From: Terence Bowers, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 6 April 2010, at 5 P.M. in room 115 of the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the 2 March 2010 Minutes

3. Reports
   - The President
   - The Provost
   - The Speaker
   - Hugh Wilder, *ad hoc* Committee on Developing and Evaluating Teaching
   - Chris Fragile, chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee
   - Julia Eichelberger, chair of the Academic Planning Committee
   - Michael Phillips, chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and FAM

4. Old Business
   - Motion to amend the By-Laws regarding Article V, Sect. 3B.1(b) (the motion seeks to remove a reference to the April faculty meeting, which no longer takes place)
   - Motion to change to the description of the Budget Committee in the By-Laws, Article V. Sect. 2.B.2

5. New Business
   - Committee on Nominations and Elections
     -- Call for additional nominations to Senate Committees (Academic Planning, Budget, By-Laws)
     -- Call for additional nominations to College Committees
   - The Speaker: Call for nominations to the Nominations and Elections Committee
   - Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs
   - Faculty Curriculum Committee
   - Committee on General Education
   - Appeal of Faculty Curriculum Recommendations (the appeal asks the Faculty Senate to reconsider the decision by the Curriculum Committee to reject a proposal that would require undergraduate students to earn a grade of C-
minus or better in any coursework applied to major and minor programs in the Communication Department)
Committee on Nominations and Elections
   --Election of Senate committees (Academic Planning, Budget, By-Laws)
Faculty Curriculum Committee
   --Building Arts proposals

6. Constituents’ Concerns

7. Adjournment
2009-2010 Committee Members:
Chris Fragile, Chair (Physics & Astronomy)
Katherine Bielsky (Library)
Frank Cossa (Art History)
Doug Ferguson (Communication)
Stuart Knee (History)
Parissa Tadrissi (Hispanic Studies)
Mark Witte (Economics/Finance)

Following the public release of the College of Charleston Strategic Plan on October 16, 2009, the 2009-10 Faculty Compensation Committee identified a number of bullet points under “Strategy 3: Develop and Support a Highly Qualified, Diverse and Stable Base of Faculty and Staff” that pertain to our committee’s work. Therefore, the committee chose to take on two new roles: 1) to provide input to the administration regarding the implementation of programs related to Strategy 3, based, in part, our own research and study of CofC peer institutions; and 2) to monitor the College’s progress in achieving the overarching goals behind Strategy 3.

The current document records the Committee’s progress in researching three particular bullet points within Strategy 3 of the College’s Plan: 1) Increase the number of and funding for endowed chairs so that there are at least 10 new chairs by 2020; 2) Recognize and reward annual performance by faculty and staff in both annual raises and special awards; and 3) Establish incentives for faculty and staff to write and administer grants and contracts by 2012. In Section 1, we briefly describe the methods of research used in this study. In Section 2, we present a few illustrative results. We focus particularly on examples of programs that have already been implemented by peer institutions that we feel, if implemented here, could help the College achieve the goals behind Strategy 3. At a minimum, our findings demonstrate that it is reasonable to expect the College to be able to implement similar programs to help meet our own goals. In Section 3, we present a few concluding thoughts.

1. Method of Research

No specific guidelines were given to the committee members regarding how they were to conduct this research. Therefore, methods predictably varied by committee members. Some relied exclusively on material available on the internet, while others made direct contact with personnel in research, development, or academic affairs offices at the respective institutions. Thus, the depth of research varied considerably. For these, and other reasons, the results of this study are far from comprehensive. Nevertheless, they are illustrative.

The following list of peer institutions were all researched at least minimally. This list is based off of previous peer-based (particularly salary) studies at the College; this is not the Committee’s list.
2. Selected Results

Rather than reporting all of the Committee’s findings, we chose to only highlight some of the “best” examples of programs already implemented by our peer institutions. Thus, the results serve two purposes: 1) to demonstrate that the goals and programs outlined in the College’s Strategic Plan are achievable for an institution like ours; and 2) to provide a possible “blueprint” for how some of these programs could be implemented here at CofC. The Committee notes that these results also demonstrate that some of our peers are well ahead of where the College is currently.

- Increase the number of and funding for endowed chairs.

James Madison University is in the midst of a very aggressive campaign to increase funding for their faculty chairs, endowed professorships, and faculty fellows. Many of the JMU webpages have links to their Office of Development (http://www.jmu.edu/development/), which is very upfront about advertising the “needs of the university.” One of those needs comes under the heading “Faculty development and retention.” JMU has targeted the following endowments:

19 Faculty Chairs ($1,000,000 each)
Funds are used to provide salary supplement to new or existing lines and may be used to provide research and/or program support for the Chair holder. The goal is to recruit and/or retain star faculty. The endowed chairs would be spread relatively evenly across all Colleges of JMU.

27 Endowed Professorships ($250,000 each)
These awards are targeted at retaining mid-career faculty through recognition, a salary supplement, and research/teaching support. These positions are filled for limited terms, at the expiration of which a new recipient is selected. These are again spread across all Colleges of JMU.

Faculty Fellowships ($100,000 each)
These endowments give distinguished professors support for research, curriculum development, travel to conferences and professional meetings, and other activities vital to their professional development.

James Madison also has a supplemental funding program specifically focused on promoting “teaching excellence.” Some example programs within this area include:
distinguished teaching professorships, pedagogy courses for new faculty, a teaching fellow program, and grants for teaching innovations.

[N.B. The specific goal given in the College of Charleston Strategic Plan is to have “10 new chairs by 2020.” We note that if both JMU and CofC achieve their respective goals with regard to endowed positions, then CofC would lag JMU in this category by a factor of 4-to-1. In this respect, it may no longer be appropriate to consider JMU a peer institution. However, even if we no longer consider JMU an appropriate peer, the Committee notes that a very similar institutional campaign is also underway at UNC-Asheville, although it is unclear what their goals are with respect to the number of endowed positions.]

• Recognize and reward annual performance by faculty and staff in both annual raises and special awards.

St. Mary’s College of Maryland has one of the best, most consistent programs for rewarding faculty through salary augmentation on an ongoing basis that we saw among any of our peer institutions. Below is a list of the major milestones for tenure-track faculty at St. Mary’s, along with the associated salary increases for each milestone (based on 2005 data):

- Successful 3rd year review: $1000-$1500
- Successful tenure review: $1000-$1500
- Promotion to Associate: $2000-$3000
- Promotion to Full: $3000-$5000
- Post-tenure review/every 5 years: $0-$5000

The information that the Committee collected from St. Mary’s mentions that these salary increases are in addition to an “annual salary base increase for all faculty members.” St. Mary’s also reports that salary awards that would have occurred “in years of budgetary challenge” are instead “applied retroactively at the first available opportunity.”

The Committee feels that one of the strongest points of St. Mary’s approach is that, as there is no limit to the number of opportunities for post-tenure review, there is a continuing salary incentive for faculty to perform at a high level.

[N.B. Using data from last year’s Faculty Compensation Committee’s AAUP Salary Study, we note that St. Mary’s ranked 19th out of 20 peer institutions for average salary for Assistant Professors, 9 places behind the College of Charleston at that rank. On the other hand, St. Mary’s ranked 10th out of 20 for average salary for Full Professors, 7 places ahead of the College of Charleston at that rank. These numbers suggest that the incentive program at St. Mary’s works to the faculty’s advantage over the long term relative to the College of Charleston, and that St. Mary’s has successfully avoided the problem of salary compression that plagues CofC.]

• Establish incentives for faculty and staff to write and administer grants and contracts.
Western Washington University is one of the leaders among our peers for providing ample resources to support the grant writing success of their faculty. Some of the more prominent incentives at Western Washington include:

**Matching Equipment Funds**
Funds are available to match external dollars received to purchase research equipment.

**Publication Support**
Assistance is available to help with the costs of reprints (up to $100 per article) and page charges (up to $1,000 per article).

**Manuscript Preparation**
Assistance is available to help with the cost of manuscript preparation for publication (up to $1,500 per book).

**Mini-Grants**
Up to $1,000 is available to cover costs of incidental materials, supplies, or services.

**Grants in Aid**
Small grants (up to $2,500) are awarded to assist faculty with research and/or creative activities.

**Pilot Project Funding**
Grants of up to $4,000 are awarded to assist faculty in initiating pilot projects which will generate data needed to develop proposals for extramural funding.

**Project Development Awards**
Awards are made twice a year for the equivalent of one quarter release time (spread over at least two quarters during the academic year) during which a faculty member will develop a proposal for extramural funding.

**Summer Research Grants**
Grants of $5,000 are awarded to provide half-time salary support for summer research.

**Summer Teaching Grants**
Grants of $5,000 are awarded to allow full time faculty to engage in projects related to the enhancement of instructional quality during the summer.

**Faculty Development Grants**
Grants of up to $1,500 are available to individual faculty members and up to $2,500 to departments for improvement of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, or service.

All of the above listed programs are funded and managed through the Research and Sponsored Programs Office at Western Washington. Similar incentive programs were found at many other peer institutions, notably SUNY-Geneseo (http://www.geneseo.edu/sponsored_research/internal).

3. **Concluding Thoughts**
We reiterate that our results demonstrate that the goals and programs outlined in the College of Charleston’s Strategic Plan are achievable for an institution like ours. However, in some areas, certain peers are already well ahead of us. Therefore, any
meaningful progress is going to require a sustained financial commitment on the part of the College.

Establishing an endowed chairs program will require perhaps the most aggressive funding campaign of the three initiatives we researched. As this funding mostly needs to come from outside the College, it primarily rests with the College Foundation to aggressively pursue these funds. As we mentioned, similar financial campaigns are already underway at many of our peer institutions (notably James Madison and UNC-Asheville). Perhaps we can benefit by studying their approaches.

The issue of salary compensation is obviously central to our Committee’s work. We are pleased that the administration has set a goal to recognize and reward faculty performance through annual salary adjustments. We feel one of the keys to doing this effectively is to focus on providing ongoing incentives for faculty throughout their careers (St. Mary’s College provides a wonderful example). This may help the College avoid the strong disincentive that results from salary compression or inversion.

We feel that one of the keys to a successful funded research program at the College of Charleston is to trigger a snowball effect. If we could tap a significant portion of our current research indirects to fund incentives for faculty to write new grants, then there is a potential to ultimately dramatically increase the size of the College’s indirect budget as the number of funded grants at the College increases. The key, though, is that research indirects need to be used to fund incentives for faculty to initiate new research programs, not as a Band-Aid to plug budget holes elsewhere.

Sincerely,

P. Chris Fragile, Chair
on behalf of the Faculty Compensation Committee

cc:  Dr. George W. Hynd, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
     Prof. Joe Kelly, Speaker of the Faculty Senate
Faculty Members: C. Michael Phillips (Committee Chair and Senator), Steven Arsenault (Senator), and Erin Beutel

Committee Duties: “To review on a continuing basis the Faculty By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual; to propose changes for the improvement of the documents and to forward the recommended changes to the administration and/or the Faculty Senate as appropriate; to incorporate any revisions to or interpretations of either document in new editions of the documents; to make non-substantive changes to the Faculty By-Laws to correct unintended grammatical and spelling errors, address minor problems of stylistic consistency, and correct inaccurate administrative titles.” (Faculty By-Laws, Art. V, Sect. 2.B.3(b)).

Two motions to amend the Faculty By-Laws were offered at the March 2nd, 2010 meeting of the Faculty Senate. One motion was offered by the Committee on the By-Laws and the FAM. We reproduce the rationale and history below.

At the close of the 2009 fall semester, the Committee on By-Laws/FAM consulted with the Committee on Nominations and Elections concerning the election process for the CNE itself. When Article V, Sect. 3A was amended in May 2009 to read as follows:

Members of standing College committees are nominated by March 15 by the Committee on Nominations and Elections and are elected by members of the regular College faculty (as defined in Art. I, Sect 1) in a manner to be determined by the Committee on Nominations and Elections and consistent with all applicable requirements of the Faculty By-laws. (Rev., Ins. April 2007; Rev. May 2009),

the Committee on Nominations and Elections was no longer tied to holding the election of standing College committees at the April full faculty meeting as a result of the following concurrent change to By-Laws Article II. Sect. 1:

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.

However, the following section of the By-Laws at Article V, Sect. 3B.1 was not concurrently amended at that time:

*Election: Nominations may be made by faculty either at the April Senate meeting or by submission in writing to the Speaker at least one week prior to the April faculty meeting. As is the case with all committees, the new committee begins its work August 15 (Article V, Section 1D). (Rev. April 2007).*

Hence the Committee on By-Laws/FAM, proposes the following amendment to Article V, Sect. 3B.1(b):

*Election: Nominations may be made by faculty either at the April Senate meeting or by submission in writing to the Speaker at least one week prior to the April faculty meeting election of the Committee on Nominations and Elections. As is the case with all committees, the new committee begins its work August 15 (Article V, Section 1D). (Rev. April 2007).*

A **second motion** to amend the Faculty By-Laws, offered by Todd McNerney, current chair of the Budget Committee, is available at the faculty website. As required by Article VI of the By-Laws, we offer our recommendations to the Senate regarding this motion.

In this report, we reproduce the motion to amend as we recommend it be adopted by the Faculty Senate and the College Faculty, should the Senate and Faculty be favorably disposed to these amendments. The committee also raised the following questions about the motion:

Should this committee have two or three senators?

Historically the majority of members on senate committees have been senators. However, the current edition of the By-Laws/FAM does not lend any support to this practice. Additionally, we have reason to believe that the following statement, “The majority of members of standing senate committees must be senators,” at Article V, Sect. 2A of the 1998 edition of the By-Laws/FAM was improperly removed.

Hence we on the Committee on the By-Laws and FAM ask the senate’s guidance in this matter. Is that 1998 language still in effect? Should we formally move to strike, modify, or include this language in the By-Laws?
Proposed Amendments. Please see the original motion for the rationale to amend, as supplied by Todd Mc Nerney.

We propose the following substantive changes to the motion:

(1) In order to follow the current election process for senate committees at Article V. Sect. 2.A., the Budget Committee must be elected by senators at the April senate meeting. Hence, we recommend removing “elected by the whole faculty” from the first sentence in the composition section, section a, of the proposal to amend.

(2) Rather than using the generic phrase “including serving on the Academic Affairs Planning and priorities Committee,” in the first sentence of the duties section, section c, of the proposal, we suggest “including sending no more than three representatives to serve on the Academic Affairs Planning and Priorities Committee.”

The motion to amend appears below. Changes to the By-Laws are denoted by strikethrough and underline to indicate stricken items and additions, respectively.

Article V. Sect. 2.B.

