculty earned the largest salary increase, is unionized. Jason Coy (History) thanked the committee members for their work and said that the news about last year’s salary increases is encouraging, but asked about this year’s news on the salary front. What can we do this year to keep the momentum going? Mr. Wilder replied that Laura Turner, chair of the committee, has met with President Benson, and that the committee’s recommendations will offer the President guidance. The AAUP, however, predicts tough times ahead for colleges and universities, but the President has said that increasing faculty salaries is a high priority.

Old Business
Committee on By-Laws and *Fac./Admin. Manual*

Deanna Caveny, chair of the committee, explained that the Senate would vote on five motions that had originally been presented to the Senate in the March meeting for feedback. Those motions have now been brought back to the Senate for a vote. Ms. Caveny also explained that Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM) consists of two parts: (1) the by-laws, which the faculty controls; and (2) the sections that affect faculty and consist mainly of academic policy. The By-Laws and FAM Committee, Ms. Caveny continued, has the responsibility of maintaining the FAM and reporting to the Senate on proposed changes to the non-faculty controlled sections, which the Senate has traditionally voted on with the understanding that votes on those sections are only advisory. The first four motions pertained to the faculty-controlled section of the FAM, the fifth to the non-faculty controlled section.

Before introducing the five motions, Ms. Caveny announced that her committee will have a Web site that lays out the different parts of the FAM and explains who owns what part of it. She also announced that during the summer the committee would work with Tom Trimboli, Sr. VP of Legal Affairs, on details of the hearing and grievance policy (a delicate matter). The committee will also look at the College’s sabbatical policy, consult with the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review on issues pertaining to Sr. Instructors and Instructors, and work on policy changes that are voted on today.

**First motion:** Ms. Caveny introduced the first of the five motions, which seeks to define more clearly the term “regular faculty.” She noted that the motion is the same as the one brought to the Senate in March, except for some small changes in the footnote and a change (highlighted in red under the heading of “Intent”) that combines Instructors and Senior Instructors with tenure and tenure-track faculty members. She added that at the March meeting Bill Olejniczak (chair of the History Department) brought up a question about whether visiting faculty fit into the definition “regular faculty,” and said that there may be a motion next year to include visiting faculty in the definition. The full text of the motion is as follows:

**Action:** Change to By-laws Article I, Section 1: Membership in the College Faculty, Regular Faculty.

**Status:** Presented to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009. To be considered by Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009.

**Intent:**
- To more clearly define “regular faculty”
- To include among regular faculty those full-time tenured and tenure-track employees who normally teach only three contact hours, including chairs of large departments and assistant and associate deans
- To replace “instructor” with “Instructor”
- **To combine Instructors and Senior Instructors with tenured and tenure-track faculty members in application of the three-credit-hour rule**
- To clarify which administrators are members of the regular faculty
Motion:

Article I. Membership in the College Faculty

Section 1. Regular Faculty

The faculty members of the College of Charleston are those individuals whose obligation in the institution is both the dissemination and expansion of academic knowledge of an accepted academic nature. At the College of Charleston the following individuals are considered regular faculty members: (1) those full-time \(^1\) tenured, and tenure-track, Instructor, and Senior Instructor employees of the institution who normally teach at least six \(^a\) contact hours \(^b\) of college credit courses or the equivalent in assigned academic research in their academic fields each semester; (2) full-time Instructor and Senior Instructor employees; (3) (2) full-time professional librarians; and (4) (3) ex officio, the President of the College, the Provost, the Vice President for Research and Professional Development and Dean of Graduate Studies, the Deans of Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Academic Deans, the Dean of the Honors College, and all administrative officers of the College with academic rank. \(^3\) These members of the faculty have voting rights at meetings of the College faculty.

The Senate voted, passing the motion.

Second Motion: Ms. Caveny introduced the second motion, which mainly seeks to more clearly define who is eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate. Ms. Caveny explained that this draft of the motion is almost the same as the one introduced in the March meeting, except for the fact that it combines Instructors and Senior Instructors with tenured and tenure-track faculty in applying the three-hour contact rule for Senate eligibility (this revision is highlighted in red under the heading of “Intent”). The full text of the motion is as follows:

Action: Change to By-laws Article IV, Section 2: Faculty Senate, Composition and Election.

\(^1\) For the purpose only of interpreting Art I., Sect. 1, a “full-time” employee of the College of Charleston shall be defined as an employee receiving a salary and fringe benefits from the College in return for 40 hours or more of labor per regular work week. Any employee holding a title customarily associated with regular faculty membership is presumed to be a full-time employee unless the Provost stipulates in writing that the employee in question has part-time status. The determination of full-time status is not linked to the type or nature of the work assignment for each individual faculty member.

\(^2\) When they are full-time tenured and tenure-track employees of the institution, full-time Instructor and Senior Instructor employees, or full-time professional librarians, Department Chairs, Assistant Department Chairs, Associate Department Chairs, Assistant Deans, and Associate Deans are defined as employees normally teaching at least three contact hours of college credit courses in each semester.

\(^3\) An “administrative officer” shall be defined as any College of Charleston employee with a position title using the words “President” or “Provost.” In addition, the Provost may stipulate in writing that any College employee with academic rank is an administrative officer if that employee (a) has a position title using the word “Director” and (b) normally teaches fewer than three contact hours of college credit courses or the equivalent in assigned academic research in her or his academic field each semester.
Status: Presented to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009. To be considered by Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009.

Intent:
- To more clearly define which regular faculty members are eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, vote in senatorial elections, and be counted in apportionment of Faculty Senate seats
- To replace “instructor” with “Instructor”
- To combine Instructors and Senior Instructors with tenured and tenure-track faculty members in application of the three-contact-hour rule
- To resolve an ambiguity in whether department chairs are allowed to serve as Faculty Senators. Our by-laws have specifically stated that chairs are eligible to serve as faculty senators. However, chairs were not clearly included in the regular faculty, which produced a contradiction.
- To specify that Assistant Deans and Associate Deans (who are otherwise members of the regular faculty) are also eligible to serve as Faculty Senators
- To clearly state which administrators are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators
- To clearly state which administrators are not eligible to vote in senatorial elections and should not count in Faculty Senate seat apportionment.

Motion:

Article IV, Faculty Senate

Section 2. Composition and Election

A. Eligibility.

A Faculty Senator must be a full-time tenured, or tenure-track, Instructor, or Senior Instructor employee of the College who has completed at least three years of service at the College, and who normally teaches at least three contact hours per semester or the equivalent in assigned research or who is a full-time Instructor, Senior Instructor, or professional librarian. Without regard to teaching load, Department Chairs, Assistant Department Chairs, Associate Department Chairs, Assistant Deans, and Associate Deans who otherwise would be members of the regular faculty, regardless of their teaching loads, are eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. (Approved App. April 2005) Administrators, Administrative officers, including Deans of Schools and the Dean of Libraries, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Academic Deans, and the Dean of the Honors College are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. Faculty members on leave are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators.

C. Election
1. Without regard to teaching load, all and only regular faculty members as defined under provisions (1), (2), and (3) of Article I Section 1, in Art. I, Sect. 1, excluding all those qualifying as ex officio regular faculty members under provision (3), are eligible to vote in Senate elections.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) said that he was glad to see that these things are being clarified, and noted that the Committee on Nominations and Elections, of which he is a member, has also wrestled with eligibility issues. However, he was unsure about the proposed amendment, particularly the part that makes Assistant and Associate Deans eligible for the Faculty Senate. In the past, they have not been included, so this aspect of the amendment would represent a major change and not a good one in his view. In contrast to Deans, who tend to look outward, Assistant and Associate Deans attend to internal problems, and so by including them in the Senate they would have a kind of double vote—as faculty and as deans. Moreover, since they answer to Deans, it is hard for Assistant and Associate Deans to be independent and to speak against the views of the Deans. Having persons in the Senate who truly represent the faculty and have independent views becomes especially important if the Senate becomes a smaller body, as the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance has suggested it will recommend. Mr. Phillips therefore moved to put Assistant and Associate Deans in the category of those who are ineligible to serve in the Faculty Senate. The motion was seconded.

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) voiced his support for Mr. Phillips’ motion. The argument, he observed, to make Assistant and Associate Deans eligible for the Senate is that they come from the faculty and presumably will return to the faculty ranks. But he pointed out that this practice may change, and that there is no provision in the motion to account for the change. He stressed, too, that Assistant and Associate Deans have little independence and serve at the pleasure of the Deans. Further, the number of Assistant and Associate Deans may grow in the future. He agreed that it was best to exclude them from Senate eligibility.

Brian McGee (guest and a member of the By-Laws and FAM Committee) remarked that the committee discussed the issue and thought this aspect of the their motion might spark some controversy. He said that the amendment to the committee’s motion was fine with him, but he pointed out that the same argument used to exclude Deans and Associate Deans could be used to exclude department chairs, who have more power over faculty. Yet we wouldn’t want, he concluded, to exclude chairs. Ms. Caveny agreed that excluding chairs would be a bad idea. Mr. Krasnoff responded that the issue isn’t mainly about power, but about independence, which is what Assistant and Associate Deans lack.

Mr. Phillips added that we already include the dean ranks as faculty in terms of service on committees. But whereas the Committee on Nominations and Elections can make a judgment as to whether faculty serving as deans should be on certain committees, there is no such committee to mediate such matters when it comes to Assistant and Associate Deans serving in the Senate. He thus urged the passage of his amendment.

The Senate voted, passing Mr. Phillips’ amendment to the By-Laws and FAM Committee’s second motion.
The Senate then voted on the By-Laws and FAM Committee’s second motion, which passed.

**Third Motion:** This motion would (among other things) eliminate regularly scheduled fall and spring faculty meetings, which in recent years have been sparsely attended. (Items listed below in red under the heading of “Intent” refer to changes in the amendment that have been made since the March Faculty Senate meeting, when the amendment was first introduced.) The full text of the amendment is as follows:

**Action:** Change to By-laws Article II, College Faculty Meetings. Associated Change to Article VI, Amending Procedures.

**Status:** Presented to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009. To be considered by Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009.

**Intent:**
- To eliminate requirement of fall and spring full faculty meetings
- To continue to allow meetings of the faculty to be called by the President of the College, Speaker of the Faculty, or petition to the Speaker of the Faculty by fifty faculty members
- To allow everything (except election of faculty committees and approval of degree candidates) that took place in the required fall and spring faculty meetings to take place at “ordinary” faculty meetings called at Speaker’s discretion
- **To specify how election of faculty committees will take place**
- To reclassify meetings of the faculty from “regular” and “special” to “ordinary” and “extraordinary”, since “regular” seemed to imply “with some regularity or regular schedule”
- To more clearly state that ordinary faculty meetings are not deliberative
- To specify who (the Speaker or Speaker’s designee) can waive the one-week advance notification requirement when calling extraordinary faculty meetings
- To clearly specify that Robert’s Rules of Order shall govern the conduct at extraordinary faculty meetings
- To fix section numbering in Article VI, Amending Procedures

**Motion:**

**Article II, College Faculty Meetings**

**Section 1. Regular Ordinary Faculty Meetings**

The College faculty shall meet twice annually, once early in the first semester and again late in the second semester, to hear reports from and to question the President of the College, the Provost, and the Speaker of the Faculty. At its spring meeting, the College faculty shall recommend recipients of degrees and certificates at spring commencement. Any written reports to the College faculty from the President, the Provost, or the Speaker of the Faculty shall be distributed by the Faculty Senate Secretariat to all faculty members. Ordinary meetings of the College faculty may be called by the Speaker of the Faculty.
Ordinary faculty meetings may be called for such purposes as the distribution of information, discussion of a topic or topics relevant to the College faculty, hearing a presentation, and asking questions of the President of the College or other administrative officers of the College. An ordinary meeting of the College faculty is not a deliberative assembly, and faculty at such meetings have no legislative or review authority.

Section 2. Special Extraordinary Faculty Meetings

A. Special Extraordinary meetings of the College faculty may be called by the President of the College, or the Speaker of the Faculty, or a petition to the Speaker of the Faculty by fifty faculty members. At such special extraordinary meetings the College faculty may review any Faculty Senate action.

B. Senate actions may be amended or vetoed by a simple majority vote of those members of the regular College faculty (as defined in Article I) present at such special extraordinary meetings of the College faculty, provided there is a quorum present.

C. The College faculty has legislative authority (i.e., may legislate and recommend to the President on matters normally under the purview of the Faculty Senate) only in case it acts in a special extraordinary meeting of the College faculty called by a petition to the Speaker of the Faculty by 50 regular College faculty members (as defined in Art. I) on a specific issue included in the agenda for that meeting and distributed at least one week prior to the date of the meeting.

D. A quorum at special extraordinary College faculty meetings shall be a simple majority of regular College faculty members.

E. Special Extraordinary meetings of the College faculty must be called in writing at least one week prior to the date of the meeting. A written agenda for each meeting will be distributed to all faculty at least one week prior to the meeting. The requirement of one week advance notice may be waived by the Speaker of the Faculty (or the Speaker’s designee) in case of emergency.

F. The current edition of Robert’s Rules of Order will govern the conduct of special extraordinary meetings of the College faculty.

G. The Faculty Secretary shall perform as secretary for all meetings of the College faculty.

Section 3. Presiding Officer

The Speaker of the Faculty shall preside at all regular and special ordinary and extraordinary meetings of the faculty. If the Speaker cannot be present, she or he shall designate an alternate Speaker for that meeting from among the members of the regular faculty of the College.
Article VI. Amending Procedures

Section 1. Amending Procedures

Section 1. Senate Option for Amendment Introduction

A. Motions for amendment or repeal of these by-laws may be made in writing at any meeting of the Faculty Senate. The motion shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the Senate its recommendations on the motion and any amendments at the next Senate meeting. Motions to amend or repeal these by-laws require a two-thirds vote in the Senate for approval. Approved motions must then be ratified by a simple majority of regular faculty members voting by electronic ballot on the motion. (Rev. Jan. 2007)

Section 2. Extraordinary Meeting Option for Amendment Introduction

B. Motions for amendment or repeal of these by-laws may be made in writing at any special extraordinary meeting of the College faculty. The motion shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the faculty its recommendation on the motion and any amendments at a second special extraordinary faculty meeting called by the Speaker of the Faculty to consider the motion. The faculty will then vote on the motion to amend or repeal the by-laws. It shall be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the membership voting, provided a quorum is present.

The Senate voted, passing on the amendment.

Motion four: This proposed amendment specifies that the President and Provost must report to the faculty in an early meeting of the Faculty Senate in the fall semester and in a late meeting of the Faculty Senate in the spring semester. The intent of the motion is to retain the function of having the President and Provost report to the faculty, which the previous amendment eliminated. The full text of the amendment is as follows:

Action: Change to By-laws Article IV, Section 1: Faculty Senate, Functions.

Status: Presented to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009. To be considered by Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009.

Intent:
- To take the requirement that the President and Provost report to the faculty, which was part of the required full faculty meetings, and place it under Faculty Senate meetings instead

Motion:
Article IV. Faculty Senate

Section 1. Functions

A. The Faculty Senate is the primary legislative body of the College of Charleston faculty. The Senate may make recommendations on any matter under its purview to the President of the College. Except where otherwise specified in the By-Laws of the College Board of Trustees, the President shall have the power of veto over any action by the Senate. The veto shall be communicated in writing to the Senate, with reasons, within thirty days after receipt by the President. By a two-thirds vote, the Senate may appeal any action thus vetoed, through the Speaker of the Faculty, to the College Board of Trustees.

B. The Faculty Senate shall be concerned with all matters relating to academic programs, the curriculum, admissions and continuation standards, the grading system, degree and certificate requirements, and the utilization of the intellectual resources of the College. The Faculty Senate shall have the right and obligation to initiate needed institutional and academic studies, either directly or through appropriate committees.

C. The Faculty Senate may request meetings with the College Board of Trustees to discuss matters of mutual concern. Senators shall receive minutes of all meetings of the College Board of Trustees.

D. The Faculty Senate may establish and instruct such committees, standing and ad hoc, as may be necessary for the performance of its functions and elect or provide for the members of the committees in accordance with these by-laws.

E. At one Faculty Senate meeting early in the first semester and at one meeting late in the second semester, the Faculty Senate shall hear reports from and have the opportunity to question the President of the College and the Provost. Any written reports provided to the Faculty Senate by the President or the Provost shall be distributed by the Faculty Senate Secretariat to all faculty members.

F. The Faculty Senate is authorized by the College faculty to approve all degree candidates for graduation.

G. The specific duties of the Faculty Senate shall also include, but not be limited to, recommendations to the President concerning any of the following:

The Senate voted, passing the amendment.

Fifth Motion: Ms. Caveny reminded the Senate that the next amendment—which concerned procedural matters in tenure, promotion, and review processes—dealt with the part of the FAM that was not controlled by the faculty. The full text of the proposed amendment is as follows:
**Action:** Change to *Faculty/Administration Manual*, VI.D.7, Reporting Procedures of Departmental Evaluation Panel.

**Status:** Presented to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009. To be considered by Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009.

**Intent:**
- To implement previously endorsed change requiring: (a) tenure, promotion, and review candidates to sign their evaluation panel’s letter, and (b) panel chairs to provide candidates with a copy of that panel letter
- To specify that panel members should all sign their evaluation panel’s letter
- To specify what the panel members’ and candidates’ signatures mean

**Motion:**

VI, Sect. D. Evaluation of Faculty, Procedures for Third-year Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty

7. Reporting Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel

After due deliberation, the panel will *shall* take its vote by written ballot. The chair will *shall* draft a statement for the members of the panel to sign that reports the recommendation and vote of the panel. This statement should include justification for the panel’s recommendation. While maintaining the confidentiality of any meetings, the statement will summarize the discussion that took place among panel members, including positive and negative deliberations.

The chair of the departmental panel will *shall* meet with the faculty member being evaluated to inform him/her *provide the faculty member with a copy* of the panel’s written recommendation *written statement*, which will *shall* include actual vote splits and the signatures of all the panel members. The signatures of the panel members acknowledge only that the panel members participated in panel deliberation and had the opportunity to contribute to the development of the written statement. Third-year candidates will sign the panel’s evaluation. The faculty member shall sign a copy of the statement, with the signed copy to be retained by the chair of the panel for submission to the appropriate Academic Dean. The signature of the faculty member acknowledges only that a copy of the statement has been received by the faculty member.

The evaluation panel chair will *shall* forward the panel’s recommendation(s) *statement* to the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries. In the case of tenure and promotion recommendations, this must be done by November 1. In the case of third-year reappointment recommendations, this must be done by January 15. *(Editorial Note: This last sentence will subsequently be revised by another motion addressing deadlines in the tenure and promotion process.)*
The Senate voted, passing the amendment.

New Business

Committee on By-Laws and Fac./Admin. Manual

The committee had four proposed amendments to the FAM to present to the Senate—all involving changes to the part of the FAM that is not controlled by the faculty—as well as an announcement concerning the language on annual and merit evaluation to be inserted into the FAM.

Language on annual/merit evaluation to go in the FAM, VI.E and VI.F: Ms. Caveny explained that this language on annual/merit evaluations has been looked at by numerous faculty committees and that Associate Provost Bev Diamond has incorporated, when she could, a number of their recommendations. She reported that Assoc. Provost Diamond has asked that the Senate not amend the document containing the language on annual/merit evaluation given that various faculty committees have already reviewed it. The text of the document appears in Appendix 1 at the end of the minutes.

Associate Provost Diamond said that she would be happy to hear all comments on the document. Mr. Krasnoff asked if Ms. Diamond could speak to the provision that faculty, or a chair, dean, or the Provost may request a more detailed report. Ms. Diamond replied that the merit/annual evaluation model follows the model used at the University of Miami in Ohio. The main purpose is to allow faculty to get more detailed assessment, especially when going up for promotion. Some committees have voiced some objections over this part of the document, but the administration has kept a general provision in for the generation of more detailed reports. The intent behind it, she said, is to benefit faculty. On a different topic, Ms. Diamond said that she does not yet know if the post-tenure review will be rolled into the annual/merit review, but that it could happen. Following up on his question, Mr. Krasnoff said that he could see the intent of the provision allowing for more detailed assessments, but wished to know more specifically what ”more detailed” means. Ms. Diamond replied that the administration didn’t want to spell out rigid guidelines and thought it was more appropriate to leave room for different practices for different occasions and contexts. Ms. Caveny added that the old practice was that every third year a tenured faculty would get a detailed evaluation, but it could be now happen anytime.

At the conclusion of the discussion of the language on annual/merit evaluation, Ms. Caveny announced the first of four amendments to the FAM.

First proposed amendment to the FAM: motion to insert a section on the religious accommodation for students. The full text of the amendment is as follows:

**Action:** Change to Faculty/Administration Manual, VIII.A, Faculty Responsibilities to Students, to add a statement on religious accommodation for students.
**Status:** To be presented to Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009. Committee will request that Faculty Senate consider this motion at one of the April meetings.

**Intent:**
- To add a statement of religious accommodation for students

**Motion:**

In VIII, Sect. A, Faculty Responsibilities to Students, insert new #11 and renumber current #11-16 as #12-17.

**Insertion:**

11. **Religious Accommodation for Students**

The College of Charleston community is enriched by students of many faiths that have various religious observances, practices, and beliefs. We value student rights and freedoms, including the right of each student to adhere to individual systems of religion. The College prohibits discrimination against any student because of such student’s religious belief or any absence thereof.

The College acknowledges that religious practices differ from tradition to tradition and that the demands of religious observance in some traditions may cause conflicts with student schedules. In affirming this diversity, like many other colleges and universities, the College supports the concept of “reasonable accommodation for religious observance” in regard to class attendance, and the scheduling of examinations and other academic work requirements, unless the accommodation would create an undue hardship on the College. Faculty are required, as part of their responsibility to students and the College, to ascribe to this policy and to ensure its fair and full implementation.

The accommodation request imposes responsibilities and obligations on both the individual requesting the accommodation and the College. Faculty members are expected to reasonably accommodate individual religious practices. Examples of reasonable accommodations for student absences might include: rescheduling of an exam or giving a make-up exam for the student in question; altering the time of a student’s presentation; allowing extra-credit assignments to substitute for missed class work or arranging for an increased flexibility in assignment dates. Regardless of any accommodation that may be granted, students are responsible for satisfying all academic objectives, requirements and prerequisites as defined by the instructor and by the College.

The Senate voted, passing the amendment.
Second proposed amendment: motion to change *FAM*, VI.A. VI.B, VI.D, and VI.H. This motion, as Ms. Caveny explained, seeks to change deadlines and address details related to reporting requirements in the tenure, promotion, third-year, and post-tenure review processes. The full text of the proposed amendment follows below:

**Action:** Change to *Faculty/Administration Manual*, VI.A, VI.B, VI.D, and VI.H, addressing reporting requirements and deadlines in tenure, promotion, review, and post-tenure review processes.

**Status:** To be presented to Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009. Committee will be requesting that Faculty Senate consider this motion at one of the April meetings.

**Intent:**
- To clarify deadline for President’s decisions and notifications in tenure, promotion, review, and post-tenure review processes.
- To keep August 15 and March 15 deadlines in the *Faculty/Administration Manual* but remove all other explicit deadlines, replacing explicit dates with more general references and referring readers to the annual calendars distributed for these two review processes.
- To replace many instances of “will” with “should” or “shall”.

**Motion:**

**DEADLINES IN TENURE, PROMOTION, AND THIRD-YEAR REVIEWS**

*Changes are in color and are denoted with strikethrough (for deletion) and underline (for addition). Boldface headers were added for clarification. Remainder of the language was cut and pasted from the Faculty-Administration Manual (FAM).*

**FAM, pg 104, applicable to promotion reviews of all instructional faculty:**
Normally, a petition nominating a faculty member to a higher rank should be made not later than August 15 of the academic year in which a decision on promotion is to be made. The faculty member will then be evaluated under the provisions outlined in Art. VI.D. entitled “Procedures for Third-Year Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty.”

**FAM, pg 109, applicable to instructors’ third-year evaluation and review for promotion:** By August 15, each Department Chair will should provide the appropriate Academic Dean and the Provost with a list of faculty members to be considered.

**FAM, pg 118, applicable to promotion reviews of library faculty:** Deadline for Nomination. Normally, a petition nominating a library faculty member for promotion to a higher rank should be made not later than August 15 of the academic year in which a decision on promotion is to be made.
FAM, pg 120, applicable to all reviews of instructional and library faculty: By August 15, each Department Chair will should provide the appropriate Academic Dean and the Provost with a list of faculty members to be considered. The Dean of Libraries will should provide a list of eligible library faculty members to the Provost.

FAM, pg 110, applicable to instructors’ third-year evaluation and review for promotion: A faculty member will shall submit to the chair of the departmental evaluation panel by the announced deadline a packet containing a current curriculum vitae and evidence assembled to demonstrate that the standards and criteria have been met.

FAM, pg 120, applicable to all reviews of instructional and library faculty: A faculty member will shall submit to the Chair of the Departmental Evaluation Panel by the announced deadline a packet containing a current curriculum vitae and evidence assembled to demonstrate that the standards and criteria have been met. The review process begins once the faculty member’s contribution to the packet has been formally submitted for departmental evaluation.

FAM, pg 123, applicable to all reviews of instructional and library faculty: The evaluation panel chair will shall forward the panel’s recommendation(s) to the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries by the announced deadline. In the case of tenure and promotion recommendation, this must be done by November 1 deadline is typically at the end of October. In the case of third-year reappointment recommendations, this must be done by January 15 deadline is typically near mid-January.

FAM, pg 124, applicable to third-year evaluations of instructional and library faculty: The appropriate Dean will shall review the faculty member’s packet and the departmental evaluation panel’s recommendation, interview each candidate, and notify the candidate in writing of his/her recommendations. The recommendation of the Dean will be submitted in writing to the Provost by February 1. The Dean shall forward all packets, including those prepared for third-year review, to the Provost’s Office. The Dean shall submit his/her recommendations in writing to the Provost and forward all materials to the Provost’s Office by the announced deadlines, which are typically at the end of January.