2. Budget Committee

a. Composition: Seven Five faculty members. At least two of whom must be members of the Faculty Senate. The Provost and the College Budget Director are non-voting ex-officio members of the Budget Committee.

b. Terms: Once elected to the committee, a member shall serve for a term of three years. Terms are staggered, so that each year one (or two) new term(s) will be open for election. No one may serve two consecutive terms or parts of terms. If a seat is vacated before the end of its term, a member of the faculty will be elected by the Senate to serve for the remainder of that term. Candidates should declare that they are not taking or have any plans to take a sabbatical or other planned leave of absence during their term.

b.c. Duties: To review College policies relating to long-range financial planning, budget preparation and the allocation of funds within budget categories, and to recommend policy changes. To represent the faculty in the preparation of the College budget, including sending no more than three representatives to serve on the Academic Affairs Planning and Priorities Committee. To review in particular the projected costs of proposals for new College programs and initiatives, and to inform the Senate, before these proposals are put to a vote, of the Committee’s evaluation of their potential budgetary impact. To review each annual College budget. To present to the faculty through the Faculty Senate on a regular basis reports on the College's budget. The Chair of the Budget Committee or her or his representative shall attend meetings of the Budget Committee of the Board of Trustees.
Motion to Change to the Description of the Budget Committee in the By-Laws, Article V. Sect. 2.B.2

First Proposed by Todd McNerney, Chair of the Budget Committee, at the 3-2-10 Faculty Senate Meeting

2. Budget Committee

a. Composition: Five faculty members elected by the whole faculty. At least two of whom must be members of the Faculty Senate.

b. Terms: Once elected to the committee, a member shall serve for a term of three years. Terms are staggered, so that each year one (or two) new term(s) will be open for election. No one may serve two consecutive terms or parts of terms. If a seat is vacated before the end of its term, a member of the faculty will be elected by the Senate to serve for the remainder of that term. Candidates should declare that they are not taking or have any plans to take a sabbatical or other planned leave of absence during their term.

c. Duties: To represent the faculty in the preparation of the College budget, including serving on the Academic Affairs Planning and Priorities Committee. To review in particular the projected costs of proposals for new College programs and initiatives, and to inform the Senate, before these proposals are put to a vote, of the Committee's evaluation of their potential budgetary impact. To present to the faculty through the Faculty Senate on a regular basis reports on the College's budget. The Chair of the Budget Committee or her or his representative shall attend meetings of the Budget Committee of the Board of Trustees.
Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, 
Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for the Faculty Senate 6 April, 2010 Meeting

(All curricular proposals along with supporting 
documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

Communication

New Course Proposals:

COMM 538 Health Communication
COMM 549 Risk Communication
COMM 569 Leadership Communication
COMM 594 Political Communication

Proposal to Change a Graduate Program - MA in Communication (Addition of Electives)

Computer and Information Sciences

Proposals to Change a Graduate Course (change names and descriptions):

CSIS 601 Data Modeling and Database Design
CSIS 638 Advanced Topics in Database Systems

Proposals to Change a Graduate Program – MS in Computer and Information Sciences (Requirement Changes):

CSIS 631 and 638 – IS Specialization
CSIS 659 – IS Specialization
CSIS 659 – SE Specialization
**Faculty Curriculum Committee**

**List of Proposals Approved by the Committee**

*(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)*

I. **Course Changes and Program Changes**: All course- and program-change proposals will be voted on as a single group, unless a Senator wishes to isolate a specific proposal for discussion and a separate vote. Senators are asked to contact the Faculty Speaker or the Faculty Secretary in advance, if they wish to separate a proposal from the group. Of course, this action can also be done on the floor of the Senate.

- **Art History (Program in Historic Preservation & Community Planning)**
  - New Course—HPCP 250 Architectural Drawing and Drafting I
  - New Course—HPCP 251 Architectural Drawing and Drafting II
  - New Course—HPCP 305 Building Pathology
  - Change Minor—HPCP Minor (add HPCP 250 to the list of elective courses)
  - Change Major—Bachelor of Arts (add HPCP 250, 251, and 305 to the required courses for the major)

- **Arts Management**
  - Change Course—ARTM 210 Introduction to Music Management
  - New Course—ARTM 350 Marketing, Fund Raising and Grantwriting for Nonprofit Arts Organizations
  - New Course—ARTM 352 Fundraising Event Creation, Planning and Execution for Nonprofit Arts Organizations
  - New Course—ARTM 370 Building Participation in the Arts
  - Change Major—BA Arts Management (requesting a substitution of a new required course for the major, ARTM 350)

- **Biology and Psychology**
  - Change Minor—Neuroscience (add PHYS 203, PHYS 270, PHYS 320, PHYS 230 and PHYS 340 as electives for the program)

- **Communications**
  - Change Course—COMM 332 Business Communication

- **English**
  - Change Concentration—Creative Writing (deletion of certain required course sequences; replacement of those sequences with different courses)
History

New Course—HIST 115 Pre-modern History
New Course—HIST 116 Modern History

International and Intercultural Studies

Change Concentration—International Studies Major, Asia Concentration (add courses to the electives that fulfill the Asia Concentration of the Major)
New Course—LTAR 220 Modern Arabic Fiction
New Course—ARST 240 Special Topics in Arabic Studies
New Course—ARST 340 Special Topics in Arabic Studies
New Course—CHST 240 Special Topics in Chinese Studies
New Course—CHST 340 Special Topics in Chinese Studies
New Course—HNDI 201 Intermediate Hindi
New Course—HNDI 202 Intermediate Hindi
New Course—INTL 290 Special Topics I International Studies
New Course—INTL 390 Special Topics in International Studies
New Course—INTL 400 Independent Study in International Studies
New Course—INTL 401 Internship in International Studies
New Course—INTL 499 Bachelor’s Essay
Change Major—International Studies Major: Asia Concentration (add courses to the “General Category;” add courses to the Asia Concentration)
Change Major—BA International Studies (add courses to the “General Category;” add courses to the Asia Concentration)

Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs

Change Minor—Asian Studies (expand its list of courses that may fulfill the 15 hours of electives in the Minor)

Latin American & Caribbean Studies

New Course—LACS 401 Latin American and Caribbean Studies Internship
New Course—LACS 495 Latin American and Caribbean Studies Capstone
Change Major—BA Latin American Studies (re-organization of major curriculum by adding courses to requirements and to electives)

Management

Change Concentration—Concentration in Leadership, Change, and Social Responsibility (add MGMT 403 as an elective course)
Change Concentration—Concentration in Entrepreneurship (add MGMT 403 as an elective course)
Change Course—ENTR 321 New Venture Planning
Change Course—ENTR 335 Funding New Ventures
Change Course—ENTR 406 Not for Profit Entrepreneurship
New Course—MGMT 403 Entrepreneurial Leadership
Change Minor—Minor in Leadership, Change, and Social Responsibility (add MGMT 403 as an elective course)

Mathematics

Delete Course—MATH 450 Discrete Mathematical Models
Delete Course—MATH 460 Continuous Mathematical Models
New Course—MATH 315 Introduction to Complex Variables
New Course—MATH 402 Advanced Linear Algebra
New Course—MATH 430 Mathematical Statistics I
New Course—MATH 431 Mathematical Statistics II
New Course—MATH 455 Bayesian Statistical Methods
New Course—MATH 470 Mathematical Modeling
Change Major—Bachelor of Science (Actuarial Studies Track) (change list of required courses for the track)
Change Major—Bachelor of Science (Applied Mathematics Track) (change list of required courses for the track)
Change Major—Bachelor of Science (Pure Mathematics Track) (change list of required courses for the track)
Change Major—Bachelor of Science (Statistics Concentration) (replace MATH 530 and MATH 531 with MATH 430 and MATH 431; replace MATH 355 with MATH 455 as one of the six courses listed for “six additional hours chosen from:”)
Change Major—Bachelor of Science (Teacher Education Track) (change list of required courses for the track)
Delete of a Program—Discrete Mathematics Track within the Math Major

MSCM

Change Course—DSCI 300 Management Information Systems
Change Course—TRAN 432 Global Logistics Systems Management
New Course—INTB 260 Special Topics in International Business
New Course—INTB 313 Global Commerce and Enterprise
New Course—INTB 360 Special Topics in International Business

Sociology

Change Course (drop a required 200-level sociology course for the following)— SOCY 331 Society and the Individual; SOCY 332 Collective Behavior; SOCY 336 Death and Dying; SOCY 337 Prejudice; SOCY 339 Special Topics in Social Psychology; SOCY 340 Medical Sociology; SOCY 341 Criminology; SOCY 342 Juvenile Delinquency; SOCY 344 Social
Gerontology; SOCY 345 Social Policy; SOCY 346 Environmental Sociology; SOCY 348 Sociology of Alcohol and Drugs; SOCY 349 Special Topics in Social Problems; SOCY 351 Urban Sociology; SOCY 352 Population and Society; SOCY 355 Science, Technology and Society; SOCY 356 Sociological Perspectives on Religion; SOCY 357 Political Sociology; SOCY 358 Sociology of Organizations; SOCY 359 Special Topics in Social Organization; SOCY 360 Class, Power and Privilege; SOCY 361 Child Welfare; SOCY 362 Social and Cultural Change; SOCY 364 Gender and Society; SOCY 365 Sociology of Music; SOCY 366 Race and Ethnic Relations; SOCY 369 Special Topics in Social Inequality

Change Course—SOCY 101 Introduction to Sociology
Change Course—SOCY 109 Special Topics in Sociology
Change Course—SOCY 260 Development of Social Thought
Change Course—SOCY 271 Introduction to Social Research
Change Course—SOCY 272 Statistics for Sociology
Change Course—SOCY 336 Death and Dying
Change Course—SOCY 341 Criminology
Change Course—SOCY 344 Social Gerontology
Change Course—SOCY 358 Sociology of Organizations
Change Course—SOCY 371 Quantitative Research Practicum; SOCY 372 Qualitative Research Practicum; SOCY 379 Special Topics in Social Research
Change Course—SOCY 381 Internship
New Course—SOCY 335 Aging and the Family
New Course—SOCY 373 Social Network Analysis
New Course—SOCY 382 Student Research Apprenticeship in Sociology
New Course—SOCY 383 Student Academic Apprenticeship in Sociology
Change Minor—Sociology (drop SOCY 202 as a required course for the minor)
Change Major—BS Sociology (drop SOCY 202 Introduction to Social Institutions as a required course for majors)
Change Major—BS Sociology (drop SOCY 491 Capstone as a required course for majors)

II. New Major and Minors:

Jewish Studies

Change Course—JWST 315 Southern Jewish History
Change Course—JWST 325 Jewish Mysticism
New Course—JWST 310 Topics in Jewish History
New Course—JWST 320 Topics in American Jewish Culture
New Course—JWST 335 Modern Jewish Politics
New Course—JWST 450 Research Seminar in Jewish Studies
New Course—HBRW 313 Hebrew Conversation and Composition
New Course—HBRW 314 Hebrew Conversation and Composition
Change Minor—Jewish Studies (JWST 210 to become a required class for the minor; expand list of courses approved for the minor)
New Major—Jewish Studies

Physical Education

New Course—PEHD 342 Techniques and Strategies of Coaching
New Minor—Coaching Minor

Physics

Change Course—PHYS 101 Introductory Physics I
Change Course—PHYS 102 Introductory Physics II
Change Course—PHYS 419 Research Seminar
Change Course—ASTR 129 Astronomy I
Change Course—ASTR 130 Astronomy II
New Course—PHYS 270 Nanotechnology in Medicine
New Course—PHYS 350 Energy Production
Change Minor—Physics (add PHYS 270 to the list of approved courses)
Change Minor—Astronomy (add ASTR 377 to the list of approved courses)
Change Major—BS Physics (remove PHYS 203 from the list of approved courses)
New Minor—Biomedical Physics
New Minor—Energy Production
Committee on General Education

Proposal for Faculty Senate November 10, 2009 Meeting

(All curricular proposals and supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

New Courses requesting General Education Status:

Courses to satisfy the General Education history requirement:

- History 115/: Pre-Modern History
- History 116: Modern History

Courses to satisfy General Education humanities credit:

- JWST 310: Topics in Jewish History
- JWST 320: Topics in American Jewish Culture
- ARST 240 -- Special Topics in Arabic Studies
- ARST 340: Special Topics in Arabic Studies
- CHNS240: Special Topics in Chinese Studies
- CHNS 340: Special Topics in Chinese Studies
- LTAR 220: Modern Arabic Fiction
Appeal of Faculty Curriculum Recommendations
Submitted by Brian McGee, chair Department of Communication

Colleagues:

Earlier this month, the Faculty Curriculum Committee declined to support the Department of Communication's proposals that, effective with the 2011-2012 catalog, undergraduate students must earn a grade of C-minus or better in any coursework applied to major and minor programs in our department.

As permitted by the Faculty/Administration Manual, the Department of Communication is appealing the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee to the full Faculty Senate. Documents regarding this appeal have been supplied to all members of the Faculty Senate. If other members of the College community would like an electronic version of these materials before they are posted on the Faculty Senate Web site, please let me know. We'll get the file to you.

These proposals have been or are being reviewed by three other College-wide committees. As explained elsewhere, the objective of our proposals is to improve learning outcomes for students in the department's programs. Similar requirements already are in place at many other universities.

Please let me know if you have questions about this appeal.

Cordially,
Brian McGee

Dr. Brian McGee
Professor and Chair
Department of Communication
College of Charleston
66 George Street (Office at 9 College Way)
Charleston, SC 29424
o 843.953.5906
f 843.953.7037

NOTE: The document that presents the full text of the appeal along with supporting evidence is posted on the Faculty Senate Web site.
Faculty Curriculum Committee

List of Proposals Approved by the Committee

(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

Historic Preservation and the Building Arts

New Course—HPBA 101 Introduction to Building Arts I
New Course—HPBA 102 Introduction to Building Arts II
New Course—HPBA 201 Continuation to Building Arts I
New Course—HPBA 202 Continuation to Building Arts II
New Course—HPBA 301 Advanced Building Arts I
New Course—HPBA 302 Advanced Building Arts II
New Course—HPBA 401 Advanced Building Arts III
New Course—HPBA 402 Advanced Building Arts IV
New Course—HPBA 495 Capstone
New Major—Historic Preservation and the Building Arts
From: Terence Bowers, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 2 March 2010, at 5 P.M. in room 115 of the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the 9 February 2010 Minutes

3. Reports
   - The Provost
   - The Speaker
   - Chris Fragile, chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee
   - Michael Phillips, chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and FAM

4. Old Business
   - Motion to specify when a Senator leaving the Faculty Senate is eligible to return

5. New Business
   - Budget Committee
     -- Motion change to the description of the Budget Committee in the by-Laws
   - Committee on General Education
     -- Elimination of free back credits in languages

6. Constituents’ Concerns

7. Adjournment

**Please Note:** A revised By-Laws/FAM report will be sent electronically to Senators later in the week prior to the Senate meeting, as will the text of the Budget Committee’s motion. These documents will also be posted on the Faculty Senate Web site, when they are received.
Report to the Faculty Senate
Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
College of Charleston
March 2, 2010

Faculty Members: C. Michael Phillips (Committee Chair and Senator), Steven Arsenault (Senator), and Erin Beutel

Committee Duties: “To review on a continuing basis the Faculty By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual; to propose changes for the improvement of the documents and to forward the recommended changes to the administration and/or the Faculty Senate as appropriate; to incorporate any revisions to or interpretations of either document in new editions of the documents; to make non-substantive changes to the Faculty By-Laws to correct unintended grammatical and spelling errors, address minor problems of stylistic consistency, and correct inaccurate administrative titles.” (Faculty By-Laws, Art. V, Sect. 2.B.3(b)).

A motion to amend the Faculty By-Laws was offered at the February 9, 2010 meeting of the Faculty Senate. As required by Article VI of the By-Laws, we offer our recommendations to the Senate regarding this motion. The original motion offered by Irina Gigova (Senator At-Large) is available at the faculty senate website.

In this report, we reproduce the motion to amend as we recommend it be adopted by the Faculty Senate and the College Faculty, should the Senate and Faculty be favorably disposed to these amendments. The committee also raised the following questions about the motion: (TBD)

Proposed Amendments. Please see the original motion for the rationale to amend, as supplied by Irina Gigova.

We propose the following two substantive changes to the motion:

(1) Article IV, Section 2E. Rather than reinstatement of eligibility after a period of four years, we suggest a shorter period of one semester. This will allow greater flexibility of continued senate service in smaller departments. (We’ll elaborate further in our final report.)

(2) Article IV, Section 2E. In order to cover cases of partial term service in what we feel was the original intention of the term limits statement at this section of the By-Laws, we suggest inserting the following sentence: “For purposes of eligibility, a partial term of service shall be counted as a full term.”

The motion to amend appears below. Changes to the By-laws are denoted by strikethrough and underline to indicate stricken items and additions, respectively.

Amend Article IV, Section 2 E (12/09 revision), of the By-Laws as follows:
E. The term of office for Senators shall be two years; terms begin the day after spring commencement. No Senator may serve more than two consecutive full terms. A Senator shall be eligible for re-election to one additional consecutive term, following which one semester must pass before he or she is again eligible. For purposes of eligibility, a partial term of service shall be counted as a full term. One half of the Senators are elected each year. In the first year, election is for seats of one or two year terms, determined by lottery. A Senator elected in the first year to serve a one-year term is then eligible to be re-elected to two additional full terms.
Motion to Specify When a Senator Leaving the Faculty Senate Is Eligible to Return
Proposed by Irina Gigova (Senator At-Large)

Purpose: This motion seeks to fill a lacuna in the Faculty Administration Manual regarding how long a person who has completed two full terms as a Senator must stay out of the Faculty Senate before being eligible to be nominated and run for Senator again.

Action: Amend Article IV, Section 2D (E according to the 11/10/09 revision)

Current version:

D. The term of office for Senators shall be two years; terms begin the day after spring commencement. No Senator may serve more than two consecutive full terms. One half of the Senators are elected each year. In the first year, election is for seats of one or two year terms, determined by lottery. A Senator elected in the first year to serve a one-year term is then eligible to be re-elected to two additional full terms.

Proposed amendment:

E. The term of office for Senators shall be two years; terms begin the day after spring commencement. No Senator may serve more than two consecutive full terms. A Senator shall be eligible for re-election to one additional consecutive term, following which four years must pass before he or she is again eligible. One half of the Senators are elected each year. In the first year, election is for seats of one or two year terms, determined by lottery. A Senator elected in the first year to serve a one-year term is then eligible to be re-elected to two additional full terms.

Rationale: I ask the By-Laws/FAM Committee and the Senate to consider introducing a specified time off the Senate in light of the recently adopted reduction in the size of the Faculty Senate. This amendment aims to promote turnover in the smaller body on the premise that it would ensure more democratic representation of the entire faculty. Currently, the silence in the FAM could practically allow a Senator who has completed two consecutive terms to return to the Senate after a semester or even several meetings, thus negating the entire notion of term limits.

The proposed change does not restrict faculty involvement on campus or prevent engaged faculty from having their voices heard. The Faculty Standing Committees at the College of Charleston provide essential venues for those who desire service but are not eligible to be on the Senate. At the same time, the measure may encourage faculty members with limited committee and administrative experience to participate in the shared governance of the College of Charleston.

This amendment should not affect considerably the functions of the Faculty Senate. The current practice of staggered elections ensures enough continuity in institutional memory.
and practice. Whatever experience has been lost due to the longer periods of "sitting out" would be offset by the influx of new ideas and different perspectives.

In deliberating the appropriate amount of “time off” members of the By-Law/ FAM Committee and the Senate may consider the following possible models:

1. The period of “time off” equals the total period of service. The Faculty By-Laws already include such an example in the case of members of standing committees in Article V, Section 1B:

   B. Members of committees (Including alternates) serve for a term of one year and may be re-elected twice and then may serve again on the committee only after a lapse of three years. Terms begin on August 15. (Rev. Aug. 1999)

   If the same model is applied to Senate membership, then for each two full terms served, a Senator must take a four-year-long break. This is the model adopted in the present motion.

2. The period of “time off” equals the length of one full term of service, namely two years.

3. Finally, a period of three years off the Senate could be adopted to coincide with the three-year-period of merit evaluations, assuming that the odd number does not complicate the task of the Committee of Nominations and Elections, which is responsible for keeping track of candidates’ eligibility.

Finally, I would like to mention that such measures are already in place at other institutions of higher learning. I include two examples in the Appendix.
Committee on General Education
Proposal for Faculty Senate, 2 March, 201- Meeting

Motion to Eliminate Free Back Credits in Languages

The School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs seeks to change the policy that awards free back credits in languages to incoming students who complete introductory and intermediate language courses successfully in their first year. Currently the policy, (page 9 of the 2009-2010 catalogue) gives first year students who place or are placed into a higher level language course and pass it with at least a C additional credits towards graduation for courses at the lower level in that language, even though they have not taken those classes at the College of Charleston.

For example,

A student who places into 102 and passes it with a C or above will receive the three credits for that class, plus 3 credits for 101, which he/she did not take.

A student who places into a 201 class and passes it with a C or above will receive the three credits for that class, plus 3 credits for 102 and 3 credits for 101, which he/she did not take.

A student who places into a 202 class and passes it with a C or above will receive the three credits for that class, plus 3 credits for 201, 3 credits for 102, and 3 credits for 101, which he/she did not take.

A student who places into a 300-level class and passes it with a C or above will receive the 3 credits for that class, plus 3 credits for 202, 3 credits for 201, 3 credits for 102, and 3 credits for 101, which he/she did not take.

The School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs suggests the following changes to the catalogue:

(Strike through for words to be deleted; RED for words to be added.) (Currently p. 9)

College of Charleston Languages Department The School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs’ Policy on Placement Credit. To fulfill the language requirement, entering students may take any spoken language, other than English and Hindi, offered by the College. However, students who wish to continue a language studied in high school or elsewhere must take a departmentally-approved placement test in the language. Note that students of Spanish do not take a placement test, rather are placed according to their years of high school study of the language (see http://lcwa.cofc.edu/hispanicstudies for placement procedures). Students do not have to take a departmental placement exam if they have scored a 3 or higher on the AP modern language test or a 6 or higher on the International Baccalaureate Exam. (A 6 on the IB exam in Classical Greek, French, German, or Latin, or a 7 on the IB exam in
Spanish). Note that students of Spanish do not take a placement test, rather are placed according to their years of high school study of the language (see http://lcwa.cofc.edu/hispanicstudies for placement procedures). The placement test score determines the level at which the student will continue his or her study of the language. Transfer students with college credit in a foreign language, who wish to continue in the same language, should not take the placement exam, and will not receive College of Charleston placement credit if the placement exam is taken. will be placed into the appropriate level in that language, based on their transcript. Transfer students with college credit in a foreign language, who wish to continue in a different language, should take the placement exam. Students who present two or more years of high school study in a language and who do not place in the LANG 102 course or higher may take the LANG 101 course, but are encouraged to may want to consider starting a new language. Credit through placement may be earned for only one language, and no more than a total of 12 placement credits in that language will be awarded. Students may earn credits through placement tests as described below:

—If the student places in, and subsequently passes, the LANG 102 or LANG 105 course with a grade of “C” (2.0) or higher, six credits will be granted for the 101 and 102/105 courses. The validation course must be completed within the first two semesters of study at the College.
—If the student places in, and subsequently passes, the LANG 201 course with a grade of “C” (2.0) or higher, nine credits will be granted for the 101, 102, and 201 courses. The validation course must be completed within the first two semesters of study at the College.
—If the student places in, and subsequently passes, the LANG 202 course with a grade of “C” (2.0) or higher, 12 credits will be granted for the 101, 102, 201, and 202 courses. The validation course must be completed within the first two semesters of study at the College.
—If the student places in, and subsequently passes, a 300-level course with a grade of “C” (2.0) or higher, 15 credits will be granted for the 101, 102, 201, 202, and the 300-level course. The validation course must be completed within the first two semesters of study at the College.
—Students who pass but do not receive a grade of “C” (2.0) or higher in the validation course will receive only the three credits for the validation course. Students who place in a 300-level course will have satisfied the College’s minimum degree requirement in languages, whether or not they take a validation course.

Advanced Placement (CEEB) The Advanced Placement (AP) Program of the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) is accepted by the College of Charleston. A student who has taken college-level courses in foreign language or literature will be awarded advanced placement (AP) credit in accordance with the following scale:

**AP Modern Language Test** (French, German, Italian, Spanish)

4 or 5: six semester hours credit for 202 and a higher level course—300 level course (FREN 390, GRMN 390, ITAL 390, SPAN 313 275)
3: six semester hours credit for 201 and 202. A score of three or higher fulfills the general education requirement in a foreign language.

**AP Literature Test** (French, German, Spanish)

4 or 5: six semester hours credit for 202 and 300-level literature course (FREN 324, GRMN 365, SPAN 320)
3: six semester hours credit for 201 and 202. A score of three or higher fulfills the general education requirement in a foreign language.

Student may enroll in an advanced language course.
**AP Latin Test** (all forms): A score of 4 or 5: six semester hours credit for 201 and LATN 390. A score of 3: six semester hours credit for 201 and 202. A score of three or higher fulfills the general education requirement in a foreign language. Student may enroll in an advanced language course.

**The International Baccalaureate Exam** (IB) is accepted by the College of Charleston. A student will be awarded credits towards graduation for the following scores:

Classical Greek (Higher Level Exam only): IB Score of 4: 3 credits, for GREK 201; IB Score of 5, 6, or 7: 6 credits, for GREK 201 and GREK 202.

French: (Higher level exam only). IB score of 4: 6 credits, for FREN 101 and 102; IB score of 5: 9 credits, for FREN 101, 102, and 201; IB score of 6 or 7: 12 credits, for FREN 101, 102, 201, and 202.

German: (Higher level exam only). IB score of 4: 6 credits, for GRMN 101 and 102; IB score of 5: 9 credits, for 101, 102, and 201; IB score of 6 or 7: 12 credits, for GRMN 101, 102, 201, and 202.

Latin (Higher Level Exam only). IB Score of 4: 3 credits, for LATN 201; IB Score of 5, 6, or 7: 6 credits, for LATN 201 and LATN 202.

Spanish: (Higher Level Exam only). IB score of 4: 6 credits, for SPAN 101 and 102; IB score of 5 or 6: 9 credits, for SPAN 101, 102, and 201; IB score of 7: 12 credits, for SPAN 101, 102, 201, and 202.

A student with a score of 6 or 7 on the IB exam in Classical Greek, French, German, or Latin has satisfied the general education requirement in languages. A student with a score of 7 on the Spanish IB exam has satisfied the general education requirement in languages.

Note: Students who have scored a 3 or higher on an advanced placement language test should not take the College of Charleston placement test in that language. Students may enroll directly into a 300 level language course. Students who receive advanced placement (AP) credits and elect to take an additional course in that language at the College may be eligible to receive College of Charleston placement credits (see “Policy on Placement Credit” above).

Students may receive language credits in the form of transfer credits from a college or university or based on their scores on an AP or IB test. No credits will be received based on placement tests.

(End of changes to the catalogue.)

**Justifications for this change are the following:**

1. Changing this policy allows students more flexibility to pursue further academic interests.
2. We currently award up to 12 free credits to students; this is the equivalent of one full semester of coursework that they did not do here.

3. Students who receive a 3, 4 or 5 on the AP tests will earn 6 placement credits, whereas a student with significant high school experience may receive up to 12 free credits.

4. Frequently, students decline to use their AP credits in order to receive 12 credits instead of 6.

5. The AP and IB exams are already in place to deliver college-level content which can then be used for college credits.

6. An example of how many credits we have given away is in Spanish. Between the years 2005 and 2008 the Department of Hispanic Studies awarded 5,527 credits to students for work that was not completed here or at another university.

7. Foreign Languages are the only disciplines that give college credit for high school work that isn't AP or dual enrollment. Other disciplines (Math, English) use or have used placement instruments but give no credit for it. When we give credit for high school work, we 'use up' student credit in such a way that they end up needing/ taking fewer hours overall at the College. It decreases motivation to explore options, take skills courses that lead to lifetime learning, choose to double major, etc.

8. Most institutions which give as much placement credit as CofC do it for two reasons: to encourage students to take foreign languages and to place students at the correct level. Since we require students to take a foreign language, the first is a moot point for us. There are other ways to ensure placement that work just as well. NOT giving credit if a student takes a course below what he/she scores into is actually a more effective way to ensure correct placement.

This change in policy has been approved by the department chairs and program directors in the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs and has the support of the majority of the faculty in the School.
From: Terence Bowers, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 9 February 2010 at 5 P.M. in room 115 of the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the 19 January 2010 Minutes

3. Reports
   - The Provost
   - The Speaker
   - Michael Phillips, chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and FAM

4. New Business
   - Motion to specify how long a Senator must “sit out” of the Faculty Senate after serving two consecutive terms
   - Green-Plan Resolution
   - Faculty Curriculum Committee

5. Constituents’ Concerns

6. Adjournment
Motion to Specify When a Senator Leaving the Faculty Senate Is Eligible to Return
Proposed by Irina Gigova (Senator At-Large)

Purpose: This motion seeks to fill a lacuna in the Faculty Administration Manual regarding how long a person who has completed two full terms as a Senator must stay out of the Faculty Senate before being eligible to be nominated and run for Senator again.