FAM, pg 124, applicable to tenure and promotion reviews of instructional and library faculty: The appropriate Dean will review the evaluation panel recommendations and the candidate’s packet and may choose to interview candidates. The Dean will notify the candidate in writing of his/her recommendations. The Dean will forward these materials to a designated room for review by the Provost and the Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion review by December 1. The Dean will provide his/her recommendation to the Provost by December 1. The Dean shall provide his/her recommendations in writing to the Provost and forward all materials to a designated room for review by the Provost and the Advisory Committee on Tenure.
Promotion, and Review by the announced deadlines, which are typically at the end of November.

FAM, pg 124, applicable to tenure and promotion reviews of instructional and library faculty: The Provost will shall 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 shall notify each candidate in writing of its recommendation by the announced deadlines.

FAM, pg 124, applicable to third-year reviews of instructional and library faculty: The Committee will shall 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 shall refer the case to the Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee for their recommendations. The Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee will shall 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.

NEW PARAGRAPH to be added just after the preceding paragraph: The Provost’s recommendations for all reviews and the Faculty Advisory Committee’s recommendations in cases where they act shall be submitted in writing to the President by the announced deadlines.

FAM, pg 125, applicable to tenure and promotion reviews of instructional and library faculty: After the Faculty Advisory Committee has made its written recommendation to the President, the Provost may interview the candidate as part of his/her independent evaluation of the candidate. The Provost’s recommendation will shall be submitted in writing to the President by the announced deadlines.

FAM, pg 125, applicable to all reviews: Upon receipt of the recommendations of the departmental evaluation panel, appropriate Dean, the Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Provost, the President shall make a final determination and inform the candidate, the Provost, the Dean, and the evaluation panel chair in writing of his/her decision by March 15 or within two weeks of receipt of the recommendations, whichever comes later. In the course of deliberation, the President shall have access to all materials used in the evaluation. The President shall make a final determination within 2 weeks after she/he receives recommendations from all of the following: the departmental evaluation panel, the appropriate Dean, the Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Provost. All such recommendations shall be submitted to the President no later than March 1 of each year. In addition to these recommendations, Deadlines for earlier stages of the review process are prior to March 1 and are announced by Academic Affairs each year.
the President shall also have access to, and may consider, other materials used by any or all of the foregoing during the course of their respective evaluations. Once a final decision is made by the President, and within the 2 weeks after the last recommendation is received by her/him, the President shall inform the candidate, the Provost, the Dean, and the evaluation panel chair, in writing, of her/his decision.

DEADLINES IN POST-TENURE REVIEW

Changes are in color and are denoted with strikethrough (for deletion) and underline (for addition). Boldface headers were added for clarification. Remainder of the language was cut and pasted from the Faculty-Administration Manual (FAM).

FAM, pg 128: A Faculty Member Will Submit to Her/His Department Chair a Packet of Material that Must Include A faculty member shall submit to his/her Department Chair by the announced deadline a packet of material that must include:

FAM, pg 130: The department chair (or the departmental panel) will shall forward to the candidate’s dean by December 18 the announced deadline, typically mid-December, the candidate’s packet with either a brief letter of acknowledgement of the chair’s (or panel’s) concurrence with the candidate’s self-evaluation or a detailed negative letter to the candidate’s dean. At this time a copy of the letter will shall be forwarded to the candidate.

FAM, pg 130: The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall review and forward its recommendations to the Provost by the end of February announced deadline, typically at the end of February. Normally, the committee will not review a "satisfactory" recommendation unless the candidate requests the committee to do so. The Provost may make a recommendation and will shall forward all recommendations to the President by the announced deadline.

FAM, pg 130: Upon receipt of the recommendations of the department chair (or the departmental panel), and any or all of the following: the appropriate dean, the Post-Tenure Review Committee, and the Provost, the President shall make a final determination and inform the candidate, the Provost, the Post-Tenure Review Committee, the dean, and the department chair in writing of his/her decision by March 15 or within two weeks of receipt of the recommendations. In the course of deliberation, the President shall have access to all materials used in the evaluation. The President shall make a final determination within 2 weeks after she/he receives recommendations from all of the following: the department chair (or the departmental panel chair), the appropriate Dean, the Post-Tenure Review Committee, and the Provost. All such recommendations shall be submitted to the President no later than March 1 of each year. In addition to these recommendations, the President shall also have access to, and may consider, other materials used by any or all of the foregoing

5 Deadlines for earlier stages of the review process are prior to March 1 and are announced by Academic Affairs each year.
during the course of their respective evaluations. Once a final decision is made by the President, and within the 2 weeks after the last recommendation is received by her/him, the President shall inform the candidate, the Provost, the Dean, and the department chair (or departmental panel chair), in writing, of her/his decision.

The Senate vote, passing the amendment.

**Third proposed amendment to the FAM:** motion to change VI.H.2, Post-tenure Review, Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member’s Packet. This motion seeks to change the number of letters required for those seeking a satisfactory rating in their post-tenure review. The full text of the proposed amendment follows below:

**Action:** Change to *Faculty/Administration Manual*, VI.H.2, Post-tenure Review, Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member’s Packet.

**Status:** To be presented to Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009. Committee will request that Faculty Senate consider this motion at one of their two April meetings.

**Intent:**
- To remove the requirement of two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers for candidates seeking a “satisfactory” rating
- To still require two letters from candidates seeking a “superior” rating

**Motion:**

VI, Sect. H, Post-tenure Review

2. Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member’s Packet

a. A Faculty Member Will Submit to Her/His Department Chair a Packet of Material that Must Include:

1. A letter from the candidate indicating the rating for which he/she wishes to be considered.
2. Curriculum vitae.
3. Statement from the candidate on teaching, research and service addressing accomplishments since the last review and future plans and goals.
4. Computer-generated student teaching evaluations (summary pages with numbers) for all evaluated courses taught by the candidate during the period under review.
5. Annual performance evaluations by the department chair during the period under review. In the event that a department chair is being evaluated, the dean's annual evaluations of the chair will be included instead.
6. Two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers, concerning aspects of the candidate's teaching (or, for librarians, professional competency).
7. Candidates seeking a "superior" rating must also furnish clear evidence of exemplary teaching effectiveness (exemplary professional competency in the case
of librarians), leadership in service, and continuing quality scholarship. This evidence must include two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers, concerning aspects of the candidate’s teaching (or, for librarians, professional competency). Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore, the evidence must also include at least two scholarly articles and/or books (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). Candidates must provide evidence that the scholarly material submitted is peer reviewed, juried or professionally evaluated. Evidence is to be compiled for the intervening period between promotion evaluation and/or post-tenure reviews. A late packet will not be considered for a superior rating except in extraordinary circumstances. A letter must accompany the packet to explain these circumstances.

The Senate voted, passing the amendment.

Fourth proposed amendment: motion to change FAM, X.A.2, the section concerning benefits when on unpaid leave. Ms. Caveny said that this motion constitutes a human resources issue and probably should be handled by the Human Resources Office. It is an example of how for some changes in the FAM we only need to be informed about them and shouldn’t have to vote on them. The full text of the motion follows below:

Action: Change to Faculty/Administration Manual, X.A.2, Leave of Absence.

Status: To be presented to Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009. Committee will be requesting that Faculty Senate consider this motion at one of the April meetings.

Intent:

- To remove a false suggestion that a faculty member can avoid paying for benefits while on leave without pay

Motion:

FAM X.A.2. Leave of Absence:

Any member of the tenured or untenured faculty may apply to the Provost for a leave of absence without pay for a period of up to two years. Such leaves commonly are granted to complete the doctoral dissertation, to enable a professor to return to graduate school, to accept a post-doctorate fellowship, to pursue research or to participate in a faculty exchange or internship program. When granted to an untenured faculty member, a scholarly leave of absence of one year or less will count as part of the probationary period as though it were prior service at another institution, unless the individual and the institution agree in writing to an exception to this provision at the time the leave is granted.
Normally a leave without pay will not be for longer than two years. Any agreement to the contrary will be fully outlined in the leave of absence document given to the faculty member.

A faculty member on leave may petition the Provost for an extension of his or her leave period. Such a request should be made at least three months before the date of termination of the authorized leave. The Provost will consult with the Dean and Department Chair, and after consideration, rule on the extension.

In the case of a leave of absence without pay, faculty members must pick up funded portions of any health and/or life insurance plans plus the payroll deduction amount if they desire to continue this coverage. However, participants do have the option to terminate all coverage until such time as they return to an active pay status. Faculty members considering a request for leave without pay should consult with Human Resources regarding benefits.

The President of the College has the sole discretion to accept or reject the Provost’s recommendation concerning the faculty member’s request for a leave of absence.

The Senate voted, passing the amendment.

Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review

The Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review (T & P Committee) had three motions to bring before the Senate: the first two involved changes to the FAM, and the third was a recommendation to relieve the workload of the T & P Committee.

First T & P Motion: change FAM, VI.A by amending language governing “Exemplary area.” As Richard Nunan, chair of the committee, noted, this motion concerns the use of the word “exemplary” when judging faculty in the tenure, promotion, and third-year review processes. He explained that now the FAM requires “exemplary” levels of performance in at least one area—teaching, research, or service—and “high professional competence” in all. Such a standard is not realistic, he said; and faculty have never seen it as realistic. We pretend that someone who is strong or good in an area is “exemplary.” A more realistic approach that merits institutional support is to reward with tenure and promotion those faculty who present a solid, well-balanced record and do good work in all areas. Mr. Nunan also noted that junior faculty are not generally expected to develop strong service records and their chairs, while encouraging them to engage in service activities, advise them not to become heavily burdened with service work. The motion, he said, would modify the FAM to better reflect this reality. The full text of the motion is as follows:

Page numbers refer to pagination in the current on-line pdf copy of the FAM.

Motion 1: Recommendation to Amend Language Governing ‘Exemplary area’
Modify VI.A (p. 93), second paragraph of Preamble to section on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-year Review, to read as follows:

"Tenure and promotion require substantial evidence of consistently high professional competence in teaching, research and professional development, and service. In addition, evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the three specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development is required."

[The last sentence of above paragraph currently reads: “In addition, evidence of exemplary performance is required in at least one of the specified professional competency areas.”]

Similarly, VI.A.4.a (p. 102), last sentence in first paragraph of section enumerating specific criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should read:

“Evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development is required."

[That sentence currently reads: “Evidence of exemplary performance is required in at least one of the specified professional competency areas.”]

VI.A.4.b (p. 103), second sentence of paragraph enumerating specific criteria for tenuring candidates who were hired at the rank of Associate Professor should read:

Evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the three specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development is required."

[That sentence is currently identical to the language just quoted for section 4.a]

VI.A.4.c (p. 103), last sentence of first paragraph enumerating specific criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor should read:

“Evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in all three areas is required.”

[That sentence is currently identical to the language just quoted for section 4.a]

Meg Cormack (at-large), speaking in support of the motion, said the changes were excellent and thanked the T & P Committee for proposing them. Bob Perkins (Teacher Education) asked if service could count as area of “exemplary” work. Mr. Nunan replied that it could. In response, Norris Preyer (Physics) noted that Mr. Nunan’s remarks indicated that service was being excluded as a category that one could count as “exemplary.” Mr. Nunan responded that
service was not being excluded, but that it was unlikely that junior faculty would count service as their “exemplary” area. Debra Socha McGee (Communication) observed that a faculty member who came here from another institution without tenure might be heavily involved in service and chose service as an area of “exemplary” work.

At this point, Steve Jaumé called for a quorum. A count of the remaining Senators was conducted by the Speaker, who found that there were just enough for a quorum. Mr. Nunan urged the Senate to deal with the T & P issues now, pointing out that to stop now might mean it would be another year before these proposed changes to the FAM could be made. Ms. Caveny noted that any Senate votes on the section of the FAM dealing with T & P are advisory only.

Debate on the motion resumed. Jason Coy (at-large) spoke against it. He thought the tenor was somewhat disturbing, as it seemed to lower standards, which he thought was unwise, particularly at a time when (as Mr. Wilder indicated in his report) we are paying new faculty at the assistant professor level more than ever. Ms. Cormack supported the motion, saying that on the issue of service she had always viewed it as something faculty focused on post-tenure, after proving that they belonged by doing quality work in teaching and research. Julia Eichelberger (at-large) said that she supported the motion, though she found the language or key terms of the motion—“exemplary,” “significant achievement,” and “high professional competence”—a little unclear. To help clarify things, she noted that the term “high professional competence” seemed to mark an important threshold of good work and translated into a grade of “B.” The term “significant achievement” seemed to indicate a slightly higher notch in quality, something like a “B+”; and “exemplary” suggested an “A,” an extraordinary level of achievement that really distinguishes one. So the proposal, Ms. Eichelberger continued, says that for tenure and promotion faculty need to meet a standard in teaching and research that is actually quite high.

Sarah Owen (at-large) said that she also found the terms a little confusing, but was especially concerned about the idea that service could be counted as “exemplary” for tenure. “Is that true,” she asked? That is true, replied Mr. Nunan, so long as the threshold of “high professional competence” is met in all three areas. Mr. Krasnoff was worried about the phrase “significant achievement,” pointing out that this constituted a new category—one that is supposed to have real meaning as opposed to the category of “exemplary,” which, according to Mr. Nunan, has become a kind of phony category. He wondered if Mr. Nunan was concerned about the meaning of this new category. Tim Carens (English) also asked for more comment on the distinction between “high professional competence” and “significant achievement.” Mr. Nunan replied that a new category was needed because the phrase “exemplary” did not accurately apply to quality work done by faculty, which should be validated and supported by the institution. He acknowledged that it is not really possible to quantify these categories. We simply do the best we can to interpret them and draw distinctions among them. John Huddlestun (Religious Studies), speaking in support of the motion, echoed Mr. Nunan’s comment, saying that we design the categories and do our best to figure what they mean and how they work. He emphasized that the key idea behind the motion—that if you are strong in the three areas (teaching, research, and service) you deserve tenure and promotion—is sound.
Mr. Jaumé asked at what level the evaluation applies—departmental, the level of the T & P Committee, the level of the deans? Mr. Nunan responded that the evaluation and the new language apply at every level, starting with the department. At each level, one reads the language in the FAM and tries to exercise one’s best judgment as to how to apply it.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) spoke in support of the motion, saying the proposed changes were great. We waste time, he continued, debating what is “exemplary.” He liked the idea of talking about significant achievements of tenure and promotion candidates, especially at the departmental level and in the formal evaluation letter.

The Senate voted, passing the motion.

Second T & P Motion: Change FAM VI.A.4.c(1) by eliminating “Exemplary Teaching Effectiveness” Standard for Promotion to Professor. The full text of the motion follows below:

**Motion 2: Recommendation to Eliminate ‘Exemplary Teaching Effectiveness’ Standard for Promotion to Professor**

VI.A.4.c(1) on p. 103, characterizing criterion for promotion to the rank of Professor in the area of teaching should read:

(1) Promotion to the rank of Professor requires sustained high quality and effective teaching.

[That sentence currently reads:
(1) Promotion to the rank of Professor requires exemplary teaching effectiveness.]

[The proposed change would replace the exemplary teaching effectiveness standard with language signaling an expectation of continuing development as a teacher since meeting the standard for tenure (sustained effectiveness in teaching) VI.A.4.a(1), p. 102.]

Mr. Nunan explained that the motion does two things. First, it clears up a confusion in the language of the FAM: on the one hand, the FAM currently says that promotion to professor requires “exemplary performance” in one of three areas (teaching, research, or service); on the other, it requires “exemplary teaching effectiveness,” which inadvertently implies that the “exemplary performance” must be in the area of teaching. The motion removes this confusion. Second, the motion also states in plainer language what the standard for teaching is. Now, Mr. Nunan explained, no one knows what “exemplary teaching effectiveness” means. The proposed language makes plain that the for promotion to professor, a faculty member must be a strong teacher.

The Senate voted, passing the motion.
Third T & P motion: workload relief for those serving on the T & P Committee. Mr. Nunan explained that the T & P Committee would like the Senate to endorse this recommendation, which would grant those serving on the T & P Committee a one-course workload reduction for spring semester. The work-relief proposal is justified given how onerous, stressful, and time-consuming the task of serving on the committee is. The proposal, Mr. Nunan added, has been brought up with the Academic Affairs Office in the past. The full text of the motion is as follows:

**Motion 3: Recommendation for workload relief for all regular members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review**

Whenever the total number of tenure, promotion, and renewal cases before the President’s Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review exceeds 25 in a single academic year, the five regular members of the Committee should be granted extra workload relief in the form of a teaching reduction of one course section for the spring semester of that year.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked how often the twenty-five-case threshold is reached. Mr. Nunan answered that it had been reached each time in the last three years when he has been on the committee. Mr. Perkins said that he endorsed the proposal, as would anyone who has served on the committee. There is “an amazing amount of work” required of this committee.

Norris Preyer (Physics and Astronomy) took a different view, saying that the T & P Committee brings such work burdens upon itself because it does very comprehensive reviews, which are not required by the FAM. “What would you have us do,” asked Mr. Nunan? The FAM, Mr. Preyer observed, does not require that the T & P Committee do an independent evaluation. Mr. Nunan disagreed with that interpretation of the FAM, adding that the T & P Committee has conducted independent evaluations for years.

Mr. Krasnoff spoke in support of the proposal, but added that the Senate should think about whether it might be a better idea to have such detailed, independent reviews done at the school level. A shorter, procedural review could then be done at the college level. Rob Dillon (Biology) emphasized Mr. Preyer’s point, which he thought was excellent. The T & P Committee’s job, he continued, is to ensure that the proper procedure for reviews has been followed at the departmental level. That task can be done quickly, in about half a day. He thought there was no need for the proposal.

David Gentry (at-large) asked about how alternates on the T & P Committee are currently used. Mr. Nunan said that in recent years, typically only a single alternate has been used when regular members have to be replaced. There is a big advantage both with respect to familiarity with the process and consistency of judgment to having an alternate review several cases rather than just one. The alternate is chosen by lottery from among those actually available, given their teaching schedules.

The Senate passed the proposal on a voice vote.
Mr. Dillon asked for a division of the house. Speaker Kelly asked those who voted for the proposal to raise their hands, counted their hands, and repeated the process for those who voted against the proposal. The vote was 24 (in favor) to 11 (opposed). A Senator then asked if the sum of the votes constitutes a quorum. Speaker Kelly said no, and George Pothering (Parliamentarian) explained that they don’t because some voters may abstain in the vote.

Reports

Richard Nunan, chair of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review

Mr. Nunan said that he wished to summarize his committee’s report, but encouraged Senators to read the whole thing, which deals with issues that need to be addressed next year. (The report is available on the Faculty Senate Web site.)

The first item of the report concerned a slight difference in the FAM about research expectations between those seeking tenure and those seeking promotion to Professor. The difference centers on the use of the word “typically” when referencing the need for scholarly publications for tenure, a qualifier that, as Mr. Nunan pointed out, is absent from the corresponding standard for promotion to Professor. If publications are required at both levels, Mr. Nunan contended that this word should be excised from the tenure standard.

The second item concerned standards in the area of service that are slightly different for those seeking tenure from those seeking promotion to Professor. One difference is in the phrase “in a leadership capacity,” which is found in the standards for promotion to Professor, but not in the standards for tenure. There is a question as to how seriously the standard of “leadership capacity” is taken, what precisely the phrase means, and whether it is (or can be) uniformly applied across the College. Another issue centers on the phrase “service . . . where appropriate, to the community.” Mr. Nunan said that there is ambiguity in how to interpret this aspect of the service standard and how it applies to various disciplines across the College.

The third item concerned the standards for tenure and promotion of librarians, the one group for whom no scholarly publishing is required for tenure. However, for promotion to Librarian III and then to Librarian IV, the FAM does seem to indicate some publication requirement (although even that is not entirely clear). But the phrase “clear evidence of continued professional development and growth” becomes difficult to assess at the level of the tenure evaluation, if no substantive publication record is required. Mr. Nunan said that he was not at the meeting to criticize librarians, but to point out that it is somewhat illogical to require no publications for librarians to receive tenure, only to later suggest such a requirement for promotion at higher levels (Librarian III and IV).

Also related to item three is the fact that the language governing the professional growth and development standards for librarians is slightly different than that governing the professional growth and development standards for other faculty. For example, the word “high” is absent from the phrase “promise for continued professional growth and development” in the standard
for tenure for librarians, as is the phrase “All evidence should be evaluated rigorously.”
Another related issue is that the Dean of the Libraries is given a special status, which other deans don’t have, in the process of evaluating faculty. These are two issues, Mr. Nunan concluded, that need to be discussed.

Mr. Preyer asked if the phrase “focused research,” used in his own department, is in the document. Mr. Nunan replied that the FAM contained no specific constraints on the precise nature of the academic research required for a successful evaluation, and that, so far as he knew, use of the phrase was unique to Mr. Preyer’s department.

Laquita Blockson (Management and Entrepreneurship) asked if the committee’s recommendations would go into effect in the fall 2010 semester, were they to be adopted next term. Mr. Nunan thought that fall 2010 would probably be when they would go into effect. Following up, Ms. Blockson asked how the changes (should they be approved) would affect those faculty going up for tenure and promotion. Would they be grandfathered in? Mr. Nunan answered that the grandfathering approach was unlikely, since the revised standards would actually broaden, rather than narrow the range of thresholds available for justifying tenure and promotions.

With the report concluded and the Senate’s business completed, there was a motion to adjourn, which was instantly seconded and approved. The Senate adjourned at around 6:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Appendix 1

Language on Annual/Merit Evaluation to Go in the FAM

E. Procedures for Annual and Merit Evaluation of Regular Instructional and Library Faculty

1. Introduction

In keeping with S.C. state law, all faculty members at the College of Charleston will be evaluated annually in accordance with the College’s established standards and criteria and with established procedures.

Department Chairs and the Dean of Libraries are responsible for the annual performance evaluation of each faculty member within their departments. In the exceptional case that a faculty member is housed in a program and not in a department, the Program Director will assume the role of Department Chair in the evaluation process.

Annual evaluations shall serve two functions: (1) to guide the professional development of the faculty member, and (2) to record part of the evidence upon which personnel decisions and salary recommendations shall be based. Accordingly,

- each regular faculty member of the College of Charleston will be evaluated annually on the basis of performance over the last calendar year at the College.

In addition,

- each faculty member with at least one full calendar year of service at the College will be assigned a merit category on the basis of performance over the last three calendar years (or the time since hire if this is less than three years) as one factor to be considered in the determination of any salary increase.

Newly hired faculty members will not be assigned a merit category. Instead, normally each will receive an “average” raise determined by the relevant dean and based on the percentage of the salary pool allocated to the faculty member’s school for raises.

Each annual performance evaluation should include strengths, weaknesses, and specific recommendations for improvement. Probationary faculty should be rigorously evaluated each year in preparation for third-year and tenure reviews. In the case of a tenured faculty member or a Senior Instructor, the assessment may be less
detailed. A faculty member, Chair, Dean or Provost can request that a more extensive evaluation be conducted in any given year. A faculty member may make a request for a more detailed evaluation at any time. A Chair, Dean or Provost should make a request by October 1 of the calendar year for which performance is to be evaluated in order to provide time for a faculty member to assemble required materials.

The form of the performance evaluation may vary by school and department, as well as by the rank of the faculty member being evaluated. At a minimum, the Chair or Dean of Libraries will provide an appraisal letter addressing teaching effectiveness, research and professional development, and professional service (for teaching faculty) and professional competency, professional growth and development, and professional service (for library faculty). Notification to the faculty member of the merit category assigned, which may take place separately from the discussion of the annual evaluation, should include a brief justification of the category assigned. Departments and schools may develop additional rating instruments.

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to ensure that he/she is making progress toward meeting the criteria published in the Faculty/Administration Manual for other evaluations (tenure and promotion) as well as any additional criteria approved by the school and/or department, and to seek the advice of the Chair or Dean of Libraries and other department faculty toward that end.

A tenure and/or promotion review requires additional evidence beyond that required for an annual review of performance or assignment of merit category, as well as assessment over a different time frame. For instance, a department may conduct a peer review of teaching or an external review of research, and graduate surveys are solicited, at the time of tenure and promotion decisions.

Annual performance and merit reviews constitute only one of many factors that are considered during the tenure and/or promotion decision-making process and in no way conclusively determine that outcome. Because tenure and promotion decisions often involve an assessment of career achievement and potential, as well as a demonstrated ongoing commitment to scholarship and to the mission of the institution, annual performance reviews and the assignment of merit categories to a faculty member for purposes of salary administration for one or several years are insufficient, by themselves, to determine the outcome of such important decisions.

2. Standards, Criteria and Evidence for Annual Evaluation
Schools and departments will develop specific policies, criteria and standards for annual evaluation and the assignment of merit categories in their units. Criteria should be clearly stated and available to all members of the department. They may vary in detail but they must be consistent with general College policies. (See Faculty/Administration Manual, Sections A, B and C.) In particular, teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty at the College of Charleston.

The Faculty Welfare Committee and an ad Hoc committee of past members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review will provide comments on departmental and school evaluation instruments upon their initial development. Approval of these plans by the appropriate Academic Dean and by the Provost is required before implementation. After initial adoption, any significant changes must be sent to the Faculty Welfare Committee for review/recommendations and to the Provost for approval before implementation. All approved school and department annual evaluation and merit review policies will be available to all College faculty members.

3. Annual Evaluation and Merit Review Process

Annual evaluations will normally be completed early in each calendar year. A calendar for the evaluation process will be posted on the website of the Office of Academic Affairs.

While specific policies may differ by school and department, all annual evaluations should provide sufficient information to allow for full, fair and constructive evaluation without being unnecessarily burdensome to faculty or Department Chairs. At a minimum, faculty members will provide

- a current *curriculum vitae*, and
- a 1-2 page personal statement presenting accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research and professional development, and service (or, in the case of librarians, professional competence, professional growth and development, and service) over the last calendar year.

Schools and/or departments may require faculty to submit additional material, and required documentation may vary by tenure status and rank. Evidence of the sort typically provided for major evaluations should be requested of probationary faculty; schools may require less extensive documentation for tenured faculty and Senior Instructors. Schools and departments may require that the personal statement
include goals for the next one-to-three years. The Department Chair or Dean of Libraries will conduct the annual evaluation and will have access to additional information, including the faculty member’s

- previous annual evaluations and personal statements,
- course evaluations, and
- information included in the Faculty Activity System.

To facilitate Chairs’ work in assigning merit categories, concurrent with the submission of materials for the annual evaluation of performance, any faculty member with at least one full calendar year of service at the College of Charleston will submit

- a 1-2 page personal statement presenting accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research and professional development, and service (or, in the case of librarians, professional competence, professional growth and development, and service) over the last three calendar years, if employed by the College during that period of time, or, for a faculty member with fewer than three years of service at the College of Charleston, over the period since hire.

The Department Chair or Dean of Libraries will assign a merit category on the basis of this three-year summary and the annual evaluations over the same three calendar years. In the case of the Department Chair, this assignment will normally be tentative until discussed with the Dean. Newly hired faculty members need not submit any additional materials.

In the case of a faculty member undergoing a major evaluation (Third-Year Review, tenure and/or promotion, post-tenure review, or renewal as Senior Instructor), an evaluation of performance over the last calendar year will not be conducted. A merit category for the purposes of salary administration will be assigned. Normally, the documentation provided by the faculty member in the major evaluation will be sufficient to allow the Chair to assign a merit category. (Since major evaluation packets are completed early in the fall semester, documentation of activities through the end of the calendar year could reasonably be added for this assignment.) This assignment of a merit category will consider the faculty member’s performance during the same three-year window used for other faculty.

The Department Chair may consult with a faculty committee in conducting the annual evaluation or assigning a merit category.

The faculty member must present the requested documents in accordance with the established format for his/her department or school.
and the published schedule. Any faculty member who fails to submit the required documentation for his/her annual evaluation and assignment of merit category will receive a merit rating of “does not meet the merit threshold” and will be ineligible for a salary increase that year.

In the case of library faculty who are supervised by department heads and/or assistant Deans, these supervisors will provide written comments on the performance of the librarians. These comments are forwarded to the Dean of Libraries who uses them as he/she writes the final evaluation narrative. The librarian receives the comments from all supervisors in addition to the Dean’s final evaluation.

After reviewing materials submitted by the faculty member, the Department Chair or the Dean of Libraries shall provide the faculty member with a signed and dated evaluation.

4. Chair’s Interview with the Faculty Member

By the date designated on the evaluation calendar, the Chair or Dean of Libraries shall conduct an interview with each member of his/her department. At least one week prior to the interview, the faculty member will receive the Chair’s or Dean of Libraries’ narrative assessment of strengths and weaknesses and suggestions for improvement. Records of the evaluation will be on file in the office of the Department Chair.

At the evaluation interview, the faculty member and the Chair or Dean of Libraries will discuss the evaluation narrative. The faculty member will sign the form to indicate that he or she has met with the Chair or Dean of Libraries. If there is disagreement about any part of the evaluation, the Chair or Dean of Libraries and the faculty member shall seek to resolve those differences. If a resolution is reached, the Chair shall change the evaluation document accordingly if appropriate.

5. Appeal of Annual Evaluation

A faculty member may appeal his/her annual evaluation to the appropriate Academic Dean by submitting a written request for an appeal hearing to the Dean within 10 working days of the evaluation interview. The Dean will arrange and chair a meeting with the faculty member and the Department Chair to discuss the appeal. At the appeal hearing, the faculty member should state specifically the basis for the appeal and provide appropriate information in support of the appeal. The Dean will attempt to mediate an agreement between the faculty member and the Chair. If unsuccessful, the Dean will reach a decision
and inform all parties in writing. The faculty member may appeal the Dean’s decision to the Provost who will receive all written material pertaining to the case. After consultation with the faculty member, the Department Chair and the Dean, the Provost will render the final decision in writing to all parties concerned.

Library faculty should follow the steps outlined above. Their appeals should, however, go directly to the Provost, who will render the final decision.

6. Dean’s and Provost’s Role in the Assignment of Merit Categories

The Dean plays an active role in the development of departmental and school criteria and standards for annual evaluation and the assignment of merit categories. The Dean is responsible for ensuring that these standards and criteria are applied by chairs equitably across departments in his or her school. The Provost is responsible for ensuring that these standards and criteria are applied by Deans across schools. Normally a Dean and Chair will discuss the assignment of merit categories before a faculty member is notified of such. Notification to the faculty member of the assignment of a merit category may occur separately from the annual evaluation.

7. Appeal of Merit Category Assigned

A faculty member may appeal the assignment of a merit category to his or her performance by following the procedure outlined in Section 5, Appeal of Annual Evaluation, above. Chair, Dean and provost will proceed as in Section 5. However, the Provost’s role in this appeal is limited to ensuring, through discussion with the Dean and/or Chair, that the assignment of the merit category is consistent with criteria and standards at the Department, School and College level and with the assignment of merit categories to others in the Department or School, as appropriate.

F. Merit categories and Salary Increases

Eligibility for any salary increase will be based on merit. The assignment of a merit category will indicate whether the faculty member is eligible for any salary increase. Eligibility for any salary increase requires satisfying the merit threshold. The merit threshold is defined as demonstrating professional competence in all three evaluation areas (teaching, research and professional development, service) according to criteria and standards articulated by schools and departments. Criteria and standards may vary by school, department, tenure status and rank.
The description of additional merit categories will be available on the Academic Affairs website during 2008-09 and included in the Faculty/Administration Manual thereafter.

In addition to merit ratings, market factors may contribute to a salary increase. Market factors will contribute to any salary increase only when the faculty member has met the merit threshold. Market factors may include:

- Data collected in comparative salary studies;
- Internal (College, school, departmental) equity, including gender equity, salary compression and/or inversion.

The respective roles of merit and market factors in salary reviews may vary each year and by school and department and should be communicated annually to faculty as appropriate.
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 7 April 2009

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 7 April 2009, at 5:00 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium. After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, the minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on 10 March 2009 were approved.

In tribute to Bill Moore, Professor of Political Science who had recently passed away, Claire Curtis (Political Science) read the following statement:

In his 37-year career at the College, Dr. Moore was, first and foremost, a truly devoted teacher and mentor. He held many different titles and undertook many responsibilities over the span of his career but he always identified himself as a teacher. His courses were invariably the first to reach capacity; one of the most persistent tasks for the chair of the department was explaining to students that there simply were no more seats available in Dr. Moore’s class. He always had an extremely large number of advisees and took on special responsibilities for student athletes, always mindful of the special challenges posed by pursuing both athletic and academic achievement.

A caring father and family man, Bill balanced the life of a teacher with an impressive scholarly output, a passionate commitment to College of Charleston athletics, and a willingness to share his expertise with both print and television journalists in Charleston and across the country. He was as much the voice of the Political Science Department as he was the voice of Cougar basketball.

Bill earned his B.A. and Masters degree from Southern Illinois University and his PhD from Tulane. He was a well-known expert on South Carolina politics, Southern politics, and political extremism. He was the author of Political Extremism in the United States and co-author of South Carolina Politics and Government as well as numerous scholarly articles, encyclopedia entries and publications on Southern and extremist politics, civil rights, electoral politics, campaign spending, and intergovernmental relations. He served as chair of the Department of Political Science, director of the Master of Public Administration program, Speaker of the Faculty, director of Maymester and Summer Programs, director of the Taft Institute for high school civics teachers, NCAA faculty representative, and Vice President and President of the Southern Conference. In 1997, Bill was designated as the SC Governor’s Professor of the Year. He has also been awarded the Distinguished Teaching Award at the College (1981) as well as the Distinguished Service Award (2000), the Distinguished Advising Award (2001), and the first ever Distinguished Teacher-Scholar Award (2001). Bill also served on the Board of Advisors at the Charleston School of Law.

He will be greatly missed by students, student-athletes, alumni, faculty, staff, and area journalists.

Reports
**The Provost**

Provost Elise Jorgens reported that Associate Provost Bev Diamond has been working on the revision of the modified duties policy, and that the executive team would look at it soon. She was hopeful that it would be approved.

Provost Jorgens said that everyone is waiting for the latest version of the budget, but that first we must wait to see what the governor plans to do. There is also the possibility that there will be another cut in state funding, which would likely happen in early July.

As she is retiring, the Provost said that this would be her last meeting with the Senate. It has been an eventful six years, she mused, during which time there have been many changes. She has brought about some of these changes, and she has been pushed by others to bring about changes. She thanked the Senate for its work over the past six years.

**The Speaker**

Speaker Kelly reminded the Senate that the presentation of faculty awards would no longer take place in the spring faculty meeting, and that it would have its own event, which would be held on April 21. Speaker Kelly said that he would wait till after next week’s Board of Trustees meeting to present his full report, which would appear in the next newsletter.

He said, too, that given the heavy agenda, the order of some items have been changed to make sure that time-sensitive issues are addressed in this meeting, rather than in the continuation meeting scheduled for April 21. He announced that Richard Nunan’s report on behalf of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review has been moved to the end of the agenda.

The Speaker then asked if there were additional nominations to the Faculty Committee slates. Darryl Phillips (at-large) said that he had nominated Noelle Carmichael for the Nominations and Elections Committee.

**Larry Krasnoff, chair of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance**

Mr. Krasnoff said that his committee was still revising its final report on faculty governance, which would include recommended changes. The revisions, he explained, are based on comments made by Senators at the last Senate meeting. He added that the committee was taking seriously the idea of guaranteeing some degree of departmental representation—a concern that was raised in the March meeting.

**Laura Penny, chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee**

Ms. Penny reported that her committee was concerned about whether certain pedagogical articles count as “research” in tenure and promotion decisions. Referring to a handout, she noted that in a presentation at the Academic Forum, the Advisory Committee on Tenure,
Promotion, and Third-Year Review (T & P) had stated that for Senior Instructors “pedagogical practitioner” articles are not considered to be research articles, though they are seen as “evidence of scholarship.” She said that the FAM (see IV.A.2.b.4.) was not entirely clear about this for Senior Instructors (see in particular items j and k in this section of FAM). This lack of clarity raises “the larger issue of the suitability of pedagogical articles as evidence toward tenure and promotion at the professorial ranks.” Ms. Penny reported that her committee would like the Senate (and faculty in general) to look into this matter and specifically to address the questions of what constitutes pedagogical research: are peer-reviewed pedagogical practitioner articles and applied pedagogy articles considered to be “research in pedagogy,” which, as the FAM states (see IV.A.2.a), counts as evidence of research and professional development? Or are such articles not in the category of “research in pedagogy”? Her committee would also like the faculty to investigate whether the term “research in pedagogy” is interpreted in markedly different ways in different disciplines. She said that her committee has also met with the T & P Committee about the matter, and that in the field of physics, colleagues generally regard pedagogical articles published in peer-refereed journals as being in the category of research. But until some of these questions are clarified, her committee recommends that candidates coming up for tenure and promotion be notified that peer-reviewed pedagogical practitioner articles may not count as evidence of research.

New Business

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

Tom Kunkle, chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections (N & E), asked the Senate to approve the slates of nominated committee members. He urged the Senate not to vote down the slates, as it would negate a lot of effort by N & E committee and require a lot more effort to create new ones.

Laquita Blockson (Management and Entrepreneurship) said she was a first-year Senator and requested some explanation of the election process. Speaker Kelly replied that the Senate is voting to approve members of next year’s Budget Committee, Academic Planning Committee, and By-Laws Committee, which are elected by the Senate, and which report to the Senate. He added that N & E nominated people to those committees, that there was a period open for additional nominations, that currently there are the exact number of candidates for the committee seats, and that if there were more candidates, the Senate would elect individuals to serve on each committee, rather than approve (or not approve) slates of candidates for the committees.

The Senate voted and approved the following slates presented for each Senate committee (note: * = incumbent; *c = incumbent chair):

- **Academic Planning Committee**
  7 (at least 4 senators)

  Avendano Nadia HISP Asst Prof Senator
  Cherry Lynn Communication Assoc Prof Senator
The following proposals were approved without discussion:

Proposals for a New Graduate Course in MAT in Middle Grades:
- EDMG 698: Transition to the Profession
- EDMG 699: Middle Grades Clinical Internship

Proposal for a New Graduate Certificate in MS in Computer Science and Information Science:
- Service-Oriented Computing (Certificate Program Proposal)

This packet also includes Proposals for a New Graduate Course:
- CSIS 633: Semantic Web Principles
- CSIS 659: Service-Oriented Computing;

and a Proposal to Change a Graduate Course:

- CSIS 636: Name change, from -- Information Technology Policy and Strategy to -- Information Technology Policy, Strategy and Governance
Faculty Curriculum Committee

Bob Perkins, chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, introduced the following proposals:

International Studies

New Major—International Studies
New Course—INTL 100
New Course—INTL 300
New Course—INTL 495

One Senator asked if the International Studies (IS) minor was being changed, given the creation of an IS major. Mr. Perkins responded that currently there was no such plan.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) wondered why INTL 300 was just a one-credit course. Why not make it a three-credit course? David Cohen (guest and Dean of the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs) responded that the plan was to start INTL 300 as a one-credit course, to see how it went, and to change it to a three-credit course if such a change was deemed useful.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) said that he had mixed feelings about the proposal. On the one hand, he thought that certain aspects of the proposal were good: for instance, the Africa and Asia concentrations were good, and the Comparative Literature concentration was okay. On the other, he thought other elements were problematic. In particular, he thought the European Studies concentration was too broad. He tried out various courses combinations that one could take to satisfy the concentration’s requirements, and found no sufficient focus to link the courses. It struck him as a kind of shopping list of courses that was too broad for a major. Such breadth was perhaps acceptable for a minor, but not for a major. Further, he found that many of the twenty-one hours for the concentration could also count as Gen-Ed courses. The concentration struck him as a Gen-Ed curriculum, not a curriculum for a major. He urged that the Senate consider a model that offered more focus and coherence. Mr. Cohen responded that the European Studies capstone, the IS capstone, as well as the other required IS courses would provide the concentration with an appropriate degree of focus and coherence. In addition, the proposed major has a strong advising component. Advising, he stressed, is critical in helping students bring focus to their studies in the major.

Norris Preyer (Physics and Astronomy) asked if the new faculty member who will direct and teach in the major has been hired. Mr. Cohen said yes—the new person has been hired.

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) urged the Senate to think more about the coherence of the major and what gives it coherence. Is it a focus on an area that provides coherence? Perhaps a focus on a set of methodologies would provide coherence. He thought that the proposal was weak in this latter aspect and thought that the lack of an economics component was a problem. Most IS programs, he said, involve some study of economics, but this proposal has none. He was also concerned about the appropriateness of the Comparative Literature
concentration in the major. What will students in the Comparative Literature concentration have common with students in other concentrations? He thought the Senate should talk about these issues. He then moved to delete the European Studies concentration from the proposal, though he said that his mind was not made up on this issue. The motion received a second.

Richard Nunan (guest) observed that this version of the IS major seemed very different from the earlier version, but the same problems about its structure and coherence remained. He noted that book-ending a collection of courses with an introductory course and capstone course does not make the whole thing a major. Julia Eichelberger (at-large) thought it was not fair to characterize the proposal in that way and pointed out that students are required to take core courses and that those courses along with the introductory course, the INTL 300 course on methodology, and the capstone structure the major well and give it coherence. In addition, she thought it was unlikely that students would end up taking a wildly disparate collection of courses, and that a modicum of sound advising would handle that problem. There was a lot done in revising the proposal, Ms. Eichelberger noted, to provide students with a coherent pathway through the major, while allowing them a lot of choice and numerous opportunities for discovery. She noted, too, that there is much interest among students in the major, and that the demand for such a program is high.

Mr. Perkins pointed out that the earlier version of the proposal had five tracks within the European concentration, which made the whole proposal complicated. Those tracks were eliminated to simplify the proposal. He stressed, too, the importance of the advising component in the proposal to take care of the issue of coherence, which the system of tracks formerly took care of. Mr. Cohen echoed Mr. Perkins’ point about the unwieldiness of the system of tracks that had been in the proposal.

Mr. Phillips commented that other solutions could have been found. He said that what makes the African concentration strong is that it has a select number of courses, which are mainly not focused on individual countries. That is not the case with European Studies. Also, he thought there was too much weight put on the capstone course, that too much was expected of it in terms of taking care of the problems that have been pointed out. He had another question about the proposal: why was Classics dropped from the European Studies component? His department never discussed the issue. It seemed to happen by chance. He can only remember having a casual, impromptu conversation about it with Bill Olejniczak (chair of the History Department and director of the European Studies Program), and then Classics was no longer part of the concentration. Mr. Olejniczak said that Mr. Phillips’ suggested interpretation of events was interesting, but not accurate.

At this point, Rob Dillon (Biology) asked if those from Europe would care to offer their thoughts on this issue. Agnes Ayme-Southgate (Biology), who is from France, said that her son is in college and majoring in IS, and that his area focus was decided by his foreign language choice. The foreign language choices of IS students, she said, will provide some focus and coherence in terms of what IS students study and what their course selection is.
Mr. Krasnoff observed that while there are many courses that have something to do with Europe, many of them aren’t really about Europe. He wondered if there were enough courses in the concentration that truly focus on Europe.

Sarah Owen (at-large) spoke in favor of the proposal as it is, and urged the Senate not to support the proposed amendment. Allen Lyndrup (Theatre) also supported the proposal and pointed out that students who choose this major will have a larger perspective on life and will be very independent. We have to give such students leeway to choose courses suited to their goals. We also, he continued, need to give them credit for being able to fashion a program that will meet their needs. He also wished to give credit to the committee that put together the IS proposal for coming up with a major that provided such opportunities to students. Mr. Nunan responded that Mr. Lyndrup had provided an elegant defense for a build-your-own major—a General Studies sort of major. That’s fine, but the IS proposal is a “quasi-build-your-own major” without actually calling it that.

Mr. Olejniczak observed that were the Senate to approve Mr. Krasnoff’s motion, it would be creating an IS major that entirely eliminated Europe as a focus of study. An IS major that cut out Europe would be a very odd major, he observed. Mr. Phillips said that the Senate’s action today could be a beginning, not an end. We can come back, he said, and refine the major and add new tracks and include Europe later. He again wanted to know why Classics was dropped from the major.

The Senate defeated the motion to delete the European Concentration from the IS proposal.

The Senate resumed discussion of the original proposal. Mr. Phillips raised a question about the number of required credit hours, pointing out that it appears that 46 hours would be needed to complete the major, not 34-35 as stated in the proposal. Ms. Curtis also had a question about the study-abroad component of the proposal, asking if funds had been set aside for it. She was concerned too about students who can’t afford to go on a study-abroad program.

With regard to the study-abroad component, David Cohen recalled that the International Business major passed with such a requirement. A member of the Business School then spoke, confirming that such a requirement had indeed passed, that it had been approved on the assumption that funds would be available to support students, and that those funds have in fact been available. Mr. Cohen assured Senators that much has been done to secure funds so that students will be able to participate in the required study-abroad experience: for instance, he and his colleagues have gone to the Board of Trustees to make sure that there are adequate funds; and they have gone to the Freeman Foundations for needs-based funds. We have done well in this area, he stressed. Meg Cormack (at-large) asked if those study abroad funds were limited just to IS majors, and Mr. Cohen answered that they were not.

On a different topic, Mr. Krasnoff asked about the inclusion of the comparative literature concentration in the IS proposal. He prefaced his remarks by saying he was not arguing against comparative literature as such. He thought it was an important field of study, but saw it as an odd fit in the IS major where the other concentrations are all based on area studies. It
also seemed to him that it lacked an interdisciplinary methodology, unlike the other
concentrations. He therefore moved to delete the comparative literature concentration from
the IS proposal. His motion received a second.

Ms. Curtis asked how INTL 300 would fit with the comparative literature concentration.
Mary Beth Hester (guest) responded that in her view students who were motivated to pursue
study in this field would be interested in looking at literature from different perspectives and
would be open to other methodologies.

Jon Hakkila (guest) said that he was an undergraduate literature major, but despite his affinity
for the subject, he thought that comparative literature was not a good fit for the IS major.
Catharine Thomas (English) disagreed, arguing that there are serious world issues—such as
genocide—that can be investigated through the study of literature. Literature constitutes a
vehicle for the analysis of global problems.

The Senate voted, defeating the motion to delete the comparative literature concentration from
the IS major.

Deanna Caveny (at-large) said she was bothered by the lack of a required economics course in
the IS proposal, and wondered why there was none. Mr. Cohen said that the problem mainly
stemmed from the selection of existing courses and the staffing difficulties in the School of
Business where faculty are needed to teach macro- and micro-economics, which are required
for most majors in that school. Perhaps in the future, he said, a new economics course could
be developed for IS majors and the staffing issue resolved. Ms. Caveny followed up by
asking if the economics course would then be made a requirement for the IS major. Mr.
Cohen responded that there were different possibilities: the economics course could become a
requirement for all IS majors, or it could be required for certain concentrations.

Scott Peeples (English) wished to address the issue first brought up by Mr. Phillips earlier
regarding the number of credit hours required to complete the major. Mr. Cohen answered
that if one double-counts the foreign language courses and study abroad courses (as satisfying
both the requirements for the major and Gen-Ed requirements), then the number goes down.
Ms. Hester echoed Mr. Cohen’s point, saying that what seems like a lot of hours isn’t with the
double-counting.

Don Burkard (guest and Assoc. VP for Enrollment Planning) voiced his support for the
proposed IS major, remarking that there has been a lot of interest in the major and that it is in
keeping with the movement to internationalize the College that has occurred over the last
decade or so.

The Senate voted, approving the IS major and its new courses.

Mr. Perkins next introduced the following proposals:

English
Ms. Curtis made a motion to remove the C or better requirement for ENGL 110. The motion received a second. Susan Katwinkel (guest and director of the First Year Experience) said that she liked the motives behind the C grade requirement, but was concerned about its impact on the First Year Experience program (FYE), especially in terms of logistics.

The Senate voted and passed Ms. Curtis’ amendment.

Mr. Phillips asked why ENGL 110 was presented as four-credit course and what the logistical impact would be. He added that his department had wanted to propose a four-credit-hour course, but found that it wouldn’t work in terms of scheduling and logistics. Ms. Caveny said that there were also classroom-availability issues with four-credit-hour courses, particularly in light of the fact that the College operates at such high capacity in terms of classroom use. She added that the Math Department has also experienced difficulties in trying to schedule four-credit courses, and that in general there is a loss of efficiency in scheduling four-credit courses.

Brian McGee (guest) responded to these arguments by pointing out that the proposed ENGL 110 course entails the elimination of ENGL 101 and 102, which means that overall there is a reduction from six to four credit hours. By going from two required classes (ENGL 101 and 102) to one required class (ENGL 110), a lot of class space will be freed up. He said, too, that if we use the time after 2 P.M. for classes outside the typical three credit-hour range, then we wouldn’t have classroom time and use problems. Mr. Hakkila said that he was relieved to hear that classroom time will be freed up, but was still concerned about scheduling problems that four-hour-credit courses might create.

Norris Preyer (Physics and Astronomy) said that the ENGL 110 course proposal has tremendous budgetary implications and asked for more information on this aspect of the proposal. Trish Ward (at-large and English Dept. chair) said that this year there were 68 sections of ENGL 101 and 21 sections of ENGL 102 in the fall, and five sections of ENGL 101 and 64 sections of ENGL 102 in the spring, and that next year there would be close to 40 sections of ENGL 110 in the fall and about 40 in the spring. Further, the English Department’s use of adjuncts and expenses will be drastically reduced.

Mr. Phillips remarked that the sample syllabus indicates that the extra-hour is a conference hour. If that is what happens in the fourth hour, then he would have to take issue with the proposal. The course would give students an extra-credit hour just for meeting with faculty. That is problematic because many faculty in other courses have conferences with students, but their courses aren’t listed as four-credit-hour courses (For example, in some of his courses, students meet with him twice for one-hour conferences.) He thought that adding an extra-credit-hour that was not tied to classroom contact time with students set a dangerous precedent.
Chris Warnick (guest) said the extra-hour would not always be used in conferences with professors. Those students who were not meeting with the professor might be required to go to the Writing Lab, or go to a lecture and write about it, or do some other assignment. The fourth credit hour, he said, was earned.

Todd McNerney (at-large) asked how the ENGL 110 proposal would affect the Writers’ Group. Mr. Warnick answered that it would not affect the Writers’ Group, which is a voluntary program to help weak students with significant writing problems.

Next, Mr. Phillips moved to amend the ENGL 110 proposal by reducing the credit hours from four to three. The motion received a second. He said that he hears the explanations for what students will do in the extra-hour to earn the fourth credit hour, but all of that is already done in many other classes that are worth three credit hours. Traditionally, credit hours have been determined by hours students are in the classroom; so if we approve the ENGL 110 proposal change as a four-credit course, then we will be changing the principle by which credit hours are determined, and we need to go into this with our “eyes wide open.”

Seaton Brown (guest and SGA President) said that he liked the idea of the four-credit course and the idea of learning not only inside the classroom, but also outside the classroom in a different context with the professor. He thought, too, that the College should reconsider how it determines credit hours. Ms. Curtis argued that the issue was not just a matter of using the fourth hour for an extra assignment; rather, it’s about different kinds of instruction that can happen in the fourth hour.

Laquita Blockson (Management and Entrepreneurship) wanted to verify that approving the ENGL 110 proposal meant that the Gen-Ed literature requirement would be eliminated. She also asked how other schools would enhance their writing requirements. For example, her department has a one-hour business-writing course. Will the proposed four-credit course in English have any effect on that course?