Action: Amend Article IV, Section 2D (E according to the 11/10/09 revision)

Current version:

*D. The term of office for Senators shall be two years; terms begin the day after spring commencement. No Senator may serve more than two consecutive full terms. One half of the Senators are elected each year. In the first year, election is for seats of one or two year terms, determined by lottery. A Senator elected in the first year to serve a one-year term is then eligible to be re-elected to two additional full terms.*

Proposed amendment:

*E. The term of office for Senators shall be two years; terms begin the day after spring commencement. No Senator may serve more than two consecutive full terms. A Senator shall be eligible for re-election to one additional consecutive term, following which four years must pass before he or she is again eligible. One half of the Senators are elected each year. In the first year, election is for seats of one or two year terms, determined by lottery. A Senator elected in the first year to serve a one-year term is then eligible to be re-elected to two additional full terms.*

Rationale: I ask the By-Laws/FAM Committee and the Senate to consider introducing a specified time off the Senate in light of the recently adopted reduction in the size of the Faculty Senate. This amendment aims to promote turnover in the smaller body on the premise that it would ensure more democratic representation of the entire faculty. Currently, the silence in the FAM could practically allow a Senator who has completed two consecutive terms to return to the Senate after a semester or even several meetings, thus negating the entire notion of term limits.

The proposed change does not restrict faculty involvement on campus or prevent engaged faculty from having their voices heard. The Faculty Standing Committees at the College of Charleston provide essential venues for those who desire service but are not eligible to be on the Senate. At the same time, the measure may encourage faculty members with limited committee and administrative experience to participate in the shared governance of the College of Charleston.

This amendment should not affect considerably the functions of the Faculty Senate. The current practice of staggered elections ensures enough continuity in institutional memory.
and practice. Whatever experience has been lost due to the longer periods of "sitting out" would be offset by the influx of new ideas and different perspectives.

In deliberating the appropriate amount of “time off” members of the By-Law/ FAM Committee and the Senate may consider the following possible models:

1. The period of “time off” equals the total period of service. The Faculty By-Laws already include such an example in the case of members of standing committees in Article V, Section 1B:

   B. Members of committees (Including alternates) serve for a term of one year and may be re-elected twice and then may serve again on the committee only after a lapse of three years. Terms begin on August 15. (Rev. Aug. 1999)

   If the same model is applied to Senate membership, then for each two full terms served, a Senator must take a four-year-long break. This is the model adopted in the present motion.

2. The period of “time off” equals the length of one full term of service, namely two years.

3. Finally, a period of three years off the Senate could be adopted to coincide with the three-year-period of merit evaluations, assuming that the odd number does not complicate the task of the Committee of Nominations and Elections, which is responsible for keeping track of candidates’ eligibility.

Finally, I would like to mention that such measures are already in place at other institutions of higher learning. I include two examples in the Appendix.
Appendix:
Two Examples of Similar Limitations on Senate Membership

1. William and Mary Faculty Assembly:

ARTICLE V
Membership
Section 1. The membership of the Assembly shall be limited to tenured and tenure-eligible faculty.
Section 2. The members of the Assembly shall serve for terms of three years so adjusted that the terms of approximately one-third of the members shall assume office at the first regular meeting of each academic year. A member shall be eligible for reelection to one additional consecutive term, following which two years must pass before he or she is again eligible. For purposes of eligibility, a partial term, to fill out the unexpired term of some other elected member or for any other reason, shall be counted as a full term.
Section 3. Vacancies shall be filled promptly through election by the original constituency.

http://www.wm.edu/sites/facultyassembly/constitutionandbylaws/index.php

2. UNC Faculty Assembly:

Members of the Assembly

A. The Assembly shall be composed of elected representatives from each institution according to the provisions of Sec. II, Par. 1 of the Charter. The number of full-time faculty and professional staff members at each institution shall be calculated as the number of budgeted teaching positions (FTE) at the institution. Using this number as of the second regular meeting of the Assembly, the Chair shall notify the Assembly during the second regular meeting of the number of delegates to which each institution is entitled during the next academic year.
B. The Assembly shall make no determination of the method of election, those matters being specifically reserved to the faculties of the several institutions.
C. The terms of delegates to the Assembly shall range from two (2) to three (3) years as established by each institution, and each institution shall assure continuity of delegation membership by a system of rotated terms. To be eligible as a delegate, a faculty member may not have served as a delegate to the Assembly for more than six (6) of the preceding nine (9) years, nor be selected to a term that would result in a violation of this limitation. However, a delegate shall be exempt from the above limitation while serving as chair or president of a faculty senate or council or as president of the campus faculty. Time spent while serving as an alternate is not counted in the above limitation. If a delegate is elected Chair, his or her institution may replace him or her with an alternate delegate for the remainder of their elected term as delegate. The Assembly Chair shall notify each delegation of any ineligible members.
D. Each institutional faculty shall select such alternate delegates as it deems necessary, but must have at least one.
E. All regular terms of service shall begin and end on July 1 of each year. The delegate list and authorized alternates for the coming academic year shall be recorded by the secretary and in the hands of the Assembly Chair by May 1.

http://uncfacultyassembly.northcarolina.edu/html/bylaws.htm
Resolution of the College of Charleston Faculty Senate
Proposed by Phil Dustan (Biology)

Whereas the *Charleston Green Plan: Sustainability and Climate Protection for the 21st Century* is the Charleston’s first local action plan for sustainability and climate protection;

Whereas the Charleston Green Plan will help to provide a roadmap for the future to minimize negative impacts on our natural resources, improve our quality of life, and preserve Charleston’s unique character; and

Whereas the plan provides the critical, long-range “big picture” perspective to guide City Council and citizens to work collaboratively to develop individual ordinances and informative campaigns supporting sustainability;

The Faculty Senate urges Charleston City Council to adopt the *Charleston Green Plan*. 
Faculty Curriculum Committee

List of Proposals Approved by the Committee

(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

I. Course Changes: Note that all course-change proposals will be voted on as a single group, unless a Senator wishes to isolate a specific proposal for discussion and a separate vote. Senators are asked to contact the Faculty Speaker or the Faculty Secretary in advance, if they wish to separate a proposal from the group. Of course, this action can also be done on the floor of the Senate.

Computer Science

   Change Course—CSCI 210 Game Programming

Hispanic Studies

   Change Course—LING 498 Independent Study
   Change Course—SPAN 328 Spanish Language Study Abroad
   Change Course—SPAN 350 Intensive Conversation and Composition
   Change Course—SPAN 390 Special Topics in Spanish
   Change Course—SPAN 496 Directed Readings
   Change Course—SPAN 498 Independent Study
   Change Course—SPAN 499 Bachelor’s Essay
   Delete Course—SPAN 330 Collateral Study

II. Program Changes:

   Art History

   Change Minor—Historic Preservation & Community Planning: Remove HIST 211 from the required curriculum; add an additional 3 hours to electives

   Biology & Psychology

   Change Minor—Neuroscience: Add PSYC 307, Abnormal Psychology, as an elective for the program

   Computing in the Arts
New Course—CITA 120 Building Virtual Worlds
New Course—CITA 180 Computers, Music and Art
New Course—CITA 210 Game Programming
New Course—CITA 295 CITA Seminar
New Course—CITA 495 CITA Capstone Seminar
New Major—Bachelor of Arts in Computing in the Arts

International and Intercultural Studies

Change Minor—Change requirements (e.g., add as requirements INTL 100, one interdisciplinary course, and one course from a group of courses that are part of the IS major)

Jewish Studies

Change Minor—Add JWST 245/ENGL 191, Introduction to Jewish-American Literature

Women’s and Gender Studies

Change Major—Add WGST 350, Gender and Violence, and WGST 356, Conservative Voices, to Women’s and Gender Studies
Change Minor—Add WGST 350, Gender and Violence, and WGST 356, Conservative Voices, to Women’s and Gender Studies
From: Terence Bowers, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 19 January 2010 at 5 P.M. in room 115 of the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the December 2009 Minutes

3. Reports
   - The Provost
   - The Speaker
   - Steven Jaumé, chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections

4. New Business
   - Committee on Nominations and Elections
     --Call for nominations of Faculty Senate officers
   - Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

5. Constituents’ Concerns

6. Adjournment
Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for the Faculty Senate January 19, 2010 Meeting

(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

Teacher Education

Proposals to Change a Graduate Course – Teacher Education:

EDFS 760: Change in Title and Catalog Description
EDFS 761: Change in Title and Catalog Description
EDFS 762: Change in Title and Catalog Description

Proposals for a New Graduate Course – Teacher Education:

EDFS 763: Advanced Curriculum Practices for the Gifted and Talented
EDFS 764: Social and Emotional Development of Gifted and Talented

Proposal for a New Certificate Program – Certificate in Gifted and Talented Education

Business Administration

Proposals for a New Graduate Course – Master of Business Administration:

MBAD 500: Law of Corporate Governance
MBAD 502: Accounting Issues for the Business Manager
MBAD 503: Financial Management and Permission to Cross-list with FINC 503
MBAD 504: Managing and Leading in Organizations
MBAD 505: Creativity and Innovation
MBAD 506: Operations Management
MBAD 515: International Financial Markets and Risk Management
MBAD 516: Financial Modeling
MBAD 517: Advanced Corporate Finance
MBAD 518: The Global Economy
MBAD 520: Global Enterprise
MBAD 521: Consumer Marketing Strategy
MBAD 522: Marketing Research and Analysis for Decision Making
MBAD 525: Marketing Management and Permission to Cross-list with MKTG 525
MBAD 590: Integrated Capstone

Proposal for a New Graduate Program - Master of Business Administration
From: Terence Bowers, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 8 December 2009 at 5 P.M. in room 115 of the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the November Minutes
3. Reports
   - The Provost
   - The Speaker
4. New Business
   - Committee on Academic Standards
     --Proposal to extend the deadline to withdraw from a course
   - Faculty Curriculum Committee
   - General-Education Committee
   - Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs
5. Constituents’ Concerns
6. Adjournment
Faculty Committee on Academic Standards  
Proposal to Change Official Withdrawal Deadline

Proposal
Move the last day to withdraw from a course from six weeks after the start of classes to eight weeks after the start of classes. Wording in the Undergraduate Catalog (page xxx) would change as follows:

Rationale
Pushing back the withdrawal deadline to eight weeks after the start of classes will allow students to potentially make a more informed decision if they are considering withdrawing from a course. Additionally, after eight weeks into the semester, midterm grades will have been made available to students via Cougar Trail. Though midterm grades aren’t always an accurate indicator of academic progress in a course, they can provide students with an idea of how they are performing. Having additional time to assess progress will allow students to use that time judiciously rather than withdrawing from a course in “panic mode.”

Current CofC policy/dates/deadlines:
Students may voluntarily withdraw from individual courses and/or labs until the official withdrawal deadline for the semester (see "academic calendar") through Cougar Trail on the Web, or by submitting the required paperwork to the Registrar’s Office. A grade of "W" will be entered on their record unless the student has been found responsible for an Honor Code violation. In that case, the professor determines the grade entered on the student’s record for that class. Students wishing to drop or withdraw from Express II courses after the deadlines for full-semester courses must fill out a request in the Registrars Office by the deadline for these processes. This cannot be done via Cougar Trail on the Web.

Fall 2009:
Tuesday, October 6: Last day for students to withdraw with a W from Spring semester classes
Tuesday, October 20: Midterm grades available to students via Cougar Trail

Course Withdrawal—impact on other areas:
- Financial Aid
  - Withdrawal—Any student withdrawing from coursework will be evaluated based on the minimum number of credit hours attempted at the point of aid disbursement. E.G., a student enrolled in 18 hours and withdraws from 6, the
evaluation is based on 12 hours. Anything less than 12 hours will have an adverse effect.

- Incremental quantitative standards—Students must earn a minimum percentage of cumulative hours attempted to demonstrate satisfactory academic progress toward degree completion.
- Time Limitation Quantitative Standards—Undergraduate who have attempted 183 credit hours (includes transfer, advanced placement, and CLEP credits) will cease to be eligible for financial aid.

- **Residence Life**
  - Students who drop below 9 hours are not eligible for on-campus housing.

- **Drop/Add Period, Express II**
  - Currently, the drop/add period for Express II courses ends three days prior to midterm grade availability.

- **LIFE Scholarship ($5000/year) and LIFE Scholarship Enhancement ($2500/year, specific science and math requirements)**
  - College of Charleston students’ LIFE Scholarship retention rate has gone down in the past year and is lower than that of Clemson University and the University of South Carolina (both of which have grade forgiveness options).
  - In-state students’ financial assistance needs are steadily increasing
  - Students who receive the LIFE Scholarship and the enhancement (if applicable) need to be able to make strategic decisions about their academic progress and courses.

---

**Other institutions’* withdrawal periods/deadlines, fall 2009:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Withdrawal Period</th>
<th>Withdrawal Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State University</td>
<td>9 weeks</td>
<td>October 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>11 weeks</td>
<td>November 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>October 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>October 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College of New Jersey</td>
<td>9 weeks</td>
<td>October 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College of William and Mary</td>
<td>9 weeks</td>
<td>October 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elon University</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>October 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>9 weeks</td>
<td>October 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>9 weeks</td>
<td>October 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan University</td>
<td>7 weeks</td>
<td>October 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>7 weeks</td>
<td>October 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>October 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Vermont</td>
<td>9 weeks</td>
<td>November 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>5 weeks</td>
<td>September 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
<td>7 weeks</td>
<td>November 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other institutions'* policies/dates/deadlines:

- **Appalachian State University**
  During the first nine weeks of a fall or spring semester, students are permitted to withdraw from the University without academic penalty (i.e., the student is assigned a grade of "withdrawal" on each course for which he or she is enrolled). During the first nine weeks of a fall or spring semester, students may discontinue enrollment in a specific course(s) and have the course(s) dropped from their schedule of classes without academic penalty (i.e., the course will not appear on the student's academic record and will not be computed in his or her grade point average).

  Fall 2009:
  Tuesday, August 25: Classes begin
  Wednesday, October 14: First-half of semester ends
  Wednesday, October 28: Last day to drop a full semester course; last day to withdraw without academic penalty (9 weeks)

- **Boston College**
  Undergraduates may drop or add a course(s) on-line during the first seven days of the semester. Undergraduates only may drop a course, including a sixth course, until October 1, in the fall and February 15, in the spring semesters in their Associate Dean's office. After the extended drop period, undergraduates who withdraw from a course will have a "W" recorded in the grade column of their academic record. To withdraw from a course all students must go to the Forms page of the Student Services website, print the withdrawal form, and then go to the Office of the Associate Dean for their school. Students will not be permitted to withdraw from courses after the published deadline.

  Fall 2009:
  Tuesday, September 8: Classes begin
  Monday, November 30: Last date for official withdrawal from a course or from the University (11 weeks)

- **Clemson University**
  W—Withdrew indicates that the student withdrew from the course or was withdrawn by the instructor after the first two weeks of class work and prior to the last seven weeks of classes, not including the examination period.

  Note: Instructors are required to submit midterm grades for students in all undergraduate classes.