Going back to the issue of using the fourth hour for student conferences, Mike Duvall (guest) said that students often make their biggest strides in writing in conference situations.

Mr. Hakkila wanted to know what would happen if the Senate passed the ENGL 110 proposal, but the course didn’t pass as a Gen-Ed proposal. Ms. Ward answered that the course would not be taught.

Jim Newhard (Classics) said that he had mixed feelings about the ENGL 110 proposal: on the hand he liked the goals of the course; on the other hand, he was concerned about the fourth hour, and about relationship between the course and the First Year Experience (FYE). He said he would like more thought put into that latter issue. On the fourth-hour question, he remarked that while it was good for students to go to the Writing Lab or to meet with their professor, such activities are what any good student would ordinarily do. The proposed course would therefore simply be rewarding students with an extra-credit hour for doing what they should do anyway. Ms. Kattwinkel remarked that she was at first concerned about the logistical impact of the four-hour course on the FYE, but she no longer feels that it will be a
problem and that the course will work well with the FYE, that it will reinforce the learning done in the FYE and help make good writing apply to all classes.

At this point a Senator called the question. The motion received a second and then passed.

The Senate voted down Mr. Phillips proposed amendment to reduce ENGL 110 from four to three credits.

Ms. Kattwinkel said that she was very concerned about starting ENGL 110 next year and that it would be difficult to coordinate it with the FYE. Ms. Eichelberger said that she appreciated Ms. Kattwinkel’s position on the matter, and that it would indeed be a big problem if the English Department were adding more requirements, but the department is not doing that. She thought that ENGL 110 could fit into the FYE as easily as ENGL 101 has.

Mr. Hakkila remarked that he was worried about costs of implementing the change to ENGL 110, especially in light of the budget cuts, more of which are likely to come. And Ms. Caveny asked for more information on adjunct use. Ms. Ward responded that the English Department would save about $200,000—much of that going to adjuncts. The department’s need for adjuncts would almost vanish.

Mr. Nunan observed that a move from the six-credit course sequence of ENGL 101 and 102 to the four-credit ENGL 110 course would require students to find another course to meet the 122 credits required for graduation. Provost Jorgens pointed out that it would be no problem for students to find another course, as numerous upper level courses are half empty. Mr. Krasnoff added that most students graduate with more than 122 credit hours.

At this point, Meg Cormack (at-large) called the question, which received a second. The Senate voted on the motion to call the question, which passed.

The Senate voted and approved ENGL 110 and ENGL 344.

The following proposals were approved without discussion, except for a comment by Mr. Perkins, who singled out the Women’s and Gender Studies new major proposal as being exemplary in its thoroughness and presentation. He said it was a model for those wishing to present proposals for new majors.

**Criminal Studies Minor**

- Change Minor—Crime, Law and Society Minor
- New Course—CRLS 310
- New Course—CRLS 311

**Physics**

- Change Minor—BS in physics
Change Major—Physics

Neuroscience (Biology /Psychology)
- Change Minor—Neuroscience (Add PHYS 296 to electives)
- Change Course—BIOL/PSYC 351 Neuroscience I
- Change Course—BIOL/PSYC 352 Neuroscience II
- Change Minor—Neuroscience (Add ANTH 342 as an elective)

Sociology and Anthropology
- Change Course—ANTH 491
- New Course—ANTH 109
- New Course—ANTH 290
- New Course—ANTH 306
- New Course—ANTH 307
- New Course—SOCY 290
- New Course—SOCY 492

Women’s and Gender Studies
- New Course—WGST 401
- New Major—Women’s and Gender Studies

Mr. Perkins next introduced the following proposals:

Honors
- Change Course—HONS 158 and lab
- Change Course—HONS 151 and lab
- Change Course—HONS 152 and lab
- Change Course—HONS 153 and lab
- Change Course—HONS 154 and lab
- Change Course—HONS 212
- Change Course—HONS 211
- Change Course—HONS 155 and lab
- Change Course—HONS 156 and lab
- Change Course—HONS 157 and lab
- New Course—HONS 110

Ms. Curtis moved that the requirement of a C or better for HONS 110 be deleted. Her motion received a second. A Senator then called the question, which was seconded. The Senate passed the motion to call the question.

The Senate voted on and approved Ms. Curtis’ proposed amendment to eliminate the requirement of a C or better for HONS 110.
The Senate next approved the HONS 110 proposal and all the others Honors curriculum proposals.

Next, the following proposals were approved without discussion:

**Linguistics**
- Change Minor — Linguistics Minor

**Environmental Studies**
- New Course — ENVT 355

**Math**
- Change Course — Math 320 History of Mathematics

**Hispanic Studies**
- New Course — Portuguese 291 Portuguese for Spanish Speakers
- New Course — Portuguese 291C Portuguese for Spanish Speakers

**Urban Studies**
- Change Major — Urban Studies

**Russian Studies**
- New Course — RUSS 295
- Change Minor — Russian Studies

Mr. Perkins next introduced the following proposals:

**Marketing and Supply Chain Management**
- Change Course — MGMT 409
- Change Course — MGMT 322
- Change Course — DSCI 314
- Change Major — International Business
- Change Minor — Global Logistics Concentration/Minor
- New Course — MGMT 402

Ms. Curtis asked whether MGMT would be cross-listed with any other courses, and Kelly Shaver (guest and chair of the Department of Management and Entrepreneurship) said that no cross-listing would be done.
The Senate approved the proposals under the heading Marketing and Supply Chain Management.

Mr. Perkins next introduced the following proposals:

Jewish Studies

New Course—JWST 250 Jewish Mysticism
New Course—JWST 280 Southern Jewish History
Change Minor—Jewish Studies

Jason Coy (at-large) announced that the History Department had looked at the proposal for JWST 280 Southern Jewish History, and that it did not have any problem with it.

The Senate approved JWST 280 and the two other proposals from Jewish Studies.

Next, the following proposal was approved without discussion:

Arts Management

Change Course—ARTM 370

Mr. Perkins then introduced a motion from the Faculty Curriculum Committee that was not on the agenda. This motion stemmed from the discovery of an error in a curriculum proposal that was approved in the March Faculty Senate meeting. The full motion, which is presented below, asks that the language in section B be replaced with the language in section C.

When the Biology Department submitted their Change to the BA degree to the FCC and then to the Faculty Senate in the March 2009 meeting, the Biology Department inadvertently omitted some language in the NOTE that provides details of the degree requirements (see below).

Here are 3 versions: (a) the old one that used to be in the catalog; (b) the one that was approved in the Senate meeting in March; and (c) the corrected version that the Biology Department is requesting.

\[ a\text{- NOTE: Students can get } 13 \text{ hours with three 4-hour courses plus a 1-hour course (BIOL 212L or BIOL 452), or one 4-hour course and three 3-hour courses. Students must complete at least three biology courses with laboratories at the 200 level or above. The laboratory courses may carry separate credit or may be part of a 4-credit course. Independent study (HONS 398), Tutorial (BIOL/HONS 399), Bachelor’s Essay (BIOL/HONS 499), or problems courses (BIOL 448, 450, 451) with laboratories do not fulfill the laboratory requirement.} \]

\[ b\text{- NOTE: Students must complete at least three additional biology courses with} \]
laboratories, two of which must be at the 300 level or above. The laboratory courses may carry separate credit or may be part of a four-credit (4) course. Independent study (HONS 398), Tutorial (BIOL/HONS 399), Bachelor’s Essay (BIOL/HONS 499), or problems courses (BIOL 448, 450, 451) with laboratories do not fulfill the laboratory requirement.

**c- NOTE:** Students must complete at least three biology courses with laboratories at the 200 level or above, two of which must be at the 300 level or above. The laboratory courses may carry separate credit or may be part of a four-credit (4) course. Independent study (HONS 398), Tutorial (BIOL/HONS 399), Bachelor’s Essay (BIOL/HONS 499), or problems courses (BIOL 448, 450, 451) with laboratories do not fulfill the laboratory requirement.

The Senate passed the motion.

With the business of the Faculty Curriculum Committee completed, Speaker Kelly thanked Mr. Perkins for his work as chair of the committee for the 2008-09 academic year.

At this point, Mr. Phillips moved that the Senate adjourn. He argued that as the hour was late and there was still much left to do, it was best to finish the remaining business in the continuation meeting on April 21. The motion received a second.

Bev Diamond (guest and Associate Provost) pointed out that some proposals would not go into the catalog, if they were not passed tonight. Speaker Kelly implored the Senate to continue the meeting until the Gen-Ed agenda items had been dealt with.

The Senate voted, defeating the motion to adjourn.

**Faculty General Education Committee**

Before discussing the Gen-Ed proposals, Chris Starr, chair of the committee, introduced the members of his committee, reviewed the work that the committee had performed during the year, briefly explained the committee’s duties, and reminded the Senate of the Gen-Ed goals that had been approved in a prior academic year. He then introduced the following proposal:

**English**

Proposal to replace the current required coursework of English 101 and English 102 with English 110 to satisfy General Education Goals I.1 and I.2.

Liz Jurisich (Mathematics) said that she was uncomfortable with the cap of twenty students in each section of ENGL 110, especially in light of the logistical issues that had been raised earlier. Though she understood the desire to cap enrollment at twenty and was sympathetic to the idea, she said that is was unfair that such a privilege was granted to the English Department, but to not other departments, which would also like to establish enrollment caps
of twenty for some of their courses. She therefore moved to delete language in the proposal referring to an enrollment cap of twenty.

Speaker Kelly ruled that Ms. Jurisich’s motion to amend the Gen-Ed committee’s motion was out of order because it was not relevant to the main motion, which was to replace ENGL 101 and ENGL 102 with ENGL 110 to meet the Gen-Ed Goals I.1 and I.2.

Though the motion was ruled out of order, Evan Parry (Theatre) defended the cap of twenty, arguing that it speaks to the complaint that many have heard about students not writing well. He said that in the long run the cap would save everyone time. Mr. Coy also defended the cap, pointing out that the English Department will still have to meet its workload requirement.

The Senate voted, approving the motion that ENGL 110 replace ENGL 101 and 102 to satisfy Gen-Ed Goals I.1 and I.2.

Mr. Starr introduced the following motion:

**History**

Proposal to change departmental distribution requirement in history to a goal-based, history requirement.

Referring to a document submitted by the History Department and titled “Memo to Gen-Ed Committee” (available on the Faculty Senate Web site), which lays out the details of the proposal, Mr. Starr explained that the proposal is designed to meet Gen-Ed Goal III.1 ("Knowledge of Human History") and would require students to take two courses that together cover two broad historical periods: pre-modern and modern. As the document explains, the existing history courses that satisfy the current Gen-Ed history requirement would meet the proposed departmental distributional requirement (HIST 101 and 103 would cover the pre-modern period, and HIST 102 and 104 would cover the modern period). However, the proposal would also make it possible for new courses to be developed by the History Department and other departments to satisfy Goal III.1. He also pointed out that, in contrast to the current Gen-Ed history requirement, there was no prescribed sequence in which the historical periods had to be covered (e.g., one could take HIST 104 and then HIST 101 to meet the goal.)

Bill Olejniczak (guest and chair of the History Department) said that he would like a Senator to delete the references to AP credit in the document submitted by the History Department. He explained that in conversations with the Registrar it became clear that the scheme in the document that outlines how to handle AP credit with respect to the Gen-Ed History Goal would have to be revised. Mr. Starr said that such a motion was not necessary and that that issue could be worked out later between the History Department and the Registrar.

Mr. Olejniczak said that he also wished to provide some context for the proposal by mentioning that it is the product of last year’s Gen-Ed discussion, and that he wanted to make
clear that he would work with the Registrar in dealing with the details of implementing the proposed Gen-Ed requirement, which would probably happen in fall 2010.

Deanna Caveny (at-large) asked about item #4 in the document under the heading of “The Changes that will result,” which speaks about an assessment tool. She wished to know if this would be something that the Gen-Ed Committee would be using. Claire Curtis (Political Science and a member of the Gen-Ed Committee) replied that since the College must assess its courses in order to be re-accredited by SACS, the History Department will develop an assessment tool to see if the history courses are meeting Gen-Ed Goal III.3 so that the College can say to SACS that it is fulfilling its assessment obligations for re-accreditation. Ms. Caveny also asked if other departments will use the assessment tool, and Ms. Curtis responded that it could be shared with other departments. Mr. Starr added that the assessment tool could also be used to help vet new proposed courses that seek to satisfy the Gen-Ed History Goal.

Ms. Caveny also asked about whether the Gen-Ed Committee would consult with departments in its deliberations, and noted that there is no requirement that the committee do so as there is with the Faculty Curriculum Committee. Ms. Curtis said that she could not imagine that the Gen-Ed Committee would not consult with departments that are affected by Gen-Ed proposals, and gave assurances that the practice of consultation would continue. Mr. Olejniczak said that he would consult and share information with the Gen-Ed Committee as his department develops the assessment instrument.

Mr. Krasnoff remarked that he thought the Gen-Ed History proposal was great, and that it would lead to the development of some wonderful new courses by the History Department as well as by other departments. He also did not think the proposal would be difficult to implement.

Ms. Kattwinkel commented that the FYE was not taken into account the Gen-Ed History proposal last year when it was developed, but she thought it would benefit the FYE and make it easier to involve students in the study of history. A student attending the meeting also spoke in favor of the proposal.

Todd McNerney asked if the proposal meant that the new kinds of history courses that would be developed could also be double-counted for both the history and humanities Gen-Ed requirements. Mr. Krasnoff responded that that sort of double counting was not allowed.

The Senate voted, passing the Gen-Ed History proposal.

Mr. Starr next introduced the Jewish Studies proposal:

Proposal to allow Jewish Studies 210 (Jewish History I: Ancient to Modern) and Jewish Studies 215 (Jewish History II: Modern to Present).

Mr. Krasnoff then moved that, in light of the passage of the Gen-Ed History proposal, the above Jewish Studies motion be replaced by the following one:
JWST 210 be approved for General Education credit in the history of the pre-modern era, and JWST 215 be approved for General Education credit in the history of the modern era. (Both JWST 210 and 215 are existing catalog courses, already approved by the Curriculum Committee and the faculty Senate for academic credit.)

The motion received a second and was approved by the Senate. The Senate then voted on and approved the amended Gen-Ed Jewish Studies proposal.

Mr. Starr then moved that the Senate approve the language to go in the catalog that explains the new English Gen-Ed requirement:

English: complete ENGL 110, Introduction to Academic Writing, a four-semester-hour course in effective writing, critical reading, gathering and using information. (A degree candidate must enroll in ENGL 110 in the first year and each semester after that until the English requirement has been fulfilled.)

Ms. Eichelberger was not sure that the parenthetical statement in the English requirement was needed and asked for unanimous consent to remove it. Unanimous consent was granted. Deanna Cavensy (at-large), however, thought that the Senate should try to stipulate that students take the ENGL 110 in the first year, and moved to include the following statement, which was seconded:

(A degree candidate must enroll in ENGL 110 in the first year at the College and until the requirement has been fulfilled.)

Brian McGee (guest) asked if the Senate controls the language that goes into the catalog. Norris Preyer (Physics and Astronomy) thought that the added language was not needed and that the issue addressed in the proposed catalog language should been handled by the College’s advisors at Freshman Orientation.

The Senate voted and approved Ms. Cavensy’s amendment.

Speaker Kelly then turned to George Pothering, the Faculty Senate Parliamentarian, to ask about the issue Mr. McGee raised. The Senate, Mr. Pothering said, needs to decide on the issue, though it could table the matter and address it at a later time. Kay Smith (guest) asked the Registrar, Cathy Boyd, to comment on the issue. Ms. Boyd said that she would like the Senate to approve the Gen-Ed language in the catalog. Every section of the catalog, she added, has an owner. Mr. McNerney urged the Senate to deal with the motion at hand and pointed out that perhaps in the future the Gen-Ed Committee will have authority over language in the catalog regarding Gen-Ed requirements. Jaap Hillenius (at-large) pointed out that approval of catalog language involves more than wordsmithing or verbal stylistics; it also affects the content or substance of what the catalog presents.

At this point a Senator called the question, and the motion received a second. The Senate passed the motion.
The Senate voted, approving the English Gen-Ed catalog language as presented by the Gen-Ed Committee and modified by Ms. Caveny’s amendment.

Mr. Starr then moved that the Senate approve the language to go in the catalog that explains the new History Gen-Ed requirement:

   History: six semester hours. Complete one course in pre-modern history and one course in modern history from the list of approved courses satisfying the history requirement. The two courses do not have to be taken from the same department or in sequence.

The Senate voted, passing the motion.

A motion to adjourn and continue the meeting on April 21 at 5:00 P.M. was made, seconded, and passed. The Senate adjourned at 7:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 10 March 2009

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 10 March 2009, at 5:00 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium. After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, the minutes of the Special Faculty Senate meeting on 27 January 2009 were approved, as were the minutes of the regular Faculty Senate meeting on 10 February 2009.

Reports

The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens said that her report would be short. Her main concern centers on budgetary matters. There is a lot of uncertainty about what the legislature will do with federal monies sent to the state as part of the stimulus package, but she said that the College will do all it can to get some of it.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked the Provost about a wish list for the C of C that was circulated some time ago, and wondered if that list was correct. The Provost answered that it was not, and that several efforts have been made to put together an accurate list. Speaker Kelly then added that the list referenced by Ms. Curtis had to include only “shovel-ready” projects and therefore was not fully representative of what the College needs and desires. The Provost said that her office is working on the task of putting together a proper list. Phil Dustan (Biology) suggested that weatherproofing and efforts to “go green” (including planting trees) should be on the list.

The Speaker

Since part of the Speaker’s report included an update on the new Provost search, Speaker Kelly gave the floor to Fran Welch, Chair of the Provost Search Committee. Ms. Welch informed the Senate that the advertisement for the position would go out to the Chronicle of Higher Education next week, and that information will be posted on a Web site as the search process moves forward. The timeline for the process, which will also be on the Web site, is to narrow the group of candidates by June, to bring the finalists for the position to campus in September, and to have a new Provost in place by January 2010. In the meantime, Bev Diamond will serve as interim Provost. Ms. Welch also asked that faculty help the Search Committee identify possible candidates. If faculty know of strong candidates, they should let the committee know. Assisting with the search is Alice Witt of the firm Witt/Kieffer, who is serving as the contact person.

Speaker Kelly, resuming his report, announced that the ad hoc Committee on Developing and Evaluating Teaching has created four sub-committees to work on various issues. One issue under discussion is the status of faculty development efforts; another is the course evaluation instrument in current use. The committee will work on a new draft of the evaluation form.

The Speaker next reported on the issue of budget reform. The ad hoc Committee on the Budget is developing a new budget process for the Academic Affairs part of the school budget, which will be brought to the Academic Forum for review.

Larry Krasnoff, chair of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance

Mr. Krasnoff said the committee has been examining the efficacy of the current college-committee system, looking at the size and composition of the Faculty Senate to consider whether a smaller Senate might be better, and reviewing the relation of the Senate to the
schools. He said that the committee would soon issue a draft report that will suggest some changes, especially with respect to committees. Committees are particularly ineffective, he said, on budget issues. There will be a new Budget Committee proposed that will replace the old Budget Committee, and that will be run out of the Academic Affairs Office, but include a lot of faculty representation.

Mr. Krasnoff then discussed the Senate. After giving an overview of how Senators are elected and how the apportioning system works (e.g., each department gets one Senator for every ten department members), he noted that the ratio of at-large Senators to department Senators has changed over time: there are fifteen at-large Senators, a number that has remained the same since the inception of the Faculty Senate, though the total number of Senators has increased as the College has grown and departments have gotten larger. Mr. Krasnoff also noted that compared to other colleges and universities, the C of C’s Senate is quite large. He said that his committee would propose that the Senate be reduced in size and that there be more at-large Senators who would represent schools. Reducing the size of the Senate by, say, twenty or thirty Senators would put the College more in line with other institutions and would likely attract people who really want to serve and are committed to the task of faculty governance. He added that a switch to at-large Senators who are elected by schools, rather than by the entire faculty, makes sense because it is no longer clear that, given the growth of the College, faculty know colleagues across schools.

Mr. Dustan pointed out that schools are not currently represented equally in the College, and asked if the committee talked about a system that addressed that issue. Mr. Krasnoff said that the committee had not because it had not seen a model based on equal representation of schools. Tim Carens (English) then asked for some elaboration on why a smaller Senate would be better. Mr. Krasnoff replied that a large Senate is unwieldy, making it harder to get things done; a smaller Senate also attracts more committed participants. He wondered whether all Senators come to Senate meetings and whether they even want to be here. He noted, too, that often people have to be dragooned into serving. Jason Coy (History) said that Senators sometimes can’t be at all meetings because of occasional conflicts (such as conferences they are scheduled to attend). He also said that there could be problems in having a Senate that is too small. Mr. Krasnoff replied that he thought a suitable size could be found that would allow for adequate representation of faculty and yet be effective.

Elizabeth Jurisich (Mathematics) asked what institutions the committee was comparing us to. Were they institutions with roughly the same number of students or with a comparable number of faculty with Ph.D.s? Mr. Krasnoff answered that regardless of how the comparison is done, the C of C’s Senate is larger than most schools. Steve Jaumé (Geology) asked if the committee considered the issue of the Senate’s size in light of the fact that a certain number of Senators are required to serve on certain committees. Mr. Krasnoff replied that the committee was aware of that issue, but focused on the more fundamental issue of what the optimal size of the Senate should be.

Bill Manaris (Computer Science) wished to know what problem the committee is trying to fix. What is wrong with the Senate as it is? Mr. Krasnoff referenced last year’s Gen-Ed reform failure effort as an example of how the Senate is ineffective in its current form. Speaker Kelly clarified that the issue of considering the Senate size was not motivated by the Gen-Ed reform failure, but rather by a sense that shared governance isn’t really happening as the by-laws says that it should. Mr. Manaris pointed out that the Gen-Ed effort is just one example. He asked for more evidence that proved the Senate was ineffective. Mr. Krasnoff responded that the Senate is not an effective body when it comes to planning. A smaller Senate would be much more effective in this area. Deanna Caveny (at-large) agreed that the Senate was not effective, nor was the current committee system, in her view, particularly effective.
Frank Cossa (Art History) expressed concern that a small Senate would not adequately represent the faculty, and that it would become a kind of Star Chamber filled with ambitious office seekers. He also observed that sometimes unwieldiness is a good thing. Jerry Boetje (Computer Science), addressing the issue of the Gen-Ed reform effort, said that he thought the process worked last year, and that the Senate needed to hear all the voices of its members. He was also not sure that a smaller Senate would have produced a better result, and added that the Senate does accomplish things and gets business done. Mr. Krasnoff disagreed, saying that he didn’t think the Senate got much done in the sense of playing an effective role in the College. As an example, he referenced the recent creation of the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs, which happened outside the Senate. He added that the Senate often gets bogged down in minutiae (such as routine curriculum proposals), and that it had accomplished little this year.

Jeffery Diamond (History) asked if the committee was going to propose a revised Senate that was still department based. Mr. Krasnoff said no. Mr. Diamond followed up, replying that we should not get rid of department based representation, which is how the College is organized. Mr. Krasnoff responded that at most institutions the Senate is not considered a department-based organization. The fact that ours is department-based proved to be a problem in the Gen-Ed reform last year.

Rohn England (Mathematics) said that maybe the Senate did do its job well last year. He added that in other institutions there is a more active school structure, where monthly meetings take place, and where the will of the faculty is expressed. In this regard, he suggested that the committee take a broader look at faculty governance. Mr. Krasnoff replied that the committee will recommend more involvement of faculty at the school level.

Mr. Dustan commented that he thought the biggest impediment to effective shared governance was on the administrative side. Perhaps the main problem is not the size of the Senate. Mr. Krasnoff said that we do see administrative good will in some areas of shared governance, but at any rate we, the faculty, must first “get our house in order.”

Speaker Kelly added that the Senate has not really participated in key decisions at the College. We are in our own silos, and while we may have our say on some things, it doesn’t change anything. He agreed that it was hard for a large Senate to function well as a decision-making entity. However, the senate may not wish to sacrifice wide representation for the possibility of creating a body that is more effective in getting things done. He concluded by encouraging Senators to send additional comments and ideas to the committee.

**Old Business**

**Motion to Change Article V Section 2.B.3 of the By-Laws: Duties of the By-Laws/FAM Committee**

This motion to amend the by-laws, which was introduced at the February Faculty Senate meeting, passed without further discussion. The specifics of the amendment are as follows:

- **Action:** Change to Article V, Section 2.B.3. Presentation to Faculty Senate on February 10, 2009. Faculty Senate consideration and possible action on March 10, 2009.

- **Intent:** To allow Committee on the By-laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual to correct inaccurate administrative titles in the FAM without action by the Faculty Senate and the faculty.
Motion:

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

   a. Composition: Three faculty members. *Ex-officio* members are the Speaker of the Faculty, the Faculty Secretary, the Provost (or Provost’s designee), and the Vice President for Legal Affairs. (Rev. April 2007)

   b. Duties:

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

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

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

      (4) To make non-substantive changes to the Faculty By-Laws to correct unintended grammatical and spelling errors, and to address minor problems of stylistic consistency, and correct inaccurate administrative titles. Such a non-substantive change shall not constitute an amendment to or repeal of the Faculty By-Laws. Such changes shall be made only when unanimously approved by the Committee. Notice in writing shall be given to the Faculty Senate within 60 calendar days of such changes being approved by the Committee. Such changes shall be repealed if an appropriate motion to amend something previously adopted is approved by a simple majority of the Committee, the Faculty Senate, or the College Faculty. (Ins. April 2007)

New Business

Ms. Caveny, chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, introduced five motions to amend the by-laws. She explained that, in accordance with the by-laws, the proposed changes would not be voted on in this meeting, but would be discussed today, returned to the By-Laws/FAM Committee for further consideration, and then brought back to the Senate for a vote, perhaps as early as the next meeting in April.