  Fall 2009:
  Wednesday, August 19: Classes begin
Friday, October 2: Last day for instructors to issue midterm evaluations
Friday, October 9: Last day to drop a class or withdraw from the University without final grades (8 weeks)

- **The College of New Jersey**
  Students may withdraw from a full semester course up to the ninth (9th) week of the semester. Students withdrawing from courses within the withdrawal period will automatically receive a grade of W, which has no effect on the student's grade point average. It is the student's responsibility to withdraw officially from a course. Failure to withdraw formally may result in failing grades and dismissal. Deadlines for these withdrawals are strictly adhered to.

  Fall 2009:
  Tuesday, August 25: Classes begin
  Tuesday, October 27: Last day to withdraw from a full semester course with a W (9 weeks)

- **The College of William and Mary**
  Withdrawal from Course(s): After the add/drop period, students may withdraw with a grade of ‘W’ from a course through the ninth week of classes.

  Fall 2009:
  Wednesday, August 26: Classes begin
  Friday, October 30: Last day to withdraw from a full semester course (9 weeks)

- **Elon University**
  Withdrawal from courses: A student may officially drop any class with a “W” (withdraw without penalty) through half of the term. (A “term” includes the examination period.)

  Fall 2009:
  Tuesday, September 1: Classes begin
  Friday, October 16: Mid-semester grades due
  Friday, October 23: Last day for dropping a course with "W" (8 weeks)

- **James Madison University**
  A course adjustment is any change to a student's registered course schedule. A course adjustment can include any of the following: changing a credit option, changing a section, adding a course, dropping a course or withdrawing from a course. Deadlines for processing specific course adjustments are stated in the Registration and Student Record Services Handbook and the Office of the Registrar Web site. The end of the course adjustment period (approximately one week after midterm grades are due for a regular semester) is the deadline for withdrawing without penalty from a course and changing credit options for a semester course. First semester first year students
(students who have taken 27 or fewer credit hours) must secure the prior approval of their faculty adviser for any course adjustments.

A student may terminate enrollment in a course by withdrawing from the course after the drop deadline. A student who withdraws from a course will receive a grade of "W" for the course, and this grade will be recorded (and remain) on the student's transcript regardless of the status of the student in the course at the time of the withdrawal.

Fall 2009:
Monday, August 24: Classes begin
Thursday, October 22: Last day to withdraw from a semester course (9 weeks)

- **Miami University**
  After Change of Schedule ends, you can still drop a full-semester course without a grade until the third week of the semester (for summer and sprint courses, before 20 percent of the class meetings have elapsed). After Change of Schedule ends, you must have the instructor's signature to drop a course.

  If you withdraw from a course between the third and ninth weeks of the semester (or between 20 and 60 percent of the class meetings), you will be given a grade of W. W is not figured in your grade point average.

Fall 2009:
Monday, August 24: Classes begin
Tuesday, October 13: Midterm grades available to students
Friday, October 23: Last day to withdraw from a course with W (9 weeks)

- **Rowan University**
  Registration in a given Rowan University course implies the student's obligation to complete its requirements. Provisions for withdrawal are made for special circumstances. Except in extreme circumstances when the department chair and the dean of a particular college allow, students are not permitted to withdraw from the same course more than two (2) times.

  To withdraw from a course between the drop/add period and mid-semester, students must secure a Withdrawal from Course Request Form A from the Registrar's Office. The reason for the request may be stated on the form and must be signed by both the student and the course professor, who must note the student's last date of attendance in class on the form. Upon receipt of the signed Withdrawal from Course Request Form A, the Registrar's Office will enter a W on the official transcript.

Fall 2009:
Tuesday, September 1: Classes begin
Tuesday, October 20: Last day to withdraw from a course with a “W” (7 weeks)

- **University of North Carolina Wilmington**
  Inclusive of the second through the seventh week of the semester, any student who withdraws from the university or from individual courses will receive a grade of "W." A grade of "W" will not affect the student's grade point average. Beginning with the eighth week of the semester, a grade of "WF" will be assigned for each course withdrawal and will count as GPA hours; this failing grade may be changed to "W" should extenuating circumstances warrant.

Fall 2009:
- Wednesday, August 19: Classes begin
- Thursday, October 8: Last day to withdraw with W—undergraduate students (7 weeks)

- **University of South Carolina**
  An undergraduate student may drop a course via the Internet (https://vip.sc.edu). Courses from which the student withdraws by the last day to change a course schedule or drop without a grade of W will not be recorded on a student's permanent record. Thereafter, during the first six weeks of a semester, the grade of W will be recorded on a student's transcript, but the semester hours will not enter into the computation of hours attempted, grade point average, or any other totals

Fall 2009:
- Thursday, August 20: Classes begin
- Thursday, October 1: Last day to drop a course or withdraw without a grade of "WF" being recorded (6 weeks)
- Thursday, October 8: Midpoint in semester

- **University of Vermont**
  From the eleventh day of instruction to the end of the ninth week of classes, students may withdraw from courses. To do so, students must complete a Course Withdrawal Form, consult with their advisor, and obtain the instructor’s signature. The student must deliver the form to the Registrar’s Office no later than 4 p.m. on Friday of the ninth week of classes. Students give a copy to their dean for information purposes. A grade of W will be assigned by the instructor(s) and recorded on the student’s permanent record.

Fall 2009:
- Monday, August 31: Classes begin
- Friday, November 6: Last day to Withdraw (9 weeks)

- **Wake Forest University**
  The last day in each term for dropping a class without a grade of F is listed in the calendar in the front of this bulletin. A student who wishes to drop any course on or
before this date must follow the procedure prescribed by the registrar. After this date, a student who wishes to drop a course must consult his or her academic adviser, the course instructor, and the dean of the College or the dean of business, as appropriate. If the dean approves the request, he or she authorizes the student to discontinue the course. Except in cases of emergency, the grade in the course will be recorded as F.

If, at any time, a student drops any course without prior written approval of the appropriate dean, the student will be subject to such penalties imposed by the Committee on Academic Affairs.

Fall 2009:
Wednesday, August 26  Classes begin
Wednesday, September 30:  Last day to drop courses (5 weeks)

- **Western Washington College**
  Course withdrawals that occur from the beginning of the sixth day of the quarter to the end of the second week (prior to 5 p.m. on Friday of the second week) will result in no entry on the permanent record (official transcript), but a mark of XM will appear with the withdrawn course on the unofficial record (academic history).

  Withdrawals that occur beginning the sixth day of the quarter may affect a student’s tuition charges and may result only in a half-tuition refund. There also may be implications for financial aid recipients’ awards. To withdraw from a course after the first five days of a quarter, a student must present the request in person at the Registrar’s Office. Beginning the third week of the quarter, a mark of “W” is posted for each withdrawn course.

  Course withdrawal from the beginning of the third week to the end of the seventh week is permitted only if the student has an unused annual withdrawal privilege. Each student is granted two annual withdrawal privileges at the beginning of the academic year in fall quarter. The annual withdrawal privileges can be used during fall, winter, spring or summer quarter. (See note on summer below.) Unused annual withdrawals cannot be used in subsequent years. To use an annual withdrawal privilege, a student must present the request in person at the Registrar’s Office.

  After the seventh week of the quarter, course withdrawal is not permitted. Discontinued attendance without official withdrawal results in a failing grade (Z or F). Course withdrawal deadlines are published in the dates and deadlines section of the Registrar’s Office website and the *Summer Session Bulletin* on the Web.

Fall 2009:
Wednesday, September 23  Classes begin
Friday, October 2  Last day to drop a class without using a late-withdrawal privilege
Friday, November 6

Last day for late course withdrawal *(for students with withdrawal privileges) (7 weeks)*

A Resolution FR 005
Presented by Senator Daniel Mackin
of the
College of Charleston Student Government Association
On this Twenty-Seventh Day of October, 2009

Purpose: to demonstrate the support of the Student Body in lengthening the withdrawal period for regular semester courses.

Whereas: this proposal is already being reviewed by the Faculty Senate, due to come to the floor in November,

Whereas: many of the College of Charleston’s peer institutions have longer withdrawal periods,

Whereas: a longer withdrawal period allows for greater academic success by the Student Body,

Therefore: BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SENATE OF THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION IN REGULAR SESSION ASSEMBLED, THE FOLLOWING:

Section I: the Student Government Association at the College of Charleston supports the lengthening of the withdrawal period for regular semester courses.

Section II: THIS RESOLUTION SHALL TAKE EFFECT (UPON PASSAGE) BY THE STUDENT SENATE SITTING IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND THE SIGNATURE OF THE STUDENT BODY PRESIDENT.

[Signature]

President of the Student Body 09-10
Faculty Curriculum Committee

List of Proposals Approved by the Committee

(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

Biology

Change Courses—BIOL 101 and BIOL 102 Elements of Biology

Library

Change Course—LIBR 105 Electronic Resources for Research (1)

Jewish Studies and English

New Course—JWST 245/ENGL191 Introduction to Jewish-American Literature

Teacher Education

Change Major—TEDU Cognate Major in Physics Secondary Education

Women’s and Gender Studies

New Course—WGST 356 Conservative Voices in Women’s and Gender Studies
Committee on General Education

Proposals for the Faculty Senate November 10, 2009 Meeting

(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

Proposals to Change a Course to Continue General-Education Status

BIOL101 and BIOL102 Elements of Biology

COMM 214 Media in the Digital Age

Proposal for a New Course Requesting General-Education Status

JWST 245/ENGL 191 Introduction to Jewish-American Literature
Faculty Committee on Graduate Education,
Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for the Faculty Senate November 10, 2009 Meeting

(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

Public Administration

Proposal to Change a Graduate Program:

Joint MS in Environmental Studies & Master of Public Administration

Proposals for a New Graduate Course:

PUBA 655 Nonprofit Capacity Building
PUBA 656 Fundraising and Marketing for Nonprofits
PUBA 705 Managing Public/Private Partnerships
PUBA 711 Independent Study

Proposals to Change a Graduate Course: (Change names and descriptions)

PUBA 600 Public Service Roles and Responsibilities
PUBA 601 Research Methods for Public Administration
PUBA 603 Managing Public Organizations
PUBA 604 Managing Human Resources
PUBA 605 Managing Financial Resources

Proposals to Delete a Graduate Course:

PUBA 712 Organizational Behavior
PUBA 723 Contemporary Administrative Organizations
PUBA 730 Politics and the Budgetary Process
From: Terence Bowers, Faculty Secretary

To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 10 November 2009 at 5 P.M. in room 115 of the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium).

Agenda
1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the October Minutes
3. Reports
   - The Provost
   - The Speaker
4. Unfinished Business
   - Faculty Curriculum Committee (note: curricular proposals submitted for this meeting are combined with curricular proposals that the Senate did not have time to deal with in the previous meeting)
   - Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs (note: curricular proposals submitted for this meeting are combined with curricular proposals that the Senate did not have time to deal with in the previous meeting)
   - Resolution to rename the Teacher-Scholar Award to the William V. Moore Distinguished Teacher/Scholar Award
   - Motion to change the size and composition of the Faculty Senate
5. New Business
   - Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review
     -- Clarification of language concerning tenure and promotion to Associate Professor
     -- Clarification of language concerning service standard for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor
     -- Clarification of language concerning service standard for promotion to Professor
   - Committee on General Education
6. Constituents' Concerns
7. Adjournment
Faculty Curriculum Committee

List of Proposals Approved by the Committee

(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Website)

Biology

Change Course—BIO L 101
Change Course—BIO L 102
New Course—BIOL 357 Oceanographic Research

Classics

Change Course—GREK 372: Readings in Greek Literature: Prose
New Course—CLAS 105: History of the Classical World

Communication

Change Major—B.A. (Concentration in Communication Studies)
Change Minor—Communication Studies
Change Course—CO MM 214
Delete Course—CO MM 330

Computer Science

Change Course—CSCI 220 Computer Programming I

English

Change Major—B.A. English

New Course—ENG L

Geology

Change Course—GEOL 250
New Course—GEOL 357 Oceanographic Research - The Transect Program

Latin American and Caribbean Studies

Change Major—LACS B.A.

Music

Change Course—MU S C 2 4 6 Music Theory I
Change Course—MUSC 247 Music Theory II

Change Course—MUSC 481 Music Theory III

Change Course—MUSC 482 Music Theory IV

Psychology

Change Major—BS in PSYC

Change Course—PSYC 214

Change Course—PSYC 464

Delete Course—PSYC 342

Delete Course—PSYC 384

Teacher Education

New Course—TEDU 205 Exploring Leadership: Building Peer Facilitation Skills
Main English Change Program

MS in Environmental Studies Change Program
New Course—EVSS 631 Pollution in the Environment
Change Course—EVSS 639 Wetlands Hydrology and Biogeochemistry (title change)

MAT in Middle Grades
New Course—EDMG 658 Application of Methods and Materials in Middle Level Field Grades 5-8
Permission to Cross-List EDMG 658 with EDEE 417
Program in Science and Mathematics for Teachers
Change Course—SMFT 548: Atomic Theory of Matter from Lucretius to Quarks
Change Course—SMFT 555: Applications of Physics for Teachers, How Things Work
WHEREAS Professor William V. Moore was a faculty member of the College of Charleston for thirty-seven years; and
WHEREAS Professor William V. Moore was awarded the Distinguished Teaching/Award in 1981; and
Professor William V. Moore was the first recipient, in 2001, of the Distinguished Teacher/Scholar Award; and
WHEREAS Professor William V. Moore also won campus awards for Distinguished Service (2000) and Distinguished Advising (2001) and received the South Carolina Governor’s Professor of the Year Award in 1997; and
WHEREAS, at the time of his sudden death in 2009, Professor William V. Moore was actively teaching at the College of Charleston; and
WHEREAS, Professor William V. Moore epitomized the model of the Teacher-Scholar;
WHEREAS, the executive leadership of the College is supportive of this action,
BE IT RESOLVED
THAT HENCEFORTH, upon the approval of the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President, the College of Charleston Distinguished Teacher/Scholar Award will be known as the William V. Moore Distinguished Teacher/Scholar Award.
Motion on the Composition of the Faculty Senate

Proposed to the Faculty Senate on 9-15-09 by the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance

The attached motion asks that the By-Laws be amended to change the composition of the Faculty Senate. Currently, each academic department and the Library elect at least one senator, and an additional senator for each ten faculty after the first faculty member. Fifteen at-large senators are elected by the faculty as a whole.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance has been studying our faculty governance system and considering reforms that could make it more effective. The Committee concluded that a smaller Senate with at-large members elected by school would be both more responsive to faculty concerns and more effective at giving those concerns a voice in the governance of the institution. Our full report, which includes a more detailed discussion of the composition of our and other faculty Senate s, is being made available on the Senate website.

The attached motion would create a Senate of 50 members, appointed according to the percentage of faculty in each school. There would be one senator from each academic department, with the remainder of each school's senators elected at-large by the faculty in that school.