The first proposed change, Ms. Caveny explained, was designed to address some problems that have arisen in the current definition of “regular faculty,” and specifically to clarify which administrators are to be categorized as “regular faculty.” The specifics of the amendment are as follows:

   Action: Change to By-laws Article I, Section 1: Membership in the College Faculty, Regular Faculty. Presentation to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009.

   Intent:
   - To more clearly define “regular faculty”
To include among regular faculty those full-time tenured and tenure-track employees who normally teach only three contact hours, including chairs of large departments and also assistant and associate deans

To replace “instructor” with “Instructor”

To clarify which administrators are members of the regular faculty

Motion:

Article I. Membership in the College Faculty

Section 1. Regular Faculty

The faculty members of the College of Charleston are those individuals whose obligation in the institution is both the dissemination and expansion of academic knowledge of an accepted academic nature. At the College of Charleston the following individuals are considered regular faculty members: (1) those full-time tenured and tenure-track employees of the institution who normally teach at least three contact hours of college credit courses or the equivalent in assigned academic research in their academic fields each semester; (2) full-time instructor Instructors and Senior Instructor employees; (3) full-time professional librarians; and (4) ex officio, the President of the College, the Provost, the Vice President for Research and Professional Development and Dean of Graduate Studies, the Deans of Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Academic Deans, the Dean of the Honors College, and all administrative officers of the College with academic rank. These members of the faculty have voting rights at meetings of the College faculty.

Ms. Caveny added that the first footnote is intended to deal with the problem of a chair who is a regular faculty who “normally” teaches at least three contact hours each semester, but who may not do so every semester for certain reasons.

Norris Preyer (Physics and Astronomy) asked if faculty on sabbatical are still counted under category #1. Bev Diamond (guest and Associate Provost) answered that they were. Ms. Caveny added that though they are still counted, they are not allowed to be Senators.

Bill Olejniczak (guest) asked why the committee does not include visiting assistant professors in the definition of “regular faculty,” since they seem to qualify according to the first sentence of the definition. Ms. Diamond replied that the intent of the by-laws was never to include visiting faculty. The section on roster faculty deals with this issue, she said. A Senator then asked why Instructors and Sr. Instructors are put in a separate category. Ms. Caveny agreed that it didn’t make sense to have the teaching load requirement on tenured and tenure-track faculty members, but not on Instructors and Senior Instructors; so those two sections (1 and 2), she said, will be combined when the committee presents the latest version of the amendment at the next meeting.

---

1 When they are full-time tenured and tenure-track employees of the institution, full-time Instructor and Senior Instructor employees, or full-time professional librarians, Department Chairs, Assistant Deans, and Associate Deans are defined as employees normally teaching at least three contact hours of college credit courses in each semester.

2 An “administrative officer” shall be defined as any College of Charleston employee with a position title using the words “President” or “Provost.” In addition, the Provost may stipulate in writing that any College employee with academic rank is an administrative officer if that employee (a) has a position title using the word “Director” and (b) normally teaches fewer than three contact hours of college credit courses or the equivalent in assigned academic research in her or his academic field each semester.
The **second proposed change**, Ms. Caveny explained, is mainly intended to clarify who is eligible to serve in the Senate. The specifics of the amendment are as follows:

**Action:** Change to By-laws Article IV, Section 2: Faculty Senate, Composition and Election. Presentation to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009.

**Intent:**
- To more clearly define which regular faculty members are eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, vote in senatorial elections, and be counted in apportionment of Faculty Senate seats
- To replace “instructor” with “Instructor”
- To resolve an ambiguity in whether department chairs are allowed to serve as Faculty Senators. Our by-laws have specifically stated that chairs are eligible to serve as faculty senators. However, chairs were not clearly included in the regular faculty, which produced a contradiction.
- To specify that Assistant Deans and Associate Deans (who are otherwise members of the regular faculty) are also eligible to serve as Faculty Senators
- To clearly state which administrators are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators
- To clearly state which administrators are not eligible to vote in senatorial elections and should not count in Faculty Senate seat apportionment.

**Motion:**

Article IV, Faculty Senate

Section 2. Composition and Election

A. Eligibility.

A Faculty Senator must be a full-time tenured or tenure-track employee of the College who has completed at least three years of service at the College, and who normally teaches at least six contact hours per semester or the equivalent in assigned research or who is a full-time instructor, Senior Instructor, or professional librarian. Without regard to teaching load, Department Chairs, Assistant Deans, and Associate Deans who otherwise would be members of the regular faculty, regardless of their teaching loads, are eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. (Approved April 2005) Administrators, Academic Deans, including Deans of Schools and the Dean of Libraries, are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. Faculty members on leave are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators.

C. Election

1. Without regard to teaching load, all and only regular faculty members as defined under provisions (1), (2), and (3) of Article I Section 1, in Art. I, Sect. 1, excluding all those qualifying as ex officio regular faculty members under provision (4), are eligible to vote in Senate elections.

Mr. Coy asked for more elaboration on the rationale for including some administrators among faculty who are eligible to serve in the Senate. Ms. Caveny answered that there is a need to clarify who among administrators are mainly on the academic side of things and who are not. The consensus among the committee members was that Assistant and Associate Deans have a strong connection to their departments.
Next, Ms. Caveny introduced the **third and fourth proposed changes**, which go together. The third proposed amendment seeks to eliminate the fall and spring Faculty meetings; the fourth one requires the President to come before the Faculty Senate in the latter part of spring semester. Ms. Caveny explained that the rationale for these proposed changes stems from the sense that the faculty meetings are long and accomplish little. These amendments will eliminate meetings that are no longer particularly useful, while retaining their most important function—namely, requiring the President to report to and be questioned by the faculty. The fourth proposed amendment places the duty of the President reporting to the faculty within the venue of the Faculty Senate. The specifics of both amendments are presented below

**Third proposed amendment:**

**Action:** Change to By-laws Article II, College Faculty Meetings. Associated Change to Article VI, Amending Procedures. Presentation to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009.

**Intent:**
- To eliminate requirement of fall and spring full faculty meetings
- To continue to allow meetings of the faculty to be called by the President of the College, Speaker of the Faculty, or petition to the Speaker of the Faculty by fifty faculty members
- To allow everything (except approval of degree candidates) that took place in the required fall and spring faculty meetings to take place at “ordinary” faculty meetings called at Speaker’s discretion
- To reclassify meetings of the faculty from “regular” and “special” to “ordinary” and “extraordinary”, since “regular” seemed to imply “with some regularity or regular schedule”
- To more clearly state that ordinary faculty meetings are not deliberative
- To specify who (the Speaker or Speaker’s designee) can waive the one-week advance notification requirement when calling extraordinary faculty meetings
- To clearly specify that Robert’s Rules of Order shall govern the conduct at extraordinary faculty meetings
- To fix section numbering in Article VI, Amending Procedures

**Motion:**

**Article II, College Faculty Meetings**

**Section 1. Regular Ordinary Faculty Meetings**

The College faculty shall meet twice annually, once early in the first semester and again late in the second semester, to hear reports from and to question the President of the College, the Provost, and the Speaker of the Faculty. At its spring meeting, the College faculty shall recommend recipients of degrees and certificates at spring commencement. Any written reports to the College faculty from the President, the Provost, or the Speaker of the Faculty shall be distributed by the Faculty Senate Secretariat to all faculty members. Ordinary meetings of the College faculty may be called by the Speaker of the Faculty. Ordinary faculty meetings may be called for such purposes as the distribution of information, discussion of a topic or topics relevant to the College faculty, hearing a presentation, and asking questions of the President of the College or other administrative officers of the College. An ordinary
meeting of the College faculty is not a deliberative assembly, and faculty at such meetings have no legislative or review authority.

Section 2. Special Extraordinary Faculty Meetings

A. Special Extraordinary meetings of the College faculty may be called by the President of the College, or the Speaker of the Faculty, or a petition to the Speaker of the Faculty by fifty faculty members. At such special extraordinary meetings the College faculty may review any Faculty Senate action.

B. Senate actions may be amended or vetoed by a simple majority vote of those members of the regular College faculty (as defined in Article Art. I) present at such special extraordinary meetings of the College faculty, provided there is a quorum present.

C. The College faculty has legislative authority (i.e., may legislate and recommend to the President on matters normally under the purview of the Faculty Senate) only in case it acts in a special extraordinary meeting of the College faculty called by a petition to the Speaker of the Faculty by 50 regular College faculty members (as defined in Art. I) on a specific issue included in the agenda for that meeting and distributed at least one week prior to the date of the meeting.

D. A quorum at special extraordinary College faculty meetings shall be a simple majority of regular College faculty members.

E. Special Extraordinary meetings of the College faculty must be called in writing at least one week prior to the date of the meeting. A written agenda for each meeting will be distributed to all faculty at least one week prior to the meeting. The requirement of one week advance notice may be waived by the Speaker of the Faculty (or the Speaker’s designee) in case of emergency.

F. The current edition of Robert’s Rules of Order will govern the conduct of special extraordinary meetings of the College faculty.

G. The Faculty Secretary shall perform as secretary for all meetings of the College faculty.

Section 3. Presiding Officer

The Speaker of the Faculty shall preside at all regular and special ordinary and extraordinary meetings of the faculty. If the Speaker cannot be present, she or he shall designate an alternate Speaker for that meeting from among the members of the regular faculty of the College.

Article VI. Amending Procedures

Section 1. Amending Procedures

Section 1. Senate Option for Amendment Introduction
A. Motions for amendment or repeal of these by-laws may be made in writing at any meeting of the Faculty Senate. The motion shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the Senate its recommendations on the motion and any amendments at the next Senate meeting. Motions to amend or repeal these by-laws require a two-thirds vote in the Senate for approval. Approved motions must then be ratified by a simple majority of regular faculty members voting by electronic ballot on the motion. (Rev. Jan. 2007)

Section 2. Extraordinary Meeting Option for Amendment Introduction

B. Motions for amendment or repeal of these by-laws may be made in writing at any special extraordinary meeting of the College faculty. The motion shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the faculty its recommendation on the motion and any amendments at a second special extraordinary faculty meeting called by the Speaker of the Faculty to consider the motion. The faculty will then vote on the motion to amend or repeal the by-laws. It shall be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the membership voting, provided a quorum is present.

Fourth proposed amendment:

Action: Change to By-laws Article IV, Section 1: Faculty Senate, Functions. Presentation to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009.

Intent:
- To take the requirement that the President and Provost report to the faculty, which was part of the required faculty meetings, and place it under Faculty Senate instead

Motion:

Article IV. Faculty Senate

Section 1. Functions

A. The Faculty Senate is the primary legislative body of the College of Charleston faculty. The Senate may make recommendations on any matter under its purview to the President of the College. Except where otherwise specified in the By-Laws of the College Board of Trustees, the President shall have the power of veto over any action by the Senate. The veto shall be communicated in writing to the Senate, with reasons, within thirty days after receipt by the President. By a two-thirds vote, the Senate may appeal any action thus vetoed, through the Speaker of the Faculty, to the College Board of Trustees.

B. The Faculty Senate shall be concerned with all matters relating to academic programs, the curriculum, admissions and continuation standards, the grading system, degree and certificate requirements, and the utilization of the intellectual resources of the College. The Faculty Senate shall have the right and obligation to initiate needed institutional and academic studies, either directly or through appropriate committees.
C. The Faculty Senate may request meetings with the College Board of Trustees to discuss matters of mutual concern. Senators shall receive minutes of all meetings of the College Board of Trustees.

D. The Faculty Senate may establish and instruct such committees, standing and *ad hoc*, as may be necessary for the performance of its functions and elect or provide for the members of the committees in accordance with these by-laws.

E. *At one Faculty Senate meeting early in the first semester and at one meeting late in the second semester, the Faculty Senate shall hear reports from and have the opportunity to question the President of the College and the Provost. Any written reports provided to the Faculty Senate by the President or the Provost shall be distributed by the Faculty Senate Secretariat to all faculty members.*

F. The Faculty Senate is authorized by the College faculty to approve all degree candidates for graduation.

F. The specific duties of the Faculty Senate shall also include, but not be limited to, recommendations to the President concerning any of the following:

Sarah Owens (at-large) said that she was opposed to the third motion because it eliminated the only moments during the academic year when all of the faculty are together and present to hear the President. It also eliminates the introduction of new faculty (in the fall faculty meeting), which, she thought, was a nice and useful ceremony. Ms. Caveny replied that all faculty have voice privileges in the Faculty Senate and will still be able to hear the President speak there. She added that she, too, likes the introduction-of-new-faculty ceremony, but observed that because there have been so many new faculty coming to the College due to its growth over the years, the introductions are shorter and less productive. Moreover, the introduction of new faculty will still happen, but in a different venue.

Speaker Kelly, responding to Ms. Owens, said that his view is the opposite of hers. Attendance at the fall and spring Faculty meetings tends to be very low. The only people who show up at the fall meeting are the new faculty being introduced, the people introducing them, and a few core Senators. He did not think the welcoming ceremony was very celebratory. The same goes for the spring meeting: because the faculty awards ceremony and the honoring of retiring faculty are included with the business section of the meeting, the celebratory dimension of the event ends up being nullified. His intention is to enhance the ceremonial functions of these meetings by divorcing them from Faculty and Senate business and making them their own events.

David Gentry (at-large) asked about the election of College committee members, which has been done at the spring meeting. Ms. Caveny and Tom Kunkle (guest and chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee) replied that those elections are now done electronically and not in the meeting. Mr. Gentry observed that language about those elections taking place at the spring meeting might still be in the by-laws and need to be checked.

Ms. Caveny next presented the *fifth proposed amendment*, which specifies how to implement a previously approved change requiring tenure, promotion, and review candidates to sign the letter written by their evaluation panel. Ms. Caveny explained that the proposed
amendment seeks to clarify the intent of this section of the by-laws (VI. Sect. D, 7) and to indicate what signing the letter means in situations where the candidate disagrees with the evaluation. The specifics of the proposed amendment are as follows:

**Action:** Change to *Faculty/Administration Manual*, VI.D.7, Reporting Procedures of Departmental Evaluation Panel. Presentation to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009.

**Intent:**
- To implement previously endorsed change requiring: (a) tenure, promotion, and review candidates to sign their evaluation panel’s letter, and (b) panel chairs to provide candidates with a copy of that panel letter
- To specify that panel members should all sign their evaluation panel’s letter
- To specify what the panel members’ and candidates’ signatures mean

**Motion:**

VI, Sect. D, *Evaluation of Faculty, Procedures for Third-year Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty*

7. Reporting Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel

After due deliberation, the panel will take its vote by written ballot. The chair will draft a statement for the members of the panel to sign that reports the recommendation and vote of the panel. This statement should include justification for the panel’s recommendation. While maintaining the confidentiality of any meetings, the statement will summarize the discussion that took place among panel members, including positive and negative deliberations.

The chair of the departmental panel will meet with the faculty member being evaluated to inform him/her, provide the faculty member with a copy of the panel’s written recommendation, which will include actual vote splits and the signatures of all the panel members. The signatures of the panel members acknowledge only that the panel members participated in panel deliberation and had the opportunity to contribute to the development of the written statement. Third-year candidates will sign the panel’s evaluation. The faculty member shall sign a copy of the statement, with the signed copy to be retained by the chair of the panel for submission to the appropriate Academic Dean. The signature of the faculty member acknowledges only that a copy of the statement has been received by the faculty member.

The evaluation panel chair will forward the panel’s recommendation(s) statement to the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries. In the case of tenure and promotion recommendations, this must be done by November 1. In the case of third-year reappointment recommendations, this must be done by January 15.

**Faculty Curriculum Committee**

The following proposal was approved without discussion:

New Course—PHYS 296 - BIOL 396, Biophysical Modeling of Excitable Cells
Next, Bob Perkins (chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee) introduced the following proposal:

**New Course—JWST 280 Southern Jewish History**

Bill Olejniczak (guest and chair of the History Department) said that the History Department has not seen this proposal (or the other Jewish Studies proposals) and was particularly concerned that his department did not have the chance to review it. He asked that the Senate take this into consideration in its decision to approve the proposal or not. Mr. Krasnoff responded that though the word “history” is in the course title, it is a Jewish studies course. Jeffrey Diamond (History) said that it looks like a history course and thought that students would think it was one, and expect it to count as one. It would have been a proper courtesy, he added, to let the History Department know about the course.

The Senate voted and the course was not approved.

Mr. Perkins next introduced the following course, also in Jewish Studies:

**New Course—JWST 330 Representations of the Holocaust**

Mr. Cossa asked if “Representations” include plays, pictures, and other art forms. Mr. Krasnoff said that it could, and that it would be left up to the instructor as to whether a particular section would focus on memoir and films, or other forms of representation. If taught primarily as a film course, Mr. Cossa followed up, would it count as a Film Studies course? Mr. Krasnoff said the Jewish Studies Program isn’t asking for that because it can’t guarantee that the course will always primarily focus on films.

The Senate voted and approved the proposal.

Mr. Perkins then said that the next curriculum item was the proposal to change the minor in Jewish Studies, but he did not think that this could be passed as it contained two new courses, one of which was JWST 280 Southern Jewish History, the proposed new course that the Senate had just voted down.

Mr. Krasnoff suggested that he would bring back to the Senate in April the new course proposal for JWST 280 and the proposal to change the minor, but asked that the History Department would provide assurance that it would consider the proposals in time for the next Senate meeting. He added that in his experience the History Department has been slow in reviewing proposals. Mr. Olejniczak responded that that was not true, and said the department would review the proposals. Mr. Krasnoff wanted further guarantees that History review the proposals in time for the April Senate meeting; he then asked that the Senate approve the change of minor proposal with JWST 280 deleted from it.

One Senator asked whether the Curriculum Committee would have to review the whole proposal again, if Jewish Studies wished to add JWST 280 back into the change of minor proposal. Mr. Perkins said that since the committee had already approved the change of minor proposal with JWST 280 in it, there would be no need for the committee to review the exact same proposal again.

Mr. Krasnoff asked for unanimous consent to delete JWST 280 from the change of minor proposal, and unanimous consent was granted. Mr. Krasnoff announced that at the next meeting he would bring another change of minor proposal that included JWST 280.
The Senate voted and approved the proposal to change the minor in Jewish Studies (with JWST 280 deleted from the proposal).

The following proposals were all approved without discussion:

**Accounting**

Change Major—Accounting

**Biology**

Change Course—BIOL 322, Developmental Biology
Change Course—BIOL 212 and BIOL 212L, Genetics lecture and Genetics lab
Change Major—BA in BIOL
Change Major—BS Biochemistry: change the BIOL 212/212L choice to BIOL 305/305L
Change minor—Biology: change the required BIOL 212 to BIOL 305
Change Major—BS Biology with concentration in Molecular Biology
Change Major—BS Biology, BS Marine Biology, Teaching option
Change Courses with BIOL 212 prerequisite

**Constituents’ Concerns**

Scott Peeples (English) said that he was asked by a colleague to voice a concern—which he, too, shared—regarding the recent news that the President Benson had hired a speechwriter during a period of budgetary crisis. Mr. Peeples thought it was unwise to allocate precious resources to staff such a position, when it was becoming increasingly difficult to find the resources to maintain current levels of teaching personnel (i.e., faculty) in order to fulfill the institution’s core mission.

With all business on the agenda completed, a motion was made to adjourn. The motion was seconded and approved: the Senate adjourned at around 6:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers  
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 10 February 2009

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 10 February 2009, at 5:00 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium. After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, the minutes of the 9 December 2008 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens reported on the on-going fall-out of budget cuts. She began by saying that this academic year fifteen academic positions have been lost and that she is not happy about this, though the Office of Academic Affairs has worked hard to minimize losses, and to spread them out over the campus so that no one area is affected more than others. Also, the Office has chosen to not fill some positions, rather lay people off—though fifteen losses, she admitted, is still significant. Eleven staff positions have also been cut and efforts have been made to consolidate staff positions.

The Provost also reported that there have been cuts in the operating budget. As for future budget cuts, the Provost thought that there wouldn’t been anymore this fiscal year, but that there would likely be another in July.

On the issue of enrollment, the Provost was happy to report that applications have been up 16% from last year, which makes this year a “banner year.” Deposits received by students who have been accepted are up by 20%. The Provost said that these were very positive developments. She also urged the faculty to attend admission events and reported that fifty-seven faculty have been involved in a pilot program to call prospective students to encourage them to attend the C of C. She thanked those faculty for their participation in the program.

The Provost next reported on the findings of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) survey, which is administered by the Higher Education Research Institute of UCLA to freshmen nationally to find out the key reasons for their choice of college or university. One key reason, the findings show, is the school’s reputation. Another centers on the social life of the campus. Cost of tuition is another. Of increasing importance to prospective students is whether the school serves as a helpful gateway to graduate school and whether it will lead to jobs. Visits to campus, the survey reveals, are also very important in influencing students’ choice of school.

At this point, the Provost opened the floor to questions. Rohn England (Mathematics) asked whether the rise in deposits by accepted students applies mainly to in-state students or out-of-state students. Provost Jorgens responded that the increase applies to both categories, but that the greatest increase is among in-state students.

The Provost then mentioned a recent article in the George Street Observer and said it was mostly accurate, but that she was misquoted in her statement regarding a search for a new coordinator of the Office of Diversity. Provost Jorgens told the Senate that due to the sudden resignation and departure of the previous coordinator, her office, along with other members of the Executive Management Team, will need time to evaluate the role of this office on campus before a replacement is hired. Student workers in the Office of Diversity will complete ongoing projects (such as the Model U.N.) but are being assigned to other offices on campus.

The Speaker
Speaker Kelly reported that the Faculty Compensation Committee is looking at the proposed language on annual and merit evaluations and would make a report on it in the future. He said that the rest of his report could be found in the most recent issue of his newsletter.

In the ensuing question-and-answer period, Bill Manaris (Computer Science) noted that the Speaker in his newsletter had made reference to a pilot program that would involve faculty in working with a new learning management system, which may replace WebCT. He asked how faculty could learn more about the program and possibly participate in it. The Speaker said that he should talk to Susan Beattie, Director of IT, for additional information.

Noelle Carmichael, chair of the First-Year-Experience Committee

Ms. Carmichael said that her committee wished to update the Senate on the First Year Experience program (FYE). She said that fifty-eight faculty are slated to participate next year. About half of these are new to the program, and half are returning. Currently the FYE is meeting the needs of 800 students; next year it will serve 1100, and the year after that 1500. The plan is to have over 2000 in the FYE by 2012, which is when the FYE will be required for incoming students in their first year.

Ms. Carmichael said that the committee and program directors are working on making it easier for faculty to find teaching partners for learning communities and are soliciting feedback from those who have participated in the program to learn how to improve it. She reported, too, that the budget for the FYE has been cut by 10%, but that they are coping successfully and that there will be no problem in keeping the program running. She announced that brochures will be distributed at the end of the month and that students will also start signing up for courses.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) asked if the FYE will continue to receive new faculty lines in light of the recent budget problems. Ms. Carmichael responded that of eight lines that had been pledged, two are going through and six are on hold.

Phil Dustan (Biology) asked what criteria were used to measure the program’s success. Ms. Carmichael replied that students are surveyed. Kay Smith (guest and Assoc. VP for the Academic Experience) said that surveys measure student satisfaction. She said, too, that part of the Quality Enhancement Plan includes an assessment schedule for the FYE. As part of the assessment, learning outcomes, which professor teaching the FYE course have chosen to emphasize, are also evaluated. With respect to the question concerning new lines, Ms. Smith informed the Senate that the two new positions slated for this year have been put on hold.

Laura Penny, Fac. Welfare Committee (report on annual & merit evaluations)

Ms. Penny presented a written report that contained the proposed language defining the annual and merit evaluations to be inserted in the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM) along with the Welfare’s Committee’s comments on certain sections of that language. Presented below are passages from the proposed language on evaluations (in italics), the Welfare Committee’s comments (in red) on those passages, and summaries of Ms. Penny’s additional comments (in regular text) made during the meeting.
1. Introduction

Annual evaluations shall serve two functions: (1) to guide the professional development of the faculty member, and (2) to record part of the evidence upon which personnel decisions and salary recommendations shall be based. Accordingly,

- each regular faculty member of the College of Charleston will be evaluated annually on the basis of performance over the last calendar year at the College.

In addition,

- each faculty member with at least one full calendar year of service at the College will be assigned a merit category on the basis of performance over the last three calendar years (or the time since hire if this is less than three years) as one factor to be considered in the determination of any salary increase.

Newly hired faculty members will not be assigned a merit category. Instead, each will receive an “average” raise determined by the relevant dean and based on the percentage of the salary pool allocated to the faculty member’s school for raises.

The term ‘average’ is vague. Is this the actual numerical average? It is possible that the newest faculty members of a department would be higher paid than colleagues hired a year or two before and this would only exacerbate a salary inversion issue.

Each annual performance evaluation should include strengths, weaknesses, and specific recommendations for improvement.

There are certainly cases where no weaknesses exist. Is this statement requiring a chair to manufacture a weakness for the review?

Probationary faculty should be rigorously evaluated each year in preparation for third-year and tenure reviews. In the case of a tenured faculty member or a Senior Instructor, the assessment may be less detailed. A faculty member, Chair, Dean or Provost can request that a more extensive evaluation be conducted in any given year.

This is a significant change from the past policy allowing a tenured faculty member to forgo any evaluation for up to 2 years. Welfare is concerned about the added workload of a more extensive evaluation at the request of the administration. We suggest that those departments that do implement tiered evaluations should have specific guidelines on notifying tenured faculty members that a detailed evaluation is being sought. Also that they develop
policies on how often or for what causes these extensive evaluations of tenured members would be requested.

Ms. Penny added in the meeting that a timetable should be provided for when a detailed evaluation is required, along with notification and reasons as to why it is needed.

Annual performance and merit reviews constitute only one of many factors that are considered during the tenure and/or promotion decision-making process and in no way conclusively determine that outcome. Because tenure and promotion decisions often involve an assessment of career achievement and potential, as well as a demonstrated commitment to scholarship and the mission of the institution, annual performance reviews and the assignment of merit categories to a faculty member for purposes of salary administration for one or several years are insufficient, by themselves, to determine the outcome of such important decisions.