Amend Article IV, Section 2, of the By-Laws as follows:

Section 2. Composition and Election

A. Composition. There shall be 50 Faculty Senators, appointed by the percentage of faculty in each school (including the Library). There shall be one senator elected by each academic department and the Library, with the remainder of each school's senators elected at-large by the faculty in that school. If a school should have more departments than its apportionment of apportioned senators, then all of that school's senators shall be elected at-large by the faculty in that school.

B. Eligibility. A Faculty Senator must be a full-time tenure, 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 professional librarian. Without regard to teaching load, Department Chairs, Assistant Department Chairs, and Associate Department Chairs who otherwise would be members of the regular faculty are eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. (App. April 2005)

Administrative officers, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Academic Deans, the Dean of the Honors College, Associate Deans, and Assistant Deans are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. Faculty members on leave are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. (Rev. May 2009)
B. The President of the College, the Provost, a student representing the Student Government Association, and the Faculty Secretary are non-voting ex-officio members of the Faculty Senate.

C. Election

1. Without regard to teaching load, all and only regular faculty members as defined 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.

2. No later than February 15, vacancies from the group of at-large Senate seats will be filled by means of an election conducted among the eligible faculty of each school (as defined in Section 1 above) through an electronic ballot. Candidates for the at-large Senate seats are nominated by February 1 by the Committee on Nominations and Elections or by nomination or self-nomination. By February 1, any and all regular faculty of a school may forward nominations or self-nominations to the Committee on Nominations and Elections for the at-large Senate seats in that school. The candidates receiving the most votes cast in this election shall be elected to the at-large seats allocated to each school. Any ties shall be decided by lot.

3. No later than March 15, each of the academic departments and Library will elect its Senator(s) from among its eligible members (as defined in Section 2A above). Units with one to ten eligible voters (as defined in Section 2C.1 above) elect one Senator; units with eleven to twenty eligible voters elect two Senators, and so on by increments of ten.

4. The Committee on Nominations and Elections shall oversee all Senate elections. (verifying Senate apportionment and voter eligibility; constructing, distributing, collecting and validating ballots; and certifying results).

5. All elections for at-large Senate seats shall be conducted by secret electronic ballot. Upon the receipt of a vote, the Committee on Nominations and Elections shall ensure that the vote was cast by an eligible voter. In case of a tie vote, the election is decided by lot.

6. A candidate for the position of Speaker cannot be a candidate for an at-large senate seat in the same election. In the event that a candidate for Speaker is in the middle of a term as an at-large Senator and wins the election for Speaker, of those unsuccessful in the election for at-large seats, the person obtaining the most votes will complete the second year of the Speaker-elect's term.

Amend Article IV, Section 2, as follows:
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By Laws/FAM committee. Substantive Amendment 3
Vacancies due to resignation, recall or any other reason may be filled by a special election by the appropriate electorate. Senators elected in such special elections will serve out the term of the Senators they replace. If an Aat-Large Senator needs to be replaced, the faculty of that school shall elect the replacement by ballot. The Committee on Nominations will provide a slate of at least two candidates circulate to the faculty at least two weeks before the election. Additional nominations from the faculty may be sent to the Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections at least one week before the election. No Senator, including replacement Senators, shall serve for more than four consecutive years. (Rev. Jan. 2007, April 2007; Ins. April 2007)

Amend Article IV, Section 3, B. 1.c (concerning the Committee on Nominations and Elections) as follows:

c. Duties:

(1) To nominate for the offices of Speaker of the Faculty and Faculty Secretary, for the fifteen at-large Senate seats, and for membership on all standing and ad-hoc committees of the Faculty Senate and of the College;

(2) To fill all vacancies through nomination or appointment which may occur on any committee;

(3) To present to Senators, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing Senate committees at least 15 days prior to the April Senate meeting;

(4) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing College committees and five sixteen faculty for the College Honor Board by March 15;

(5) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of candidates for the offices of Speaker of the Faculty and Faculty Secretary by February 1;

(6) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of at least twenty-five candidates for the fifteen at-large Senate seats by February 1; Conduct elections for at-large school senators (verifying Senate apportionment and candidate and voter eligibility; constructing, distributing, collecting and validating ballots, and certifying results.)
Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review

Proposed Senate Motions

I. Clarification of language concerning tenure and promotion to Associate Professor

Current Language
There must be clear evidence of high promise for continued quality scholarship and professional activity. Since peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality, typically the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professional evaluated performance or exhibits in the arts).

Proposed New Language
The there must be clear evidence of high promise for continued quality scholarship and professional activity. Since peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality, typically the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professional evaluated performance or exhibits in the arts).

Justification
In practice, in order to earn tenure and promotion to Associate Professor at the College of Charleston, a candidate must have peer reviewed scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, performances or exhibits in the arts). The word "typically" in the current language is misleading.

II. Clarification of language concerning service standard for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor

Current Language
There should be active and sustained participation in service to the College and, where appropriate, to the community.

Proposed New Language
There should be active and sustained participation in service to the College and, where appropriate, to the community or there should be active and sustained service in the candidate's professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.

Justification
The current language is ambiguous about two things: when service to the community is required and what the community consists of. The original "where appropriate" language suggests that community service is not always required, but it does not address the issue of when it is required. Does the language mean that faculty from certain schools and disciplines are required to participate in service to the community while faculty from other schools and disciplines aren't? We believe that, in practice, the various evaluative bodies accept active and sustained service to either the college or to the larger community (or both) as fulfilling the service requirement for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The revision reflects this.
In addition, the new language clarifies that service must be done in a candidate’s professional role and that the community does not simply mean the local Charlotte community, but can also refer to larger communities, which may include professional organizations.

III. Clarification of Language concerning Service Standard for Promotion to Professor

Current Language

There should be active and sustained participation in a leadership capacity in service to the College and, where appropriate, to the community.

Proposed New Language

There should be active and sustained participation in a leadership capacity in service to the College and, where appropriate, to the community. Leadership should be demonstrated either in college service or in the candidate’s professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.

Justification

The justification is largely the same as for motion II above. But the current language for promotion to Professor is perhaps even more ambiguous because of the “leadership capacity” language. The current language suggests that a candidate may have to serve in a leadership capacity in both service to the college and in service to the community. We do not believe that this is the intent of the original language. The revised language attempts to make clear that, while sustained service to the college is required, service in a leadership capacity may be performed either at the college or to the larger community.
Proposal for New Course Requesting General Education Status

CLAS 105—History of the Classical World: to satisfy Pre-Modern and Humanities Gen-Ed requirements
Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the September Minutes

3. Reports
   
   The Provost
   The Speaker
   Steven Jaumé, Committee on Nominations and Elections
      --Report on motion to change the Faculty Senate
   Michael Phillips, chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and the FAM
      --Report on motion to change the Faculty Senate

4. Unfinished Business

   Motion to adopt a new Instructor/Course Evaluation Form
   Motion to change the size and composition of the Faculty Senate

5. New Business

   Faculty Curriculum Committee
   Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs
   Resolution to rename the Teacher-Scholar Award to the William V. Moore Distinguished Teacher/Scholar Award

6. Constituents’ Concerns

7. Adjournment
Report by the Committee on Nominations and Elections on the Motion on the Composition of the Faculty Senate

Annalisa Calini, Noelle Zeiner-Carmichael, Maureen Hays, Steve Jaume (Chair), Glenn Lesses, RoxAnn Stalvey, Patricia Ward

Issue 1: Apportionment of Senators – based upon the reading of the motion before the Senate, there are two means of apportioning Senators among the various Schools of the College which are potentially in conflict with each other: a) apportionment by percentage of School faculty to total faculty and b) apportionment of one senator per department. The final composition of the Senate under the proposed model will depend upon which of the two components takes priority. As an example, Table 1 and Table 2 below show the composition of the Faculty Senate by School under different assumptions of whether a) or b) above are implemented first. Note that this is done using the number of departmental faculty, together with the inclusion of non-departmental School faculty, used to calculate the composition of the Senate for this year. This allows a somewhat “apples to apples” comparison with the current Senate (Table 3). Given that the Senate changed the definition of regular faculty during Spring 2009, a recalculation under the current definitions may yield slightly different numbers.

Note that in both cases below the Hill-Huntington method (i.e., method used to apportion the US House of Representatives) was used for the apportionment by percentage of School faculty to total faculty.

Table 1: Apportionment by percentage of total faculty followed by apportionment of one senator by department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total Senators</th>
<th>Departmental</th>
<th>At-Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHHP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCWA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note in Table 1 that many schools would only have one “at-large” senate seat available; i.e., all other senate seats are taken up by departmental representatives. Dependent upon the future evolution of the College’s faculty, it is possible that a School will find itself with no “at-large” Senate seats. The Committee on Nominations and Elections notes that the model used to derive Table 1 even has the potential to assign fewer senate seats to a school than the number of departments. If this case occurs there needs to be some mechanism to decide how the senate seats are apportioned within the School in question; i.e., either by making all the seats “at-large” or assigned to the largest departments.

Table 2: Apportionment of one senator by department followed by apportionment by percentage of total faculty for remaining senate seats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total Senators</th>
<th>Departmental</th>
<th>At-Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mechanism used to produce Table 2 effectively guarantees that all Schools have at least one and usually more than one “at-large” senate seat to fill from within that School. However, it does this in general by taking senate seats away from the larger Schools and giving them to the smaller Schools.

We also note that, under either model above, there is a possibility of a “tie” with regards to apportionment of Senate seats among the various Schools. Currently, the FAM calls for a decision by lot in case of a tie in a contested election for a Senate seat. Unless instructed by the Senate otherwise, the Committee on Nominations and Elections would use this same model to resolve a tie in apportionment.

Finally, we also compare the two Senate models above with the composition of departmental senators in the current Senate (Table 3). Note that there are currently 59 departmental senators as compared to 50 senators in the proposed models.

Table 3: Comparison of apportionment of senators between schools in the current Senate versus the two models above. Only departmental senators in the current Senate are counted here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHHP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCWA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issue 2: Number of Senators available to fill seats on Senate standing committees – the current Senate standing committees require a total of 10 senators to serve on those committees. This 1 in 7 senators from the current Senate (74) but would be 1 in 5 senators in the new model Senate (50). This will likely make it more difficult for the Committee on Nominations and Elections to fill these seats, given there are fewer total Senators available.

Issue 3: Timing of elections – under the proposed Senate model there would be up to seven different elections for At-Large Senators; i.e., one election per School. It is currently unknown if the electronic balloting software currently in use can be configured to support seven simultaneous elections where only those faculty associated with a School can vote in that School’s election. If not, then either a series of sequential electronic ballots would necessary (which would require a change in the time allowed for the elections) or another form (paper?) of balloting would be required.

Issue 4: Counting of faculty for apportionment – the Committee on Nominations and Elections currently uses the composition of the faculty at the end of the previous fall semester to calculate departmental
senate seats for the succeeding year. Unless instructed otherwise by the Senate, we will do the same for apportioning Senate seats by School under the proposed model.

**Issue 5:** Faculty joint appointments and Senate apportionment – it was noted that there are a small number of faculty who have “joint appointments” with more than one School. Currently no mechanism exists for deciding which School such faculty would be assigned to for the purpose of Senate apportionment.

**Issue 6:** Term of service of Senators – it was noted that the current restrictions on Senate service (“No Senator, including replacement Senators, shall serve for more than four consecutive years.”) allow for a “4 years on, 1 year off, 4 years on” type of Senate service. With fewer Senate seats available to be filled, there is the potential for less turnover within the Senate.

**Issue 7:** Lack of College-wide “At-Large” Senate seats – the Committee of Nominations and Elections had reservations about the proposed model for the Senate eliminating College-wide “At-Large” Senate seats and also disadvantaging smaller schools. We wondered if alternative models would reduce the size of the Senate, but address some of these concerns.
Faculty Members: C. Michael Phillips (Committee Chair and Senator), Steven Arsenault (Senator), and Erin Beutel

Committee Duties: “To review on a continuing basis the Faculty By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual; to propose changes for the improvement of the documents and to forward the recommended changes to the administration and/or the Faculty Senate as appropriate; to incorporate any revisions to or interpretations of either document in new editions of the documents; to make non-substantive changes to the Faculty By-Laws to correct unintended grammatical and spelling errors, address minor problems of stylistic consistency, and correct inaccurate administrative titles.” (Faculty By-Laws, Art. V, Sect. 2.B.3(b)).

A motion to amend the Faculty By-Laws was offered at the September 15, 2009 meeting of the Faculty Senate. As required by Article VI of the By-Laws, we offer our recommendations to the Senate regarding this motion. The original and a revised motion are available on the Faculty Senate Web site. The revised motion was offered by Larry Krasnoff, chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance.

In this report, we reproduce the motion to amend as we recommend it be adopted by the Faculty Senate and the College Faculty, should the Senate and Faculty be favorably disposed to these amendments. The committee also raised the following questions about the motion: (1) Could decreasing the size of the senate adversely affect the formulation of committee slates that require senators and (2) Can the current calendar requirement that both the major senate officers and the proposed at-large school senators be elected by February 15th be met if all of these elections are conducted separately?

Proposed Amendments. Please see the original and revised motions for the rationale to amend, as supplied by the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance.

We propose the following four substantive changes to the motion:

(1) Article IV, Section 2D.2. Rather than the deans forward a slate of candidates to the Committee on Nominations and Elections, we propose instead that faculty of a school forward nominations or self-nominations to the Committee on Nominations and Elections for the purpose of developing a slate of at-large candidates for that school. This limits all parts of the election process to faculty and faculty committees and does not directly involve the academic administration;

(2) Article IV, Section 2D.5. Remove “electronic” since it is unclear to us that our current electronic balloting system will be able to handle a maximum of seven elections with seven different electorates in two weeks time;

(3) Article IV, Section 2D.6. Remove this item since the proposed motion requires that the election of senate officers and at-large senators be held separately; and

(4) Article IV, Section 3B.1.c.6. As the motion from the Ad Hoc Committee indicates, strike the sixth duty of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, but add in its place “Conduct elections for at-large school senators.” We assume this was an oversight.
We also propose the following four non-substantive changes:

(1) At Article IV, Section 2A, remove “and the Library” in the second sentence. Since the Library has no formal internal departments, there are no distinct sets of departmental or at-large senators as with the schools. Hence, the case for the Library is better described by the first sentence alone.

(2) A change of reference in Article IV, Section 2D.3 due to the insertion of a new composition clause at section A of this same section;

(3) For clarity and completeness at Article IV, Section 2D.4, remove the parenthetical “verifying Senate apportionment and voter eligibility; constructing, distributing, collecting and validating ballots, and certifying results” and add the following in parentheses after the duty described at Article IV, Section 3.B.1.c.6: “verifying Senate apportionment and candidate and voter eligibility; constructing, distributing, collecting and validating ballots, and certifying results”; and

(4) A change of fact at Article IV, Section 3B.1.c.4. There are now 16, not 5, faculty elected to the College Honor Board by March 15. 8 serve on the board and 8 serve as advisors to students called to appear before the board; and

The motion to amend appears below. Changes to the By-laws are denoted by strikethrough and underline to indicate stricken items and additions, respectively.