While we see the merits of the above paragraph, Welfare does feel that there should be a clear and predictable relationship between the annual & merit evaluations and progress towards tenure & promotion. Are we really saying that a probationary faculty member could receive 5 years of good annual evaluations and still not be good enough to receive tenure?

This segues to the larger topic of College wide standards for tenure & promotion. If schools and departments come up with their own policies then the T&P committee must accept those policies and criteria specified by the individual departments when evaluating faculty. Are there no specific and quantitative College wide benchmarks that all departments must require from their faculty? Are we comfortable with having no common scale for teaching, research and service?

Ms. Penny added that this paragraph of the evaluation proposal particularly bothered the Welfare Committee because it seems to say that just because one gets good evaluations, one shouldn’t expect tenure and promotion. Such an idea, she stressed, seems very problematic and leads to the issue of there being no across-the-College-standards, especially those of a quantitative nature.

From 2. Standards, Criteria and Evidence for Annual Evaluation

The Faculty Welfare Committee and an ad Hoc committee of past members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review will provide comments on departmental and school evaluation instruments upon their initial development. Approval of these plans by the appropriate Academic Dean and by the Provost is required before implementation. After initial adoption, any significant changes must be sent to the Faculty Welfare Committee for review/recommendations and to the Provost for approval before implementation.

Welfare shares the concern of T&P with regard to the workload that we will receive with regard to this last paragraph. At the very least the departmental evaluation procedures should be vetted through their individual schools and presented for review by Welfare collaboratively. Or it may be best to set up an ad Hoc committee to approve the initial instruments/procedures and then any subsequent changes can be reviewed individually by Welfare.
From: 3. Annual Evaluation and Merit Review Process

Annual evaluations will normally be completed early in each calendar year. A calendar for the evaluation process will be posted on the website of the Office of Academic Affairs.

While specific policies may differ by school and department, all annual evaluations should provide sufficient information to allow for full, fair and constructive evaluation without being unnecessarily burdensome to faculty or Department Chairs. At a minimum, faculty members will provide

- a current curriculum vitae, and
- a 1-2 page personal statement presenting accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research and professional development, and service over the last calendar year.

We perceive issues in evaluating teaching with only two pages of narrative. Research and service are fairly easily quantified, but effective teaching is difficult to demonstrate without additional materials. We suggest that all faculty members be allowed to include some (limited) amount of additional evidence for review.

Ms. Penny added that the Welfare Committee thought the two-page narrative for evaluating teaching should perhaps be a required minimum length, not a maximum length.

From: 6. Dean’s Role in the Assignment of Merit Categories

The Dean plays an active role in the development of departmental and school criteria and standards for annual evaluation and the assignment of merit categories. The Dean is responsible for ensuring that these standards and criteria are applied by chairs equitably across departments in his or her school. Normally a Dean and Chair will discuss the assignment of merit categories before a faculty member is notified of such. Notification to the faculty member of the assignment of a merit category may occur separately from the annual evaluation.

Welfare has received many comments on how the merit category and subsequent raises are decided and how much of that information is shared with the faculty member. In general the faculty feel that this process should be transparent where they are notified of the specific recommendations of their chair, dean, provost, and final rating. As the administrator with the most knowledge of their faculty, if the chair’s initial recommendation is changed, support for that change should be given.

Ms. Penny added that this was the most commented on section, and stressed the need for transparency in the decision making process. If chairs’ decisions are overruled by deans, then justification must be provided, since chairs know faculty in their departments best.

Deanna Caveny, chair of the Committee on By-Laws and Fac/Admin. Manual
Ms. Caveny reported that her committee is working on several issues. One issue is to eliminate an ambiguity in the by-laws concerning the definition of “regular faculty,” a definition that has implications for determining who is eligible to serve as a Faculty Senator and how many Senate seats are allocated to academic departments. The main ambiguity centers on faculty who are also administrators. For example, some chairs may not be counted in senatorial apportionment decisions and be ineligible to serve in the Senate because they may not “teach at least six hours.” The question of who is an “administrator” is also problematic and has implications for how one defines and counts “regular faculty” in departments. Ms. Caveny said that this issue has been around for a while and is complicated, but that the committee will present a proposal to address it, probably at the next Senate meeting.

Ms. Caveny also reported that the committee is bringing to the Senate an amendment that will allow the committee to make changes to defunct or inaccurate titles. The committee is also crafting language to deal with a change to the FAM endorsed by the Senate last year. This change requires the candidates for tenure, promotion, renewal, and third-year review to sign their departmental evaluation panel’s letter and receive a copy. Finally, the committee is considering proposing changes to the FAM that would require that students be provided reasonable accommodations for religious observance. Ms. Caveny remarked that this issue was first brought to the committee’s attention by a faculty member, and that Tom Trimboli, Legal Counsel, advised that rights concerning religious freedom obligated the College to accommodate students.

**New Business**

**Motion to Amend Article V Section 2.B.3. of the By-Laws**

Ms. Caveny, on behalf of the Committee on By-Laws and Fac./Admin. Manual, introduced the following motion:

**Intent:** To allow Committee on the By-laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual to correct inaccurate administrative titles in the FAM without action by the Faculty Senate and the faculty.

**Motion:** to amend Article V Section 2.B.3. of the By-Laws

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

   a. Composition: Three faculty members. *Ex-officio* members are the Speaker of the Faculty, the Faculty Secretary, the Provost (or Provost’s designee), and the Vice President for Legal Affairs. (Rev. April 2007)

   b. Duties:

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

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

      3. To incorporate any revisions to or interpretations of either document in new editions of the documents; and
4. To make non-substantive changes to the Faculty By-Laws to correct unintended grammatical and spelling errors, and to address minor problems of stylistic consistency, and correct inaccurate administrative titles. Such a non-substantive change shall not constitute an amendment to or repeal of the Faculty By-Laws. Such changes shall be made only when unanimously approved by the Committee. Notice in writing shall be given to the Faculty Senate within 60 calendar days of such changes being approved by the Committee. Such changes shall be repealed if an appropriate motion to amend something previously adopted is approved by a simple majority of the Committee, the Faculty Senate, or the College Faculty. (Ins. April 2007)

The Speaker pointed out that, as required by the by-laws, the motion must go to (in this instance return to) the By-Laws/FAM Committee for review. At the next meeting, the By-Laws/FAM Committee will report on the motion and the Senate will vote on it.

**Save-Our-Trees Resolution**

Speaker Kelly next recognized Phil Dustan (Biology), who said that he wished the Senate to vote on a resolution that would encourage the College administration to put a halt to the planned removal of some trees in front of Randolph Hall until a public hearing was held and the administration provided a fuller justification for their removal.

The Speaker informed the Senate that to introduce such a resolution at this time, the Senate would have to vote to suspend the rules, and that a two-thirds majority was required. Mr. Dustan made a motion to suspend the rules, and the motion received a second. The Senate voted and the motion passed.

Mr. Dustan said that he thought many Senators had followed the discussion about the tree-removal controversy on the College listserv, but he wanted to provide some additional context. He said that this was not the first time that the administration had tried to take down trees without consulting the college community. He mentioned that the Sotille tree was almost taken down simply because some administrator thought it was ugly. It was saved because students protested. Similarly, an attempt was made to take down the bald cypresses in Cougar Mall, but that effort too was stopped after some protest. Such incidents, he continued, prompted the creation of an *ad hoc* Tree Committee, though that committee, which was created to deal with a specific controversy, no longer exists. The same pattern is recurring now where trees are going to be removed without consultation with the College community simply because someone in the administration does not like how they look. Though other reasons have been given for their removal, Mr. Dustan said that they were questionable, and that the resolution asks for a forum so that the reasons for their removal can be examined and discussed. He then moved that the following resolution be endorsed by the Senate:

**Save our Trees**

*February 2009*

*Dear President Benson,*

*It is our understanding that the College of Charleston Administration is planning to remove 10 significant native trees from the area around Randolph Hall. The 4 large magnolias and 2 mature palms that grace the south side of the building are slated to go, as well as 4 American hollies (the trees with the red berries) on the north side.*

*We object to this because cutting these trees will significantly diminish the beauty of our campus landscape, and significantly reduce the diversity of the plantings*
around Randolph Hall. These are mature trees that add a lot of grace to the building, and a lot of color and texture as well. They are home to many birds and small mammals. The trees are far enough away from the building to allow for air circulation, and their root systems pose no obvious threat. We object to cutting the hollies particularly because of their fruit — these red berries add welcome dots of color to our campus during the winter season. They also play a large role in ameliorating the urban heat island effect and help save energy by providing shade for buildings. Trees are a very important part of our campus. They provide us with a sense of place. There is no need to take the drastic action of removal. Therefore, the undersigned members of the College of Charleston community request that no removal action be taken until such action is satisfactorily explained and justified to the entire campus community. We urge the persons who have suggested such removal to hold a well-announced public hearing to present their rationale.

The motion received a second.

Michael Gomez (Hispanic Studies) asked if the magnolia trees were twenty years old. “Yes,” Mr. Dustan replied. They were planted as mature trees and contain a lot of bio-diversity. In response to a question about the justification given for the removal of the trees, Mr. Dustan said that the primary reason was to reduce moisture around and on Randolph Hall, and that the administration cited a guideline that no tree should be within 25 ft. of a building. Mr. Dustan thought this was a wildly unrealistic guideline because if it were followed, it would entail the removal of 80% of the trees on campus. Problems of moisture, he added, can fixed by installing drains and pruning. No one wants to damage Randolph Hall, but the building can be preserved without removing the trees, which help give us a sense of place.

Anthony Williams (Philosophy) asked if the consultants hired by the College have in mind some sort of future image-making use of Randolph Hall and wondered if that may be motive for the tree removal. Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) then asked about the declarative statement at the end of the second paragraph of the petition: There is no need to take the drastic action of removal. He suggested that, given the spirit of the resolution and its call for open-mindedness, the language of that sentence be modified. Mr. Dustan proposed changing the word “is” in the sentence to “may.” This change was accepted without objection.

The Senate voted on Mr. Dustan’s motion to endorse the petition: the motion passed.

PASCAL Resolution

David Cohen (guest and Dean of Libraries) introduced the PASCAL resolution (below), which, he explained, comes to Senate from the Faculty Library Committee.

To the South Carolina State Legislature:
Submitted by the College of Charleston Faculty Senate
Author: Faculty Library Committee

Purpose: To advocate the restoration of full funding for PASCAL by the South Carolina General Assembly.

Whereas, PASCAL is a statewide academic library consortium, of which the College of Charleston is a member, and
Whereas, PASCAL’s funding has been supported by the member colleges and the South Carolina General Assembly, and

Whereas, PASCAL has succeeded in serving the research needs of students by expanding access to information through a rapid delivery system and through access to online databases provided at consortial pricing and

Whereas, the state funding for PASCAL was decreased by 90% in FY2008-2009, necessitating increased fees by member colleges and reduced services and

Whereas, without a reinstatement of legislative funding, PASCAL will cease to exist in FY2009-2010, and

Whereas, the online and print materials provided by PASCAL will no longer be available to the majority of the 230,000 students and faculty of South Carolina institutions, and

Whereas, the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education Study Committee has identified PASCAL as “the best current example for sharing inter-institutional costs for technology in South Carolina,” and

Whereas, the Commission on Higher Education has recommended funding PASCAL at a cost of $2.3 million,

Whereas, the South Carolina General Assembly has the authority to reinstate PASCAL’s funding and to support the inter-institutional cooperation that serves the students and faculty of South Carolina’s colleges and universities, and

Whereas, the College of Charleston is a direct beneficiary of PASCAL’s resources having received access to over ten million books, 13,000 research publications and delivery of over 3,938 books. Therefore,

Be it enacted, by the College of Charleston Faculty Senate the following:

That, the College of Charleston Faculty Senate strongly appeals to the South Carolina General Assembly to Fund PASCAL at the $2.3 million amount recommended by the Commission on Higher Education.

Mr. Cohen then explained that PASCAL is consortium of South Carolina libraries that shares books and pools resources to purchase and share databases. State funding for PASCAL, however, has been cut by 90%, which, if continued, will cause our library and other state libraries to loose databases and the software needed to make them functional within the system. Such drastic cutbacks, Mr. Cohen continued, will also hurt faculty research efforts and ultimately compromise the mission of the College. He added that Faculty Senates in other colleges have passed similar resolutions. He also encouraged faculty to call or write their legislative representatives to urge them to restore PASCAL to its previous funding levels.

Sheila Seaman (guest and Asst. Dean) added that the College contributes around $12,000 for participation in the PASCAL consortium, but gets over $100,000 in database assets, which make us comparable to the University of South Carolina in this area. PASCAL democratizes library resources and makes available to each academic library in the state the resources of all the other libraries.
The Senate voted and the PASCAL resolution passed.

Faculty Curriculum Committee

The following curricular proposals were approved without discussion:

- Change Minor—Women’s and Gender Studies
- Change Minor—Archeology

Next the following proposal was introduced:

- Change of Major—Latin and Caribbean Studies

Mr. Krasnoff asked whether there had been any discussion of the study abroad component in the proposal when it was reviewed by various committees. He said that he thought it was good for students to have study abroad experiences, and was glad that there was a clause in the proposal that students could opt of it. But he was worried about the financial burden such a requirement would impose on students and wondered about the wisdom of requiring educational experiences that students or the College might not be able to afford.

Sarah Owen (at-large) responded that she and her colleagues in Latin and Caribbean Studies had talked about the issue. She pointed out that there is a lot funding for study abroad and that many study abroad scholarships are available to students. So the money is there, she stressed, and students can always opt of the study abroad requirement. She also stressed that study abroad constitute wonderful and valuable learning experiences for students. Bob Perkins (chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee) said that his committee did discuss the study abroad component of the proposal, and Norris Preyer (Physics and chair of the Budget Committee) said that his committee discussed the issue a lot and were glad to hear that many study abroad scholarships were available.

The Senate voted and the proposal to change the Major in Latin and Caribbean Studies passed.

Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

The following proposal passed without discussion:

- Proposal for a New Graduate Program: MAT in Teaching in the Middle Grades

Next, Heather Tierney, chair Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs, informed the Senate of the following curricular change that her committee had passed:

- Permission to Cross-List A Graduate Course – FREN 590 with FREN 490

Constituents’ Concerns

James Williams (Library) asked that Senators spread the word that students should never give out their C of C account password to anyone soliciting it, especially through email.
Mr. Krasnoff asked if the Speaker could update the Senate on the Provost Search. The Speaker replied that the first meeting of the Provost Search Committee would take place on February 16.

With the Senate’s business concluded, a motion was made to adjourn. The motion received a second and passed. The Senate adjourned at around 6:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Special Faculty Senate Meeting, 27 January 2009

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 27 January 2009, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium in a special meeting called by the Speaker Joe Kelly to elect faculty members who would potentially serve on the Provost Search Committee.

After Speaker Kelly called the meeting to order, he gave the floor to Tom Kunkle, chair of the Faculty Committee on Nominations and Elections (N & E). Mr. Kunkle presented to the Senate for approval the following slate of candidates for the Provost Search Committee.

Andrew Lewis HEHP
Bob Mignone MATH
Darryl Phillips CLAS
Pam Riggs-Gelasco CHEM
Claire Curtis POLS

Mr. Kunkle explained that N & E, in consultation with the Speaker, felt it was imperative that the Senate select the faculty’s representatives as soon as possible so that the faculty could not be accused of delaying the provost search. He explained, too, that it was not possible to nominate someone from every school, and that N & E looked for experienced people—a criterion that excluded non-tenured faculty. Overall, he thought that N & E came up with a strong slate.

Todd McNerney (at-large) asked who else would be on the Provost Search Committee and specifically whether the Deans of the School of Arts and the School of Business and Economics would be on it. He pointed out that if those deans were likely to be on the committee, the Senate would not need to add representatives from those schools to the slate presented by N & E. Speaker Kelly replied that he will be on the committee and thought that some deans and high-level administrators would also be on the committee. He noted that in the last Provost search, ten faculty members were on the committee. The Speaker added that he had informed the President of this fact earlier, but did not hear back from the President until mid-January, and that it was not clear how many persons would be on the committee this time. He guessed that there would be nine to ten persons in total.

Pete Calcagno (Economics & Finance) remarked that he was not sure if his current dean—the interim Dean of the School of Business and Economics—or the new dean of his school would be on the committee; so he was concerned that there might be no representatives from his school. The Speaker replied that because the search would begin right away, it would be too late for the new dean to be on the committee.

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) asked if the President is likely to include on the committee all five faculty representatives on the slate. Speaker Kelly said that he was not certain, but thought the President would take all five. Jeffery Diamond (History) asked if additional nominations to the slate could be made so that the faculty could potentially have more than five representatives on the committee. The Speaker replied that adding names would be in order. Edith Stillwell (Health & Human Performance) expressed support for this idea. So, too, did Deanna Caveny (at-large), who suggested adding faculty so that all schools are represented. She also thought that the persons on the slate presented by N & E were good. She added that the work on the Provost Search Committee is hard, and that faculty who serve on it need to be strong representatives and dedicated to the task. She also said that it would be good if more than half of the committee members are faculty. Since the Provost represents the faculty, faculty need to make sure that they are well represented in the search process.
Mr. Calcagno wondered if the Senate could have more time to solicit other potential faculty representatives in order to make sure that they are willing to serve on the committee. The Speaker responded that the Senate must decide on a final slate tonight. Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) inquired whether faculty from the Business School were asked to be on the slate, and if so, who turned the invitation down. Mr. Kunkle responded that many faculty turned N & E down, that he did not think it was appropriate to mention names, and that N & E put people on the slate who agreed to serve. He stressed that N & E thought that having strong people on the Search Committee is the most important consideration, and that he does not think having representatives from each school is crucial. Laquita Blockson asked how faculty would know that the opinions of those schools that do not have representation on the committee would be heard. Mr. Kunkle replied that “we need to trust each other,” and that it is impossible to represent every constituency. Even if every school had a representative on the committee, that does not mean that every discipline would be represented. He urged the Senate to rely on the experience and judgment of their colleagues. Trish Ward (at-large Senator and a member of N & E), added that N & E carefully considered the experience and qualities of those selected to be on the slate. Mr. Krasnoff remarked that if Senators don’t believe that colleagues can’t represent colleagues in other schools, then they have a pessimistic view of who we are and of our future Provost. He also reminded Senators that the work of the Search Committee constitutes only part of the search process, and that there will be opportunities for all faculty to interview candidates. He also pointed out that every name that is added to the slate increases the possibility that another name already on the slate will be not be selected by the President to be on the committee.

At this point, another Senator asked why there are no untenured faculty on the slate and said that the views of young and untenured faculty need to be represented. Mr. Kunkle responded that untenured faculty might be afraid to speak out, and that it would unfair to expect them to serve on such a committee. He added that N & E has selected people who have been on the Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review, understand faculty and what they go through, and have extensive experience. Speaking in support of Mr. Kunkle, Rohn England (Mathematics) said that he is untenured and probably would not have the depth of experience in certain hiring issues to be on this committee, yet would feel comfortable to go to those faculty on the committee slate to express his concerns. He was confident that they would listen and understand those concerns.

After a couple of more brief remarks by Senators, Jason Overby (Chemistry & Biochemistry) called the question, which received a second. The motion to call the question passed.

The motion from N & E to approve the slate of faculty representatives for the Provost Search Committee passed.

Next, Mr. Calcagno moved to expand the list of faculty representatives by two. The motion received a second.

One Senator expressed concern that less than half of the Provost Search Committee might consist of non-faculty members, and thought it was a good idea to enlarge the slate. Michael Gomez (Hispanic Studies) pointed out that though the Senate might put additional persons on the slate of faculty representatives, it could not be sure that the persons chosen would be willing to serve. John Huddlestun (Religious Studies) wondered if the Senate could send the five names already voted on to the President and add two more later. Mr. Krasnoff urged the Senate to vote down the motion, arguing that if it wished to expand the slate of faculty representatives, it should nominate names of persons.

Mr. Krasnoff then called the question, which received a second. The motion to call the question passed.
The Senate voted on Mr. Calcagno’s motion expand the list of faculty representatives by two, which failed.

A Senator then moved that Todd McNerney, Associate Professor of Theatre and chair of the Theatre Department, be added to the list of faculty to serve on the Provost Search Committee. The motion received a second.

Mr. McNerney was then asked to give a brief summary of his experience and his qualifications to serve on such a committee. After doing so, the Senate voted and approved the motion to add him to the list of faculty representatives.

Mr. Calcagno then made a motion to add Rhonda Mack, Professor of Marketing and interim Dean of the School of Business and Economics, to the list of faculty to serve on the Provost Search Committee.

Ms. Mack was also asked to provide a brief summary of her experience and her qualifications to serve on the committee. After she did so, Mr. Diamond asked if it was appropriate that a dean be on the committee, especially given the likely possibility that the deans of other schools would not be the committee. The Speaker responded that President Benson might appoint a dean to head the committee; in any event the President would make the final determination of the committee’s composition. The Senate approved the motion to add Ms. Mack to the list of faculty representatives.

A motion to adjourn was next made, which was then seconded. The Senate voted to adjourn. The meeting ended at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 9 December 2008

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 9 December 2008, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, the minutes of the 11 November 2008 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens announced that there would likely be future budget cuts. This year already state funds have been cut some $5,000,000, and this month another 2% will in all likelihood be cut and another 2% in January. She reported that the General Assembly has asked the college to plan for an additional 15% cut next year (2009-10).

How do we deal this, the Provost asked? One possibility is personnel reductions. She said that faculty positions would be protected as much as possible, and that she has worked with deans to prioritize which faculty searches would continue. Some open faculty positions, however, will not be filled this year. So far thirteen faculty searches have been cancelled. Among staff, she reported that no one has thus far been laid off, but ten open staff positions either won’t be filled or have been eliminated, such as the following:

--the office manager in financial aid will not be filled;
--the position of assessment officer in the office of Accountability, Accreditation, Planning, and Assessment has been filled by someone from the advising office, whose position in advising has been eliminated;
--and academic support position in the office of the First Year Experience has been eliminated;
--a recently vacated position in IT won’t be filled
--the Diversity Office has given up a vacancy.

Provost Jorgens added that while the budget cuts have spurred the College to be more creative in utilizing the talents of its personnel, they have created some pain, which the administration has tried to spread out. For example, no department has been asked to eliminate more than one faculty position. A “cushion plan” is also being formulated to deal with the next round of cuts. One coping strategy, she suggested, is to fill vacant faculty positions with visiting professors.

While the budget problem has created some hardship, the Provost said that things could be worse. In one institution, she said, the faculty senate has asked professors to take a pay cut to avoid layoffs. Harvard University has frozen salaries and stopped searches (it has lost 30% of its endowment). Other South Carolina state schools have experienced complete hiring freezes. Coastal Carolina University has asked every faculty member to take on a 4/4 teaching load. Other institutions have increased class sizes.

The Provost concluded her prepared report by pointing out that in the long run the College will have to be very creative to find new ways of supporting itself financially.

The Provost then said that she would be happy to answer questions. Jerry Boetje (Computer Science) asked about possible tuition increases. Provost Jorgens answered that the President has been talking to the Board of Trustees about adjusting the ratio between in-state students and out-of-state students as a means of bringing in additional revenue. Projections have also been done with regard to tuition increases: to recover the funds cut by the state since August,
tuition would have to be increased by 8%. The President, she said, will raise this possibility with the Board. Mr. Boetje replied that students have been telling him that they can’t financially deal with another tuition increase and would probably have to drop out, if it were to happen. Provost Jorgens said that another idea it to impose an $80 fee to help deal with the budget shortfall. Also, the College is about seventh in the state in terms of the price of tuition. Other state schools charge more, so there is some room for a possible increase.

Phil Dustan (Biology) asked about the TERI program and whether it has come into discussions with respect to the budget crisis. The Provost said that it hadn’t, but that it is costing the state a lot money. The Speaker concluded by thanking the Senators for their help.

The Speaker

Speaker Joe Kelly reported a request from the Registrar regarding proposals for new programs with a starting date in 2010, spring semester: the Registrar requests that such programs not start at that time in order to avoid possible complications that might happen during the switch over to the new computer system, which is scheduled to occur at the same time. The Speaker thought that this request was reasonable, especially given the fact that not many new programs start during the spring semester. He said, too, that he and Bob Perkins, chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, informed the Academic Council about this request, and that the Council sees no problem with it.

Deanna Caveny, chair of the Committee on By-Laws and Fac/Admin. Manual

Ms. Caveny reported that her committee has been making progress on all the items mentioned in her last report at the previous Senate meeting, and that later in the meeting she would comment on the motion concerning the policy on departmental tenure and promotion panels.

Annual and Merit Evaluations: Report from the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review

Before Richard Nunan, chair of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review (T & P Committee), made his report, Laura Penny, chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, reported that her committee has begun to review the proposed procedures and standards regarding annual and merit evaluations, and would make a formal report to the Senate next semester. Mr. Nunan then delivered the following prepared report, which he asked to be included in the minutes.

At the invitation of the Speaker of the Faculty, the President’s Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review has reviewed the Office of Academic Affairs’ draft language for the proposed new Section VI.E, to be inserted in the Faculty Administration Manual under the subsection title, “Procedures for Annual and Merit Evaluation of Regular Instructional and Library Faculty.” This subsection would fall under the main section governing “Evaluation of Faculty,” following a series of four sections laying out the standards and procedures governing the major evaluations of tenurable faculty, instructors, and library faculty for tenure, promotion, retention, and third-year review.

The T&P Committee has three pieces of advice to offer concerning the draft language with respect to annual and merit evaluations of faculty.