Amend Article IV, Section 2, of the By-Laws (concerning the Faculty Senate) as follows:

Section 2. Composition and Election

A. Composition. There shall be 50 Faculty Senators, apportioned by the percentage of faculty in each school (including the Library). There shall be one senator elected by each academic department, with the remainder of a school’s senators elected at-large by the faculty in that school.

A. B. Eligibility. A Faculty Senator must be a full-time tenured, 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 professional librarian. Without regard to teaching load, Department Chairs, Assistant Department Chairs, and Associate Department Chairs who otherwise would be members of the regular faculty are eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. (App. April 2005) Administrative officers, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Academic Deans, the Dean of the Honors College, Associate Deans, and Assistant Deans are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. Faculty members on leave are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. (Rev. May 2009)

B. C. The President of the College, the Provost, a student representing the Student Government Association, and the Faculty Secretary are non-voting ex-officio members of the Faculty Senate.

C. D. Election
1. Without regard to teaching load, all and only regular faculty members as defined 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.

2. No later than February 15, vacancies from the group of at-large Senate seats will be filled by means of an election conducted among the eligible faculty of each school (as defined in Section 1 above) through an electronic ballot. Candidates for the at-large Senate seats are nominated by February 1 by the Committee on Nominations and Elections or by nomination or self-nomination. By February 1, any and all regular faculty of a school may forward nominations or self-nominations to the Committee on Nominations and Elections for the at-large Senate seats in that school. The candidates receiving the most votes cast in this election shall be elected to the at-large seats allocated to each school. Any tie shall be decided by lot.

3. No later than March 15, each of the academic departments and Library will elect its Senator(s) from among its eligible members (as defined in Section 2A B above). Units with one to ten eligible voters (as defined in Section 2C.1 above) elect one Senator; units with eleven to twenty eligible voters elect two Senators, and so on by increments of ten.

4. The Committee on Nominations and Elections shall oversee all Senate elections. (verifying Senate apportionment and voter eligibility; constructing, distributing, collecting and validating ballots; and certifying results).

5. All elections for at-large Senate seats shall be conducted by secret electronic ballot. Upon the receipt of a vote, the Committee on Nominations and Elections shall ensure that the vote was cast by an eligible voter. In case of a tie vote, the election is decided by lot.

6. A candidate for the position of Speaker cannot be a candidate for an at-large senate seat in the same election. In the event that a candidate for Speaker is in the middle of a term as an at-large senator and wins the election for Speaker, of those unsuccessful in the election for at-large seats, the person obtaining the most votes will complete the second year of the Speaker-elect’s term.

Amend Article IV, Section 2, F as follows:

F. Vacancies due to resignation, recall or any other reason may be filled by a special election by the appropriate electorate. Senators elected in such special elections will serve out the term of the Senators they replace. If an at-large Senator needs to be replaced, the faculty of that school shall elect the replacement by ballot. The Committee on Nominations will provide a slate of at least two candidates circulated to the faculty at least two weeks before the election. Additional nominations from the faculty may be sent to the Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections at least one week before the election. No Senator, including replacement Senators, shall serve for more than four consecutive years. (Rev. Jan. 2007, April 2007; Ins. April 2007)
Amend Article IV, Section 3, B.1.c (concerning the Committee on Nominations and Elections) as follows:

c. Duties:

(1) To nominate for the offices of Speaker of the Faculty and Faculty Secretary, for the fifteen at-large Senate seats, and for membership on all standing and ad-hoc committees of the Faculty Senate and of the College;

(2) To fill all vacancies through nomination or appointment which may occur on any committee;

(3) To present to Senators, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing Senate committees at least 15 days prior to the April Senate meeting;

(4) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing College committees and five sixteenth faculty for the College Honor Board by March 15;

(5) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of candidates for the offices of Speaker of the Faculty and Faculty Secretary by February 1;

(6) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of at least twenty-five candidates for the fifteen at-large Senate seats by February 1; Conduct elections for at-large school senators (verifying Senate apportionment and candidate and voter eligibility; constructing, distributing, collecting and validating ballots, and certifying results.)
New Instructor and Course Evaluation Form
Proposed by the *ad hoc* Committee on Developing and Evaluating Teaching
at the 9-15-09 Faculty Senate Meeting

College of Charleston
Instructor and Course Evaluation Form
Instructions

- Your thoughtful and independent responses to this evaluation form are important to the instructor and to the College.
- To ensure that your feedback is collected anonymously, please do not put your name on the form. Your responses will be collected by someone other than the instructor and kept in a secure place until after course grades have been submitted to the Office of the Registrar.
- Please use a No. 2 pencil or blue or black ink pen to complete the form.
- Please make solid marks that fill the circle completely.

Your written comments will be shared with your instructor after he or she submits final course grades. To protect anonymity, please print your comments and do not use any personal identifiers.
**College of Charleston**  
*Instructor and Course Evaluation Form*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Course/Section</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SA = Strongly Agree  A = Agree  N = Neutral  D = Disagree  SD = Strongly Disagree  
You are encouraged to provide written comments.

**Organization**

1. Course materials were well prepared and carefully explained.  
   Comments.  
   SA  
   A  
   N  
   D  
   SD

2. Course objectives were clearly stated and pursued.  
   Comments.  
   SA  
   A  
   N  
   D  
   SD

**Assignments**

3. Assignments, tests and written work in the course reflected the content and emphasis of the course. Comments.  
   SA  
   A  
   N  
   D  
   SD

4. Required readings/texts were valuable.  
   Comments.  
   SA  
   A  
   N  
   D  
   SD

**Grading**

5. Methods used for evaluating student work were fair and appropriate.  
   Comments.  
   SA  
   A  
   N  
   D  
   SD

6. Feedback on graded assignments was valuable.  
   Comments.  
   SA  
   A  
   N  
   D  
   SD

**Learning**

7. I found this course intellectually challenging and stimulating. Comments.  
   SA  
   A  
   N  
   D  
   SD

8. I acquired valuable developed my skills and knowledge in this course.  
   Comments.  
   SA  
   A  
   N  
   D  
   SD

9. Students were encouraged to share knowledge and ideas.  
   Comments.  
   SA  
   A  
   N  
   D  
   SD

10. This course increased my interest in the subject. Comments.  
    SA  
    A  
    N  
    D  
    SD

**Instructor**
11. The instructor communicated enthusiasm about teaching. Comments.  
SA  
A  
N  
D  
SD

12. The instructor showed interest in students as individuals. Comments.  
SA  
A  
N  
D  
SD

13. The instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class. Comments.  
SA  
A  
N  
D  
SD

Overall

14. Overall, this instructor is an effective teacher.  
SA        A        N        D        SD

15. Overall, this is a good course.  
SA        A        N        D        SD

16. Please comment on aspects of the instructor’s teaching or of the course that have been most valuable to you.  

17. Please comment on aspects of the instructor’s teaching or of the course that you feel most need improvement.  

18. Before enrolling in this course, how much interest did you have in taking it?  
Very interested       Somewhat interested       Indifferent       Not interested       Hostile

19. Overall GPA:  
New student, no established GPA       4.0-3.50       3.49-3.0       2.99-2.5       2.49-2.0       1.99-1.5       1.49-1.0       .99-0

20. Expected grade in this course:  
A       B       C       D       F

21. Reason for taking the course:  
General education credit or requirement  
Major requirement  
Minor or concentration requirement  
Other requirement  
Elective

22. How difficult did you find this course?  
Very difficult       Difficult       About average       Easy       Very easy

23. The workload for this course was:  
Very heavy       Heavy       About average       Light       Very light

24. How many classes has the professor missed during this course?  
0 – 3       4 – 6       7 – 9       10 or more

25. How many classes (excused and unexcused) have you missed during this course?  
0 – 3       4 – 6       7 – 9       10 or more
Motion on the Composition of the Faculty Senate
Proposed to the Faculty Senate on 9-15-09 by the 
*ad hoc* Committee on Faculty Governance

The attached motion asks that the By-Laws be amended to change the composition of the Faculty Senate. Currently, each academic department and the Library elect at least one senator, and then an additional senator for each ten faculty after the first faculty member. Fifteen at-large senators are elected by the faculty as a whole.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance has been studying our faculty governance system and considering reforms that could make it more effective. The Committee concluded that a smaller Senate with at-large members elected by school would be both more responsive to faculty concerns and more effective at giving those concerns a voice in the governance of the institution. Our full report, which includes a more detailed discussion of the composition of our and other faculty Senates, is being made available on the Senate website.

The attached motion would create a Senate of 50 members, apportioned according to the percentage of faculty in each school. There would be with one senator from each academic department, with the remainder of a school’s senators elected at-large, by faculty in that school.

**Amend Article IV, Section 2, of the By-Laws** (concerning the Faculty Senate) as follows:

Section 2. Composition and Election

A. Composition. There shall be 50 Faculty Senators, apportioned by the percentage of faculty in each school (including the Library). There shall be one senator elected by each academic department and the Library, with the remainder of a school’s senators elected at-large by the faculty in that school.

B. 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. Department Chairs, regardless of their teaching loads, are eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. (Approved April 2005) Administrators, 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. The President of the College, the Provost, a student representing the Student Government Association, and the Faculty Secretary are non-voting *ex-officio* members of the Faculty Senate.

D. Election

1. All and only regular faculty members as defined under provisions (1), (2), and (3) of Article I Section 1 are eligible to vote in Senate elections.
2. No later than February 15, vacancies from the group of at-large Senate seats will be filled by means of an election conducted among the eligible faculty of each school (as defined in Section 1 above) through an electronic ballot. Candidates for the at-large Senate seats are nominated by February 1 by the Committee on Nominations and Elections or by nomination or self-nomination. By February 1, the deans of each school will forward to the Committee on Nominations and Elections a slate of candidates (which shall be open to self-nominations) for the at-large Senate seats in that school. The candidates receiving the most votes cast in this election shall be elected to the at-large seats. Any tie shall be decided by lot.

3. No later than March 15, each of the academic departments and Library will elect its Senator(s) from among its eligible members (as defined in Section 2A above). Units with one to ten eligible voters (as defined in Section 2C.1 above) elect one Senator; units with eleven to twenty eligible voters elect two Senators, and so on by increments of ten.

4. The Committee on Nominations and Elections shall oversee all Senate elections (verifying Senate apportionment and voter eligibility; constructing, distributing, collecting and validating ballots; and certifying results).

5. All elections for at-large Senate seats shall be conducted by secret electronic ballot. Upon the receipt of a vote, the Committee on Nominations and Elections shall ensure that the vote was cast by an eligible voter. In case of a tie vote, the election is decided by lot.

6. A candidate for the position of Speaker cannot be a candidate for an at-large senate seat in the same election. In the event that a candidate for Speaker is in the middle of a term as an at-large senator and wins the election for Speaker, of those unsuccessful in the election for at-large seats, the person obtaining the most votes will complete the second year of the Speaker-elect’s term.

Amend Article IV, Section 2, F as follows:

F. Vacancies due to resignation, recall or any other reason may be filled by a special election by the appropriate electorate. Senators elected in such special elections will serve out the term of the Senators they replace. If an at-large Senator needs to be replaced, the faculty of that school shall elect the replacement by ballot. The Committee on Nominations will provide a slate of at least two candidates circulated to the faculty at least two weeks before the election. Additional nominations from the faculty may be sent to the Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections at least one week before the election. No Senator, including replacement Senators, shall serve for more than four consecutive years. (Rev. Jan. 2007, April 2007; Ins. April 2007)

Amend Article IV, Section 3, B.1.c (concerning the Committee on Nominations and Elections) as follows:
c. Duties:

(1) To nominate for the offices of Speaker of the Faculty and Faculty Secretary, for the fifteen at-large Senate seats, and for membership on all standing and ad-hoc committees of the Faculty Senate and of the College;

(2) To fill all vacancies through nomination or appointment which may occur on any committee;

(3) To present to Senators, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing Senate committees at least 15 days prior to the April Senate meeting;

(4) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing College committees and five faculty for the College Honor Board by March 15;

(5) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of candidates for the offices of Speaker of the Faculty and Faculty Secretary by February 1;

(6) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of at least twenty-five candidates for the fifteen at-large Senate seats by February 1;
Resolution to Rename the Teacher Scholar/Award for William V. Moore

WHEREAS Professor William V. Moore was a faculty member of the College of Charleston for thirty-seven years; and

WHEREAS Professor William V. Moore was awarded the Distinguished Teaching/Award in 1981; and

Professor William V. Moore was the first recipient, in 2001, of the Distinguished Teacher/Scholar Award; and

WHEREAS Professor William V. Moore also won campus awards for Distinguished Service (2000) and Distinguished Advising (2001) and received the South Carolina Governor’s Professor of the Year Award in 1997; and

WHEREAS, at the time of his sudden death in 2009, Professor William V. Moore was actively teaching at the College of Charleston; and

WHEREAS, Professor William V. Moore epitomized the model of the Teacher-Scholar;

WHEREAS, the executive leadership of the College is supportive of this action,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT HENCEFORTH, upon the approval of the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President, the College of Charleston Distinguished Teacher/Scholar Award will be known as the William V. Moore Distinguished Teacher/Scholar Award.
Faculty Curriculum Committee

List of Proposals Approved by the Committee

(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

Biology

New Course—BIOL 357 Oceanographic Research

Computer Science

Change Course—CSCI 220 Computer Programming I

Geology

New Course—GEOL 357 Oceanographic Research - The Transect Program

Music

Change Course—MUSC 246 Music Theory I
Change Course—MUSC 247 Music Theory II
Change Course—MUSC 481 Music Theory III
Change Course—MUSC 482 Music Theory IV

Psychology

Change Major—BS in PSYC
Delete Course—PSYC 342
Delete Course—PSYC 384

Teacher Education

New Course—TEDU 205 Exploring Leadership: Building Peer Facilitation Skills
Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for Faculty Senate October 6, 2009 Meeting

(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

Proposals to Change a Graduate Course

SMFT 548: Atomic Theory of Matter from Lucretius to Quarks

SMFT 555: Applications of Physics for Teachers, How Things Work
From: Terence Bowers, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 15 September 2009 at 5 PM in room 115 of the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the April Minutes (Faculty Senate and Faculty meetings)

3. Election of 2009 – 2010 Speaker Pro Tem

4. Reports

   The President
   The Provost
   The Speaker
   Larry Krasnoff, *ad hoc* Committee on Faculty Governance
     --Full text of the report is on Faculty Senate Web site
   Hugh Wilder, *ad hoc* Committee on Developing and Evaluating Teaching
     --Report on revising the Instructor/Course Evaluation Form

5. New Business

   Motion to change the size and composition of the Faculty Senate
   Motion to adopt a new Instructor/Course Evaluation Form as it appears in the appendix of the report from the *ad hoc* Committee on Developing and Evaluating Teaching

6. Constituents’ Concerns

7. Adjournment
Motion on the Composition of the Faculty Senate

The attached motion asks that the By-Laws be amended to change the composition of the Faculty Senate. Currently, each academic department and the Library elect at least one senator, and then an additional senator for each ten faculty after the first faculty member. Fifteen at-large senators are elected by the faculty as a whole.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance has been studying our faculty governance system and considering reforms that could make it more effective. The Committee concluded that a smaller Senate with at-large members elected by school would be both more responsive to faculty concerns and more effective at giving those concerns a voice in the governance of the institution. Our full report, which includes a more detailed discussion of the composition of our and other faculty Senates, is being made available on the Senate website.

The attached motion would create a Senate of 50 members, apportioned according to the percentage of faculty in each school. There would be one senator from each academic department, with the remainder of a school’s senators elected at-large, by faculty in that school.

Amend Article IV, Section 2, of the By-Laws (concerning the Faculty Senate) as follows:

Section 2. Composition and Election

A. Composition. There shall be 50 Faculty Senators, apportioned by the percentage of faculty in each school (including the Library). There shall be one senator elected by each academic department and the Library, with the remainder of a school’s senators elected at-large by the faculty in that school.

A. B. 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. Department Chairs, regardless of their teaching loads, are eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. (Approved April 2005) Administrators, 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. The President of the College, the Provost, a student representing the Student Government Association, and the Faculty Secretary are non-voting *ex-officio* members of the Faculty Senate.

D. Election

1. All and only regular faculty members as defined under provisions (1), (2), and (3) of Article I Section 1 are eligible to vote in Senate elections.

2. No later than February 15, vacancies from the group of at-large Senate seats will be filled by means of an election conducted among the eligible faculty of each school (as defined in Section 1 above) through an electronic ballot. Candidates for the at-large Senate seats are nominated by February 1 by the Committee on Nominations and Elections or by nomination or self-nomination. The candidates receiving the most votes cast in this election shall be elected to the at-large seats. Any tie shall be decided by lot.

3. No later than March 15, each of the academic departments and Library will elect its Senator(s) from among its eligible members (as defined in Section 2A above). Units with one to ten eligible voters (as defined in Section 2C.1 above) elect one Senator; units with eleven to twenty eligible voters elect two Senators, and so on by increments of ten.

4. The Committee on Nominations and Elections shall oversee all Senate elections (verifying Senate apportionment and voter eligibility; constructing, distributing, collecting and validating ballots; and certifying results).

5. All elections for at-large Senate seats shall be conducted by secret electronic ballot. Upon the receipt of a vote, the Committee on Nominations and Elections shall ensure that the vote was cast by an eligible voter. In case of a tie vote, the election is decided by lot.

6. A candidate for the position of Speaker cannot be a candidate for an at-large senate seat in the same election. In the event that a candidate for Speaker is in the middle of a term as an at-large senator and wins the election for Speaker, of those unsuccessful in the election for at-large seats, the person obtaining the most votes will complete the second year of the Speaker-elect’s term.

Amend Article IV, Section 2, F as follows:

F. Vacancies due to resignation, recall or any other reason may be filled by a special election by the appropriate electorate. Senators elected in such special elections will serve out the term of the Senators they replace. If an at-large Senator needs to be replaced, the faculty of that school shall elect the replacement by
ballot. The Committee on Nominations will provide a slate of at least two candidates circulated to the faculty at least two weeks before the election. Additional nominations from the faculty may be sent to the Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections at least one week before the election. No Senator, including replacement Senators, shall serve for more than four consecutive years. (Rev. Jan. 2007, April 2007; Ins. April 2007)

Amend Article IV, Section 3, B.1.c (concerning the Committee on Nominations and Elections) as follows:

c. Duties:

(1) To nominate for the offices of Speaker of the Faculty and Faculty Secretary, for the fifteen at-large Senate seats, and for membership on all standing and ad-hoc committees of the Faculty Senate and of the College;

(2) To fill all vacancies through nomination or appointment which may occur on any committee;

(3) To present to Senators, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing Senate committees at least 15 days prior to the April Senate meeting;

(4) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of candidates for standing College committees and five faculty for the College Honor Board by March 15;

(5) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of candidates for the offices of Speaker of the Faculty and Faculty Secretary by February 1;

(6) To present to members of the faculty, in writing, its slate of at least twenty-five candidates for the fifteen at-large Senate seats by February 1;
Ad Hoc Committee: Developing and Evaluating Teaching

Report of the Subcommittee on Revising the Student Instructor/Course Evaluation Form

- March 9, 2009 -

Introduction

Speaker of the Faculty Joe Kelly and Provost Elise Jorgens established an ad hoc Committee on Developing and Evaluating Teaching in the fall of 2008. A sub-committee of this larger group was formed to study and propose revisions to the current instructor/course evaluation form (“form”).

The charge of this subcommittee was to (a) review and evaluate the current form, (b) undertake a literature review and determine current best practices concerning instructor/course evaluation forms, and (c) propose a revised form based on findings in (a) and (b).

The College’s current form was developed and finalized November 9, 1992 and was in full use by the spring of 1994. According to institutional research records, there were some item, open-ended question and report revisions around the 1996-1997 academic year. However, records denoting exact changes have not been found to-date. There is also not any record of the form undergoing rigorous psychometric testing (i.e., reliability and validity analyses) to inform interpretation of results or subsequent revisions.

Subcommittee membership includes:
- Raymond Barclay, Ph.D., Associate Vice President, Institutional Research
- Martin Jones, Ph.D., Professor, Mathematics
- Pamela Niesslein, Ph.D., Associate Vice President, Accreditation, Accountability, Planning, and Assessment
- Hugh Wilder, Ph.D., Professor, Philosophy

The subcommittee has now completed its work and is pleased to submit this report and a revised instructor/course evaluation form (Appendix 1).

Guiding Principles

Although all evaluation instruments have limitations and should be used in conjunction within other evaluation approaches (quantitative and qualitative), the current form is understood as a summative assessment measure because it primarily informs tenure, promotion and other personnel-related activities. As such, the subcommittee focused its work on enhancing the form primarily toward these purposes and did not attempt to incorporate other approaches to assessment (e.g., learning assessment, etc.).
There is substantial interest on campus in developing methods of course assessment which are more useful for “formative” purposes as faculty consider ways to improve their teaching. The subcommittee recommends that the College support the development and use of such formative assessment methods (on a voluntary and individual basis). For example, a re-constituted Center for Faculty Development could be charged with developing and supporting formative assessment course and learning assessment methods for use by individual faculty.

The guiding principles supporting the proposed revision to the form include:

**Principle 1:** The form should include items that adequately cover the measurement dimensions most often cited in the literature as being related to effective teaching: Learning Value; Instructor Enthusiasm; Organization/Clarity; Breadth of Coverage; Group Interaction; Individual Rapport; Examinations/Grading; Assignments/Readings; and Workload/Difficulty.

**Principle 2:** The form should not put an undue burden during the administration and completion phases for the respondents or instructor.

**Principle 3:** The results should provide the instructor important student feedback useful for evaluating her/his approach to teaching.

**Principle 4:** The form (items) should be content neutral or domain-independent and not focus on areas that might be perceived as discipline- or content-related.

**Principle 5:** Where possible, the form should encapsulate items from the previous form if they meet the threshold of principles 1-4.

**Principle 6:** The Committee will not address issues related to administration (i.e., web vs. paper administration; use within tenure and promotion processes, etc.), but focus on the structure and content of items on the form.

**Principle 7:** The form should be used, in conjunction with other appropriate assessment tools, especially if the instructor seeks to obtain diagnostic and formative assessment information for the purposes of improving teaching and student learning.

**Form Revision Process**

The subcommittee first undertook an exploratory factor analysis using data from the prior four academic terms to review the factor scores of items on the current form. The general finding was that there was imbalanced or a lack of coverage of the dimensions most often found in the literature as indicative of effective teaching.
The subcommittee then undertook a significant literature review that included several meta-analytic studies describing the key dimensions of teacher effectiveness instruments (see listing of literature at end of report). All members reviewed items on the current form as well as the following forms -

- Individual Development and Assessment Center’s (IDEA) Student Reactions to Instruction and Courses Short and Long Diagnostic forms;
- Herbert Marsh's Student Evaluations of Educational Quality (SEEQ) instrument; and
- Educational Testing Service’s (ETS) Student Instructional Report, II (SIR, II).

The aforementioned example forms are all multi-dimensional, used in variety of post-secondary contexts, and have significant reliability and validity findings supporting their use.

A review of current practices at other reputable institutions ensued and the committee found many of these institutions have relied on the SEEQ as a starting point for item development and/or have simply adopted the form. Given Marsh’s work is significantly cited in the literature and the instrument seems to be in widespread use across many institutional types, the subcommittee felt the SEEQ would serve as an appropriate item pool and baseline for assessing adequate dimensional coverage.

The subcommittee used this information to inform its own meta-analytic review. Specifically, the committee used item-factor scores across several validity studies to rank a particular item from the SEEQ. The three highest ranking items for each dimension were assessed against the current College form’s items and when a match existed, the current item was maintained and/or refined (Principle 5). Remaining items were eliminated and supplanted with other high scoring SEEQ items. To balance a need for an efficient form (Principle 2) with a need for content coverage (Principle 1), 2-3 items were proposed per dimension. Items considered representative of the SEEQ Breadth of Coverage dimension was not included because it could be argued that these items are not content neutral (Principle 4).

The subcommittee contends it is reasonable to maintain a qualitative/feedback aspect to the form and has provided an area for the student to make comments in relationship to each item. Additionally, the subcommittee included key questions to aid the instructor in interpreting results and assist in understanding the form’s psychometric properties (questions 18-23).

The current form includes student-generated questions, responses to which are available to students. Members of the subcommittee met with the members of the Student Government Association who are responsible for these student-generated questions. The students recommend retention of the current student-generated questions. The subcommittee supports that recommendation.
The subcommittee attempted to employ a reasonable, contextually-appropriate, and methodologically sound approach to the development of the revised form. However, there were qualitative assumptions employed in this review and decisions were based upon “best judgments”. The subcommittee welcomes feedback from stakeholders and is open to incorporating suggestions and/or providing more information about why certain items have been added or eliminated from the current form.

**Testing and Validation**

The subcommittee contends it is important to conduct a pilot of the form over a two year period that includes an analysis of item reliabilities and the factor structure of the instrument. The Office of Institutional Research and/or recommended faculty members from Faculty Senate should participate in designing approach to undertaking this pilot. The Faculty Senate should review the results following year 1 and year 2 analyses.

**Literature**


**Example Forms**

**SEEQ**

Long Form: [http://www.umanitoba.ca/academic_support/uts/media/seeq.pdf](http://www.umanitoba.ca/academic_support/uts/media/seeq.pdf)

Short form: [http://www.mta.ca/petc/TONI_SEEQ/Student%20Evaluation%20of%20Educational%20Quality%20SHORT.pdf](http://www.mta.ca/petc/TONI_SEEQ/Student%20Evaluation%20of%20Educational%20Quality%20SHORT.pdf)

**IDEA**

Student Diagnostic - IDEA*: [http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/Student-Ratings_Diagnostic-Form.pdf](http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/Student-Ratings_Diagnostic-Form.pdf)

Student Diagnostic/Short-form - IDEA: [http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/Student-Ratings_ShortForm.pdf](http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/Student-Ratings_ShortForm.pdf)

useful white papers: [http://www.theideacenter.org/IDEAPapers](http://www.theideacenter.org/IDEAPapers)
SIR, II* (page 42 - Appendix A): http://www.ets.org/Media/Products/283840.pdf
APPENDIX ITEM 1:

College of Charleston
Instructor and Course Evaluation Form
Instructions

• Your thoughtful and independent responses to this evaluation form are important to the instructor and to the College.
• To ensure that your feedback is collected anonymously, please do not put your name on the form. Your responses will be collected by someone other than the instructor and kept in a secure place until after course grades have been submitted to the Office of the Registrar.
• Please use a No. 2 pencil or blue or black ink pen to complete the form.
• Please make solid marks that fill the circle completely.

Your written comments will be shared with your instructor after he or she submits final course grades. To protect anonymity, please print your comments and do not use any personal identifiers.
**College of Charleston**  
**Instructor and Course Evaluation Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Course/Section</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SA=Strongly Agree  A=Agree  N=Neutral  D=Disagree  SD=Strongly Disagree  
You are encouraged to provide written comments.

### Organization

1. Course materials were well prepared and carefully explained.
   - Comments.
   - SA  A  N  D  SD
2. Course objectives were clearly stated and pursued.
   - Comments.
   - SA  A  N  D  SD

### Assignments

3. Assignments, tests and written work in the course reflected the content and emphasis of the course.
   - Comments.
   - SA  A  N  D  SD
4. Required readings/texts were valuable.
   - Comments.
   - SA  A  N  D  SD

### Grading

5. Methods used for evaluating student work were fair and appropriate.
   - Comments.
   - SA  A  N  D  SD
6. Feedback on graded assignments was valuable.
   - Comments.
   - SA  A  N  D  SD

### Learning

7. I found this course intellectually challenging and stimulating.
   - Comments.
   - SA  A  N  D  SD
8. I acquired valuable skills and knowledge in this course.
   - Comments.
   - SA  A  N  D  SD
9. Students were encouraged to share knowledge and ideas.
   - Comments.
   - SA  A  N  D  SD
10. This course increased my knowledge in the subject.
    - Comments.
    - SA  A  N  D  SD

### Instructor

11. The instructor communicated effectively about teaching.
    - Comments.
    - SA  A  N  D  SD
12. The instructor showed interest in individuals.
    - Comments.
    - SA  A  N  D  SD
13. The instructor was adequately available during office hours or after class.
    - Comments.
    - SA  A  N  D  SD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall, this instructor is an effective teacher.</th>
<th>Overall, this is a good course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Please comment on aspects of the instructor’s teaching that have been most valuable to you.

17. Please comment on aspects of the instructor’s teaching that you feel most need improvement.

18. Before enrolling in this course, how much interest did you have in taking it?
   - Very interested
   - Somewhat interested
   - Indifferent
   - Not interested
   - Hostile

19. Overall GPA:
   - New student, no established GPA
   - 4.0-3.50
   - 3.49-3.0
   - 2.99-2.5
   - 2.49-2.0
   - 1.99-1.5
   - 1.49-1.0

20. Expected grade in this course:
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

21. Reason for taking the course:
   - General education credit or requirement
   - Major requirement
   - Minor or concentration requirement
   - Other requirement
   - Elective

22. How difficult did you find this course?
   - Very difficult
   - Difficult
   - About average
   - Easy
   - Very easy

23. The workload for this course was:
   - Very heavy
   - Heavy
   - About average
   - Light
   - Very light