First, some concern has been expressed, both on the Committee and among the faculty at large, about potential negative consequences which the decentralization of authority concerning the development of “specific policies, criteria and standards for annual
evaluation and the assignment of merit categories,” which would, under the draft policy, devolve to the level of departments and schools. The chief concern thus far has focused on the future status of teaching at the College of Charleston, as the primary mission of the faculty and the institution as a whole. Does the new policy mean that individual departments will soon be free to choose just where to place primary emphasis, with respect to raises and the quality of annual evaluations, so that the traditional ranking of teaching, research, and service might be reordered? Would departments, for example, or even entire schools, be free to make a decision under this policy to privilege research over teaching?

It’s difficult to assess the answer to this question. In favor of the view that departments could act unilaterally in this manner, there is the elimination of the past practice of weighting teaching as counting for at least 50% of the annual evaluation. Some of the comments emerging from the Office of Academic Affairs at some public faculty forums, about the virtues of such decentralization, may also have contributed to this reading.

Against this analysis, the decentralization policy itself is qualified by language in the draft proposal immediately following the expression of the decentralization policy: “Schools and departments will develop specific policies, criteria and standards for annual evaluation and the assignment of merit categories in their units. Criteria should be clearly stated and available to all members of the department. They may vary in detail but they must be consistent with general College policies. (See Faculty/Administration Manual, Sections A, B and C.)” [N.B.: A Roman numeral ‘VI’ should be inserted here before ‘A, B, and C’.]

Presumably, one of the College policies at issue here would be the remark, expressed twice at the outset of Subsection VI.A (on p. 94, in the preamble of Subsection A, and again at the beginning of the subordinate section on teaching effectiveness), that “Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty at the College of Charleston.” In other words, the elimination of the weighting policy in annual evaluation practices may be irrelevant, because the issue is addressed elsewhere.

In the view of the Advisory Committee on Tenure & Promotion, it would be prudent to repeat this language expressly in Subsection VI.E, in the paragraph quoted. One possibility would be to append the following sentence to the end of the above paragraph: “In particular, departments and schools need to be sensitive to the fact that teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty at the College of Charleston.”

Second, the T&P Committee is concerned about its own role in a mandate set forth in the paragraph immediately following the one just quoted: “The Faculty Welfare Committee and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review will provide comments on departmental and school evaluation instruments upon their initial development. Approval of these plans by the appropriate Academic Dean and by the Provost is required before implementation. After initial adoption, any significant changes must be sent to the Faculty Welfare Committee for review/recommendations and to the Provost for approval before implementation.”

On the one hand, the Advisory Committee on Tenure & Promotion does believe that members of this committee have an important, and perhaps unique perspective to bring to bear on the various individual annual and merit evaluation policies which might be crafted by the various departments and schools in response to the decentralization plan. On the other hand, the Committee also suffers already under a very heavy workload, and does not need yet another major responsibility on its plate, as this review process would surely be,
if it is to be done properly. Given the rhythms of faculty governance policy development, it is not implausible to think that the Committee would be asked to conduct many of those evaluations during a couple of spring semesters, when the Committee is either overwhelmingly busy (in January and February) or exhausted (March and April).

The Committee does not think this is a reasonable demand for the Office of Academic Affairs or the Senate to impose on the Committee itself. Consequently, the Committee suggests that the important role of T&P Committee review of these developing departmental and school evaluation policies be assigned instead to an ad hoc committee consisting entirely of former members of the President’s Advisory Committee on Tenure & Promotion. This strategy would leave the current membership of the T&P Committee free to conduct its normal business, but still preserve input from the T&P Committee perspective in the important oversight provisions governing the new evaluation policies to be developed at the local level.

Third, it has come to the T&P Committee’s attention that some faculty have been asking why we should not have one-year windows for both types of evaluation, instead of the separate three-year window of data now in use for merit evaluation. The existing policy was developed by last year’s Compensation Committee, and it seems a good one from our perspective on the T&P Committee. A three-year window on merit reflects the recognition that faculty performance patterns cannot easily be confined to a single year’s duration, especially when evaluating faculty along three distinct dimensions. We would therefore urge the retention of the three-year window for merit evaluation.

Unfinished Business

Motion concerning the policy on departmental Tenure and Promotion Panels

This motion, which had been made by the T & P Committee in the November Faculty Senate meeting, was sent to the Committee on By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual (By-Laws Committee) for review, as required by the by-laws. Ms. Caveny, chair of the By-laws Committee, said that her committee supported of the motion, but wished to make some minor changes mainly for the purposes of streamlining the language that would be inserted into the FAM and enhancing its clarity.

Original Motion

FAM VI.D.4, ¶ 3. When the department consists of five or more tenured faculty members, one tenured faculty member from outside the department shall be added to the panel. If a department is reviewing more than one candidate for tenure, promotion, or third year evaluation, the same individual from outside the department sits with departmental panel members for all cases, unless the department has six or more candidates due for panel evaluation. In such cases, a single extra-departmental panel member is still preferred, but at the discretion of the panel chair and panel, the department may appoint no more than two extra-departmental panel members to sit with the panel in different cases, with the cases divided in such a way so that a single extra-departmental panel member must serve in all cases under review for the same rank.

Revised Motion

FAM VI.D.4, ¶ 3. When the department consists of five or more tenured faculty members, one tenured faculty member from outside the department shall be added to the panel. If a department is reviewing more than one candidate for tenure, promotion,
or third-year evaluation, the same individual from outside the department sits with departmental panel members for all cases, unless the department has six or more candidates due for panel evaluation. In such cases, departmental members of the panel may appoint no more than two extra-departmental panel members to sit with the panel in different cases, with the cases divided such that a single extra-departmental panel member shall serve in all cases under review for the same rank.

Ms. Caveny explained that the revised language removed the preference clause (“a single extra-departmental panel member is still preferred. . . .”) to avoid creating any possible ambiguity or confusion for departments wishing to be guided by the FAM on adding more than one extra-departmental member to its review panel. The revised language also makes explicit who selects the additional extra-departmental panel member (it is departmental panel members, not all panel members, one of whom may include an extra-departmental panel member). Mr. Nunan said that the T & P Committee has approved the revisions suggested by the By-Laws Committee.

The Senate voted on the By-Laws Committee’s amendment to the motion made by the T & P Committee, which passed.

The Senate then voted the entire T & P motion, which passed.

Faculty Curriculum Committee

Prior to the meeting all proposals dealing with the proposed International Studies major were withdrawn. All of the other curricular proposals on the agenda were approved without discussion and include the following:

Latin American and Caribbean Studies

Change of Minor--Latin and Caribbean Studies

Geology

New Course--GEOL 235 Geology and Civilization

Hospitality and Tourism Management

Change Course--HTMT 488 Strategic Hospitality and Tourism Management
Change major

Mathematics

Change Major--Actuarial studies track

School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs

Change Minor--Archeology Minor
Change minor--Asian Studies

Historic Preservation and Community Planning

New Course--HCPC 375 Landscape Preservation and Community Planning
New Course--HCPC 298 AutoCAD and PhotoShop for Preservationists
Psychology

Change major

BS Psychology

New Course--PSYC 460 Advanced Conditioning and Learning with Lab
New Course--PSYC 462 Advanced Social Psychology with Lab
New Course--PSYC 464 Advanced Physiological Psychology with Lab
New Course--PSYC 466 Advanced Sensation and Perception with Lab
New Course--PSYC 468 Advanced Cognitive Psychology with Lab

Discovery Informatics

New cognate--Accounting
New cognate--Finance

Religious Studies

New Course--RELS 285 Religion and Feminism
Change Course--RELS 265 Women and Religion

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

The following curricular proposals were approved without discussion:

Proposal for a New Graduate Course:

Program -- Joint MAT in Middle Grades with The Citadel: EDMG 657 Teaching Writing in the Middle Grades

Proposal to Change a Graduate Program:

MAT in Special Education – Requirement Change

Proposal for a New Certificate Program:

Certificate in Special Education

Proposal to Change a Graduate Course:

ENGL 702 Internship – Change in hours of work

Constituents’ Concerns

Lynn Cherry (guest) reminded the Senate of the December commencement ceremony in the new sports arena. She said that the ceremony is very important to students and their parents and friends, and she urged faculty to attend.

With its business concluded, the Senate adjourned at around 5:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

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

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 11 November 2008, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, the minutes of the 7 October 2008 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens announced her retirement and read the following statement:

When I was interviewing for this position in the spring of 2003, then-President Higdon asked me if I planned to go on from a provost’s position to seek a presidency. I said I did not know but that I would not feel I had failed to fulfill my goals if I were to end my academic career as a provost. And that is what I am about to do. I have informed President Benson that I wish to retire as provost, effective June 30, 2009. At that time, I will have been in academia for 32 years, 17 of them as an administrator, and the last six as your provost here at the College of Charleston. It sometimes seems as though I just got here, but actually six years turns out to be a fairly lengthy tenure for a provost; I read recently that almost 45% of provosts nationally leave the job in three years or less!

I am not going to recount my accomplishments. Some days, as I head home after a day in which I have not even left the desk, I wonder whether I have accomplished anything at all! I can say, though, that while I had the usual faculty member’s concern about going over to the dark side, I have generally found academic administration both consuming and rewarding. I used to say to candidates for department chair positions that I thought the greatest challenge for faculty members going into administration was to put aside the need for personal accomplishment and learn to take pride in the accomplishments of others. That is what my job is really all about – your accomplishments, the accomplishments of students, and of alumni, and of course the overall performance of the College. If I am doing my job well, all of you will succeed. So as I contemplate stepping out of this role, I have much to be proud of. The College of Charleston is a great university and getting better – and better known – all the time. Our students are excellent, and reading the College Magazine about the things our alums are doing is quite simply inspiring. But it is faculty accomplishment that is nearest and dearest to me, and it is no exaggeration to say that you, the faculty of the College of Charleston, as devoted educators and scholars, have made my job here enormously gratifying.

I will, of course, still be here and working hard for this year. I would not have chosen to have to reduce budgets as my swan song, but the retirement has been lurking there for longer than the budget crisis. After I retire from the provost’s office, I will stay on with the College for one more year, on a reduced schedule. President Benson tells me there is a lot I could help out with, and I think that year of transition will be good for me too.

One of my accomplishments I will mention, because while it might seem now like a self-serving one, it is an area in which I hope to continue to make a contribution. That is the status and conditions of retirees. Some of you are aware that a year or so after I got here, I convened a group of retirees and near-retirees to advise me on this. It seemed to me that retirees here were a neglected group. Needless to say, they agreed,
and we have, in fact, made some progress in matters such as securing of on-going e-
mail accounts for emeritus faculty, and my office now does a retiree recognition
dinner for all retired faculty members and their spouses. But I think there are other
ways in which the College could continue to provide a supportive environment and, in
turn, ways in which retirees can contribute to the on-going strength and culture of the
institution. I hope to be able to provide some emeritus leadership, if you will.

And in the meantime, it’s those two grandchildren. They have made very clear that
they are not going to wait to grow up until I am ready, so I just have to accommodate
them!

President George Benson next thanked Ms. Jorgens for her work as provost, noting also
that she has met the difficult challenge of working with three very different presidents of the
College. He thanked her also for her great help to him in making the transition to the College.
President Benson pointed out that Ms. Jorgens has been more than a provost while at the
College and taken on the duties of general counsel, which has been an enormous burden.

President Benson then recognized a number of Provost Jorgens many accomplishments,
which included some of the following:

--Creating the Office for the Academic Experience
--Developing new student programs, such as the Freshman Seminar and First-Year
   Experience
--Initiating a review of General Education
--Focusing on Charleston as a learning environment
--Developing retention strategies and an enrollment plan
--Developing a merit-review process and an accountability plan
--Reviewing and developing a teaching-load plan
--Merging Institutional Research and Academic Affairs
--Organizing a space planning committee
--Helping in the creation and development of the School of Languages, Cultures, and
   World Affairs

President Benson also said that Provost Jorgens has promoted high standards for teaching and
scholarship, and done a great job in “holding the President’s feet to the fire” in supporting
academic quality. The President said that Provost Jorgens would continue to help with the
strategic plan. He concluded by formally thanking Provost Jorgens.

Next, President Benson said he would be happy to answer questions, if Senators had any.
One Senator asked whether more budget cuts were likely. The President said they were very
likely, especially given the fact that tax revenues are down farther than expected.

Rob Dillon (Biology) asked how the budget situation would affect hiring. President Benson
said that there would be a hiring slowdown, but not a hiring freeze. He added that the out of a
total budget approaching $200 million the state’s contribution was about $32 million, but that
has been cut to $28 million, which amounts to nearly a 2.5% drop in the overall budget.
“This is bad,” the President said, “but not catastrophic.” We will continue, he added, to make
new hires in critical areas, but each hire will be reviewed by the Executive Team. Some hires
will happen, some won’t.

Mr. Dillon followed up by asking whether departments should go ahead with their searches
for new faculty. Mr. Benson said that each department should consult with its dean. Provost
Jorgens echoed Mr. Benson’s response and added that the Academic Affairs Office has
developed plans with various departments. She also stressed that the most important hires are
faculty hires. They have priority.
Mr. Benson added that the College is not looking at furloughs or layoffs. Things are not that bad. He also said that he does not think the funding cuts will do long-term damage to the institution. However, he was concerned that people aren’t standing up and publicly speaking for higher education in the state. The business community, for example, has been largely silent, but needs to speak out for higher education. While there does seem to be a tendency in the state to support K-through-12 education, he said that K-12 is linked to higher education forming one integrated system. All parts of that system, he stressed, need to be protected. The President also reported that he had recently come back from a conference where strategies for dealing with these issues were explored.

Addressing the need to speak up for higher education, one Senator said that the College’s Board of Trustees should be doing this. However, the Trustees, he pointed out, are appointed by the legislature, the very body that doesn’t strongly value higher education. The system thus produces a kind of vicious circle. The President replied that the point was valid, but that he found our Board to be strong supporters of higher education. He said, too, that he prefers a trustee system (in which board members are elected by the legislature) to a regents system (in which the governor appoints board members). When asked what could be done about this vicious circle, he said that faculty could encourage advocates for higher education to run for trustee positions.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) asked about when the search for a new provost would begin. President Benson said that it would probably begin in January 2009, and that Provost Jorgens has agreed to stay on until a new provost is found.

Returning to the issue of the budget and public funding for the College, the President said that state support has gone up and down over the years, but that the long-term trend, which mirrors the national trend, is that state funding is dropping. State support is now down to about 14%. We need, he continued, to think about “the end game”—how everything ends up in terms of the financial situation of the College and how the College sustains itself financially. He expressed his hope that the strategic plan would develop a more stable economic model for financially operating the College.

**The Speaker**

Speaker Kelly personally thanked Provost Jorgens for her work over the years at the College. He said also that she has been a strong advocate for the faculty, often behind the scenes where such advocacy counts the most.

The Speaker referenced his newsletter and said that the bulk of his report could be found in the most recent issue. He only wised to add that a survey is underway to assess the campus climate for gays. He said that his unsuccessful work on seeking equal benefits for gay faculty and staff led him to see that there might be a campus climate problem. He added that he has met with faculty about such issues, and invited anyone interested to join him in working on them.

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

Ms. Caveny first mentioned that the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM) had recently been taken down from the Web site, edited, and re-posted in order to remove sections that indicated faculty members could be on disciplinary leave with pay. Ms. Caveny announced that the section in the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM) concerning payment to faculty, staff, and students from grant funds needs to be revised. She next reported that the name change of the Honors Program to the Honors College will be voted on for approval by the faculty. She also mentioned that Richard Nunan would be making a proposal to change the policy
regarding extra-departmental members serving on departmental tenure and promotion panels, and that more editorial work on the tenure and promotion section of the FAM is needed, for instance, to eliminate some redundancy and to better integrate language that was added for instructor and senior instructor positions. Ms. Caveny then reported that her committee had reviewed the motion to amend the duties of the Academic Planning Committee (the next item on the agenda) and recommends passage of the motion. She also reported that an ad hoc committee has been formed to review the duties, procedures and policies of both the Faculty Hearing Committee and the Faculty Grievance Committee, and to recommend possible changes to those committees, including the possibility of combining them. Ms. Caveny next announced that language explaining merit and annual evaluations has been posted on the Academic Affairs Web site. She added that when the final form of that language is approved, it will be in the administrative portion of the FAM. Her committee is also looking at the issue of faculty responsibilities to accommodate students observing their religious traditions. Such responsibilities may eventually be outlined in the FAM.

Unfinished Business

Motion to amend the duties of the Academic Planning Committee

Ms. Caveny explained that this motion was originally made by Hugh Wilder in the 1 April 2008 special Faculty Senate meeting devoted to Gen Ed, that her committee (By-Laws and FAM Committee) was required by the by-laws to review the motion, and that the committee recommends that it be approved with some slight re-formatting. The text of the original motion and its modified form follow below [note: the original motion refers to Art. IV, Sect. 2.B.1.b of an earlier version of the FAM, which has become Art V, Sect 2.B.1.b in the revised FAM].

Current Motion: Revise Faculty By-laws to remove general education oversight from Academic Planning Committee

Duties: To consider and recommend long-range academic programs and goals for the College, including general education programs. To this end, the committee shall …

Original Motion: Revise Faculty By-Laws to change the duties of the Academic Planning Committee. (The original motion was proposed by Hugh Wilder at 1-Apr-08 Faculty Senate meeting devoted to general education proposals.)

Revise the Faculty By-Laws, Art. IV, Sect. 2.B.1.b as follows:

Duties: To consider and recommend long-range academic programs and goals for the College. [DELETE THE NEXT PHRASE IN THE ORIGINAL: “INCLUDING GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.” THE TEXT OF THE SECTION WILL THEN CONTINUE WITH NO CHANGES.]

Paul Young (Mathematics), speaking against the motion, said that as chair of last year’s Academic Planning Committee he had given his opinion on the motion when it was sent to the By-Laws and FAM Committee. He argued that it was not necessarily a good thing that the phrase “including General Education programs” be deleted from the Academic Planning Committee’s duties. He didn’t see a compelling reason why Academic Planning shouldn’t review things connected to Gen Ed.

The Senate voted on the motion and it passed.
New Business

A proposal to change the extra-departmental panel member workload policy with respect to departmental T&P panels

Richard Nunan, chair of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review, proposed on behalf of his committee the following motion to change the policy regarding extra-departmental panel members on departmental tenure and promotion panels.

The beginning of paragraph 3 of Manual section M.4 now reads:

When the department consists of five or more tenured faculty members, one tenured faculty member from outside the department shall be added to the panel. If a department is reviewing more than one candidate for tenure, promotion, or third year evaluation, the same individual from outside the department sits with departmental panel members for all cases.

The Committee proposes the following modification of this language, to go into effect in the 2009-10 Manual and evaluation cycle:

When the department consists of five or more tenured faculty members, one tenured faculty member from outside the department shall be added to the panel. If a department is reviewing more than one candidate for tenure, promotion, or third year, the same individual from outside the department sits with departmental panel members for all cases, unless the department has six or more candidates due for panel evaluation. In such cases, a single extra-departmental panel member is still preferred, but at the discretion of the panel chair and panel, the department may appoint no more than two extra-departmental panel members to sit with the panel in different cases, with the cases divided in such a way so that a single extra-departmental panel member must serve in all cases under review for the same rank.

Meg Cormack (at-large) seconded the motion. Mr. Nunan then explained that the proposal arose in light of recent requests from two departments. He said that the proposal was designed to accommodate large departments that sometimes have trouble recruiting extra-departmental panel members because of the amount of work and time involved in reviewing large numbers of candidates. He stressed, however, that should the motion be approved the intent of the committee was that in cases where departments did recruit more than one extra-departmental panel member, one member should review the same category of candidates up for review, the other extra-departmental member should review another category of candidates. He added that since submitting the motion to be put on the Senate agenda, his committee has slightly modified the motion (though none of the changes is significant), and that the revised version will be what the Senate will vote on.

Speaker Kelly said that because the motion involved a change in the FAM, the by-laws required that the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administrative Manual review the proposed motion. The Speaker therefore remanded the proposal (in the revised form) to the By-Laws and FAM Committee for review.

Resolution Regarding the Illegal Immigration and Reform Act

Tim Carens (English) moved that the Senate endorse following resolution.
WHEREAS, the 2008 Illegal Immigration Reform Act (A280, R327, H4400) requires South Carolina’s public institutions of higher education to prevent illegal aliens from enrolling; and

WHEREAS, we have seen no evidence, neither statistical nor anecdotal, of illegal aliens enrolled at the College of Charleston, which renders this requirement more symbolic than material; and

WHEREAS, we know that the cost of bringing the College of Charleston into compliance with this requirement will be significant; and

WHEREAS, in these difficult economic times, the state is seeking to cut unessential expenses; and

WHEREAS, the legislature has not appropriated any money to pay for this provision of the law, and

WHEREAS, the legislature has just ordered the College to cut $4.9 million from its 2008/2009 budget, and

WHEREAS, the symbolism of this requirement, which publicizes the exclusion of a class of residents, harms the spirit of a public university; and

WHEREAS, to demand proof of citizenship of every student unnecessarily inconveniences those students and offends the liberty to which they are entitled; and

WHEREAS, if the Act were successful in excluding anyone, those likely to bear the brunt of its provisions would be the children of undocumented workers; and

WHEREAS, the children of undocumented workers are not responsible for their immigration status; and

WHEREAS, such children are likely to be poor, and the purposeful exclusion of the poor from higher education would contribute unintentionally to the perpetuation of an underclass within our borders; and

WHEREAS, symbolic gestures of exclusion are unbecoming a great people;

WE, the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston, THEREFORE ask the President of the College of Charleston to work with the legislature for the repeal of that portion of the Illegal Immigration and Reform Act that deals with “Illegal immigrations and higher education” (Section 17).

Ms. Cormack seconded the motion. Mr. Carens remarked that the Illegal Immigration and Reform Act largely represents political symbolism. But even if one assumes that it really seeks to address a documented problem—that "illegal aliens" are attending our college and that they are absorbing benefits to the detriment of the state—the issue has already been addressed by the Supreme Court in 1982 in relation to K-12 public education. The logic of that ruling, Mr. Carens argued, extends to higher education. In Plyler v. Doe, the court held that a "Texas statute which withholds from local school districts any state funds for the education of children who were not 'legally admitted' into the United States, and which authorizes local school districts to deny enrollment to such children, violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment" (210-230). Mr. Carens then quoted Justice Brennan, who wrote for the majority in the case:
the Texas statute imposes a lifetime hardship on a discrete class of children not accountable for their disabling status. These children can neither affect their parents' conduct nor their own undocumented status. The deprivation of public education is not like the deprivation of some other governmental benefit. Public education has a pivotal role in maintaining the fabric of our society and in sustaining our political and cultural heritage; the deprivation of education takes an inestimable toll on the social, economic, intellectual, and psychological well-being of the individual, and poses an obstacle to individual achievement. In determining the rationality of the Texas statute, its costs to the Nation and to the innocent children may properly be considered.

Rob Dillon (Biology) offered an amendment to the motion. He said that he thought the first six premises of the motion were fine and he approved of them, but not the other premises, which he thought were hyperbolic and “nonsense.” His proposed amendment received a second.

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

Mr. Dillon, in response to the excerpt of the Supreme court ruling that Mr. Carens read, said that he didn’t see how that ruling was relevant to the motion, since that ruling did not deal with higher education, which, he stated, is a not a right, but a privilege. The state is just asking that those who attend institutions of higher learning to obey the law. Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) responded that though it is true that college students are not minors by the time they graduate, they are minors when they apply to and are admitted to college. In that sense, he said, the supreme court ruling read by Mr. Carens is relevant because the decision for most illegal immigrants to be in college is not principally theirs, but their parents. In that respect, they are not guilty of breaking the law as Mr. Dillon suggests. Therefore we should educate these students.

The Senate voted and endorsed the resolution.

Faculty Curriculum Committee

The following curricular proposals were approved without discussion:

Computer Science

- New Minor--Computational Thinking
- Change Course--CSCI 112 Communication, Technology and the Internet
- Change Course--CSCI 420 Principles of Compiler Design
- Change Course--CSCI 362 Software Engineering
- Change Course--CSCI 320 Programming Language Concepts
- Change Course--CSCI 380 User Interface Development
- Change Course--CSCI 470 Principles of Artificial Intelligence
- Change Course--CSCI 334 Data Mining
- Change Course--CSCI 462 Software Engineering
- Change Course--CSCI 332 Database Concepts
- Change Course--CSCI 325 Declarative Programming Languages
- Delete course--CSCI 130 Visual Basic for Applications

Discovery Informatics

- Delete course--DISC 201 Introduction to Databases and Data. Mining
French
Change of Major--French and Francophile

German and Slavic Studies
New Course--RUSS 331 Business Russian
Change Minor--Russian Studies

The following proposals were next submitted for approval:

Latin American and Caribbean Studies
Change of Major--Latin and Caribbean Studies
Change of Minor--Latin and Caribbean Studies

Claire Curtis (Political Science) had a question about item #5 in the proposal form—“Justification for Change(s)”—for the Change of Major proposal. She said that she was not sure that requiring a disciplinary minor constituted an adequate grounding in a discipline. She gave the examples of minors in political science and computer science, which are not designed to give students a grounding in those disciplines. Doug Friedman (guest) responded that the proposal does not say that the same grounding will be provided in the minor as in the major. Also, he said that the addition of the Study Abroad component and the foreign language component should add sufficient familiarity with the discipline.

Mr. Krasnoff asked if there was a relevance requirement for the disciplinary minors. Is there, for instance, a list of approved minors? Or can students take any minor? He thought there should be an approved number of minors that were relevant to the major. Mr. Friedman said that there was no such list; the only requirement was that the minor be in a discipline (and not interdisciplinary), though there was the assumption that a set of disciplinary minors would naturally go with this major. Mr. Krasnoff replied that the requirements for the major did not make complete sense, and that they should be related to the field in a proper way. John Creed (Political Science) and Jeffery Diamond (History) also voiced concerns about the coherence of the major, and thought that it should be more in line with other majors.

The Senate voted on the two Latin American and Caribbean Studies proposals, which failed.

The following curricular proposals were approved without discussion:

Marketing and Chain Supply Management
Change of Major--BS International Business

Mathematics
New Course--MATH 445 Numerical Analysis
Delete course--MATH 545 Numerical Analysis I

The following proposals were approved:

Theatre
Change Minor--Scenography I
Change Minor--Scenography II
Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

The following curricular proposal was approved without discussion:

Proposal to Change a Graduate Program: MS in accountancy

Heather Tierney, chair of the Committee on Graduate Education, reported on some revisions to the Policies and Procedures for Graduate Certificate Programs. She said that the changes make the policies and procedures more transparent.

Constituents’ Concerns

Ms. Cormack said that she was concerned about the increase in bureaucratic paperwork and effort that would ensue from the requirements for annual and merit evaluation. She read the following statement that explained her concerns, and suggested that perhaps Provost Jorgens’ final contribution to the College could be the reduction of bureaucracy:

My concern is the implication of the increase in bureaucracy (especially that required by the new evaluation procedures at C of C) for department chairs. Even aside from these evaluations, the duties of chairs, during the 14 years I have been at the college the work-load of chairs has gone from bad to worse, and has not, been compensated in terms of additional time (further course releases) or money. I do not count the two additional months pay chairs receive: they work for that (and work hard) and those months are not ‘extra’ pay, but rather (in my opinion) an inadequate compensation for the time taken away from the teaching or research which most of us would prefer to do during the summer. To quote a chair whose term finished about 2 years ago - and who at that time was NOT required to write annual evaluations for every member of the department ‘not only does it eat up every minute of time during the semester, it completely wipes out the summer’

A chair must by definition put her research program on ‘hold’, and it is also unlikely that she would be able to do much in the way of development in the area of teaching. Given the current evaluation procedure, individuals whose contributions are essential to the administration of the institution are likely to be excluded from the ‘high’ or ‘outstanding’ ratings which they so amply deserve. Becoming chair involves a huge increase in duties and responsibility that is not, at present, recognized in any concrete form.

Present chairs are stuck with this situation; the problem will become critical when they step down. There is absolutely no incentive to become chair; my senior colleagues observing the situation are for the most part saying ‘not on your life’ or using even stronger language. Unless something is done to rectify the conditions of chairship, it is unlikely that anyone will willingly take on the job, which is likely to be imposed on newly promoted associates who have not yet realized that it is, in fact, possible to say ‘no’ when asked to perform an onerous and thankless task, and who may not realize that they are writing off any chance to do research in the period of their tenure. The college will find itself in a major administrative crisis a few years down the road. I would like to urge the administration to address this situation now, rather than waiting for that crisis. Perhaps a solution to this pressing problem could be the Provost’s legacy to the college.

Next, Mr. Krasnoff asked if the Budget Committee was playing any kind of role in making decisions on budget cuts. Norris Preyer (Physics/Astronomy and chair of the Budget
Committee) said that committee members had attended various meetings on budget issues, but have not been involved in decisions about budget cuts.

On a different topic, Deanna Caveny (at-large) said that she would like various committees to look at the language concerning annual and merit evaluations that will go into the FAM. Speaker Kelly said that he would see to this request and invited all faculty and departments to review such language and to provide input so that it could be brought before the Academic Forum.

Provost Jorgens, in a response to Mr. Krasnoff’s earlier question about budget cuts, said that no decisions on cuts have been made. Decisions on cuts will be discussed and “come up” from the faculty to the administration, and will not be imposed from above. No one, she continued, has been excluded in this process. Indeed, faculty and departments especially need to be involved in setting priorities.

Continuing the discussion on budget decisions, Todd McNerney (at-large) asked about a form that had been circulated that listed the key decision makers. The Provost explained that the form referenced means that all on the list have approved certain budget items as a priority. Provost Jorgens again emphasized that everybody needs to be involved in these discussions. She does not want vice-presidents to make all the decisions on budget cuts; faculty must be involved in establishing priorities.

Mr. Diamond asked if the faculty could have representation in the final decisions on budget cuts. Provost Jorgens responded that she is that representative. She added that all members of the Executive Team see faculty appointments as priorities. Steve Osborne, for example, Sr. VP of Business Affairs, is a staunch supporter of academic positions.

With its business concluded, the Senate adjourned at around 6:15 P. M.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 7 October 2008

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 7 October 2008, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, all the minutes of the spring 2008 Faculty Senate meetings devoted to the Gen-Ed Proposals (15 January, 29 January, 5 February, 19 February, 26 February, 18 March, 25 March, and 1 April) were approved. The minutes of the last regular Faculty Senate meeting (9 September 2008) were also approved.

Reports

The Provost

Associate Provost Bev Diamond substituted for Provost Elise Jorgens, who was out of town. Ms. Diamond reported that the Academic Forum had recently met and looked at draft language concerning annual faculty evaluations, which would go in the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM). Consensus, she said, is developing, though more detail is still needed. She added that faculty committees would look at the proposed language, that deans and chairs are working on their documents involving evaluations, and that faculty would be involved.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) asked if the College was looking at doing away with post-tenure review in light of the new system of annual and merit evaluations. Ms. Diamond replied that it makes perfect sense to get rid of post-tenure review and replace it with annual evaluations. But she said that doing so would also mean the elimination of the $2,500 salary increase that goes with a superior post-tenure-review rating. Some way of building that reward into the new system needs to be found.

The Speaker

Speaker Kelly spoke about the new merit system, noting that he was concerned that good teaching might not count as much as it has traditionally at the College. To address this concern, he reported that he and Bev Diamond have put together an ad hoc committee to look into what constitutes good teaching and how best to evaluate it. Sub-committees have been formed to look at various aspects of the issue. The committee’s goal is to provide a list of best practices to guide the development and evaluation of good teaching at the College.

Speaking on the Modification of Duties policy, the Speaker reminded this year’s Faculty Senate that last year’s Senate endorsed a resolution to adopt a new policy that was modeled on the one used at the University of South Carolina. The Speaker said that the Welfare Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee have been working on the details of adopting and implementing a new policy.

The Speaker next mentioned the status of the TERI plan and whether faculty on the plan are at-will employees or not (at-will employees lose their tenure). The Speaker said that the issue was complicated, and that various difficult legal points of law were involved, which have forced Academic Affairs and Human Resources to seek legal counsel in interpreting law, which is vague on this issue. He said that he would update the faculty as he finds more information.

Next, the Speaker reported an issue concerning the amount that the College contributes to the retirement of faculty in optional retirement programs (ORPs), such as TIAA-CREF. The College reports that it contributes 12.4%, but in fact it only contributes 5%, which is well below what the national average is and what our peer institutions contribute. The Speaker
said that he has met with Steve Osborne (Sr. VP of Business Affairs), Tom Trimboli (Sr. VP of Legal Affairs), and Shirley Hinson (Director of Government Relations), and that they are working on the issue, which is important because the College is not competitive in this area.

The Speaker next reported on the formation of a privacy committee organized by Tom Trimboli. The College has been lax with how it handles personal information, such as students’ social security numbers, and so the committee is tasked with writing a new policy to deal with such matters. The Speaker added that the Welfare Committee would look at drafts of the new policy and provide input. He urged faculty to send their ideas to the Welfare Committee.

Finally, the Speaker announced that he had been invited to serve on the Holiday Party Committee in order to represent the faculty. He invited Senators and other faculty members to take on this responsibility in his place.

**Alex Modly, Student Government Association**

Ms. Modly announced that the Major/Minor Fair had been changed from Thursday, 9 October to Thursday, 16 October to avoid a conflict with the Jewish holiday Yom Kippur. The event will take place in Physicians Promenade.

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

Ms. Caveny announced that highlights as well as full minutes of the meetings of the Committee on the By-Laws and Fac/Admin. Manual (FAM) are posted on the Faculty Senate Web site. She said that the revised FAM will be posted on the Academic Affairs Web site. She added that the revised FAM would contain only content of “enduring significance,” which mainly includes policies, statements of purpose, and some key information about certain procedures (though not all procedures). Other information, which includes some procedural guidelines, will be posted on the Academic Affairs Web site.

Ms. Caveny announced that additions to the FAM include the following:
- a policy statement on Courtesy Appointments,
- the Modification of Duties policy,
- a slight change to the Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review (T, P & R) section involving details about when the President’s letter on any T, P, & R decision is due,
- some refinement to the language on annual and merit evaluations,
- the complete Post-Tenure Review policy,
- a clarification of the Sabbatical policy, which will state that all faculty on sabbatical must normally relinquish their administrative duties, and that they must sign a statement promising to return to the College after the sabbatical.

Ms. Caveny explained that the faculty owns and controls the by-laws, but not other information in the FAM, which is controlled by the administration. However, she said that the philosophy of the Committee is that any changes in the FAM should involve consultation between the faculty and the administration.

She also reported that when the Faculty Senate approved the formation of the new Gen-Ed Committee, it also proposed a change to the by-laws concerning the Academic Planning Committee. Her committee, she said, will report on this issue at the next meeting.

Finally, Ms. Caveny reported that her committee has reviewed the proposed by-laws amendment regarding the composition of the Gen-Ed Committee (the next item on today’s
agenda), and that the committee agrees that the proposal should be heard by the Senate. However, she reported that the committee is not making a recommendation on whether to approve or reject the proposal.

**Unfinished Business**

**Motion to amend language on the composition of the Gen-Ed Committee**

Since the Committee on the By-Laws and Fac./Admin. Manual had given its report on the motion, as required by the by-laws for any proposed change to the by-laws, the Senate resumed its deliberations on the motion, which reads as follows:

Insert a new Standing College Committee, the Committee on General Education.

1) Composition: Seven regular faculty shall be elected to serve on the Committee. Each academic school shall be represented on the Committee. The Committee shall have one voting student member selected by the Student Government Association. Committee members shall serve a term of one year and may, if re-elected, serve as many as three consecutive terms. The Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience (or other administrator designated by the Provost) and the Director of Assessment (or other administrator designated by the Provost), and one representative from the library faculty are *ex officio*, non-voting members.

Darryl Phillips said that while it was good to have wide representation on committees, he was opposed to this amendment for various reasons. First, he said that the use of the term *ex officio* was inappropriate. Normally, the term signifies one who holds another office and becomes a member of a committee. This definition, however, does not apply to the library faculty in this matter as it does with other *ex officio* members of the committee. Second, the motion doesn’t explain how the library member will be selected, which is generally not a good practice to start adopting. Third, the amendment implies a sense of ownership of the Gen-Ed Committee with respect to the library faculty. We wouldn’t, continued Mr. Phillips, say that of some other group, such as the English Department or the History Department. There are other ways to make the committee more representative.

James Williams (Library) said that he agreed with Mr. Phillips on the point about the use of the term *ex officio*, but not with his other points. The library faculty, he pointed out, supports the entire curriculum in a way that, say, the English Department and Math Department do not. The library therefore needs to be included in the Gen-Ed Committee’s deliberations and should have representation on the committee.

Pete Calcagno (Economics and Finance) wondered if library faculty are required to be on the Faculty Curriculum Committee. He thought that the Curriculum Committee is similar in kind to the Gen-Ed Committee, and that the rules governing membership in that committee would serve as a guide for whether or not the library must be represented on the Gen-Ed committee. Bob Perkins (Teacher Education and chair of the Curriculum Committee) said that a representative of the library was not required to be on the Curriculum Committee.

The Senate voted on the motion to amend the composition of the Gen-Ed Committee, and the motion failed.

**New Business**

**Faculty Curriculum Committee**
Speaker Kelly announced that one proposal from the Curriculum Committee had been withdrawn. This was the proposed minor in applied computing. The Speaker said that the reason for its withdrawal stemmed from the fact that two committees in addition to the Curriculum Committee are required to review the proposals, and that this process of moving documents through three committees slows things down. He said that he was looking into how the process might be made to work faster.

Bob Perkins (chair, Curriculum Committee) introduced the first two of four proposals coming from the Computer Science Department:

1. New Course—CSCI 392 Seminar on Computing and Society
   • Change Major; add CSCI 392 as a requirement (*Pending Budget Committee and Academic Planning Committee approval*)
2. Change Major: Change math requirements

Regarding proposal #2, Rohn England (Mathematics) pointed out that MATH 260, which was listed in the proposal, has been deleted from the catalog. He wondered whether the Computer Science Department was aware of this fact. Elizabeth Jurisch (Mathematics) said that the Math Department was involved in discussions of the proposal and that her department is communicating with the chair of the Computer Science Department about MATH 260.

The Senate voted and approved the two proposals.

The following proposals were passed without discussion:

- Delete course—CSCI 116  Data Organization and Management
- Change Minor: Computer Science

Mr. Perkins next introduced the following proposal from the Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies:

New Course—RUSS 390 Special Topics

One Senator asked what the special course was exactly. Mr. Perkins responded that the proposal seeks to create the category of a special topics course because hitherto no such course category had existed in the Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies.

The Senate voted and approved the proposal.

Next, Mr. Perkins introduced the proposal from the Department of Management and Entrepreneurship:

New Minor in Leadership, Change and Social Responsibility.

Norris Preyer (Physics) asked if all three committees (Curriculum, Budget, and Academic Planning) had reviewed and approved the proposal. Mr. Perkins responded that they had.

The Senate approved the proposal.

The Senate approved the following proposals from the Philosophy and Theatre Departments without discussion:

- Delete course—PHIL 204  Mind and Machines
Change Course—THTR 146  Intermediate Tap
Change Course—THTR 207  Drafting and Rendering for the Theatre
Change Course—THTR 332  Dance Choreography
Change Course—THTR 338  Dance Ensemble

Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Program

Heather Tierney, committee chair, introduced the following proposals:

Proposal for a New Graduate Program – M Ed in Teaching, Learning and Advocacy

Proposals for New Graduate Courses – M Ed in Teaching, Learning and Advocacy
MTLA XXX – Class, Race, and Gender in Education
MTLA XXX – Critical Issues in Contemporary Education
MTLA XXX – Family and Community Involvement
MTLA XXX – Identifying and Sustaining Effective Learning Communities
MTLA XXX – Literacy Development of Early Learners
MTLA XXX – Teacher As a Member of the Professional Community
MTLA XXX – Teachers As Advocates for Children & Youth

One Senator asked why none of the course proposals had course numbers attached to them. Diane Cudahy (Teacher Education) explained that numbers had recently been assigned to the proposed courses, beginning with 601 for the first course on the list and progressing to 607.

Jeffery Diamond (History) asked if there was a disciplinary field to which these courses are connected. Ms. Cudahy explained that the general discipline is education, that she and her have colleagues spent three years planning the program, and that they consulted with other colleagues, asking what they thought about the issues surrounding learning advocacy on a theoretical level. Based on that research and planning, they designed the proposed courses, which seek to develop teachers to fulfill roles that await them in their profession, but for which standard teacher-training courses don’t prepare them. She stressed that, according to their research and what other colleagues have told them, these courses are important. Mr. Diamond said that the courses are therefore for those who are already teachers. Ms. Cudahy replied “yes.” Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) asked what non-accredited teachers do about training. Ms. Cudahy explained that there are already programs in place for teacher training and development.

The Senate approved the proposals.

Next, the following proposals were approved by the Senate without discussion:

Proposals to Change a Graduate Course – M Ed in Teaching, Learning and Advocacy
EDEE 667 – Curriculum Theory and Application (Title and Course Description Change)
EDEE 678 – Methods and Materials in Reading Instruction (Title and Course Description Change)
EDFS 672 – Linguistic/Cultural Diversity in Education (Course Description Change)
EDFS 702 – Research and Development Project (Course Credit Hour Change)
EDFS 705 – Evaluation of Developmental Field Based Experience (Title and Description Change)
EDFS 711 – Educational Procedures for Exceptional Children in the Regular Classroom (Title and Description Change)

Proposal for a New Graduate Course – MAT in Performing Arts
EDFS 794 – Clinical Practice in Music, Theater or Dance Education

Proposal for a New Graduate Course – M Ed in Languages
LALE 700 – Thesis or Action Research

Proposals for a New Graduate Course – MS in Mathematics
MATH 550 – Linear Models
MATH 589 – Special Topics in Probability and Statistics

Proposals to Change a Graduate Program – Certificate in Statistics (Requirements Change)

**Constituents’ Concerns**

No concerns were voiced.

With its business completed, the Senate adjourned at 5:45.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 9 September 2008

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 9 September 2008, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, all the minutes of the regular Faculty Senate meetings of the spring 2008 semester (22 January, 12 February, 11 March, and 8 April) were approved. The Speaker announced that approval of minutes of all the spring 2008 special Faculty Senate meetings, which have all been posted on the Faculty Senate Web site, would be on the agenda of the next Faculty Senate meeting for approval.

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Kelly said that his full report was in his newsletter, which he had circulated last week to the faculty by email. He did, however, wish to highlight one item, which concerned the implementation of a new Modification of Duties policy passed by the Faculty Senate in its last meeting (8 April 2008). He reported that he went to the Office of Academic Affairs and to the Faculty Welfare and Budget Committees to work out a timetable. He said that he would like to make sure that the new policy gets to the Board of Trustees in time so that it could go into effect by fall 2009.

Speaker Kelly reported that he has asked George Pothering, interim Dean of the School of Sciences and Mathematics, to serve as Parliamentarian this year, and that Mr. Pothering has agreed. The Speaker added that while it is generally not a good practice to have deans serve in the role of Parliamentarian, he thought that as Mr. Pothering had served as Faculty Senate Parliamentarian a number of times before and was a special individual, he hoped that there would be no objection to his choice (and there weren’t any). He thanked Mr. Pothering for serving.

Election of Speaker Pro Tempore

Trish Ward (at-large) nominated Scott Peeples (English) as Speaker Pro Tempore. The nomination was seconded and Mr. Peeples was elected.

Reports (Cont.)

The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens, after welcoming everyone back, spoke about the Modification of Duties policy. She said that the administration would look at the policies of other colleges and universities and put in place a good policy for the College. She said that she will work with Tom Casey, Director of Human Resources, to make sure that no laws are being violated. She added that the current Modification of Duties policy remains in effect until a new one is developed and approved.

Addressing the topic of the merit compensation, The Provost said that her sense was that last year’s merit raise process was successful. She also thought that the President deserved credit for putting a lot of money toward raises. The deans, she reported, also view last year’s process as a success and good step forward. They got to know their faculty better, and for many faculty the results were very positive. She added that the President is committed to raising salaries, not just those of the permanent faculty, but also those of adjuncts and staff.
With regard to standardizing the merit raise process across schools, the Provost said that she, the President, and others started with the view that not everyone would fit into the same mold because of differences in each academic field. Flexibility was therefore needed. To determine what was appropriate for each field, a two-way process was set between her (along with the deans) and department chairs and their faculty. Some schools are uniform across departments, some are not. The merit raise system is still a work in progress, the Provost said, and it will continue to be reviewed and refined. She invited Senators to offer feedback on the review process and said that she has sent messages to deans, department chairs, and the Faculty Compensation Committee asking for feedback. She stressed that the College wants to reward excellence.

The Provost then brought up a key question concerning the merit review process: are we going to do the merit review as a separate process from the tenure and Promotion review? She said that we need to be mindful of having too many evaluation processes in places, and that it would not be a good use of our time to deal with multiple reviews, especially if they could be consolidated. We need to think about how the merit evaluation and the tenure and promotion evaluation can work together.

Phil Dustan (Biology) thought that the data used to adjust salaries according to market variables should be made public and that there could be more transparency in the process. Bev Diamond (guest and Associate Provost) asked what data he was referring to beyond what has already been published in the Faculty Compensation Salary studies. Mr. Dustan said that he would like to see more data about the salaries of faculty in the peer institutions, since these data are used to help determine faculty salary raises at the College. He would also like to know more about the “sliding scale” used by the administration to determine raises. Ms. Diamond said that the salary studies didn’t break down salaries by rank in each department, but did show average salaries of faculty in the schools of peer institutions. Mr. Dustan said that he would like to see more detailed data made public. Ms. Diamond replied that that was a valid request, but advised that we not go to a level of detail that ends up pitting individuals against individuals. Meg Cormack (at-large) pointed out that the salaries of all state employees making over $50,000 a year are made public and can be found on the internet.

The Provost concluded her report by announcing that she will continue to hold her informal chats with faculty called “Conversations with the Provost,” and invited faculty to attend.

**Alex Modly, Student Government Association**

Ms. Modly announced that the Major/Minor Fair would be held this year on Thursday, 9 October, in Physicians Promenade. She said last year’s Major/Minor Fair was a great success and encouraged Senators to participate and spread the word about it. She stressed that it was an important campus event.

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) pointed out that the event would take place during the Jewish holiday Yom Kippur and wondered if it would be possible to change the date of the event. Ms. Modly replied that she would try to make the change.

**Deborah Jeter, co-chair of the Faculty Educational Technology Committee**

Ms. Jeter wished to update the Senate on the online course-evaluation option, which the Senate approved on 8 April 2008. She said that while the option is not available for express courses this semester, it is for other courses, including study-abroad courses. She added that instructions on how to sign up for online evaluations will be sent out soon, and that the registration period will be through October 3. The whole process of online evaluations will work through Cougar Trail, which is a secure system; and as stipulated by the Faculty Senate
last spring, when it approved optional online evaluations, there will be a one-week window for students to do the evaluations. During the week of evaluation, students will be able to do the evaluations between 6 am and 11 pm each day. She also noted that most evaluations are done in the middle of the day. Students will receive instructions and reminders by email.

Ms. Jeter also said evaluation results will be made available after final grades are submitted, though percentiles will be delivered later in paper form. She concluded her report by inviting faculty to offer input to her committee, to express concerns, and to ask questions.

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

Ms. Caveny informed the Senate that this year’s committee consists of herself, Trish Ward (English), and Brian McGee (Communication), and that Associate Provost Bev Diamond and Tom Trimboli, Sr. VP of Legal Affairs, will be attending meetings.

Ms. Caveny reported that the Faculty Administration Manual (FAM) is being revised, and that the revised version will be published soon (in September). The changes do not affect content, but mainly have to do with its organization. The chief purpose of the changes is to make it easier to use, especially in the online form.

Ms. Caveny also reported that the committee is examining the language in the FAM concerning pay increases with respect to faculty evaluations.

**Tom Kunkle, chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections**

Mr. Kunkle reported that some recent vacancies of faculty committee seats have occurred and that his committee is in the process of finding faculty to fill them. He said that there are some at-large Senate vacancies as well, which he hopes to have filled by the next Faculty Senate meeting. He noted, however, that his committee has had trouble finding people to serve. The committee has especially encountered difficulties in finding faculty willing to serve on the new Gen-Ed Committee, the establishment of which the Senate approved last spring (1 April 2008). He reported that he received only one response from his call for nominations for this committee.

Jason Overby (Chemistry & Biochemistry) asked if the Senate had ever fully spelled out the duties and procedures of the Gen-Ed Committee. Mr. Kunkle replied that the duties had been spelled out, but not the procedures.

Speaker Kelly encouraged Senators to get involved in the Gen-Ed Committee, but said that the committee will have a lot of work, and that some proposals are ready for submission to the committee.

**Burton Callicott, chair of the Sustainability Committee**

Mr. Callicott wanted a chance to speak to the Senate to say that his committee exists, has a Web site, and is working on various projects. He said that the committee is not a faculty committee, but a Presidential committee, so there are non-faculty members on it. The committee does include among its membership the Director of the Environmental Studies Program. Mr. Callicott then explained that the committee is divided into sub-committees, which each focus on a specific area: reducing waste, building and energy issues, policy issues, and education/marketing issues.

Mr. Callicott also reported that President Benson, on behalf of the College, signed a climate agreement, which commits the institution to reducing greenhouse emissions. This is a big
undertaking, Mr. Callicott said. The College will need to taken an inventory of the greenhouse gases its emits and plan how to reduce them.

The Committee, Mr. Callicott continued, is working on improving our recycling system, on composting, and on solar energy possibilities. A possible long-term goal is to create a sustainability corridor, which would become a model sustainability environment, which other organizations and communities could emulate. Another goal is to incorporate sustainability concepts and issues into various courses. Mr. Callicott said that so far some of these items are just ideas, but he hopes that they will become realities, and asked for the support of all members of the College and hoped that everyone tries to do his/part to reduce waste and greenhouse emissions.

Alex Modly (guest) asked if the Committee has regular meetings. Mr. Callicott said that it meets on the first Wednesday of each month, and that the sub-committees have their own schedules.

New Business

Motion to amend language on the composition of the Gen-Ed Committee

James Williams (Library) moved to change the language outlining the composition of the General Education Committee so that representatives of the library faculty would be included. The exact details of the motion are as follows:

Composition: Seven regular faculty shall be elected to serve on the Committee. Each academic school shall be represented on the Committee. The Committee shall have one voting student member selected by the Student Government Association. Committee members shall serve a term of one year and may, if re-elected, serve as many as three consecutive terms. The Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience (or other administrator designated by the Provost) and the Director of Assessment (or other administrator designated by the Provost), and one representative from the library faculty are ex officio, non-voting members.

After the motion received a second, Mr. Williams explained that it was important to have representatives of the library because they help construct that resources that students and faculty use in their Gen-Ed courses.

Because the motion entails a change in the By-Laws, Speaker Kelly remanded it for review to the Committee on By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual.

Faculty Committee on Graduate and Continuing Education

The following proposals were approved without discussion.

Proposal for a New Graduate Course – Master of Science in Marine Biology
BIOL 618: Marine Molecular Ecology

Proposals for a New Graduate Course – Master of Arts in Teaching Performing Arts
MUSE 601: Applied Voice
MUSE 602: Vocal Pedagogy
MUSE 703: Choral Music Literature Seminar

Proposal for a New Graduate Course – Master of Education in Languages
SPAN 655: Tyranny in Spanish American Film and Literature
Constituents' Concerns

None was raised.

Having finished its scheduled business, the Senate adjourned at 6:50.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary