Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 13 April 2010

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 13 April 2010, at 5:00 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium) to complete the unfinished business from April 6th.

New Business (continued from the April 6th meeting)

Committee on Nominations and Elections

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

Steven Jaumé, committee chair, presented the following slates of candidates for Senate Committees and asked if Senators wished to make additional nominations.

**Academic Planning Committee**
Burton Callicot (S) - Library
Christian Coseru - Philosophy
Julia Eichelberger (S) - English
Alex Kasman - Mathematics
Andrew Lewis (S) - Health and Human Performance
Nancy Nenno - German and Slavic Studies
Vijay Vulava - Geology and Environmental Geosciences

**Budget Committee**
Jane Clary - Economics and Finance
Mike Duvall - English
Linda Jones (S) - Physics and Astronomy
Christine Moore (S) - Computer Science
James Newhard (S) - Classics
Matthew Rutter (S) - Biology
Kendra Stewart – Political Science

**By-Laws/FAM Committee**
Mikhail Agrest (S) - Physics and Astronomy
Steve Arsenault - Accounting and Legal Studies
Scott Peeples (S) - English

There were no additional nominations.

At this point in the meeting, Larry Krasnoff asked for a quorum. Forty-two Senators were counted present, enough for a quorum.

The election of the Senate Committees continued. The Senate voted, approving by acclamation the slates presented by the Nominations and Elections Committee.
Mr. Jaumé said that the candidates for Faculty Committees (or college-wide committees) would be posted on Thursday (4-15-10), that additional nominations could still be made during that time, and that a week after the posting the elections would take place.

Speaker Kelly thanked Mr. Jaumé for his work this year in trying conditions during a period when the College was making a transition to a new Faculty Senate structure and new procedure for electing Senators.

Call for nominations to the Nominations and Elections Committee

The Speaker said that he had collected the following names of candidates to serve on the Nominations and Elections Committee:

Annalisa Calini (Mathematics)
John Creed (Political Science)
Bethany Goodier (Communication)
Genevieve Hay (Teacher Education)
Mary Beth Heston (Art History)
Nancy Nenno (German and Slavic Studies)
RoxAnn Stalvey (Computer Science)
Trish Ward (English)

The Speaker next asked if there were additional nominations. No further nominations were made. The Speaker then declared the nominations closed and said that he would send the list of candidates to the Nominations and Elections Committee.

The Speaker then asked for unanimous consent to change the agenda. He explained that he wished to discuss the Building Arts proposal next because Steve Osborne, Exec. VP for Business Affairs, had to leave early, and his expertise on the financial aspects of the proposed major might be important for the discussion. Unanimous consent was not granted. Brian McGee (Communication), who objected to the change, said that while he appreciated the Speaker’s reason for changing the agenda, he was concerned that the Senate’s quorum might not hold until it got around to the issue he was most concerned about (the appeal of the Faculty Curriculum Committee’s recommendation). Some Senators, he added, may have come just for that issue, and he wished to respect their time as much as the Speaker wished to respect Mr. Osborne’s.

Needing a two-thirds vote to change the agenda, the Speaker’s request failed.

Appeal of Faculty Curriculum Recommendation

Mr. McGee moved to overturn the Faculty Curriculum Committee’s decision to reject a Communication Department 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. The motion received a second. Mr. McGee referred to documents circulated to Senators ahead of the meeting that outlined the rationale of the Communication Department’s proposal. He said that in the interest of time he would not re-state all the arguments in the documents, but only mention that his department’s proposal is intended to improve the quality of educational outcomes in the major. The C-standard will help, not hurt this goal and won’t change any other major. You might be against the proposal, he said, but it won’t change your major or Gen Ed. He added that the proposal is worth approving if only as an experiment, and that it has been successfully implemented at other institutions.

Lynn Cherry (guest) spoke against the motion, arguing that, if approved, the Communication Department’s proposal would set a precedent for graduation standards. It will set a standard that exceeds the College’s standard, which is that a D is a passing grade for a course. Should a Communication major earn a D in one of the major’s courses, then that student could not graduate with that major and this will set a precedent for other departments. Claire Curtis (Political Science) also spoke against the motion. Though the motion, if approved, may change student behavior, she would rather change their motivation without ratcheting up the standard. Darryl Phillips (at-large) also opposed the motion for two reasons. First, he was skeptical about the usefulness of shifting what we term as “acceptable” for student performance from one symbol (or letter grade) to another. Now we call a D acceptable: either it is acceptable or it isn’t. Second, though he supported the spirit of the proposal, he was troubled by the fact that students were limited to the number of times they could repeat a course in order to graduate. The proposal might close doors to some students in the major and affect student retention.

Laquita Blockson (Marketing and Supply Chain Management) asked what discussion in the past determined that a D was an acceptable minimum. Other institutions have C-minus minimum for a passing grade for courses in the major. Larry Krasnoff (at-large) noted that we already have a 2.00 minimum GPA requirement for graduation, so that is a safeguard and forces students to do C level work overall. He added that the Faculty Curriculum Committee (FCC) has allowed some gateway courses to majors to have a minimum passing standard above a D, but this proposal goes too far and the FCC discussed that issue and voted appropriately against the proposal. He said, too, that this proposal is mainly about a small group of weak students. Perhaps their behavior will change if the proposal passes, but he thought there might better ways to achieve that goal.

Bob Perkins (Teacher Education), chair of the FCC, said that the sole concern of the FCC was that one course stop a student in the major because students can only repeat a course once. Even though the student might have 4.00 GPA in all other courses, one course could still prevent the student from graduating in that major. Julia Eichelberger (at-large), chair of the Academic Planning Committee, said that members of the committee were divided, but in the end the committee couldn’t see why this department shouldn’t make this change, if it wished. The committee also didn’t see that it would harm students in other majors or other departments.
Rohn England (Mathematics) asked if there were routes of appeal for students who couldn’t get past a course. Mr. McGee said that a chair could approve a substitution course.

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) voiced two concerns. First, she was worried that the proposal might lead to grade inflation; second, she was concerned that really weak students would leave the Communication Department and go to her department.

George Pothering (Parliamentarian) wondered whether it might be better to make a C the minimum standard, rather than a C-. Certain legal problems might arise from making a C- the minimum standard, as it is below the minimum standard for graduation. He also thought that it would send the wrong message that a C- is okay as a grade. Mr. McGee said that his department was not concerned about the graduation issue because the catalog is very clear about graduation requirements. As for why not make a C the minimum standard, he said that the department did not think the Senate would accept that proposal.

Pam Riggs-Gelasco (Biochemistry/Chemistry) said she liked the proposal and hope it has the desired effect of raising the level of student performance. Why set the bar low? Dana Cope (Sociology/Anthropology) also spoke in favor of the proposal. He said his courses have a reputation for being hard, but he wants to teach to the brightest students, not the dumbest. He was happy with the proposal and believed it would raise standards. He thought that a D was very low for a minimum standard and that if a C- becomes the new minimum, students will rise to it.

Responding to various points that had been made, Mr. McGee said that the difference between a C- and a D is between what is acceptable and barely acceptable. His department seeks to raise standards. Though the C- minimum for a passing grade is different from the D minimum set by the College, he noted that the College already discriminates against D grades in various ways. Also, other departments set higher standards for graduation all the time. What the Communication Department is doing is thus not unusual. As for the concern about grade inflation, he noted that this has not happened with some other courses that have raised the minimum grade standard, and he has confidence that it won’t occur should the proposal pass. With regard to the concern about flight from the major, Mr. McGee said that this has not happened in other colleges, even when that outcome was desired.

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

The Senate voted on the motion to override the FCC recommendation and accept the curriculum proposal from the Communication Department. A voice vote by the Senate appeared to pass the proposal, but a Senator asked for a division of the house. The proposal passed by a vote of 31 in favor and 15 against.

Faculty Curriculum Committee: The Building Arts Proposals

Bob Perkins, committee chair introduced the following proposals:
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

Mr. Perkins reported that the FCC held a special meeting in which just these proposals were discussed and eventually approved. The proposals, he continued, were also reviewed by the Academic Planning Committee (APC) and Budget Committee. The APC approved the proposals, but Budget did not. However, Todd McNerney, Budget Committee chair, did approve of the FCC bringing the proposals to the Senate for debate.

Provost Hynd spoke in favor of the proposed Building Arts major. He said that it was an opportunity to enhance the Historic Preservation Program and create a unique major in the country, which would take advantage of our region’s architectural heritage and allow the College to engage with the community in a new way. He added that the students of the Building Arts College are very good, and that President Benson supports the proposed major. The administration, he continued, is sensitive to faculty concerns and will put the program on a trial period to see how it works. The program will also be put on a separate budget so that it does not take lines away from other programs.

Vince Benigni (Communication), while he was glad to hear that other programs would lose no lines, urged that the program be supported “whole hog” to insure its success.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked if students who were not Building Arts majors would be allowed to take courses in the program, given the issue of differential tuition. Robert Russell (Art History) said that those students might have to pay an extra fee, but certainly HPBA 101 would be open to all students. There might also be another “smorgasbord course” consisting of parts of other courses for non-majors to take.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) asked where funds generated by the proposed program would go. Given that the Building Arts majors will be taking Gen-Ed courses, if the program generates revenue, would it go into the general operating budget? Steve Osborne (guest), Exec. VP for Business Affairs, said yes, adding that a separate tracking program would also be set up to measure the success of the program and whether it is financially viable. Mr. Phillips asked if Mr. Osborne could provide more specifics. Provost Hynd then responded that we are entering into an evolutionary process in terms of program funding, especially with the recently approved MBA program. He said the investment cost for the
start of the Building Arts program would be relatively small, and that ideally the program would eventually make money that would go back to the College budget to help fund other programs.

Larry Krasnoff (at-large) observed that the Building Arts College is currently not financially viable. He asked how it could possibly become financially viable without draining the College’s funds and hurting other programs, especially now during this period of economic recession. How will taking on the Building Arts program not saddle us with a financial burden? Mr. Osborne answered that he has analyzed the Building Arts operation and seen how expenses have outpaced revenues in part because of low enrollment and in part because of bad business decisions. The College, however, would only be incorporating some of the existing program (e.g., some faculty), but not all (e.g., we won’t be taking their liberal arts courses and faculty). We also have facilities at the College that we can use. Mr. Krasnoff asked if the College would be taking over the Old Charleston Jail and whether that was a good asset to acquire. Mr. Osborne said that we would not be taking it over, only assuming some of its licensing functions.

Todd McNerney (at-large) said that the Budget Committee was told that the College would bring over seven faculty from the Building Arts College and eight courses each with six sections, totaling 48 courses. There are a few additional courses that were also approved last week. All that, he said, is lot to take on and move through at this speed. He said, too, that he had received word that the Savannah College of Art and Design had considered buying the Building Arts College, but decided not to, mainly because it was financially risky. He added that the faculty of the Building Arts College teach few students compared to most of us here, and that most of their courses deal with praxis, whereas ours are in the liberal arts and sciences. He concluded by stating that he sees many problems with taking on the proposed program from a budget perspective, especially at this time.

Julia Eichelberger (at-large), chair of the Academic Planning Committee (APC), mentioned the memo on the Building Arts proposal that the APC had circulated to Senators prior to the meeting. The memo lists a number of concerns about the proposal and logistical challenges in implementing it, but overall the committee feels that the concerns can be addressed and the challenges met with a good phase-in plan and appropriate faculty oversight (through the structures of shared governance) and leadership from Academic Affairs. The memo also notes that a phase-out plan should be developed in the event that the program is not successful. Ms. Eichelberger, now speaking for herself and not as committee chair, thought the Building Art proposal was a unique opportunity that won’t come along again. It was therefore reasonable to try it and worth seeing if it could be successful. And in light of what Provost Hynd and Steve Osborne have said, the risks, in her view, seemed to be minimized.

On a different topic, Ms. Curtis asked Robert Russell what the reaction of the students at the Building Arts College has been. He replied that they were left a bit confused by events, but they said that they would come here. He explained to them that the College will try to replicate their program and that our Gen-Ed program is similar to theirs
Frank Cossa (Art History) said he had many concerns about the Building Arts proposal. He informed the Senate that his department voted against the proposal because it has nothing to do with Art History. He wondered how a program (in this case Historic Preservation) can approve a proposal that has been rejected by the department that directs the program. Does this mean that the Historic Preservation and the Building Arts would be a separate department? Also, the Budget Committee’s extensive report makes clear the financial problems with the proposed program. Mr. Cossa said that he couldn’t see how the Senate could approve the proposal.

Mr. McGee asked what the threshold was for losing money that would trigger a shut-down of the program. Mr. Osborne said they did not yet know what that threshold would be. Mr. Benigni voiced again his concern that the College not take on the proposed major in half-measures, that the administration be fully committed to supporting it and making it successful.

Jim Newhard (Classics) noted that some Building Arts students hold degrees from other institutions. Has that fact been figured into the enrollment projections? He wondered how long those students would be at the College. Bev Diamond, Sr. Vice Provost, said that there’s a level of detail that Academic Affairs hasn’t yet gotten to because it needs to know the will of the faculty on the proposal first. Mr. Pothering noted that the program at the Building Arts College has been CHE approved, so transfer credits can be determined.

Mr. Russell reported that he told the Building Arts students that some credits will not be transferable because the Building Arts College is not accredited. Despite learning this, the students were still eager to come. He reported also that CHE considers the Building Arts faculty as acceptable. Speaking to a point made by Mr. Cossa, Mr. Russell said that there are other programs that exist outside a department structure; so it’s not impossible to figure out how the Building Arts program might fit in at the College. Regarding the point that Savannah College of Art and Design passing on the chance to take over the Building Arts College, Mr. Russell reminded the Senate that the College is not taking the institution over; rather, the College is just taking on a part of it.

Todd Grantham (Philosophy) asked about the details of incorporating the Building Arts faculty into the College: where will they be housed, how will they be evaluated, who will evaluate them, and how will they be folded into faculty governance? Sr. Vice Provost Diamond responded that something like an institute might be established. Incoming Building Arts faculty would have a temporary status and might eventually be considered as Instructors or as Professors of Praxis. As for the evaluation process, that would be developed by the appropriate faculty committees.

Mr. McGee noted that our SACS, our accrediting organization, has standard governing the ratio of doctoral faculty to non-doctoral faculty. Would that standard be met. Mr. Russell said he was not sure. Sr. Vice Provost Diamond said that Pam Niesslein in the Office of Accountability, Accrediting, and Assessment could answer this. She added that
we also don’t know if CHE will approve the program, but that first the administration must hear the will of the faculty.

Returning to the issue of the Art History Department’s vote against the program, Mary Beth Heston (guest) said that while it is true that her department did reject the program, it did not vote against the program per se. The main problem was that the program didn’t really fit with the Art History Department, but not all members of the department were simply against the program. She personally supports it. Sarah Owen (at-large) also expressed support for the program. She noted that the College has some other “alternative” programs, but this one would meet our Gen-Ed and liberal-arts standards.

Evan Parry (Theatre) asked what physical facilities would be available for the program. Mr. Pothering said adopting the Building Arts program would give us access to the Old Trolley Barn and some space on James Island. Mr. Russell pointed out that the Trolley Barn would be leased to us and that it needs a lot renovation. The James Island facility is not ideal, but could also be leased to us.

Mr. McNerney said that for the College to accept transfer credits requires that the institution in question be regionally accredited. Lack of accreditation status is a problem. Mr. McNerney also brought up the issue of whether the Building Arts fits with the mission of the College. He said that though we have approved a variety of programs, we haven’t approved one that consists of 32 credits of praxis courses. If I came to you, he continued, with a major in Theatre with that many praxis credits, it would not be passed. We have limits on the number of praxis courses that can be in the major. This proposal goes against those standards. Mr. Cossa added that simply adding the word “Arts” to the title doesn’t make the activities taught in the program arts. They are crafts, not arts. This program, he continued, doesn’t belong here in a liberal arts college; its home should be in a technical college.

Mr. Russell replied that there are no other programs like the proposed one in the country. Technical colleges have refused to accommodate this sort of program. They will teach trades for modern building, but not for traditional building methods. Historic Preservation sees the Building Arts as being an important part of a larger whole: we can teach historic preservation, but it doesn’t do any good, if there is no one who can do it. Deanna Caveny, Assoc. Provost, citing the APC memo, reiterated the points that the program will be unique and that it fits into the Strategic Plan, which calls for programs that take advantage of the special qualities of our region. Also, because Building Arts majors will take Gen-Ed courses and because the program is tied to the Historic Preservation program, there should be adequate grounding in the liberal arts.

Mr. McGee moved to amend the Building Arts proposal so that the Building Arts major would have to be reauthorized by the Senate no later than December 15, 2016, or the major would be eliminated no later than July 1, 2020. The motion received a second. After summarizing the questions and concerns of Senators surrounding the Building Arts proposal (Is the fiscal model workable? Does the program fit with the mission of the College? How will new faculty fit in and be evaluated?), Mr. McGee explained that the
motion was a compromise. Once the details of the program are worked out, it will return to the Senate for re-authorization. It will die if it can’t get the authorization, and there is a sunset clause.

Mr. Russell spoke in favor of the motion. He recognized that because the proposed program happened so quickly, there were concerns and some suspicion. This is a welcome motion that speaks to those concerns. Bob Perkins (Teacher Education) said that, as FCC chair, he supports the motion and sees the proposed Building Arts program as a “golden opportunity,” but the window on it will close if we don’t act on it now.

Rohn England (Mathematics) wondered if Mr. McGee’s motion was binding. Could the administration go over the Faculty Senate on this issue? He also asked if a risk analysis had been done with respect to liability issues. If we take on the Building Arts major temporarily, can we deal with the liability issues on a temporary basis? What happens if there is a fire? Who would pay? What if a student loses an arm? We need to think through the legal implications. Vice Provost Diamond responded that some areas of the College, such as Studio Art, have similar liability issues to deal with; so we have some experience with the matter. She explained that legal counsel has not yet investigated the issue because faculty approval for the program was sought first.

Mr. Newhard said that though he was not yet persuaded by the proposal, he liked Mr. McGee’s motion, agreeing that it was an appropriate compromise. Darryl Phillips also supported the amendment. He found the Building Arts proposal intriguing and agreed with the view that if the program is approved, it be supported wholeheartedly. He was concerned, however, by the policy of differential tuition and thought it opened up potential problems. He preferred to see something akin to lab fee levied instead. He added that he would like to see his students in Classics take some of the Building Arts courses, and wants to see the Building Arts majors fully integrated into the College.

Mr. Cossa opposed the motion, arguing that it makes acceptance of the program more palatable by postponing a tough decision that the Senate should make now. It just passes off the responsibility, he said.

Mr. Perkins called the question, which received a second. The motion to call the question passed.

The Senate voting, passing Mr. McGee’s motion to amend.

Mr. Krasnoff wished to return to the issue of who evaluates the Building Arts faculty. Who is qualified to evaluate them? Art Historians and Studio Art faculty don’t see themselves as qualified. Would it be faculty in Historic Preservation?

Mr. Russell said the evaluation of teaching can be done by any other faculty. Those faculty can determine whether a Building Arts faculty member presents course content in a coherent way, responds to students in a timely and effective way. All of us can make
those sorts of evaluations. As to whether the faculty are good craft persons, for that you need experts, and we might need to call in people from outside the College.

Mr. Newhard voiced his support for the Building Arts proposal, though not as it is currently structured. He thought that it belonged here in the Lowcountry with its rich architectural legacy. As an archaeologist, he said that we need people who can protect and reconstitute our cultural heritage. However, he didn’t like the fact that it locked students into a four-year program, which would prevent them from exploring courses outside their program, which is something most of our students can do. He pointed to Discovery Informatics as another highly scripted program that is not doing well and that prevents exploration beyond the program. He, too, was concerned about the differential tuition issue and liked Mr. Darryl Phillips alternative to it.

Sarah Owen (Hispanic Studies) called the question, which received a second. The Senate defeated the motion to call the question.

Ms. Curtis voiced her support for the proposal, noting that we currently have programs in real estate and supply chain management that are outside the liberal arts. In terms of compatibility with the liberal arts mission of the College, she said that the Building Arts program is more compatible with our mission than those programs are.

Steve Jaumé (Geology) said he was ambivalent about the major. He was worried about the technical details and didn’t like being rushed into establishing it, but he also saw the benefits of the program to other departments and to the College as a whole so long as it was properly integrated into the institution. He wondered whether there would be opportunities to modify the program later, even if it were approved today. Mr. Perkins replied that there would be such opportunities. Evan Parry (Theatre) remarked that he agreed with the view that a Building Arts major does not belong in the Art History Department; he was concerned about the fiscal impact of establishing the major and was especially worried about how it might affect funding for new hires in other programs.

Bill Manaris (Computer Science) asked what the time-frame was for making a decision on the issue. Assoc. Provost Diamond said that if we don’t decide now, we will likely lose all the current students in the Building Arts College, and if that happens we probably wouldn’t go through with the merger. There were also time-sensitive issues concerning the leasing of facilities. Mr. McGee next asked about where the program would be placed given that the Art History Department doesn’t think it belongs with them. Ms. Diamond said that there have been discussions about putting the major elsewhere within the College.

Phil Dustan (Biology) expressed his support for the proposed major, arguing that the College has a symbiotic relationship with the city, which needs this program. Going back to the issue of where the program would be situated in the College, Mr. Parry asked who would direct it. Ms. Diamond said that Robert Russell would. But he is in the Art History Department, responded Mr. Parry. That okay, replied Ms. Diamond. There are many examples of such arrangements in the College.
Todd Grantham (Philosophy) called the question, which received a second. His motion passed.

As the Senate was about to vote, Mr. Krasnoff called for a quorum. There were 42 Senators in the room, enough for a quorum.

The Senate voted, approving the Building Arts major and other curriculum proposals attached to it.

**Constituents’ Concerns**

Lynn Cherry (guest) encouraged all faculty attend to the Commencement ceremonies on May 7th and 8th.

The Senate then expressed its thanks to Faculty Speaker Kelly and Faculty Secretary Bowers, whose terms of service were now ending, for their work.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 6 April 2010

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 6 April 2010, at 5:00 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Joe Kelly, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of the 2 March 2010 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

The President

President Benson reported that the College suffered another 5% across the board budget cut in December, representing $1.25 million. In the previous two years, we have experienced, he said, cuts of $10 million, which means that the state’s contribution to the operating budget is now only 11.6%. He expects another cut of $4.9 million, which, not coincidently, will equal the stimulus money that we will receive. The stimulus money, he stressed, is a one-time gift (not recurring) and will be used as such. Next year, the state’s contribution to the operating budget will be down to around 9.4% and may eventually be under 9%.

In July, the President continued, we will “hit bottom,” though the rest of the state may continue a downward trend. But because we have made preparations to deal with the economic difficulties, we should start turn things around once the new financial model is approved by the Board of Trustees and implemented. A lot of work has been done on developing the financial model and all depends on its approval.

He said that a tuition increase is an important component of the new financial model, but the new model includes a lot more. Entrepreneurship and fund raising are also key components. The fund raising apparatus has now been rebuilt and will be integrated into the financial model in a way that it hasn’t in the past. The donor pool will also been widened, but it will still take time for the benefits of this new system to take full effect. Grants are another part of the new model, and the President reported that the proper infrastructure for writing and securing more grant money must be put in place. The June meeting with the Board of Trustees will be crucial for approving the new financial model. If it is approved and implemented, the financial condition of the College should start improving by next year.

Moving to the Strategic Plan (SP), the President said that the plan for the next ten years has been broken down into three-year segments. Revenues needed for the next three years, six years, and ten years have been determined by consulting with schools and departments about their plans and projected needs. The SP calls for the addition of 32 new faculty lines and market adjustment of faculty salaries. The President said that three million dollars would be needed to raise faculty salaries to the average of those at our peer institutions, and expected there to be faculty raises in the next two or three years.

The SP also calls for a big increase in financial aid. Currently, we give only 12 million dollars in aid to students, which is not a lot, and the plan is to increase that to 26 million, starting with a three million increase in the first year and adding an additional three million or so every year for the next four years thereafter. The President pointed out that because we currently don’t offer much financial aid, we loose good students, who end up going to schools that offer them better financial aid packages.

We have been, continued the President, financially conservative over the years, which is why we have had no lay offs and furloughs during this bad period of economic downturn. However, being conservative on the tuition side has hurt us.
The President next spoke about large capital building projects. He said that five million dollars would go to these every year, mainly for debt servicing. There is also a large deferred maintenance issue with respect to servicing and maintaining old buildings. This is a 127 million dollar problem. Eventually, we will put three to four million dollars into this every year. Another area requiring funding is information technology (IT). Two to three million dollars must go toward IT. The new science building, for example, requires a major investment in technology and in the people to run and maintain it. To keep up to speed, the College must invest in IT.

As for future project, the President said that he is planning to hire of Director of Sustainability and wants to make the College a “greener” institution. He also wants to do more for procuring and implementing grants, and will consult with departments about this. The President noted that our strong research record differentiates us from other institutions like us. Procuring more grants will maintain our strength in this area and boost our status in the state. President Benson said that he also wants to invest in leadership and executive training. We have a lot of talent on our campus, which can help mid-level and senior-level people in business and other fields. The School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs (LCWA) could lead the way in this area. There is a growing demand for business executives who can speak foreign languages and understand other cultures around the world, and LCWA might house an institute where executives could acquire such expertise. Perhaps something like the Aspen Institute could be founded here, where companies pay ten thousand dollars a week to attend intensive training programs. If we need more expertise than we already have to run such an institute, we will get it.

Next President Benson presented two charts that showed the levels of state funding of public colleges and universities. The charts revealed disturbing downward trends. The President pointed out that Georgia did not gut the funding of higher education during the economic downturn because there was an outcry across the state against such measures. But here in South Carolina the reaction has been different. We need people outside of higher education, President Benson stressed, to defend and speak up for our public colleges and universities. The President lamented that with respect to higher education, we act like a poor state, though we are not in fact a poor state.

Having finished his report, the President answered questions posed by the faculty. Tim Carens (English) asked who at the College is making a case for better state funding. The President responded that he has been doing that and makes speeches on the issue at every opportunity. However, there is only so much he and others inside higher education can do. We need people in business to make the case that support of higher education leads to a better workforce, which leads to better jobs, a better economy, and a higher quality of life.

Irina Gigova (at-large) asked if the Admissions office talks to parents about this issue. She added that citizens often don’t want to pay the taxes that would support higher education, but then they complain about tuition increases. The President answered that he thinks Admissions does speak to parents about such issues. He added that after the Board of Trustees meets and makes a decision on the funding model, the College will be able to offer help to deserving families and the overall picture will be brighter. He said that he hears parents of great students who complain about filling out tremendous amounts of paperwork for scholarships only to be offered small amounts—around $2,000—which are not competitive with other schools.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked where the College now stood in terms of admissions. Steve Osborne (Exec. VP for Business Affairs) answered that the College is ahead in terms of in-state applications, and about the same as last year in terms of out-of-state applications. Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) remarked that the College is not going to have a problem.
getting students; rather the challenge is to get the best ones. On a different topic, she noted, too, that it would be helpful to faculty to have support in writing grant proposals, which is something that relates to workload issues. To write up a big proposal is a task akin to teaching a course. On the enrollment topic, the President observed that there is room for an increase at the North Campus. If we could bring in another 100 or 200 students, it would provide significant financial help to the College. We are thinking, he said, of all kinds of ways to move forward financially without changing the academic culture of the College.

**The Provost**

Provost Hynd began by saying that his office, Academic Affairs, seeks to help faculty with their research and teaching. He then ran through a “to-do” list that Academic Affairs will be working on. First, he said there needs to be some re-alignments within Academic Affairs to make the organizational structure more transparent and to make it more effective in serving the faculty. Coming up with new faculty workload guidelines is also on the “to-do” list. The aim, he stressed, is not to come up with rigid rules, but to develop guidelines to help form a good policy that will provide for a flexible system, one that will play to our strengths by helping those who are good at research to be productive in that area and those who excel at teaching to make the best use of their talents in that area. The issue of joint appointments and the policy dealing with them are also on the list. The Provost said he also wants to look at Study Abroad in relation to student career goals to see what possibilities can be developed. He cited the College’s study abroad connection with Cuba as a unique program with excellent quality of instruction. He also wants to explore the possibility of establishing Centers and Institutes at the College. And he said that diversity issues would also be a focus of his office.

He added that the North Campus, which serves both our students and those from Trident Tech, is being used more and offers some opportunities for expansion. On a different topic, he said that deans and department chairs would become more involved in fund raising. He observed that faculty salaries at the College are competitive, though they could be higher, and that we are still hiring, which is remarkable given the economic recession.

**The Speaker**

Faculty Speaker Joe Kelly said that the Board of Trustees would be meeting soon and that he will have more to say about the meeting in the next newsletter. He announced also that the Faculty Senate’s office is working on a new Faculty Senate Web page, which will conform to the standard C of C template, that it should be operational soon, and that it would contain the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender (GLBT) resource page.

Garret Mitchener (Mathematics) asked why GLBT resource page is on the Faculty Senate Web site? The Speaker explained that the resource page is there because it has been an initiative of the Faculty Senate.

The Speaker then mentioned the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement and asked Kay Smith, Assoc. VP for the Academic Experience, to comment on the survey. Ms. Smith said that the survey will give us a lot of information on faculty expectations and the information will be merged with a survey on the same topic that students will fill out. She encouraged faculty to complete the survey.

**Hugh Wilder, ad hoc Committee to Review the Instructor/Course Evaluation Form**

Mr. Wilder began his report by thanking the members of the committee and then gave a brief history of the committee’s work and the new form. He said that ad hoc Committee to Review the Instructor and Course Evaluation Form was originally a sub-committee of a larger ad hoc
committee formed to find ways to improve teaching and faculty development. That sub-committee recommended replacing the current evaluation form with a new one developed by the committee and approved by the Faculty Senate last year. However, during the approval process, concerns were voiced about the format of the form and whether mean or median scores should be reported. The current committee was tasked to address these two concerns.

As for the format, Mr. Wilder reported that the committee has worked on the layout and that it is available for viewing on the Faculty Senate Web site. The new form will be implemented in fall 2010 for a two-year trial period. He noted that in the new layout there is a reasonable amount of space under each category for student comments, and that there is more space at the end for general comments.

As for the reporting data, Mr. Wilder first pointed out that in both the old and new forms the size of the distance between possible responses are not necessarily equal. For example, in the current form, which uses a six-point scale, there is no reason to assume that the distance between a five and a six equals the distance between a three and a four (i.e., “the data are not interval data”). For that reason, means are not valid for making comparisons. However, a complaint about the use of medians is that they don’t allow one to differentiate among instructors effectively, since many instructors receive the same median scores. The new form, Mr. Wilder announced, will report both mean and median score in order to provide a full picture, though some committee members thought that mean scores should not be included.

The new reporting mechanism will contain histograms showing the distribution of student responses for each item along with indicators of where the mean and median are located.

Tim Carens (English) asked why mean scores are still included since most people think they are statistically meaningless. Mr. Wilder responded that the interpretation of mean scores can be balanced by other data provided by the reporting mechanism. Dana Cope (Sociology and Anthropology), a member of the committee, added that the new reporting mechanism allows us to ignore the mean and focus on the median, whereas the current system makes us do the opposite. Claire Curtis (Political Science), also on the committee, said that some faculty were worried about not getting mean scores; the new evaluation system gives us those scores, but we can understand in a larger context with other data.

Jim Newhard (Classics) asked if the committee dealt with the issue about the inconsistency in the meaning of the difference between intervals (i.e., the notion that one cannot assume that the distance between a five and a six equals the distance between a three and a four). Mr. Wilder said that since we are moving from a six-point scale to a five-point scale, there is some reason to think that the differences between numbers will be more reliable and equal.

Bob Mignone (Mathematics) asked how the evaluation form would be administered (online or by paper in-class). Mr. Wilder responded that that decision rests with the Provost. Mr. Krasnoff (Philosophy) asked if the committee’s work is done and whether the Senate could revisit in two or three years various issues that arise from the new form (such as how the data should be interpreted). Mr. Wilder responded that the intent of the Senate seems to be that such a review would take place.

Mr. Mignone asked if the data could be stored electronically. Provost Hynd said that he was in favor of electronically storing the data, and that he thought the data could be collected electronically when the forms are scanned and hoped to accumulate such data over time to compile a good historical record. Deanna Caveny (Assoc. Provost) also thought such data could be electronically compiled and stored.

Bill Manaris (Computer Science) wished to return to the issue of including mean scores in the reports of the evaluations. Why include meaningless data? To include them suggests that the
they will be used in the assessment of faculty teaching. Mr. Wilder replied that the mean scores do become somewhat meaningful in the context of other scores. Mr. Manaris said that the problem still remains of meaningless data being used in faculty assessment. Mr. Wilder, again, was not sure about that because of the presence of the other data. Mr. Cope said that there was a feeling in the committee that the mean scores were going to be used anyway, so it was therefore important to provide other data. The committee also recommended that the mean scores not be used because of questions about their validity. Mr. Manaris then asked if he could propose that Mr. Cope’s last statement be included on the form, but the Speaker ruled that such a motion was not in order as there was no motion on the floor and the committee was only providing an informational report.

Chris Fragile, chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee

The College’s Strategic Plan (SP), Mr. Fragile began, lists a number aims with regard to faculty in “Strategy 3: Develop and Support a Highly Qualified, Diverse and Stable Base of Faculty and Staff.” The Faculty Compensation Committee chose to provide input to the administration with regard to three of the items listed in “Strategy 3” and to monitor the administration’s progress in reaching them. Specifically, the committee focused on the following three items from the SP: 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 terms of methodology, the committee researched what our peer institutions have done in reaching similar goals. The committee’s report summarizes its findings. With respect to the first item (increase and fund at least ten endowed chairs by 2020), the committee found that James Madison University is aggressively doing this. While the College seeks to have ten endowed chairs by 2020, James Madison wants 40. They are doing much more in this area.

With respect to the second item (recognize and reward annual performance by faculty), the committee points to the policies in place at St. Mary’s College where the reward system is regular and systematic. In the long run, their system makes a big difference. Mr. Fragile pointed out that though St. Mary’s ranks nineteenth out of twenty among our peer institutions in faculty salaries for new hires, it is tenth out of twenty in faculty salaries of professors. So though faculty start out on the low end at St. Mary’s, they finish fairly high because of the regular and systematic rewards that are instituted there. We need, Mr. Fragile stressed, regular and systematic rewards put into the SP.

With respect to the third item (establishing incentives for faculty to write grants), Mr. Fragile said that our peer institution Western Washington University is the model. They offer many kinds of grants--different ways to get faculty research started and to sustain it. He added that internal grants often lead to external grants; so offering the former produces the latter.

Summing up, Mr. Fragile said that the goals listed in Strategy 3 of the SP are achievable, but will require a lot of work and significant funds. Putting in place systematic salary increase incentives is especially critical, as is putting in place a good grant support system. With regard to this last point, he noted that a snowball effect occurs once research gets going and is supported.

Mr. Fragile concluded by inviting faculty to provide feedback on his committee’s report.

At this point, Speaker Kelly asked if there were objections to switching the agenda. He wanted to move directly to the curricular proposals under “New Business,” as these were time sensitive, and return to the remaining reports on the agenda later. No objections were voiced.
New Business

Faculty Curriculum Committee

Bob Perkins, committee chair, thanked his fellow committee members for their hard work this year. Citing the great number of proposals before the Senate today, he asked that next year departments submit their proposals to the Curriculum Committee earlier in the term.

Speaker Kelly reminded Senators that, as has been the Senate’s very recent practice, all proposals in the first category on the agenda titled “Course and Program Changes” would be voted on as a single block. The goal here is to make better use of the Senate’s time by dealing efficiently with routine curricular changes below the level of new program proposals. The Speaker said that a Senator could still set aside any proposal for debate and a separate vote.

Mr. Perkins then introduced the following proposals, which were all approved without discussion:

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)

Deletion 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)

Next Mr. Perkins moved to proposals in the category called “New Majors and Minors.” He introduced the following proposals, which were approved without discussion:

**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

The Senate then voted on the following two proposals, which were approved without discussion:

**Physical Education**

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

The Senate then voted on the last group of proposals; these were also approved without discussion:

**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

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

Heather Tierney, chair of the committee, introduced the following graduate proposals, which were approved without discussion:

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

Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism) asked about the Building Arts program proposals. When will the Senate debate them? Speaker Kelly said that they have been separated from the other curricular items and put near the end agenda so that the Senate could fully debate them. Todd McNerney (at-large) noted that some of the proposals in the Art History proposals are also part of the Building Arts proposals. What happens to those proposals, which have just been approved, if the Building Arts major is not approved? Brian McGee (Communication) said that he would make a motion to repeal any previously approved proposals belong only to the Building Arts major. The Speaker asked for unanimous consent to follow Mr. McGee’s plan in the event of a defeat of the proposed Building Arts major, and unanimous consent was granted.

Committee on General Education

Claire Curtis (Political Science), chair of the committee, introduced the following new course proposals that were seeking the status of fulfilling the General Education history requirement:

History 115: Pre-Modern History
History 116: Modern History
Julia Eichelberger (at-large) asked if the new history courses would replace the current history courses (HIST 101, 102, etc.), which currently satisfy the Gen-Ed history requirements. Ms. Curtis said that they would. Larry Krasnoff (at-large) asked if each section of these HIST 115 and 116 would have its own specific course title. Ms. Curtis replied that each would.

The Senate voted, approving the proposals.

Next, Ms. Curtis introduced the following course proposals that were seeking to fulfill the General Education humanities requirement.

- 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
- CHST 240: Special Topics in Chinese Studies
- CHST 340: Special Topics in Chinese Studies
- LTAR 220: Modern Arabic Fiction

Todd McNerney (at-large) wondered if all the special topics courses would get humanities credit and pointed out that in his department (Theatre) some courses count for humanities credit, while praxis courses do not. He found this lack of specification in the proposal disconcerting. If someone were to offer a special topics course in, say, the praxis of Chinese opera in his department, it wouldn’t count toward the humanities requirement, but in the CHST 240 and 340 proposals it seems the course would count. Mary Beth Heston (guest) responded that with respect to Arabic studies now there is only one person who will teach the special topics courses in that field and they will be focused on Arabic literature, which the professor’s area of specialization. So there are built-in controls to address the concern raised by Mr. McNerney. She added that if things were to change, her department would make appropriate curricular changes.

Ms. Eichelberger wondered what designated the special-topics courses as humanities courses and not social science courses. In looking at the Gen-Ed Competency Table, it was unclear how the two were distinguished. Ms. Curtis agreed that it was not clear. On the praxis vs. humanities issue, Ms. Eichelberger thought that perhaps item two in the table, which lists analytical skills, might differentiate praxis courses from humanities courses. Ms. Heston remarked that the conversation about competencies occurred over two years ago, but there are no detailed guidelines. Brian McGee (Communication) declared that he was going to vote for the Gen-Ed proposals. He then observed that the various inconsistencies and perplexities surrounding the proposals stem from the fact that we are trying to implement Gen-Ed goals that were approved for a Gen-Ed system we didn’t adopt. He added that we are stuck in a current Gen-Ed system that cannot be properly assessed, and hoped that this situation would be addressed in a timely fashion. He then expressed his condolences to those trying to make two incompatible entities work together.

More discussion followed on the problem of using the competency table to distinguish between humanities and social science courses, particularly with respect to the Arabic Studies special topics courses. Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism) moved to insert the word “Humanities” in the title to make it clear that the course must have content appropriate to the disciplines of the humanities. The motion received a second. Darryl Phillips (at-large) asked whether such a motion would be in order, given that the Senate had just approved the courses as new courses with the current titles. Ms. Curtis thought that such a title change would have to be universally applied to all such special topics courses. Ms. Heston spoke against the motion, arguing that the title was awkward and that, as there are many special topics across
the campus, it was odd to single out one or a few courses for special treatment. Jim Newhard (classics), also arguing against the motion, added that chairs and program directors should some responsibility for making sure that the content of the course matches the requirement the course is supposed to meet. David Cohen (guest and Dean of the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs) pointed out that the course will only be taught three times before it comes back for review. Sarah Owen (Hispanic Studies) found it ironic that we spend so much time on this item, but only one minute on all the other curriculum proposals.

At this point a Senator moved to call the question, which was seconded. The motion to call the question passed.

The Senate voted on Mr. Litvin’s amendment, which was defeated.

Phil Dustan (Biology) then called the question on motion of whether to approve the courses seeking Gen-Ed humanities credit status. His motion received a second and then was passed by the Senate.

The motion to approve the courses seeking Gen-Ed humanities credit status passed.

Reports (Cont.)

Now that the time-sensitive items on the agenda had been completed, the Speaker directed the Senate to return to earlier agenda items that had been skipped over.

Michael Phillips, chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and FAM

Mr. Phillips explained that there were two motions that were submitted to the Senate at the last meeting, which the By-Laws/FAM Committee has since reviewed. The first concerns a reference to faculty meetings in Article V, Section 3B.1 of the by-laws, which refers to the election of members of members of the Nominations and Elections Committee. Mr. Phillips explained that as the stipulation to hold regularly scheduled full faculty meetings have been removed from the by-laws, this reference to faculty meetings in Article V, Section 3B.1 needs to be removed. The fact that it wasn’t removed when the faculty voted to eliminate regularly held faculty meetings was a mere oversight. Thus By-Laws/FAM Committee recommends amending Article V, Section 3B.1 as follows:

Current language:

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).

Proposed amendment:

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).

The second motion concerns a proposal submitted at the last Senate meeting by Todd McNerney to amend the area of the by-laws that describes the make-up and duties of the
Budget Committee. Mr. Phillips reported that his committee recommends passage of the motion, but also suggests some amendments to it.

Before hearing the details of the proposed amendment to the motion on the Budget Committee, the Speaker asked that the Senate debate and vote on the first motion, which meant that the Senate was now moving to the category of “Old Business” on the agenda.

**Old Business**

**Motion to amend the By-Laws regarding Article V, Sect. 3B.1(b)**

The Senate passed this motion without further discussion (see preceding section for exact language of the by-laws change).

**Motion to change to the description of the Budget Committee in the By-Laws, Article V. Sect. 2.B.2**

Below appears the text of the new description of the Budget Committee as presented in the motion made by Todd McNerney at the March Senate meeting to alter Article V. Sect. 2.B.2 of the by-laws:

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.

Mr. Michael Phillips, By-Laws/FAM Committee chair, then presented his committee’s proposed amendments to the above motion (note: underlined words signify additions to language now in the FAM and words with strike-through lines signify deletions from the current FAM):

**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.

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.

Mr. Phillips next explained the details of the committee’s proposed changes, but first pointed out an issue in section a: should the number of faculty Senators on the Budget be two or three? Historically, there have always been more than two, but language stipulating such is not in the current FAM. Brian McGee (Communication), former chair of the By-Laws/FAM Committee, added that the FAM used to stipulate that the majority of Senate committee members had to be Senators, but language stating that requirement somehow disappeared from the FAM some years without action from the Senate. The mysterious disappearance of that language was detected last year, but the By-Laws/FAM Committee was not able to deal with the problem at that time. Mr. McGee urged that the language be re-inserted into the FAM. Speaker Kelly asked that for the moment the Senate just debate the current text of the proposed new description of the Budget Committee.

Mr. Michael Phillips continued his explanation of the proposed emendations to Mr. McNerney’s motion, saying that the first involved deleting the phrase “elected by the whole faculty” in section a (titled “Composition”). This change would put the election of the Budget Committee in line with the current election procedure for other Senate Committees, whose members are elected by the Faculty Senate (see Article V, Sect. 2.A of the FAM). The other change pertains to the “Duties” paragraph (section c) and involves replacing the phrase “including serving on the Academic Affairs Planning and priorities Committee” with the phrase “including sending no more than three representatives to serve on the Academic Affairs Planning and Priorities Committee.” The proposed new language, Mr. Phillips said, is more specific and precise.

David Gentry (at-large) asked how Mr. McNerney, current chair of the Budget Committee, and other members of the Budget Committee felt about the changes proposed by the By-Laws/FAM Committee. Mr. McNerney replied that there was some disagreement, but in general the committee more or less accepted them. Speaker Kelly pointed out that By-Laws/FAM Committee modifies proposed changes to the by-laws with an eye to making the proposals logically and stylistically consistent with the rest of the by-laws.
Mr. McGee, again voicing his concern about the missing sentence from the FAM (stipulating that at least half of the members of Senate Committees had to be Senators), moved to change the second sentence of section a (titled “Composition”) from “At least two of whom must be members of the Faculty Senate” to “The majority of whom must be members of the Faculty Senate.” His motion received a second.

Ms. Curtis wondered whether the Senate would be able to find enough Senators to serve on the Senate Committees, especially in light of the fact that the new Senate will be smaller. Steven Jaumé (Geology), chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee, thought at saying “at least three” might make things simpler and more consistent with some other committees.

Mr. Mc Nerney moved to call the question, and the motion was seconded. The Senate voted, passing the motion to call the question.

Mr. McGee’s motion to amend the By-Laws/FAM Committee’s proposed new description of the Budget Committee was defeated.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) said that he liked the idea of revamping and beefing up the Budget Committee, but saw a logistical problem with the proposal: he pointed out that service on the Budget Committee, according to the proposal, is for three years, but that service on the Senate is for two years. As a portion of the committee members must also be Senators, the proposal sets up a mismatch in terms of election cycles. This is not a good situation, he stressed. Mr. Jaumé then added that the Nominations and Elections Committee already has a hard time finding willing Senators to serve on Senate Committees. The proposals, if passed, will make the Nominations and Elections Committee’s task even harder.

The Senate voted, defeating the proposal to change the description of the Budget Committee.

New Business (Cont.)

Committee on Nominations and Elections

--Call for additional nominations to Senate Committees (Academic Planning, Budget, By-Laws)

Steven Jaumé, committee chair, called for additional nominations to the Senate Committees. Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked if Mr. Jaumé had received the nomination of Kendra Stewart, and he responded that he had. Mr. Jaumé said that he would accept additional nominations till the end of the week.

At this point it was 7:15 and the Senate adjourned with the understanding that the meeting would continue next Tuesday (4-13-10) at 5:00 P.M. to complete the remaining items on the agenda.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 2 March 2010

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 2 March 2010, at 5:00 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Joe Kelly, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of the 9 February 2010 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

The Provost

Provost George Hynd reported that he has visited the School of Business and the School of Sciences and Mathematics, and will visit the School of Education, Health, and Human Performance on Friday. He said he wants to introduce himself to staff and faculty across the campus, to learn more about the College, and to listen. He thanked everyone for being patient during this process of introduction.

Provost Hynd next reported that the tenure and promotion process is nearing completion, that the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review has finished its work and done its job well, and that the process has now shifted to the Academic Affairs office.

The Provost next discussed the Lowcountry Graduate Center, reporting that a collaborative agreement with the Citadel and MUSC is being developed. The new agreement among the three parties will outline the details as to how the Center will operate.

Moving to the Strategic Plan (SP), Provost Hynd reported that a three-year plan is being developed that specifies how the SP’s goals will be implemented in the near term. The Provost next reported that the search for a new Dean of the School of Sciences and Mathematics, headed by Dean Cynthia Lowenthal, is going well. Finally, the Provost announced that Robert Russell has drafted a proposal outlining a plan to incorporate the College of the Building Arts into the College of Charleston, and that it will be reviewed by the Academic Planning Committee, the Faculty Curriculum Committee, the Budget Committee, and Planning and Priorities Committee. He concluded by saying that he welcomes input from faculty on this proposal.

Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism) asked the Provost to elaborate on the proposal involving College of the Building Arts. The Provost answered that the Building Arts College was established a number of years ago, that it offers a bachelor’s degree and specializes in teaching traditional forms of building and craftsmanship. The Building Arts College approached us, he continued, seeking to become part of the College of Charleston, something Mayor Riley wants to see happen. The Provost thought that, given Charleston’s historic buildings, it made sense that the Building Arts College remain in the city. And a partnership with the College also made sense given that we already have the Program in Historic Preservation. He foresees a major in the building arts developing within that program. He added that both he and President Benson are excited about the proposal.
Joe Kelly noted that the proposal is moving quickly, and urged faculty to attend the committee meetings just announced by the Provost. Those meetings would provide faculty with the opportunity to shape the proposal. Next, the chairs of the committees mentioned by the Provost said they would be holding meetings on the proposal shortly after Spring Break and invited Senators to attend.

**The Speaker**

Speaker Joe Kelly congratulated Darryl Phillips, who was elected as Faculty Speaker for 2010-11, and Sarah Owen, who was elected as Faculty Secretary for 2010-11. The Speaker next reported that the Diversity town hall meetings were well attended, especially the faculty session, and that the discussions were lively. He said that he would soon meet with John Bello-Ogunu to review the discussions and would report on that meeting at a later date. He then encouraged Senators to attend President Benson’s upcoming town hall meeting and announced that the report by the Faculty Compensation Committee has been withdrawn from the agenda because further data still needs to be gathered to complete the report.

**Michael Phillips, chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and FAM**

Mr. Phillips reported that his committee had reviewed the motion made at the last Senate meeting by Irina Gigova (at-large) to amend Article IV, Section 2E of the by-laws, which would specify when a Senator leaving the Faculty Senate is eligible to return. Ms. Gigova’s motion reads as follows (strike through words designate deletions, words in bold face designate additions):

**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.*
Mr. Phillips reported that his committee had two questions about the proposal. First, the committee wondered if the proposed four-year time-out period might make it difficult for small departments to maintain continuous representation in the Senate. Second, in cases where small departments were having difficulty finding eligible members to represent them in the Senate, the committee wondered whether it might be advisable to include language in the by-laws allowing exceptions to the proposed eligibility restrictions.

Mr. Phillips reported that the committee, after considering those questions, wished to make **four substantive amendments** to Ms. Gigova’s motion. **First**, the committee proposed changing the reinstatement period of eligibility from four years to one year. Mr. Phillips explained that the committee thought a four-year period was too long, and that a one-semester period was too short, and that a one-year period was in-keeping with Ms. Gigova’s motion to ensure greater turnover in the Senate, but would also allow some flexibility to help small departments find eligible representatives. **Second**, the committee thought that it would be helpful to clarify how a partial term of service should be viewed and proposed inserting the following sentence: “For purposes of eligibility, a partial term of service shall be counted as a full term.” Mr. Phillips added that this sentence reflected the original intent of the term limits restriction in the by-laws. **Third**, the committee proposed a provision that would allow a department with no eligible members to serve in the Senate to petition the Committee on Nominations and Elections for an exception. **Fourth**, the committee proposed striking the last three sentences of Article IV, Sect. 2.E, which refer to the election cycle of the Senate (half the seats are up for election one year, the other half the next). The rationale to strike the sentences is that they no longer apply to current Senate election procedures. The four proposed amendments would change Ms. Gigova’s motion to amend Article IV, Sect. 2.E as follows (the underlined words alter Ms. Gigova’s proposed new language, and the stricken lines are deletions from the by-laws):

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 year 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. Additionally, in order to maintain continuous service by departmental senators, any department with no eligible members may petition the Committee on Nominations and Elections for an exception at any time. 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.

Old Business

With the conclusion of the report from the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM), debate on **Ms. Gigova’s motion** was now open. Speaker Kelly said that the Senate would discuss and vote on each of the four amendments to Ms. Gigova’s motion proposed by the By-Laws and FAM Committee, starting with the **first amendment** to change the reinstatement period of eligibility from four years to one year.
Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) said that her department was against the original motion, but in favor of this amendment as it would help her department find eligible members to serve in the Senate. Ms. Gigova commented that she had changed her mind on the four-year time-out period, which she now viewed as too long. She thought that three or two years would be more appropriate. Larry Krasnoff (at-large) thought that the one-year time-out period would achieve the goal of Ms. Gigova’s motion, especially when one considers that a minimum period of one-year would in practice probably be longer.

The Senate voted, passing the first amendment from the By-Laws and FAM Committee.

The Senate next debated the second amendment from the By-Laws and FAM Committee, which would count a partial term of service in the Senate as a full term. Ms. Cormack moved to amend the proposed amendment by adding the phrase “of one year or more” in the fourth sentence of the proposed text for Article IV, Sect. 2.E so that the sentence would read as follows: “For purposes of eligibility, a partial term of service of one year or more shall be counted as a full term.” The motion received a second.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) was not convinced that the amendment was necessary given the other amendments proposed by the By-Laws and FAM Committee. Brian McGee (Communication), however, spoke in favor of Ms. Cormack amendment, noting that it would be useful for small departments, especially in cases when they are trying to find eligible faculty to cover for faculty who are on leave due to illness, on sabbatical, etc. He also thought the amendment would help reduce absenteeism in the Senate. Ms. Cormack agreed. Her department, she said, doesn’t look upon service in the Senate as a great opportunity, and if we over-bureaucratize service eligibility and don’t allow more flexibility, we will end up creating disincentives to serve. Todd McNerney (at-large) concurred, noting that attendance in the new Faculty Senate, which will be smaller, is going to be very important. He observed, too, that only about fifty Senators (about two-thirds of the Senate) were present at tonight’s meeting.

The Senate voted, passing Ms. Cormack amendment to the second amendment from the By-Laws and FAM Committee.

The Senate then passed the second amendment from the By-Laws and FAM Committee.

The Senate next considered the third amendment proposed by the By-Laws and FAM Committee, which would allow departments to petition for exceptions to certain eligibility restrictions to serve in the Senate. David Gentry (at-large) observed that the amendment does not make clear what the guidelines are for granting exceptions. Garrett Mitchner (Mathematics) then asked who would grant the exceptions. Michael Phillips answered that it was the Committee on Nominations and Elections. Mr. Krasnoff, speaking in favor of the proposed amendment, said that it made sense to give the Nominations and Elections Committee this authority. The committee can also take into account the spirit of the term-limits rules and prevent someone from returning again and again to the Senate in violation of the rules.
The Senate voted, passing the third amendment from the By-Laws and FAM Committee.

The Senate now turned its attention to the fourth amendment from the By-Laws and FAM Committee, which would delete the last three sentences of Article IV, Sect. 2.E. Darryl Phillips (at-large) asked whether the at-large Senators elected to the new Senate were elected for one year or for two years. Steven Jaumé (chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee) replied that as the language proposed to be stricken from the by-laws were in the by-laws at the time of the recent elections, his committee ran the elections on the assumption that the stipulations expressed that language were in effect: thus half the newly elected at-large Senators will begin with one-year terms and half with two-year terms. But he wondered what would happen should the proposed amendment pass. Would it be applied retroactively to the recent elections? Ms. Curtis spoke against the amendment, saying that it’s not good to have all the at-large Senators on the same rotation sequence. Mr. Jaumé agreed.

The Senate voted, defeating the fourth amendment proposed by By-Laws and FAM Committee.

Having voted on the amendments to Ms. Gigova’s motion, the Senate then voted on her motion, passing it.

New Business

Motion to Amend Article V, Sect. 3B.1(b) of the By-Laws

Michael Phillips wished to present a new motion from the By-Laws/FAM Committee, which had been submitted prior to the meeting but after the agenda had been published. Speaker Kelly asked the Senate to allow the motion to be made. He also pointed out that the motion would, as required by the by-laws, return to the By-Laws/FAM Committee for review; so the Senate would not debate or vote on the motion tonight. Mr. Phillips explained that the motion amends Article V Sect. 3B.1(b) of the by-laws, which deals with the election of members of the Nominations and Elections Committee, and specifically eliminates a reference to the “April faculty meeting,” which is no longer regularly held. Mr. Phillips said that the motion amends a section of the by-laws that should have been amended when the Senate approved eliminating the Fall and Spring faculty meetings in May 2009. He added that that his committee consulted with the Nominations and Election Committee about the motion. The text of the motion appears below (underlined words designate additions, and words with lines through them designate deletions):

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).
Budget Committee

Todd McNerney (at-large), chair of the committee, introduced a motion to change the description of the Budget Committee in the by-laws (Article V, Section 2B.2). Mr. McNerney explained that since the size and composition of the Faculty Senate have been changed with the goal of making faculty governance more effective, it seemed appropriate to re-think the size, composition, and duties of the Budget Committee with the same goal in mind. He added that this re-thinking is necessary given the recent creation of the Priorities and Planning Committee, which also deals with some budget issues, producing some overlap of functions with the Budget Committee. The current members of the Budget Committee have been meeting with the Priorities and Planning Committee to co-ordinate their work and sort out the areas of overlap. Mr. McNerney further pointed out that the Budget Committee, despite its name, has not historically been involved in major budget decisions. The intent of the proposed new description is to give the committee a more effective and meaningful role in budgetary decisions. The text of the proposal appears as follows:

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.

As with the previous motion, this one must, as required by the by-laws, be sent to the By-Laws/FAM Committee for review. After the committee completes its review, it will return to the Senate for a full debate and a vote.

Committee on General Education
Claire Curtis, committee chair, introduced a motion to eliminate free back credits in languages. She first asked that the Senate give unanimous consent to replace the version of the proposal that had been circulated to Senators with a slightly revised version. She explained that Garrett Mitchner (Mathematics) had pointed out some typos as well as stylistic inconsistencies (such as sometime referring to “placement exams” as “placement tests”), and that the committee has corrected those details with the goal of making the proposal a clearer and tidier document. Unanimous consent was granted.

Ms. Curtis next explained that the motion comes from the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs, and that the current policy on foreign language credits allows first-year students who are placed into a foreign language course above the introductory level and who earn a C in it to receive credits toward graduation for the lower level language courses, even though they did not take those courses at the College. The motion seeks to change this policy (as stated on page 9 of the 2009 – 2010 catalogue). The rationale for the change is multi-fold: for example, eliminating the free credits gives students flexibility to pursue other academic interests and addresses the questionable policy of giving some students a semester’s worth of credits (12) for work they did not do at the College. (The complete list of justifications for the policy change can be found in the full text of the proposal posted on the Faculty Senate Web site.) The text of the motion appears below (strike through for words to be deleted, red for words to be added, purple for words added in the latest revision of the motion):

**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 exam in the language. Note that students of Spanish do not take a placement test exam, 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 exam 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 exam 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 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, twelve 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, fifteen 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 Exam (French, German, Italian, Spanish)**

- A score of four or five fulfills the general education requirement in a foreign language. Student may enroll in an advanced language course.

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

- 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 Exam (all forms)**

- 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 exam. No credits will be received based on placement tests exams.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) moved to strike the words “spoken” and “modern” in the first paragraph, specifically changing “any spoken language” to “any language” and “on the AP modern language exam” to “on an AP language exam.” He pointed out that we teach such languages as Latin and classical Greek, which are not spoken and not modern, but which do count toward the foreign language requirement. His proposed amendment received a second. Ms. Curtis responded that faculty from the Department of Computer Science wished to include “spoken” because Latin and classical Greek are in some sense spoken, while computer programming languages are not. They wanted to make a distinction between foreign languages and scientific symbols that are sometimes called “languages.” To resolve this issue, Meg Cormack moved to amend Mr. Phillip’s amendment by inserting the word “human” where the word “spoken” had been. Her motion was seconded. The Senate voted, defeating her motion. The Senate then voted on Mr. Phillip’s motion, passing it.

Todd Grantham (Philosophy) noted that the original rationale for granting back credits for languages was to encourage students to place in courses at their actual level of ability, and not to game the system by placing in a course at a lower level to pick up an easy high grade. If the motion were to pass, what would prevent students from sandbagging courses? Shawn
Morrison (guest) replied that the incentive for students to place at their actual level of ability is to avoid having to take unnecessary language courses.

Steven Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism) asked whether removing the free language credits would create among students a disincentive to apply to the College. Ms. Curtis said that she didn’t think that outcome was likely, pointing out that most students don’t even know about the free language credits before arriving here. This fact indicates that the language credits have not functioned as an incentive for students to come to the College.

The Senate voted, passing the motion to eliminate free language credits.

Constituents’ Concerns

Steve Jaumé (Geology) asked on behalf of the Nominations and Elections Committee that faculty fill out a survey (soon to be circulated electronically), which asks faculty what college-wide committees they would be willing to serve on.

With its work completed, the Faculty Senate adjourned at around 5:55.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 9 February 2010

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 9 February 2010, at 5:00 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, the minutes of the 19 January 2010 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

The Provost

Provost George Hynd reported, in an effort to acquaint himself with various schools of the College, he would meet with the administration leadership and some faculty of each school. He reported, too, that the MBA proposal, approved by the Faculty Senate in the last meeting, continues to move forward, and that the tenure, promotion, and third-year review process, which he thinks is excellent, is nearly complete for the year.

He next mentioned the issue of faculty workload, saying that he recently met with the Psychology Department and learned more about the issue, in particular that it is a “thorny” one. He added that the existence of many interdisciplinary programs complicates the issue, and that he wants to learn more and gather ideas on how to deal with the issue.

He said that he was impressed with the faculty and would like to do more to honor them. In particular, he is looking for ideas to enhance the Faculty Awards ceremony and to find other ways to celebrate faculty achievements.

The Provost announced that the College would be participating in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) to see how engaged our students are compared to students on other campuses. Student engagement is measured against a number of benchmarks, such as level of academic challenge, level and nature of student-faculty interaction, and so on. Freshmen and seniors will get reminders to participate, and the Provost asked that faculty to encourage those groups of students to complete the survey. FSSE represents a chance for faculty to provide to their perception of student engagement, and the Provost encouraged faculty to participate in that survey.

Phil Dustan (Biology) asked if the Provost planned to visit departments as well as schools. Provost Hynd said that he did, but wanted to start with the schools first.

The Speaker

Speaker Kelly said that he would report on the upcoming Board of Trustees meeting and the Senior Leadership meeting in the next newsletter.

He also reported that he was invited to meet with leaders of the Black Student Union to hear about their experiences at the College, and that he found the meeting revealing. His
eyes were opened, he said, to certain issues, which he will talk about in the next Newsletter.

Speaker Kelly next urged Senators to attend the town hall meeting on the diversity issue, which, he said, was a more pressing problem than he had realized.

The Speaker then made a pitch to the faculty to join the Faculty Club, mentioning that members would be given free tickets to the upcoming basketball game against Elon donated by Joe Hull, Director of Athletics. The Speaker also introduced Vince Benigni, the new Faculty Athletics Representative, who said that faculty should contact him about any questions or concerns that might have about student athletes.

The Speaker concluded his report by thanking Steven Jaumé, chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee, for his work on gathering nominations for at-large Senate seats and setting up the election as we transition to the new Faculty Senate.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked if the nomination process would be closed on Monday. Steve Jaumé said that it would probably not be close because this is the first time the new election process is happening and there are still kinks and glitches to be worked out. Speaker Kelly said that he had told Mr. Jaumé that he believes the Senate would grant the extension, given the difficulties of working out a new election process for the first time.

Michael Phillips, chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and FAM

Mr. Phillips announced that his committee would be correcting a typographical glitch that resulted from the recently approved proposal to change the size and composition of the Faculty Senate. Specifically, the proposal changed the lettering of the various parts of Article IV, Section 2 of the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM), 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. If a school should have more departments than its apportioned Senators, then all of that school’s senators shall be 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 [. . . etc.].

However, in the approved proposal, not all the letters of the various parts of Article IV, Section 2 were changed. Specifically, parts D, E, and F were not changed. Mr. Phillips reported that his committee has corrected the oversight so that parts D, E, and F and have now respectively become parts E, F, and G.

Mr. Phillips then spoke briefly about the next item on the agenda, Ms. Gigova’s proposal to specify the length of time one must sit out from Faculty Senate after having served in it. He said that the FAM is silent on this issue in that it does not specify a time-out period after one’s eligibility to serve in the Senate has expired. He reported that his committee had talked about this issue in the past and considered a one-year time-out period, but would offer a detailed report on Ms. Gigova’s proposal at the next Senate meeting.

New Business

Motion to specify how long a Senator must “sit out” of the Faculty Senate after serving two consecutive terms

Speaker Kelly informed the Senate that all proposals to change the by-laws automatically go to the Committee on the By-Laws and the FAM for review, and that the appropriate time for an extensive debate would be at next month’s meeting, when the committee delivered its report on Ms. Gigova’s motion. However, he said that a short discussion of the issue now was in order.

Irina Gigova (at-large), author of the proposed motion, moved that Article IV, Section 2D (E according to the 11/10/09 revision) of the by-laws be amended as follows:

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.

Ms. Gigova explained that part of the rationale for the motion stems from concerns she has heard from faculty that the new, smaller Faculty Senate would drastically limit broad faculty participation in it. She said that people tend to let others who are entrenched in the Senate to stay there, and offer ready-made excuses for their own lack of involvement—such as the excuse that they are too busy to get involved. Her motion to specify a required time-off period for Senators whose eligibility to serve has expired is intended to facilitate greater faculty participation in the Senate. She added that the four-year time-out period was intended to match the period of time served in the Senate. The same principle could be applied to someone who served one term: two years of service would equal a two-year time-off period. After this comment on the rationale, the motion was seconded.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) wondered if the underlying perception is true that faculty who rotate off the Senate don’t stay out of the Senate for very long. Would it be possible to get some information on this question. Speaker Kelly said that he would try to find some data. Brian McGee (Communication) remarked that in the past the By-Laws/FAM Committee found that term limits apply only to members who have finished a full term. It is possible for a Senator to resign one hour before his or her term expires, which would restart the clock to zero and allow that person to be elected again as Senator. He said that the current By-Laws/FAM Committee might wish to address this loophole.

The motion was sent to the By-Laws/FAM Committee for review.

**Green-Plan Resolution**

Phil Dustan (Biology) moved that the following resolution be approved:

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*.

Mr. Dustan explained that the Charleston Green Plan is a “road map” for the city to follow to make it a better and more environmentally responsible place to live. It is a response to climate change, but even without the threat of climate change, the Green Plan, he said, is still a good plan for the city to follow for other reasons. The proposed resolution received a second.

Garrett Mitchner (Mathematics) asked what exactly the Charleston Green Plan is and whether it could be accessed so that one could read it. Mr. Dustan replied that it was accessible through the internet and that the Green Plan addresses environmental issues, including climate change. In effort to deal with such issues, the Green Plan covers such areas as making buildings “greener,” promoting “green” forms of development and land use, dealing transportation problems in an environmentally responsible way, and so on. Mr. Dustan added that the Green Plan stemmed from the 2005 Conference of Mayors meeting, where the decision was taken—and formally stated in the US Mayors Climate Protection Agreement—to deal with the problem of climate change because it appeared that government at higher levels was not going to deal with it.

Robert Russell (Art History), after remarking that he had read much of the Charleston Green Plan and that it is a big document, said that Mr. Dustan was asking Senators to vote on something that they haven’t had a chance to read. He noted that the City Council backed off from voting on the Green Plan because the members also hadn’t had enough time to read and think about it. He urged the Senate do the same. Mr. Dustan replied that he notified the Senate at last month’s meeting that he would bring the resolution forward and that Senators could access the Green Plan online. He thought that there had been adequate time for Senators to learn about the Plan. Speaker Kelly added that he had urged Mr. Dustan not to present the resolution at last month’s meeting, but to announce his intention to present it so that members would have time to read and think about the Green Plan.

Another Senator said that many things in the Plan shade from suggestion to action, and that therefore the Senate needed to know more of the specifics. Mr. Dustan responded that a lot of the rhetoric in the document has been toned down. He said, too, that there have been a number of misperceptions. For example, people thought that the document would prohibit the burning of wood in their fireplaces, when in fact the document only makes a recommendation to find ways to reduce emissions from fireplaces, wood stoves, and outside burning to improve air quality. He added that this recommendation came from Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC).

Jeffery Diamond (History) said that the cause promoted by the resolution was noble. However, since the College is part of the city, he thought it was necessary that the administration and other members of the College be involved in approving or not approving the resolution, and not just the Senate. The Speaker replied that the resolution
is non-binding. It just says that the faculty endorse the Plan. There are no obligations that go with the approval of such a resolution.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) observed that the Faculty Senate had faced a situation in the recent past where it approved a resolution setting higher standards for others than what we practice. If we were to approve this resolution, would we perhaps being putting ourselves in a hypocritical situation again. Mr. Dustan replied that he hoped we would live up to the standards outlined in the Green Plan. Brian McGee (Communication) asked if the Academic Affairs Office has a position on the issue. Provost Hynd said that it did not, as far as he knew. Claire Curtis (Political Science) observed that the resolution might be an aid to help us to live up to the standards we profess. As an example of this idea, Mr. Dustan pointed to the fact that the new science building isn’t LEED certified. Perhaps a public commitment to green standards would ensure that all new buildings are LEED certified. Now he has to answer his students’ questions as to why it doesn’t meet LEED standards.

The Senate voted, endorsing the Charleston Green Plan resolution.

Faculty Curriculum Committee

Course Changes: In accordance with the new plan to deal with curriculum proposals announced at the last Faculty Senate meeting, Speaker Kelly asked for unanimous consent that all proposals below the level of program changes (such as proposals to change a course and to delete a course) be voted on as single block. The Senate granted unanimous consent.

Bob Perkins, chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, introduced the following proposals, which were approved without discussion:

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

Program Changes: Mr. Perkins next moved to curriculum proposals that involved program changes and introduced the following proposal:
Art History

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

Jeffery Diamond (History) asked what the rationale was for deleting a required course. Was someone in the Art History Department retiring? As a point of information, Larry Krasnoff noted that the curriculum document says that the course “will not be taught in the foreseeable future.” Ms. Curtis observed that if there is no one to teach the course, then a student would not be able to complete the minor. If such is the case, Mr. Dustan responded, why doesn’t someone in the department “step up” to teach the course. Robert Russell (Art History) said that HIST 211 is an alternative to two other courses that already satisfy the minor, and is therefore not by itself a course required to complete the minor. Mr. Diamond asked if the course would be taught in the near future, to which Mr. Russell responded “probably not,” as it was unlikely that the department would have someone soon on its roster with the expertise to teach it.

The Senate voted, approving the proposal to change the Art History Minor.

Next, Mr. Perkins introduced the following proposal, which was approved without discussion:

Biology & Psychology

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

Mr. Perkins then introduced the following proposals pertaining to a new major, Computing in the Arts:

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

Ms. Curtis asked if any thought was given to starting the new program as a minor (rather than as a major) to test, among other things, the interest level among students. Mr. Perkins replied that the Faculty Curriculum Committee did not consider that question. Brian McGee (Communication) stated that the proposed major shares overlapping interests with his department and that in the spirit of collaboration and interdisciplinary
teaching and scholarship, the Communication Department supports the new major. Returning to the question raised by Ms. Curtis, Mr. Krasnoff said that it would be wise to test the program first as a minor and to test it in terms of outcomes. For example, were a music major to take Computing in the Arts as a minor, we could see how out in panned out for that student. It might be that the student would have more options out in the world with this as minor, and that the world might not recognize it as a major. Bill Manaris (Computer Science) responded that this was a good question to raise. He pointed out, however, that the proposed major was modeled on the one that has recently been established at Yale University, that given the tradition of the Spoleto Festival in Charleston, the new major seemed to be a good fit for the College, and that there is growing evidence that computing technologies are becoming more important in various arts. Mr. Diamond agreed, pointing out that in music, for example, the use of computers is widespread and increasing. He thought that things were trending toward the integration of computers with the arts, and did not see the proposed major as odd or arcane.

Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism) observed that the more majors we offer to a fixed number of students on campus, the more difficult it becomes to get the personnel to meet our staffing and curricular needs. Mr. Perkins responded that for this proposed major most of the courses and staff were already in place, and that the Curriculum Committee was concerned about the issue. When the proposal was first sent to the committee, members found it wanting with respect to this issue and sent it back for revision so that it would include more existing courses. He did not think that Mr. Litvin’s concern was a problem for the proposal now.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) thought that the proposed major was innovative and expressed support for it. He noted, too, that when he was on the Strategic Planning Committee, he and other members looked at how many majors we offer compared to other schools and found out that we don’t offer that many for a school of our size. He was pleased that the College now offers more majors at a low cost to the institution in terms of faculty assignments, and thought that we should offer more focused programs that are cost effective.

The Senate voted, approving the Computing in the Arts Major.

Mr. Perkins next introduced the following change in program proposals individually and each group was voted on and approved without discussion:

**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

Constituents’ Concerns

No concerns were voiced. With its business completed, the Faculty Senate adjourned at around 5:50.

Respectfully submitted by

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 19 January 2010

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 19 January 2010, at 5:00 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, the minutes of the 8 December 2009 Faculty Senate meeting were approved, and Speaker Kelly formally welcomed new Provost George Hynd to the College.

Reports

The Provost

Provost George Hynd said that he was “thrilled to death” to be at the College. He remarked that he is impressed with the faculty, and that there is a nice balance of full, associate, and assistant professors. Since arriving at the College, he has attended the Martin Luther King Challenge events, learned about the project involving the American College of the Building Arts, and went to the Advisory Council on Academic Programs (ACAP) meeting of CHE to discuss a planning proposal for a program in Archaeology. He said that it was good to meet the folks at CHE and reported that the College has a good reputation among them. He said, too, that he was impressed with the tenure and promotion process at the College and observed that there are many very competent faculty in administrative positions here. He noted also the arrival of the Boeing Company in Charleston and thought there would be opportunities to reach out to the company and form partnerships on various projects. He also informed the Senate that CHE is interested in promoting online education, which has significant possibilities for bringing higher education to rural communities. We need, the Provost said, to learn what others are doing in the area of online education. Provost Hynd concluded his remarks by saying that he looks forward to working with Speaker Kelly and the faculty.

The Speaker

Speaker Kelly announced that the funeral service for Michael Finefrock, Professor of History, who recently passed away, would take place on Tuesday, January 26, at Sturh’s Downtown Chapel, at 3:00 P.M.

The Speaker reported that there would be a change in the approval process of curricular proposals. In future Faculty Senate meetings, all proposals below the level of program proposals will be voted on as a single block. However, if prior to the meeting a Senator wishes to comment on or object to a proposal, that Senator should let him or the Faculty Secretary know ahead of time, and the proposal will be set apart for discussion. The Speaker said that this change was not a major departure from the way the Senate currently deals with curricular proposals, but the change should make the whole process more efficient.

Steven Jaumé, chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections

Mr. Jaumé spoke about the change in size and composition of the Faculty Senate, which was approved fall semester (2009). Elections of Senators by schools will have to be conducted soon, and Mr. Jaumé reported that it will likely be feasible with our current technology to run
simultaneous elections for different schools. There had been some concerns that it would not be feasible, but such appears not to be the case.

He reported also that the deadline for nominations of Senators is February 1, and that the apportionment of the number of Senators for each school would soon be made available.

New Business

Committee on Nominations and Elections

Committee chair Steven Jaumé said that Joe Kelly’s eligibility to serve as Faculty Speaker and Terence Bowers’ eligibility to serve as Faculty Secretary are up. He announced that nominating period for these offices is open, and that nominations should be sent to him by February 1.

Betsy Baker (at-large) asked about the election of Senators to the new Faculty Senate. Mr. Jaumé replied that the term for all current at-large Senators ends at the end of this semester, and that new at-large Senators would be elected by schools. Claire Curtis (Political Science) then pointed out that departments with more than one Senator would have to get rid of some of their Senators because in the new system each department is limited to one departmental Senator. Mr. Jaumé confirmed that that was correct.

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

Heather Tierney, chair of the committee, introduced the following proposals, which were approved without discussion.

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
Next, it was decided that all the proposals involving the MBA program would be considered as a group.

**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**

Rhonda Mack, Associate Dean of Graduate and Professional Programs in the School of Business, summarized some elements of MBA proposal. She said that it is a one-year accelerated program, which includes summer course work, that it consists of thirty-six credit hours, that most courses are taught in six-week modules, and that there are study abroad and international delivery components in the program.

Next, Julia Eichelberger, chair of the Academic Planning Committee, presented her committee’s report on the proposed MBA program. She said that overall the committee supported the proposed program and thought it was academically rigorous. She noted that the admissions criteria are higher than those for the other MBA program in town and thus likely to draw serious students. The committee also liked the international element of the proposed program and thought the program would be a good fit with the College and its core liberal arts identity in that the program seeks to draw non-business school graduates in addition to students who have majored in business. Ms. Eichelberger also pointed out that the program presents itself as financially self-sustaining or revenue neutral.

Next, Todd McNerney, chair of the Budget Committee, presented his committee’s report. He began by saying that his committee met three times to review the proposal and that their deliberations also included a lot of email correspondence. Overall, the committee approves
the proposed program, but would like to suggest some emendations. He said that in its review the committee appreciated the forthrightness and cooperation of the School of Business. Mr. McNerney then reported on the two major concerns the committee had expressed to the School of Business and the responses it received. First, the committee asked how the MBA program would affect the undergraduate program, especially with respect to space and classroom issues. The response they received was that the Tate Center is under-utilized, and that the large room in the Center, which is now often used for non-academic events, would be the primary space for the program. Also, the new hires who will teach the new courses will also teach undergraduate courses, which will enhance the undergraduate business programs and the College as a whole. The committee’s second major concern involved revenue issues. The committee noted that revenues to fund the program will come from “differential tuition” fees (i.e., the use of different tuition rates for different programs and different groups of students). However, the proposed program would also increase the workload for other staff around the College, perhaps putting some financial burden on other parts of the College. Where does the money come from to help with the added financial burden put on them?

Mr. McNerney then proposed two amendments that addressed the concerns of his committee. The first amendment addressed specifically the space issue, making explicit that the Tate Center will be the primary facility to handle new classroom and office space needs. Mr. McNerney moved that on page 16 of the “Program Proposal,” in the section titled “Physical Plant, the phrase “in the current physical plant” be stricken, and that in its place the words “in the Tate Center” be inserted. The motion passed.

The second amendment sought to address the concern over providing for additional staff support in areas beyond the School of Business. (For example, Mr. McNerney pointed out that the office on campus that helps students obtain visas for study abroad programs will have additional work if the proposed MBA comes into existence and is successful.) Mr. McNerney moved that the following sentence be added on page fifteen of the “Program Proposal” after the penultimate sentence of the first full paragraph (i.e., after the sentence that begins “In the second year”): “The program will, as needed and/or appropriate, also fund staff support to the graduate office and/or the International Studies Office to support the program’s demands upon those offices.”

Ms. Eichelberger remarked that her committee was concerned about library needs. Perhaps there should be language in the proposal that more fully addresses the required funding for this need. Mr. McNerney said that his committee members also wondered about this issue, but in their discussions they concluded that the proposal adequately addressed the funding of library resources.

Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism) expressed surprise at the questions being raised and the kind of scrutiny being applied to the proposal. ‘We’ve had many new M.A. programs brought before the Senate for approval, he said, and we’ve never posed such questions. Mr. McNerney responded that such questions were appropriate in light of the fact that the MBA proposal presents a new model of funding in that all the money generated by tuition and fees stays within the program. This represents a departure from most M.A. proposals we’ve had in
the past. Though the funds generated by the proposed program stay within it, the program will affect staffing issues and resources outside of it.

Brian McGee (Communication) remarked that in past proposals the accounting scheme was consistent with the College’s centralized accounting system, but this proposal is different. Is it our wish, he asked, to comply with the intent of the MBA proposal that all money stay with the program? Is this new program also a harbinger of how future programs will operate? In response, Provost Hynd said that the funding scheme in the proposed MBA program is common at other institutions, especially with programs that are unique or special. However, the financial model to emerge here is yet to be determined. It will be self-sustaining, but exactly how all funds will be used will be up to the deans and upper administration. He added that the conversation about the funding model is important because it is precedent setting, and that it is right for the Senate to scrutinize the academic rigor of proposed programs.

Alan Shao, Dean of the School of Business, said that the Business School won’t put a program forward that would negatively affect other programs. We’ve tried to be innovative, he continued, to find ways that would enhance and strengthen the College and not put stress on other programs and their staff. We need to be innovative so that we don’t get left behind. Mr. McNerney added that a self-funded MBA program potentially frees up resources for other programs, particularly for funding new faculty lines. Amy McCandless (Dean of the Graduate School) next spoke to the issue of differential tuition, pointing out that it is not new. For example, she said that we’ve had it with the Historic Preservation and other graduate programs. It is used as a way of funding graduate scholarships and accords with what we are trying to do at the undergraduate level—find ways to help good, deserving students.

Phil Dustan (Biology) asked what would happen if the program was wildly successful and generated a surplus. Where would the extra funds go? Mr. Hynd replied that such an outcome occurred at an institution where he had worked. Other people outside the program will want a share of the extra funds. Though this can be a problem, it is a good one to have. Mr. Hynd then urged the Senate to focus on the question of whether the proposed MBA is a good program. Mr. Shao responded that when he was at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, the same funding model was implemented. If there is a surplus, it will go to scholarships, travel grants, and so on for business students. But we want, he stressed, to be friends with all departments. He said that at UNC Charlotte the Business School helped fund some travel experiences for students from language departments, and that the Business School here might be able to offer such help to other departments from time to time. This is not just a Business School program we are proposing, but a campus program. He pledged that the Business School would help other departments when it could, and underlined that this is a win-win situation, not a zero-sum game.

Rich Heldrich (at-large) said that he was a big fan of the financial model outlined in the MBA proposal, and urged that it be accepted across the campus.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) spoke in support of the program and its innovative funding model. However, for it to garner widespread support, he suggested that a certain percentage of the revenues generated by the MBA program should go to the College's general fund to support
the College's core liberal arts mission. Since this is the first program using the new financial model, Mr. Phillips thought it was important that we discuss such issues now so that it would be part of future proposals for new programs using the new model. The proposed requirement would be like a tax to support the general good while still encouraging innovation.

At this point, Speaker Kelly reminded the Senate that there was a motion pending (the Budget Committee’s second amendment to the MBA proposal that Mr. McNerney presented), and urged the Senate vote on it. The Senate voted, passing the amendment.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) observed that in MBA proposal adjunct help would be needed four courses. She asked Mr. McNerney if this issue came up in the Budget Committee’s review. Mr. McNerney said that it did, and that the adjunct need was just in the first year. Courses in the first year would be taught by current faculty and some adjuncts. But, Ms. Curtis responded, that it is not in the budget outlined in the MBA proposal. Rohn England (Mathematics), a member of the Budget Committee, said that it is was. The proposal also explains, he continued, how added permanent staffing would arrive after the second year. He stressed that the authors of the proposal were direct about all this. He thought that in the long term the MBA program would enhance the School of Business and the College.

Ms. Eichelberger made a motion to strike a line at the top of page six of the proposal: “Any surplus from the program will be used for faculty development and student scholarships.” The motion received a second. Mr. Shao commented that the CHE really liked the sentence that the amendment would delete. He said that striking the sentence would make the program less attractive, and advised caution in making changes in the document, especially the part dealing with scholarships. Ms. Eichelberger responded that she was not opposed to student scholarships. However, the discussion today has revealed other expenses and needs requiring funds. Moreover, striking the sentence wouldn’t preclude using a surplus for scholarships.

Mr. McGee pointed out that the Senate has yet to talk about the academic dimension of the proposal, but that the discussion so far highlights the anxiety about the funding and revenue protocols proposed and the tendency toward a decentralized funding system. All this leaves one wondering about the future. He noted, too, that many programs are desirable, but not all are profitable. As for the amendment, he was not sure about whether it would matter because the Provost can do what he wants with surpluses.

Bev Diamond (Associate Provost) pointed out that discussions about some of the specifics regarding the allocation of funds for the proposed program are on-going. While the proposed program will be self-sustaining, other funding models exist that might be applied. Part of surpluses from Summer School, for example, is used to pay down debt. So some details about the use of potential funds generated by the program are still unclear and may not all be sorted out before the proposal is sent to CHE. She urged the Senate to focus on the proposal’s academic content and to recognize that some things are still up in the air. Ms. Eichelberger seconded Ms. Diamond’s remarks and praised the administration for the transparency of the development process of the proposal. She said that she was comfortable with the uncertainty regarding some of the program’s financial details.
With regard to the amendment, Larry Krasnoff (at-large) said that he supports it, and that it accords with what the Associate Provost just acknowledged—that things are up in the air. Rohn England (Mathematics) spoke against the amendment, stressing that the commitment to fund scholarships with surpluses is an attractive part of the proposal. He also said that he trusted Academic Affairs to make wise decisions with respect to financial details that remain to be sorted out. Mr. Heldrich (at-large) and Mr. McGee also expressed their confidence in Associate Provost Diamond and Academic Affairs to make good decisions.

The Senate voted, defeating Ms. Eichelberger’s amendment.

Speaking about the academic content of the proposal, Todd Grantham (Philosophy) said that he was unclear about the nature of the study abroad component of the programs. It is required of all students in the program, he noted, but they get no credit for it. Just what do the students do? Ms. Mack responded that students meet with marketing and financial experts, and that they learn to work together as group.

On a different topic, Darryl Phillips (at-large) noted that the Master of Science program in Environmental Studies could be adversely affected by the proposed MBA because a business faculty member regularly teaches a core course for MES. He said he would like to see the same T.A. support offered to the business faculty member who teaches in the MES program as would be given to faculty who teach in the new MBA program.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) said that she had three questions she would like answered. First, she pointed out that the proposal doesn’t speak much about the academic content of the program, and asked why there is no discussion of why there are different tracts and why some courses are core courses. She also wondered why there is no mention of the links between different components of the curriculum, and no mention of the different stages a student experiences in the program (the beginning, middle, and end) and how they form a whole. It is standard for proposals, she said, to address such issues. Second, she wished to know why there are no letters of support from affected departments. Third, she wondered why there is no work experience requirement, which is standard in many MBA programs because they recognize that work the experiences of students enrich the classroom experience.

Bringing up a different concern, Garrett Mitchner (Mathematics) asked why MBAD 516 (Financial Modeling) had no prerequisites in light of the ambitiousness of the syllabus. Heather Tierney (chair of the Committee on Graduate Education) replied that no prerequisites exist because you there will be different students coming to the course with different backgrounds. The “Boot Camp” phase of the program should help students get the foundation needed for the course. Ms. Mack added that all students will have taken FINC 503, which is a finance course, by the time they take MBAD 516.

In response to Ms. Curtis, Ms. Tierney said that the Graduate Committee did receive more explanation about the program—its structure, the sequencing of its component parts, and links between them—in meetings with the authors of the proposal. She said that she takes responsibility for the absence of more documentation attesting to such explanations. And what about the letters of support, asked Ms. Curtis? Ms. Tierney said that chairs of affected
departments were present during her committee’s discussion and expressed their views and their general support for the proposed program. She apologized for the lack of formal letters. Ms. Mack added that the affected departments are those teaching the courses in the program. Each department vetted each part of the proposal.

Mr. Grantham said that he didn’t fully understand the earlier explanation about the study abroad course and would like more detail. He added that it was not clear why the proposed MBA program would be delivered to foreign students in different countries, and why it is supposed to be delivered in only course units consisting of five days of instruction. These ambitious aspects of the course need to be explained, he said, especially in light of the fact that other elements of the program are already ambitious. Dean Shao answered that the international delivery of the MBA program is modeled on what is done at UNC Charlotte, that the five-day course unit in the Charlotte program has been evaluated according to the same standard as other courses and that no drop off has been detected. He added that feedback from students has been positive, and that readings are done in advance before the course begins. Also, although the instruction occurs on two weekends totaling just five days, faculty would be available to students for consultation between weekends. Finally, he said that they are including the international delivery component because it is an important part of the larger whole. Mr. Grantham expressed skepticism about such claims, and thought it was not plausible that a full three-credit course could be properly taught in just five days.

Ms. Eichelberger remarked that her committee (Academic Planning) had the same questions about the international delivery component. She observed that such courses would occur when the undergraduate curriculum is on break (e.g., spring break). If they are poorly planned (for example, if participating faculty don’t prepare to have their undergraduate classes properly covered by colleagues while they are abroad), they could harm the undergraduate curriculum; but such is true of all class practices. Overall, her committee was persuaded that participating students would benefit from the international delivery component of the program.

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies), also expressing skepticism of the international delivery and study abroad components of the program, commented that our students are already too willing to take off early around break time to miss class, and that two weeks was not enough time for a proper study abroad experience. Mr. McGee responded that compressed courses have been tried with success for decades in some of the best MBA programs. This is not an innovative aspect of the proposed curriculum, nor is it an attempt to do something on the cheap, but is consistent with other good MBA programs.

Mr. Krasnoff said that he was not convinced by the explanations of the validity of the two-week courses delivered abroad, remarking that because students give positive feedback on such courses doesn’t mean they are sound. Compressed courses, he pointed out, deprive students of reflective time. Just having the same contact hours as regular courses doesn’t mean that you get the same result. Our Maymester courses, for example, are not like regular courses. As to the directive by administrators that the Senate focus just on academic content, he said that the discussion of financial matters is not just about that: it is also about the mission of the College. It is appropriate, he insisted, that the Senate discuss financial issues.
Mr. Krasnoff then remarked that the proposed MBA is not central to our institution, which is about undergraduate education. With the respect to the international delivery component, he was not happy with the idea that in the middle of the semester faculty would leave campus and their undergraduate courses to go abroad for two weeks to teach foreign students. With respect to the issue that the proposed MBA program is being offered in response to a community need, Mr. Krasnoff observed that most MBA programs that offer a one-year program also offer a two-year program, and that the one-year program is for those who already possess a lot of work experience. This proposal, however, looks like its aimed at our own students, not those with extensive work experience. After expressing more concerns about staffing issues and the academic legitimacy of the five-day study abroad course, he moved to delete the international delivery component from the proposal. The motion received a second.

Darryl Phillips spoke against the proposed amendment. He said that he was pleased with our review process, particularly the committee reports, adding that the committee scrutiny has been rigorous and that there are “tough people” on the committees. As a whole, he thought the MBA program looked good. He urged Senators to trust their faculty committees and vote the amendment down.

Rob Dillon (Biology) called the question on the proposed amendment. His motion was seconded. The Senate approved the motion to call the question.

The Senate voted, defeating Mr. Krasnoff’s amendment.

Mr. Dillon then called the question on the main motion to approve the MBA proposal. After receiving a second, the motion to call the question was passed.

The Senate approved the MBA proposal.

Dean Shao thanked the Senate and faculty committees and said that he was impressed with the process, that the School of Business is part of the campus, and that if it benefits the whole College benefits. We want to be good neighbors, he continued, with the rest of the campus. He assured the Senate that the faculty will be proud of the new program.

Constituents’ Concerns

Phil Dustan (Biology) reported that Major Riley was one of the first majors to give serious consideration to addressing the problem of climate change. His goal is to reduce the city’s greenhouse gases by 7% below 1990 levels by the year 2012. To that end, he has put together a working group to come with a plan for the city to be greener and more sustainable. The plan has been put before the City Council, but the Council wants more time to review it. Mr. Dustan urged Senators to look at the plan, which is posted on the city’s Web site, and said that at the next Senate meeting he would introduce a resolution of support for the green plan. He also announced that he would bring a member of the Charleston Green Committee to answer questions.
Bill Olejniczak (guest) spoke about the quality of coffee in the Maybank Faculty Lounge, which is terrible, and wondered if a better quality of coffee could be provided by the administration. Such a symbolic gesture from the administration would be highly appreciated. Provost Hynd pledged to supply the Maybank Lounge with better coffee.

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) said that she was concerned about the evolution of the Ombudsman’s office and asked others who might also be concerned to contact her. Provost Diamond responded that three ombudsmen have been created—one for faculty, one for staff, and one for students. Ms. Cormack said that it is this division that concerns her. If there is conflict between these areas, it is not clear how the process would work. Ms. Diamond responded that if the process doesn’t work, then we will change it.

With its business concluded, the Senate adjourned at around 6:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by

Terence Bowers
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 8 December 2009

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 8 December 2009, at 5:00 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order. The minutes of the 10 November 2009 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

The Provost

Interim Provost Bev Diamond reported on the status of various program proposals. She said that the Women’s and Gender Studies major, the International Studies major, and the MAT in Middle School Education have been approved by the CHE Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing and will be submitted to the full CHE for approval in early spring. When such approval is received, the College can officially begin to advertise the programs.

Provost Diamond next reported that consideration is being given to the possibility of incorporating the American College of the Building Arts program into the College. Robert Russell, Director of the Program in Historic Preservation, was consulted on the idea of bringing parts of the Building Arts curriculum into the curriculum of his program to form a major in the Building Arts and Historic Preservation. Julia Eichelberger (at-large) asked if the proposed major would include a strong academic curriculum with traditional liberal arts components (history, literature, etc.). The Provost said that it would.

The Provost next reported on recent developments involving the Strategic Plan. She reminded the Senate that at the last meeting she reported that the Planning and Priorities Committee had worked on a detailed three-year implementation plan that was subsequently presented to the Executive Team. From such meetings priorities have been established. With respect to facilities, the build-out of the new science center (completion of the second floor) and three renovations have been targeted: the old science center, the Simmons Center for the Arts, and the Robert Scott Small Building. Provost Diamond pointed out that the Robert Scott Small Building will be converted to classroom space, and that this involves more than putting up a few walls, as HVAC and other elements will have to be installed to do a proper conversion. That project, she added, is important because the administration wants to move students out of the Bell Building and keep students mainly on the south side of Calhoun for their classes. As for new buildings, the highest priority is for the construction of a wellness center, which, the Provost emphasized, is important for students. In addition to facilities, scholarships for students and new faculty lines are high priorities in the Strategic Plan.

At this point the Provost invited questions. Bob Mignone (Mathematics) asked for additional details regarding the plan to incorporate the American College of the Building Arts, and more specifically Tim Carens (English) asked how its students would be integrated into the College, and if it was a liberal arts institution. Provost Diamond replied that it was a liberal arts school, that there are only about forty students or so enrolled there now, and that they would go through the regular admissions process required of all students entering the C of C.
Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked if the proposed wellness center would be a new building or part of a refurbished Stern Center. Provost Diamond said it would probably be a new building, though there is chance it could be housed in a refurbished Wilcox Center, which would be equipped for multiple uses.

Irina Gigova (at-large) asked whether the expansion of the Early Childhood Development Center (ECDC) is part of the Strategic Plan. The Provost responded that it is. Specifically, it is listed as a tier-two priority item in the category of faculty welfare. Speaker Joe Kelly added that there are two plans for ECDC, a short-term one and a long-term one. For the short-term, the plan is to partner with Charleston County Schools to expand child-care services for faculty, students, and staff. The long-term plan is to do an expansion of the ECDC facility, perhaps involving the entire block where ECDC is currently housed.

Brian McGee (Communication) asked whether the absorption of the Building Arts College would be cost neutral. And if not, why would we do it? We would only go through with such a project, the Provost replied, if we as a faculty thought it was worth preserving the traditional building arts, which is central to the Building Arts College’s mission. Speaker Kelly added that the Faculty Senate would have to approve any plan that included the creation of a new program. He said, too, that creating such a program would need to be in line with the College’s larger plan to invest in programs that take advantage of the special features (historical, environmental, cultural) of our region and that have the potential to be nationally preeminent. With those criteria in mind and given the many historic buildings in Charleston, a specialized building arts program might make sense. Provost Diamond added that if the project were to be approved, we would have to give much thought to how the faculty of the Building Arts College would be integrated into the College. Mr. McGee encouraged the administration to inform the Senate about the cost of the project. The Provost said that any developed proposal of the project would come to the faculty for review in the usual way.

Addressing a new topic, the Provost reported that George Hynd, the soon-to-be new Provost, has been involved in learning about the College, and she encouraged all Senators to give him their full support to make his tenure at the College productive and successful.

Todd McNerney (at-large) thought it was appropriate that the Senate publicly thank Ms. Diamond for her fine work as Interim Provost.

Speaker’s Report

Speaker Kelly, on behalf of faculty, expressed thanks to Provost Diamond for her work:

*The job of interim provost is a pretty delicate undertaking, especially if it expands to over one semester, as it did with our current occupant, Dr. Beverly Diamond. On the one hand, there’s the temptation--I’m not saying Bev felt this, but I certainly would have felt the temptation—to exercise your authority, throw around a little weight as the chief academic officer and number two person on campus, while on the other hand there’s the danger of postponing important decisions till after the new provost is hired. An interim provost walks a tightrope, an acrobatic balancing act, and throw...*
into this mix some very crucial months for the College’s strategic plan, and you’ve got a job that would challenge the best of us.

Well, we always knew that Bev had the expertise and the intimate knowledge of the College’s procedures to lead the Academic leviathan. In working closely with her for these past many months, I’ve developed the highest regard for her skills as a leader. Bev can run a meeting, let me tell you. She listens to those who disagree. She’s persuadable, but you better be persuasive, because if you don’t have a good case, she’ll let you know.

For a long time now I’ve been touting the new Priorities and Planning Committee that advises the provost on the Academic Affairs budget. I like to take credit for it, but really it was Bev’s doing as associate provost to institute this new, open, and inclusive budgeting process, and it was her job as interim provost to put it into practice for the first time. This is just one thing. Bev has been putting her stamp of efficiency and professionalism on Academic Affairs since she stepped into the office, and I take great comfort in knowing that she’ll still be there after George Hynd takes over the Southwest corner of Randolph Hall.

Bev, with tremendous respect, great affection, and gratitude, on behalf of the Faculty of the College of Charleston, I thank you for a job well done.

To conclude his report, Speaker Kelly informed the Senate that the MBA proposal would go to the Graduate Council this December and probably be ready for consideration by the Senate at the next meeting in January 2010.

New Business

Committee on Academic Standards

Jason Overby, chair of the committee, introduced a motion to extend the deadline to withdraw from a course. Specifically, the proposal would 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.

Mr. Overby explained that the rationale for the motion is twofold. First, the policy change would put the College in line with our peer institutions. Second, under the current policy, because midterm grades come out after the withdrawal period, students can’t make a fully informed decision about whether to withdraw from a course. Extending the withdrawal period until midterm grades come out would allow students to make better decisions about withdrawing from a course.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked if the presumption behind the proposal was that with more information, fewer students would end up withdrawing from courses. Mr. Overby said it wasn’t clear what the impact would be in terms of overall numbers of withdrawals, but that it was important for students on scholarship to be in a position to make informed decisions about course withdrawals.
Moore Quinn (at-large) asked how the motion, if passed, would affect students who might receive a WA (withdrawal because of absences). Mr. Overby thought there would be no effect.

Rohn England (Mathematics) asked whether the proposed change in the withdrawal date is coordinated with the registration date for Express courses. Debbie Vaughn (guest and Director of Undergraduate Academic Services) said that with the new deadline, it would be too late for students to register for Express courses. That means, Mr. England said, that students would have to take summer courses to make up credit hours for courses from which they had withdrawn in fall and spring. Provost Diamond said that such a scenario may not be inevitable, and that under the proposed policy it might be possible for students to withdraw on the last allowed day and still register for an Express course. She said, too, that this issue was also affected by how many Express courses would be available.

Brian McGee (Communication) supported the motion, stressing the point that the new withdrawal deadline would allow students to get more feedback on performance to help them make good decisions about course withdrawals. He also thought it was good that the policy change would align us with our peer institutions. Phil Dustan (Biology) spoke against the motion, arguing that because others institutions have a different policy is not a good reason for changing our policy. He also questioned whether the proposed extended deadline would lead to students making better or more informed decisions, and observed that students, if given more time, will simply put off making the decisions that should have been made earlier. Betsy Baker (at-large) supported the motion, noting that many students don’t have adequate information about how well they are doing in a course by the time the current withdrawal deadline arrives. Mr. Dustan responded that in such situations it was the responsibility of the faculty to provide feedback by scheduling an exam, requiring a paper, etc.

Mr. England said that he would support the motion as long as there was a path that would allow students to go to an Express course after withdrawing from a regular course. In response, Todd McNerney (at-large) said that he was concerned that marking out such a path might inadvertently encourage students to “jump ship” from regular courses in order to get into what they might perceive as easy Express courses. Bill Manaris (Computer Science) observed that in the Academic Affairs Committee’s explanation of the proposed policy change (on page three of the agenda), it says that the current “drop/add period for Express courses ends three days prior to midterm grade availability.” So there seems to be some confusion, he continued, about whether under the proposed extended withdrawal deadline it would be possible for students to enroll in Express courses after withdrawing from regular courses. Mr. McGee responded that by extending the deadline we aren’t prohibiting students from dropping courses earlier in the semester; we’re just giving them more time to get more information to make better decisions. Further, he argued that the Senate shouldn’t base its vote on whether students can move into Express courses, and that most students don’t take Express courses anyway. He urged the Senate not to link closely the withdrawal date policy to the registration dates for Express courses.

The Senate voted, passing the motion to extend the deadline to withdraw from a course.
Faculty Curriculum Committee

Bob Perkins, chair of the committee, introduced the following proposals, which were approved without discussion:

**Biology**

- Change Course—BIOL 101 Elements of Biology
- Change Course—BIOL 102 Elements of Biology

**Library**

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

**Jewish Studies and English**

- New Course—JWST 245/ENGL 191 Introduction to Jewish-American Literature

**Teacher Education**

- Change Major—TEDU Cognate Major in Physics Secondary Education

Mr. Perkins next introduced the following proposal:

**Women’s and Gender Studies**

- New Course—WGST 356 Conservative Voices in Women’s and Gender Studies

Reid Wiseman (at-large) asked why only conservative voices are being heard/taught in this course. Aren’t there liberal voices too? Alison Piepmeier (guest and Director of the Women’s and Gender Studies Program) replied that there are indeed liberal voices, but that this course focuses on conservative voices. Do you propose a “reciprocal course,” asked Mr. Wiseman. Ms. Piepmeier said that she would welcome such a course, but that the course on conservative women’s voices is the one up for approval now.

The Senate approved the new course proposal.

**General-Education Committee**

Claire Curtis, chair of the committee, introduced the following proposal to change a course to continue General-Education status:

- BIOL101 and BIOL102 Elements of Biology
Garret Mitchner (Mathematics) asked for clarification on what exactly the Senate was voting on, especially in light of Gen-Ed debate two years ago. Ms. Curtis said that any course wishing Gen-Ed status must be submitted to the Gen-Ed Committee; so the Senate is voting on whether BIOL 101 and 102 will satisfy the Gen-Ed science requirement. Also, all courses submitted to the Gen-Ed Committee need to meet the competency table for Gen-Ed that was passed in the Faculty Senate a couple of years ago. These competencies are also now in the College catalog, so Gen-Ed courses must respond to them appropriately; and in fact, the form devised by the Committee requires that those proposing courses seeking Gen-Ed status indicate specifically what competencies are satisfied. Speaker Kelly added that the Gen-Ed Committee’s charge is to vet courses seeking Gen-Ed status. Thus tonight the Senate is being asked to validate or agree with the Committee’s judgment with respect to the proposals on the agenda, and specifically with respect to the proposed changes to BIOL 101 and 102, the Senate is being asked to approve the Committee’s judgment that the sequence continue to satisfy the Gen-Ed science requirement.

Bob Mignone (Mathematics) asked if this meant that any change to an existing Gen-Ed course could put in jeopardy its Gen-Ed status. He was also concerned that after the Gen-Ed debate we were left with nothing but a list of competencies.

Mr. Wiseman asked if the Gen-Ed Committee had considered BIOL 111 and 112 for Gen-Ed status. Ms. Curtis answered that her committee has considered only proposals submitted to it.

Mr. McGee asked if the Senate was just voting on item #2 of the Gen-Ed form, which states that BIOL 101 and 102 satisfies the Gen-Ed two-term sequence in natural science, and if the rest of the form was informational. Ms. Curtis said that was correct.

The Senate approved the proposal that BIOL101 and BIOL102 (“Elements of Biology”) continue to satisfy the Gen-Ed two-term sequence in natural science.

The following two Gen-Ed proposals were approved without discussion:

Proposal to Change a Course to Continue General-Education Status
--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**

Heather Tierney, chair of the committee, introduced the following proposal:

**Public Administration**

Proposal to Change a Graduate Program:
Joint MS in Environmental Studies & Master of Public Administration

Phil Dustan (Biology) asked what the rationale for the proposal was. A member of the audience that there is an overlap between the programs (Environmental Studies and Public Administration), that two universities have already merged them, and that there is a demand for such a joint program. The joint program would allow students to earn two M.A. degrees in three and a half years as opposed to four and a half years, which it currently takes.

The Senate voted, approving the proposal.

The remaining proposals (listed below) were approved without discussion:

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

Constituents' Concerns

No concerns were voiced.

With all business concluded, the Senate adjourned slightly after 6 P. M.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 10 November 2009, at 5:00 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order. The minutes of the October 2009 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

The Provost

Interim Provost Bev Diamond reported on the South Carolina Alignment Project, which is being run by CHE. The aim of the project is to identify gaps between high school and college courses and close them in order to help high school students make the transition to college and be successful. The Provost added that the main gaps are in the areas of math and science.

The Provost next reported on the related issue of retention and Life Scholarships. If students start out poorly and fall below a 3.0 GPA, they lose their Life Scholarships, which makes it difficult for them to afford tuition. Many in such cases leave the College. For some reason, the Provost continued, retention rates are better at Clemson and USC than they are here, even though the SAT scores of our students are almost as high as Clemson’s and higher than USC’s. Forty-five percent of our students keep their Life Scholarships, whereas 80% of Clemson’s students keep theirs. What accounts for our relatively poor retention rates? Math GPA is a strong predictor of student success, and science GPA is also a significant predictor. It could be, she said, that there is something missing in the preparation of our students, and so we need to help students get up to speed in these areas. Bridge programs might be the answer, or taking a summer course, or some kind of supplemental instruction. In all likelihood, the Provost said, a variety of approaches to the problem will be required, and she invited faculty to bring suggestions to the Academic Affairs office.

The Provost next remarked that, in light of Speaker Kelly’s remarks at the last meeting about how faculty are often not informed and have no input into curriculum proposals going to CHE, she wished to update the Faculty Senate on such proposals that are now in the pipeline and to say that there has been faculty input in that the Provost and the Faculty Curriculum Committee looked at proposals before they go to CHE. She said that there are three proposals being developed: (1) a B.A. in dance (there is currently no dance program in the Lowcountry); (2) a program called “Computing in the Arts,” which would be a joint arts and computer science program; and (3) a proposal for an MBA, which is common in schools like ours and something President Benson wants.

The Provost next reported on recent developments in the plan to purchase McLeod Plantation. She said that she recently met together a group of faculty members to discuss possible academic uses of the site. There is also the Institutional Development Office, which is creating a scheme for facilities, and which needs to sign off on uses for the site and plan for them. To do this, a facilities needs list had to be put together quickly. The Provost said that a good concise list was constructed with help of faculty and that the items on it are...
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Spector Kelly said that he would forego his report to ensure that the Senate would have time to work through all items on the agenda.

Unfinished Business

Faclity Curriculum Committee

Spector Kelly reminded the Senate that in the interest of conducting business efficiently new curricular proposals (submitted for this month's meeting) have been combined with the curricular proposals from last month's meeting, which the Senate did not have time to deal with in the meeting.

Bob Perkins, chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, informed the Senate that the following proposals had been withdrawn from the agenda:

- Biology
  - Change Course—BIO L 101
  - Change Course—BIO L 102

The first of the Classics proposals was passed without discussion. Laquita Blockson (Management and Entrepreneurship), noting the second item (New Course—CLAS 105: History of the Classical World) was also listed later in the agenda as a Gen-Ed proposal, asked about this duplication, and what it meant to approve the course now and have it come again under Gen-Ed proposals. Claire Curtis (Political Science and chair of the Gen-Ed Committee) said that there are two separate decisions involved— the first pertains to whether the new course should be part of the college curriculum, the second to whether it should count toward satisfying the Gen-Ed pre-modern history requirement. Mr. Perkins added that it was possible that CLAS 105 could be approved as a new course, but that it not be approved as satisfying the Gen-Ed history requirement. The Senate then voted, approving CLAS 105 as a new course.
A part from a question about the title of the new course proposed by the English Department, all the remaining proposals on the agenda were approved. They are listed below:

- 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—LA CS B.A.
- 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
- Change Course—PSYC 214
- Change Course—PSYC 464
- Delete Course—PSYC 342
- Delete Course—PSYC 384
- Teacher Education New Course—TED U 205 Exploring Leadership: Building Peer Facilitation Skills

All the graduate curricular proposals were approved without discussion. The complete list follows below:

- Main English Change Program
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
WHEREAS 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; and
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.

Ms. Curtis then asked for unanimous consent to insert the word “Executive” in front of “Vice President” in the last paragraph. Unanimous consent was given. Ms. Curtis briefly explained the history of the resolution and pointed to the rationale for changing the name of the Teacher-Scholar Award, stressing that the late Bill Moore fully embodied and lived up to the teacher-scholar ideal.

Ms. Curtis then moved that the Senate endorse the resolution. Julia Eichberger (English) seconded the motion. The Senate voted, endorseing the resolution.

Motion to change the size and composition of the Faculty Senate
Speaker Kelly reminded the Senate of the amendment to the motion that was pending from the prior meeting. The amendment sought to add a sentence at the end of the proposed new language for Article IV, Section 2 of the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM), as follows (note: the underlined words represent the language proposed in the main motion, the words in red ink represent the pending amendment to the motion, and the word in green ink and the struck word in red ink represent changes to the proposed amendment that were approved by unanimous consent):

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, with the remainder of a school’s senators elected at-large by the faculty in that school. If a school should have more departments than it’s apportionment of appointed senators, then all of that school’s senators shall be elected at-large by the faculty in that school.
Rob Dillon (Biology) recalled that in a previous meeting there were ambiguities in the original document, and asked if those ambiguities had been resolved. Mr. Jaume said that a key one was the one the proposal dealt with. Others still remain, such as the problem of running multiple elections at the same time or running them sequentially within the time period specified by the FAM.

The Senate passed Mr. Krassoff’s amendment.

Discussion on the main motion to change the size of the Senate resumed. Darryl Phillips (at-large) said that he liked some of the ideas in the motion. For example, he thought that the move to a smaller Senate was a good idea, especially given the current problem of finding enough faculty to serve as at-large Senators. He thought, however, a Senate of fifty-one would be better than a Senate of fifty, as it is better to have an legislative body made of odd numbers to avoid the problem of tied votes. He also did not like the shift to at-large Senators representing schools (rather than the whole college), as it would likely create certain problems. For instance, the fixed ratio of Senators based on percentage of faculty in schools could very well result in voting blocks, which, he said, does not exist now. Having at-large Senators represent schools is also problematic because the College has a history of deans trying to influence Senators on how to vote. Such an attitude would only increase if the proposal in its current form were approved. Still more importantly, the move to at-large Senators ends the valued tradition of at-large Senators representing the College as a whole. Mr. Phillips continued, saying that he did find the rationale for the change, which is that the College has become so large that faculty don’t know other faculty outside of their respective schools. Such a problem could be fixed by changing the way in which at-large Senators are elected. Candidates could state their views on various issues so that other faculty could learn about them and their positions on issues.

Given these concerns, Mr. Phillips moved that the proposal be sent back to the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance with the charge of looking at the idea of changing the Senate size from fifty to fifty-one, and with the charge of changing the voting methods so that at-large Senators could be elected across schools. Reed Wiseman (at-large) seconded the motion.

Michael Phillips (at-large) spoke in support of Darryl Phillips’ motion. He thought that a school-based voting system would tend to diminish participation in both voting and faculty governance. Frank Cossa (Theatre) also spoke in favor of the motion, but pointed out that there was still no agreement about the issue of reducing the size of the Senate. We haven’t agreed on the appropriate size of the Senate, he said.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) spoke against Mr. Phillips’ motion, arguing that the Senate has not yet really had a chance to debate the original proposal yet. We don’t want to get into the routine of throwing the proposal back to the committee and having it come back to the Senate again and again. She thought the motion was premature. Kelly Shaver (a member of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance) thought it was not a good idea to send the proposal back to committee with an exact outcome in mind. If you already know what you want, there is no point in sending the proposal back to the committee. Brian McGee
Communication also opposed the motion, arguing that there have been months of work done by the committee on the proposal, and that the Senate should consider it and vote on it. He added that there are already voting blocks in the Senate, and did not think that Darrell Phillips' motion would break them up; in fact, he surmised, it might promote them. As for the argument that deals will pressure at-large Senators to vote a certain way, he pointed out that chairs have much more power to pressure their department representatives than deans have to pressure at-large representatives, but no one is calling for the end of departmental Senators because of the pressure that chairs might exert on them.

Darrell Phillips wished to clarify the intent of his motion. It was not to cut off debate on the proposal, but to shape the debate and give it direction and to avoid an unfocused "free-for-all." The ad hoc Committee can consider the idea of a fifty-one seat Senate and work out the particulars of the other charge. Charging the committee with these tasks allows the Senate to avoid spending hours and hours on details, freeing it to focus on larger problems. In this respect, his motion seeks to carry out Speaker Kelly's directive stated in the last meeting that the Senate should concentrate on big-picture issues and not get bogged down in minutiae.

Mr. Migone spoke against Mr. Phillips' motion. First, he pointed out that the proposal that the Senate should consist of an odd number of representatives addressed a non-issue, as Senate meetings are rarely attended by all Senators. On any given meeting, whether we have a fifty-seat Senate or a fifty-one seat Senate, there would be equal chances of an odd number of Senators attending as there would be an even number. Second, while he appreciates the desire that at-large Senators represent the whole school, he pointed out that most at-large Senators come from the two large schools and in that respect voting blocks along school lines already exist.

Mr. Krasnoff added that at-large Senators elected by school helps redress the loss of representation by large departments in the proposed scheme. He reminded the Senate that the big idea his committee took back from the initial discussion of the proposal in the Senate was that of retaining some form of departmental representation. But by going to the one-representative-for-each-department plan, big departments lose some representation. The practice of electing at-large Senators by school helps restore some of that lost representation and to preserve a sense that the voice of large departments matter. The idea here is that faculty from larger departments are more likely to be elected school-wide, rather than college-wide elections.

Mr. McGee, speaking in support of the main proposal, observed that in the future eventually one hundred lines will be added to the College, and given such growth it was unlikely that the faculty would be able to know other faculty in other schools in a meaningful way. He then called the question on Darrell Phillips' proposal. The motion to call the question passed. The Senate voted on Darrell Phillips' proposal, which failed.

Debate on the main motion resumed. Deanna Caveyn (guest) noted that the proposal provides an incentive for schools to have more departments, but observed, too, that the apportionment by number of faculty in schools with respect to the College as a whole was an accounting...
force. Jim NeWhaRD (Classics) remarked that the aim of getting more Senators in the Faculty Senate was an unlikely motive for Schools to create more departments. Mr. KrasNOFF noted that the proposed method of apportionment protects schools with few departments.

Speaking to a different issue, Irina GIGOVa (at-large) said she would like to know how Senators feel about term limits, which some faculty have mentioned as a policy that would facilitate more participation in the Senate. Julia EICHBERGER (at-large) said that there are already term limits now: a Senator can only serve two consecutive two-year terms and then must rotate off. Rick Heldrich (at-large) remarked that "the same folks are always driving the bus." It would be better to require a large gap—of, say, four years—between the time a Senator must rotate off the Senate and the time he or she is eligible to return.

Mr. McGEE remarked that he considered the proposal to be a polished document. Though it does not perfectly accord with his ideal model of the Senate, he thought it was an elegant compromise of competing views, as evidenced by the various people keeping arguing opposing sides of various aspects of the proposal. He then called the question on the main motion. The Senate passed the motion to call the question.

The Senate then voted on the motion to change the size and composition of the Faculty Senate, which passed.

New Business

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

Susan FAReLL, chair of the committee, introduced the first of three motions. The first motion sought to clarify language in the FAM concerning tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The proposal was approved without discussion. The text of the motion is provided below:

Clarity 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 performances or exhibits in the arts).

Proposed New 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 performances 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.

Ms. Farrall introduced the second motion, which sought to clarify the language concerning the service standard for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The full text of the motion is as follows:

**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 a relevant larger community (or both) as fulfilling the service requirement for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The revision reflects this practice. In addition, the new language clarifies that service must be done in a candidate’s professional role and that the community does not mean simply the local Charleston community, but can also refer to larger communities, which may include professional organizations.

Mr. Krasnow said that he was concerned about the use of “or” in the motion (service to the College “or” to a relevant larger community). Do we want to promote someone who has done no service to the College? It seems that some service to the College should be required. Phil Dustin (Biology) supported the suggestion that some sort of College service should be required. Ms. Farrall replied that the intent was to clarify the confusing language in the FAM. And as to the issue of service to the College, Ms. Farrall said that for tenure the key factor is research. At the next level—promotion to Professor—service to the College is expected and required.

The Senate passed the motion.
Ms. Farr ell introduced the third motion, which sought to clarify the language concerning the service standard for promotion to Professor. The motion was passed without discussion. The full text of the motion appears below:

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.

General-Education Committee

Claire Curtis, chair of the committee, commented that the proposal on the agenda is the first one from the committee this year, and that the committee is working on developing appropriate forms for various types of proposals. Ms. Curtis next introduced the following proposal:

Proposal for New Course Requesting General Education Status

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

Ms. Curtis reminded the Senate that it had already approved the course for the general curriculum. Now the committee seeks that the Senate approve the course, which now can count as satisfying the Gen Ed humanities requirement, to count as satisfying the Gen Ed pre-modern history requirement.

Ms. Blocks asked what the complementary modern history requirement would be. Ms. Curtis replied that there is not an exact corresponding course that pairs with it. There are multiple courses that could satisfy the modern history requirement. Another Senator asked if...
The course would count both toward the pre-modern history requirement and the humanities requirement. You can count it as one or the other, but not both, responded Ms. Curtis.

The Senate then voted, passing the proposal.

Constituents’ Concerns

Jaap Hillenius (at-large) brought to the Senate’s attention a document on background checks that some faculty are required to fill out. He pointed out that the categories listed in the document are so broad that they could apply to anyone: it would apply to faculty, if they have a class outside of campus, if they handle chemicals (coffee, Mr. Hillenius pointed out, could qualify as chemicals), or if they have access to a room where money is kept (a room with a candy machine, he said, would apply to this category). Mr. Hillenius stressed that the document was clumsy and ill-written, and wondered whether the Faculty Welfare Committee could look into the issue.

Speaker Kelly responded that he had spoken about the problem to Provost Diamond, who in turn remarked that the document mentioned by Mr. Hillenius was indeed broadly written and in need of re-examination. Associate Provost Casey said that she had spoken to Mr. Casey about the document and stressed that it does not constitute an attempt to do background checks on faculty. Speaker Kelly also mentioned that the document applies to new hires only, and that he and the appropriate committee would follow up on the issue.

James Williams (Library) reminded the Senate that the College is looking into acquiring a new Learning Management System (LMS), and urged faculty to provide feedback on the proposed systems. He suggested that faculty contact their Information Technology liaison about the matter. Ms. Blocksom asked what the timetable was, and Mr. Williams replied that a review of the various systems would begin this upcoming Friday.

Lynn Cherry (guest) urged the faculty to attend the December Commencement ceremony, stressing that it is very important to the graduating students. Mr. Mignon asked if the ceremony would be in the new arena, and Ms. Cherry replied that it would be.

An motion to adjourn was next made, seconded, and passed. The Senate adjourned at around 6:20 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 6 October 2009

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 6 October 2009, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order. The minutes of the September 15, 2009 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

The Provost

Interim Provost Bev Diamond reported on the recent announcement of the College’s plan to purchase McLeod Plantation. She said that last February Provost Elise Jorgens was asked to assemble a group of faculty, which included faculty from the Archeology Program, Historic Preservation, the Avery Institute, and other departments, to think about possible uses for the plantation. Altogether about twenty faculty were eventually involved in discussions, which were to be kept confidential because of the nature of the purchase process. She added that some of those faculty have been enthusiastic about the possible purchase, while others have been more cautious. She said that the College would set up a Web page devoted to the plantation and that discussion of possible uses for the plantation would continue during the due-diligence process. The Provost invited faculty to contribute to that discussion.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked what the time frame was for the due-diligence and purchase process. Provost Diamond responded that it consisted of a ninety-day period, and that the next month and a half constituted the crucial period. Julia Eichelberger (at-large) asked the Provost if she could comment on the easements and restrictions pertaining to the property. Ms. Diamond replied that there is a map that indicates some restrictions, and that she would ask the College’s legal counsel to get more information on this. Ms. Eichelberger added that the historic aspect of such properties depend on certain things being preserved. Provost Diamond agreed, saying that was an important point. She added that faculty involved in developing a use plan recently visited the site and will do so again next week. Tours can also be arranged for future faculty tours.

Rich Heldrich (Chemistry & Biochemistry) asked what the maintenance costs would be. Provost Diamond said that to stabilize the property a lot of maintenance is needed. Robert Russell (Art History) said that the immediate costs would be significant, but that there will be some long-term costs as well. “It will be,” he added, “a purchase that keeps on taking.” The Provost said that currently she doesn’t have a firm estimate for maintenance costs. Following up, Mr. Heldrich pointed out that Alumni Hall needs work, and that the new science building needs to be completed. “When do we finish a job,” he asked, “before we start a new one?”

Rohn England (Mathematics) asked if there were external funding possibilities. The Provost answered that efforts would be made to search for donors and other support, and that the chances of finding donors were good.

Phil Dustan (Biology) asked how the McLeod purchase would affect the Dixie Plantation project. The Provost responded that Dixie Plantation is a long-range project, while McLeod is
a mid-range one, which programs in Historic Preservation and the sciences can start using soon. What about building trails, Mr. Dustan asked? That is being planned, replied the Provost. Mr. Dustan next requested that the planners contact the Biology Department before work is undertaken. He noted that in a recent visit to Dixie he discovered that many acres of trees had been cut down without any consultation with his department. Steven Jaumé (Geology) said that the Geology Department also uses Dixie for some of its programs, and that no one has bothered to consult his department about its uses and development plans. Mr. Dustan next asked which entity would operate McLeod—the College or the Foundation? The College, the Provost responded. Then that is different from Dixie, said Mr. Dustan. It was the Foundation, he continued, that made the decision to cut down the trees at Dixie. Provost Diamond said that she had not heard that the Foundation had a leading management role at Dixie, but she would be happy to gather more information to clarify who will manage the McLeod site and what the management plan is.

Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism) asked what the endowment level of the Foundation was. After Speaker Kelly said that it was twenty-five million dollars, Mr. Litvin surmised that over ten percent of the endowment would go toward the purchase of McLeod. Not exactly, responded the Provost. One million dollars will be put up front for McLeod; efforts will then be made to raise the rest of the money.

Next, Bob Mignone (Mathematics) asked about transportation to McLeod and whether students would be able to bike there. Provost Diamond said that there have been discussions about how to provide transportation for students and faculty.

The Provost next reported on the new Modification of Duties Policy, which her office has been working on for about a year. She reminded the Senate that last year the Faculty Welfare Committee asked the Senate to endorse a policy modeled on the University of South Carolina’s policy. She said that she has had conversations with the Provosts at USC in Columbia and Aiken, and from those conversations she discovered that in terms of the implementation process, our policy works similarly to theirs, especially with respect to the notion that faculty on leave were still expected to work full time.

The Provost then displayed a chart showing the various policies. She noted that one big difference from the old policy to the new one is that primary caregivers on leave could do off-site duties if requested. Such was not possible in the old policy, if the modified duties semester came two months after the birth of the child. She also observed that in some respects the new policy is not as good as the old policy. For secondary caregivers, for example, the new policy is more restrictive. Secondary caregivers cannot modify their duties to the extent that primary caregivers can. However, other changes are more generous. For example, the modified duties period can now straddle two semesters, whereas before it had to fall within one semester.

In the case of the birth of a child, the modified duties period begins after the faculty member finishes sick leave, during which time that faculty member has no work obligations.
Mr. Dustan asked whether by law we may only earn six months of sick leave, which he thought was restrictive. Provost Diamond said that we have not been in situations where faculty needed more than six months of sick leave. If one needed that much time, then one would have to go into disability leave or consider retirement.

Tracy Burkett (Sociology/Anthropology) asked about situations where one has a child in June when one is not under contract. The Provost said that one could use the Modified Duties Policy in the fall. If the sick leave period falls when the person is not on contract, then the person is not required to use sick leave.

The Provost then highlighted the issue of taking care of sick parents. In such cases, the Modified Duties Policy would probably not be the appropriate solution. Faculty, in such circumstances, would need to work with chairs and deans.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) said that she was concerned about the differences in the kinds of modified duties available to faculty and in different interpretations of which solution is most appropriate. You might, for example, have a situation in which a faculty member is negotiating with a chair over how to apply the policy, but they have different readings of the faculty member’s situation. What happens then? The Provost answered that the complaint about the old policy was that it was too complicated. The new one is also complicated. All we can do is make the criteria for the denial of a request clear. The Provost said that she welcomed feedback on this issue.

Speaker Kelly then asked whether the new policy has officially been approved. It is approved, responded the Provost, but her office has not quite decided on how formally to roll out the new policy.

The Speaker

Speaker Joe Kelly said that the next issue of his newsletter would soon appear, and that he would use that medium for much of his report. Tonight he wished to address the issue of apathy and cynicism concerning shared governance, which was raised by Irina Gigova in her letter circulated on one of the campus listservs. Here Speaker Kelly delivered a prepared statement, which is provided in full below.

I’d like to address the issue that Irina Gigova brought up recently on OpenDiscussion. For those of you who didn’t see it, Irina likened the atmosphere of the president’s recent “Town Hall” style meeting to those terrible classroom sessions when the students are listless, unwilling to discuss the text, unwilling to engage. (In this case, it was the faculty who were unwilling to engage with those on stage: the senior staff and the president.) According to Irina, after the meeting “some colleagues offered an explanation - they have been through many administrations, strategic plans and meeting and yet things never changed, at least not for the better. Provosts and Presidents and everyone else ignored their opinions and recommendations. So why talk? Why get engaged? Why waste time on what is not more than a charade of dialogue and cooperation between administration and faculty?”
I’ve heard similar complaints from a number of different people, and no one seems to contradict that there’s a mood of cynicism on campus that transcends the friction that must naturally occur between faculty and administrators. Sure there will be friction between faculty and administrators. That is natural in any organization our size. But things seem to have spiraled to the point that we’re headed towards an “us v. them” attitude, a situation in which we do not feel trusted, nor do we trust. I’ve talked with Dr. Benson about this, and he too senses from the faculty the atmospheric condition on campus that Irina described, and he’s frustrated by it too.

Various people will give various reasons for it, will lay the blame for it at the feet of different people, and each one of us can point to a half dozen instances in which we are absolutely sure who is at fault and who is not. I’ve heard administrators blame the faculty, and I’ve heard faculty blame the administration. I don’t really want to get into that sort of tally sheet, because I think it gives us a false sense of the root cause. I know the faculty side of things, and I know we are dedicated to our students, dedicated to the success of this institution, and largely unselfish in our judgments about what are the right and the wrong policies to enact. If there is an uncooperative atmosphere, we are not the cause.

But I’ve also had the privilege of working fairly closely with the senior administrators, of course with the leaders in Academic Affairs like Provost Diamond but also with Legal Affairs, Student Affairs, Business, and External Affairs, and I know each of these executive vice presidents to be courteous people of genuine good will who are dedicated to the success of the institution. Even if we disagree on the definition of success or the means to success, we might grant that they are working hard to improve the College. In my view, none of these people are the cause of the problem either.

The reason I’m speaking of this now is because I think it bears on the work we in the Senate have before us this year and have before us today. I think the root of the problem is not any particular person. It is not because so-and-so is in this office now, or so-and-so is in that office. The cause is systemic: it comes out of a culture in which faculty have, traditionally, exercised very little influence on the major, strategic decisions of the College.

In normal times such a culture can be almost comical in a Dilbert sort of way. But we’re not in normal times. Changes are coming—in our relation to the State of South Carolina, in our relation to our students, in the shape of the campus, change in dozens of ways. And when the College is in a state of change, our lack of influence isn’t something that we can chuckle over. It is scary, because what we think the College is all about, who we are, and where we think we’ve been going for the last twenty years might suddenly change also.

Take our Budget Committee, which I think illustrates the problem very well. Often uninformed about the budget process, let alone the budget, it has never been more than a voice box, as if we are standing outside the castle shouting over the walls what we think ought to be done about this and that. Does anyone on the other side of the high wall even hear us? We don’t know. We don’t even know the names of the people we’re shouting to. Who writes the budget? Who decides what goes into it and what doesn’t? We can’t see over the wall. We haven’t seen anyone make those decisions; often, we don’t know decisions are being made
until after the fact. Other than the curriculum and T&P, this is how the faculty has tended to participate in the governance of the College. We have an Assessment Committee: yet what role does it play in SACS accreditation? We have an Academic Planning committee, yet it often hears about new programs after CHE up in Columbia has heard about them. We have an Educational Technology committee, yet it has nothing to do with the allocation of IT dollars. What’s the point of an Educational Technology Committee if it has no say in the millions of dollars we spend on technology each year?

The problem, as I see it, comes down to the difference between faculty governance and shared governance. We’ve been operating with faculty governance for a long time. What this means is that our committees are almost exclusively populated by faculty, and we meet and discuss, but the only power we have is to hurl our opinions over the wall of the castle and hope we hit something on the other side.

It’s frustrating whenever our opinions are not properly attended to. But it can be seductive too, because, while we don’t have much of a say in many of the substantive decisions at the College, we don’t have to bear the consequences of our opinions either. We operate sort of like the loyal opposition, quiescent on the policies we don’t have much problem with, loud on those we don’t like, but never exercising much real responsibility for anything other than the curriculum.

In practice, this is what faculty governance is. We run our committees and we run the Senate, but neither has much say in the decisions of the College.

Obviously, this has got to change, or the us v. them attitude will spiral down even further, dragging morale and our own job satisfaction and our students’ prospects and the College’s health down with it. I applaud Irina’s resistance to this cynicism, but, like her senior colleagues, I think that if we do not change the system, we will perpetuate this attitude.

I am glad of Dr. Benson’s attempts to listen to faculty—for example, in speaking to the Senate at our last meeting, at holding Town Hall sessions, in consulting with faculty about the provost search, etc. (By the way, I very strongly encourage everyone to attend one of the two sessions with George Hynd next Wednesday on the 14th and to convey your reasoned opinions to Dr. Benson. He has promised me that he will make himself available for faculty to drop into Randolph Hall and speak to him directly.)

But meaningful change will only come when we change the way faculty interacts with the administration. We and the administration have to become partners, not rival parties, one permanently in power and the other permanently in loyal opposition.

Already that change has come in the budget process for Academic Affairs. I’ve spoken of this before, and I’ll mention it again as a model for how the College should proceed. Two weeks ago, at the last meeting of the Planning and Priorities Committee faculty and administrators together discussed the allocation of four new lines coming from QEP funds (these are the funds budgeted to support the First Year Experience). Which schools should get those lines? It’s an important question, and to my knowledge never before has the Senate’s Budget and
Academic Planning committees been represented at such discussions. In the coming months, this committee will help “operationalize” large parts of the Strategic Plan, recommending budget items for the initiatives that the Plan proposes.

I think the Planning and Priorities Committee is a model for shared governance. In the coming months, the ad hoc committee on faculty governance is going to propose changes in our committee structure that try to bring this kind of genuine faculty influence into the decisions of the College, to move from faculty governance to shared governance.

We know change is coming to the College. What should come first? An expansion of ECDC or a new building for the School of Humanities and Social Sciences or the renovation of Galliard Auditorium? These are the kinds of questions that we, the Senate, the faculty leaders should be helping to answer. These are the questions we should be debating on the floor of the Senate: issues of strategic importance.

Strategic decisions. Finally, by circuitous route, this brings me to the motions before the Senate today. At our last meeting, we spent the better part of an hour debating the details of a new student course evaluation form. That is about 70-senator hours devoted to word-smithing the form. That is not very efficient. Or calculate it this way: this whole school year, the Senate will meet for approximately 18 hours, and we spent one of those hours working out the details of the evaluation form. And we are not through with it yet. Meanwhile, the College is planning to spend $4 million on McLeod Plantation, and there is little mechanism in our system of government for the Senate to participate in that decision, other than to approve it after the fact through silence or to protest it by resolution.

It is not that the student evaluation form is not important. Obviously, it is very important. But we should have handled it differently. That is my fault. What I should have done is asked the subcommittee to publish the form and, after a decent interval, hold a public hearing, during which the points brought up at our last meeting by Claire Curtis, Darryl Phillips, Dana Cope, and others could have been aired and accommodated, so that when the Senate finally considered the form for approval, these problems would have already been ironed out. If more problems were found, the Senate could send the motion back to committee and trust the committee to do the work. We cannot distract ourselves with word-smithing every motion that comes before us. Anyone involved in the Gen Ed debates two years ago knows this: and it was a hard lesson for me to learn. I should never have proposed the parliamentary procedure we used in that debate. We got bogged down in detail, and, as result, it took something like 40 hours of Senate debate to produce the Gen Ed committee.

What I’m arguing for is a sea-change in Senate culture. The Senate is not used to being a strategic body; it is entirely tactical.

As you’ll see in a minute, I’m trying to make up for this mistake, at least in the case of the student evaluation form. I’ve asked the provost to appoint Dana Cope and Claire Curtis to the subcommittee that brought the motion, so they can help address some of the problems about formatting and the reporting of data that they brought up at the last meeting, and Dr. Diamond readily agreed. This subcommittee is another example of shared governance:
faculty leaders working with the heads of Institutional Research and Accreditation, Accountability, Planning, and Assessment. I hope that the Senate will, in due course tonight, approve the new form and charge this subcommittee to work out the finer details.

There is too much at stake in the coming years for the Senate to occupy its time in minutiae. The Strategic Plan, which probably will be approved by the Board of Trustees next week, is going to propose well over a hundred “strategies” for improving the College, from establishing residential colleges to cutting our adjunct dependency in half to constructing six new large buildings. The Senate must be ready to participate in the big decisions that confront the College, and it must not get distracted by the details. This requires a cultural shift.

The other motion that we will debate tonight attempts to begin this cultural shift. It is the reduction of the Senate from an unspecified number of members to the fixed number of 50, to be apportioned by department and proportionally according to school. From what I’ve heard, the most controversial aspect of this proposal is the age-old problem of representative governments: to balance the will of the majority with protections for minorities. It is a difficult problem, but I trust the good will in this room will come to some equitable solution. Big departments and schools, and small departments and schools will look beyond self-interest and hammer out a compromise for the good of the College. Whatever is that solution, whether it is the motion as brought by the ad hoc committee and amended by by-laws, or whether it is some version modified here on the floor of the Senate, I urge you to find that solution. I am convinced that we need a smaller Senate if we are to share in the governance of the College, and function less as the loyal opposition.

I won’t go into the reasons why I think the Senate needs to be smaller if it is to act strategically, other than to offer a couple of points. One is that we must begin to think of the Senate as a very significant service commitment. Attendance should be expected and demanded by the various constituents. I think our high absentee rate is a fair barometer of how important the Senate is regarded today. It does not have much power; one’s participation in its proceedings does not much influence the College one way or the other. This has got to change.

And if we are to demand much more of our Senators, I think we need to reduce its numbers. We cannot ask a fifth or a quarter of all faculty at the College to make such a service commitment each year.

Similarly, there is the issue of inertia. The larger the deliberative body, the more difficult it is to make a decision. I think this is a direct, proportional relation. Now for someone who likes the status quo, a big Senate is a virtue: it makes it harder to effect change. But today, I do not think anyone has the luxury of protecting the status quo. Big decisions are going to be made in the next two or three years. Our choice is this: are we going to participate, or are we going to stay on the sidelines? The larger the Senate, the harder it will be to participate. We’ve got to balance this need for decisiveness with the need for representation, and find the right size. But I don’t think 70+ senators and growing can ever strike that balance.
I am not allowed to participate in the debate, so long as I preside over this meeting. But I can go so far as to urge you to find a way to balance these interests. I fear that the status quo will lead to continued frustration and cynicism: we faculty will be masters of our own domain (so to speak), but someone else will be running the College.

Unfinished Business

Having finished his statement, the Speaker asked the Senate to alter the agenda slightly. He asked that the Senate move to Unfinished Business, take up the motion to adopt the new Instructor/Course Evaluation Form, and then allow the two remaining reports from the Nominations and Elections Committee and the By-Laws and FAM Committee to be presented, as their reports pertained directly to the second item under Unfinished Business (the motion to change the size and composition of the Faculty Senate).

Motion to Adopt a New Instructor/Course Evaluation Form

Hugh Wilder—representative of the sub-committee of the ad hoc Committee on Developing and Evaluating Teaching that was charged to review the Instructor/Course Evaluation Form—said that if the new form is adopted, it would be used for a two-year trial period starting in fall 2010. He reported, too, that if the form is approved, the sub-committee will be expanded and its charge extended. It will work on layout and format issues, and examine how results will be reported, including whether central tendency will be based on means or medians.

David Gentry (at-large) asked if the form would return to the Senate for a vote after the two-year period. Mr. Wilder said that it would.

Larry Krasnoff (at-large) said that he thought the proposed new form was good, and that it gives us more information and should be approved. However, he wished to propose a change in item #11: specifically, he moved to change the wording from “The instructor communicated enthusiasm about teaching” to “The instructor showed enthusiasm for teaching the subject.” The motion received a second. Mr. Krasnoff thought that the word “communicated” (used in the original phrasing) was not the best choice, and that the question should focus not just on teaching, but on what the professor teaches, the content area. He thought his wording asked basically the same thing as the original, but did it in a better way. Godwin Uwah (guest) thought that the original wording was fine as it strongly implied enthusiasm for the subject being taught. Teaching, he continued, necessarily entails teaching something. To be enthusiastic in teaching thus involves being enthusiastic about the subject. The Senate passed Mr. Krasnoff’s amendment.

Tim Carens (English) thought that the last part of item #12—“The instructor showed interest in the students as individuals”—was a bit odd in that it seemed to go beyond the job of the faculty. He therefore moved to delete the last two words (“as individuals”) of the statement. The motion received a second.
Evan Parry (Theatre) said that he could see why the statement with the last two words might be considered problematic. However, he thought it addressed an important distinction between taking an interest in the students of the class as a collectivity and taking an interest in them as individual learners. Kristin Krantzman (Biochemistry/Chemistry) supported the motion, arguing that students often expect too much interest in them as individuals, which gets interpreted as, for example, expecting their professors to respond to 2 A.M email messages and helping with all manner of personal, non-academic matters. John Huddleston (Religious Studies) thought that the proposed change in wording didn’t really change the question, that both essentially said the same thing. Mr. Uwah, speaking against the amendment, argued that it was important to see students as individuals and not as numbers. Students remember professors by whether the professors showed an interest in them as unique persons. Irina Gigova (at-large) noted that if we are talking about individualized education, then the original wording is needed.

Jeffrey Diamond (History) spoke in support of the amendment, arguing (1) that the original wording of the statement implied a bias against large classes in which it might be difficult for professors to know all their students individually; and (2) that the original was too vague in that it could be construed as suggesting that the professor should indeed have to know about and try to take care of every little personal problem a student might have. Harland Hodges (Management & Entrepreneurship) agreed, saying that in a class of 160 students there is no way a professor can know all students as individuals.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) remarked that perhaps the question should be focused on learning and development so as to avoid the problem of whether a student expects the professor to care about the fact that “the student’s dog had a bad day.” He asked for unanimous consent that the wording be changed to say, “The instructor showed interest in the learning and development of students.” Reid Wiseman said that the proposal seemed to repeat item #8. Unanimous consent was not granted.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) supported Mr. Carens’ amendment and remarked that it changed the meaning of the question appropriately. By eliminating the words “as individuals,” students are forced to interpret the question more narrowly making it more likely that students not interpret it as including all kinds of non-academic personal issues.

At this point, Mr. Dustan called the question, which received a second. The motion to call the question passed. The Senate passed Mr. Carens’ amendment.

Darryl Phillips moved that item #12 be changed from “The instructor showed interest in students” to “The instructor showed interest in the learning and development of students.” The motion received a second.

Kelly Shaver (guest) cautioned against “double-barreled questions.” It was not a good practice to craft an assessment statement that asks one to respond to two things. The question should be focused. Mr. Huddleston thought the more fundamental thing to consider about
item #12 is why such a question is there in the first place. It was not clear to him why it was necessary. Mr. Krasnoff said he took Mr. Wiseman’s earlier point that item #12 seemed similar to item #8 and possibly redundant, but he thought that item #12 was still useful, and that Mr. Phillips’ amendment appropriately opened up the question. Mr. Wiseman wondered about the use of the plural (“students”). Why not focus on the individual student responding to the survey? Rick Heldrich (Biochemistry/Chemistry) thought the question was nebulous, that it was unclear what exactly was being measured (the learning of all students? the development of the student filling out the form?). Ms. Curtis pointed out that item #12 was different from item #8 in that #8 is about the student’s self-perception, but #12 is about the student’s perception of what the teacher did. Mr. Uwah remarked that not all students have the same learning styles, and that good teachers are able to adapt to the different learning styles of students.

Mr. Carens called the question, which received a second. The Senate passed the motion to call the question.

The Senate then passed Darryl Phillips’ motion.

Debate resumed on the main motion to adopt the new form. Rohn England remarked that when the form was drafted by the sub-committee, it was intended to measure certain things. He wondered if all the amendments to the form have resulted in the form now measuring things that it was not intended to measure. Mr. Wilder, speaking for the sub-committee, said that the question was a good one, but that his guess was that the answer was no: the changes have not altered what the form was originally intended to measure. He agreed that in making changes to the form, it was good to be cognizant of the possibility that Mr. England noted. Ray Barclay (Assoc. VP of Institutional Research and a member of sub-committee that designed the proposed form) agreed with Mr. Wilder. However, he thought that the changes to item #12 might be a slight exception. Originally #12 sought to measure the empathy displayed by the instructor, but the amendments have slightly moved the focus away from empathy. He added that the sub-committee wished to include more questions, but wanted to keep the form short. The proposed form delivers “a lot bang for the buck,” and he cautioned against deleting any of the existing questions.

Michelle van Parys (Studio Arts) said that she would like to see one large comment box on the form, not a lot of little ones.

Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism), pointing to item #15, which reads, “Overall, this is a good course,” wondered why “good,” rather than “excellent,” was the highest rating a student could give a professor. Why not have a broader range of response categories? He moved that the statement be changed to “Overall, this is an excellent course.” The motion received a second.

Laquita Blockson (Management and Entrepreneurship) wondered how students would define excellence. She thought that the word “good” was a little more flexible. The proposed change might just set us up for failure. Students might find a course “good,” but not excellent, and therefore end up giving it a negative rating because the only standard is that of
excellence. Reid Wiseman observed that items #14 and #15 seemed to ask the same thing. Kelly Shaver (guest) argued that using the word “excellent” makes the question clearer. He pointed out that a student might answer the question (in its current phrasing) with the response “Strongly Disagree,” not because he thinks the course is bad, but because he thinks the course is excellent. Mr. Krasnoff disagreed and thought that using the word “excellent” makes the question less clear. In its existing form with the word “good,” the question basically asks the student to rate the course positively or negatively. It is an up-or-down vote: the course is good or it is not. Using the word “excellent” muddies the up-or-down nature of the question. He added that though we aspire to excellence, that is a standard that most people can’t or won’t reach. The result will be a lot more “no” votes from students and much lower ratings. Dana Cope (Anthropology/Sociology) said he was against the proposed amendment, and in response to the remark that items #14 and #15 are essentially the same, he said that they are different: #14 is about the instructor, #15 about the course.

Julia Eichelberger (English) called the question, which received a second. The Senate voted, passing the motion to call the question.

The Senate voted on Mr. Litvin’s amendment, which failed.

Debate on the main motion resumed. Mr. Heldrich suggested that the category of excellence could be introduced in items #14 and #15 by re-wording the question slightly and by replacing the range of possible answers from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree” with a range of possible answers from “Poor” to “Excellent.”

Julia Eichelberger called the question on the main motion, which received a second. The Senate voted, passing the motion to call the question.

The Senate voted, passing the motion to adopt a new Course/Instructor Evaluation Form for a two-year trial period. (The fully amended form can be found in Appendix I)

Reports (resumed)

As the Speaker had directed earlier in the meeting, reports from committees concerning the motion to change the size and composition of the Senate would occur after the Senate dealt with the motion to adopt the new Course/Instructor Evaluation Form.

Steven Jaumé, Committee on Nominations and Elections

Mr. Jaumé reported that his committee, in its review of the motion to change the size and composition of the Senate, wished to bring seven issues to the Senate’s attention. The first issue concerns an ambiguity that the committee noticed in the prescribed method of apportioning Senators among the Schools of the College. He pointed out that as there are two means of apportionment—one that gives each department a Senator, the other that allows each School a number of Senators based on the percentage of each School’s faculty with respect to the total number faculty in the College—the composition of the Faculty Senate changes depending on which means of apportionment takes priority. The wording of the
proposal, he continued, was not clear on which means has priority. To show how the Senate composition would vary according to which means of apportionment was done first, he presented three tables. Table One showed the composition of the Faculty Senate when apportionment by percentage of School faculty to total faculty is implemented first. Mr. Jaumé noted that with this method some schools might not get any at-large Senators (this might happen to schools with many departments). There is also the problem of ties in apportionment, as the proposal did not explain how they would be settled. Would it be by lot, as the FAM now specifies for some elections, or by some other method? He next showed Table Two, which reverses the order of apportionment. This method gives small schools more representation. Table Three included the total numbers from Tables One and Two and compares them with the current system, giving an overall view of how the representation of different schools would change from system to system.

Mr. Jaumé reported that the second issue concerns the problem of filling Senate Standing Committees with Senators. A smaller Senate makes this task harder. Ten Senators are needed to serve on the Standing Committees. In the current Senate of 74 Senators, one of every seven Senators is needed to serve on the committees; with the proposed Senate the number drops to one of five. The third issue concerns the problem of running multiple elections. The proposed system would require seven different elections for determining at-large Senators. Currently, the College has no software to run simultaneous elections, and it may not be possible to run seven elections at different times and meet the calendar requirements for electing Senators as prescribed by the by-laws. Issue four concerns the issue of counting faculty for the purposes of Senate apportionment. Since the proposal doesn’t say when this should be done, the committee would simply follow the current practice of counting the faculty at the end of the previous fall semester to determine the apportionment for each school the following year. Issue five concerns the problem of faculty who have joint appointments in two schools. There is no mechanism in place or in the proposal for determining for the purposes of apportionment which school to assign those faculty. Issue six concerns a potential problem of limited turnover with a smaller Senate. Mr. Jaumé reported that the current rules dictate that a Senator may serve four years, and then must take a year off. Michael Phillips (at-large) corrected Mr. Jaumé, pointing out that there is no rule specifying the length of time a Senator must be out of the Senate after the four-year period of service is up. Mr. Jaumé accepted the correction, but added that the Senate might still wish to look further into the issue of the turnover rate in a smaller Senate. Issue seven concerns the lack of college-wide Senate seats. Mr. Jaumé reported that some of his committee members were uncomfortable with the disappearance of college-wide Senate representatives, which we have in our current system.

David Gentry (Psychology) asked if these concerns by the committee would become formal motions for the Senate to vote on. Mr. Jaumé said no. His committee just wanted to raise these issues for the Senate to consider. Laquita Blockson (Management and Entrepreneurship) asked if the committee was recommending one apportionment process over the other. Mr. Jaumé answered no. He said that the committee was divided over the issue.

Michael Phillips, chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and the FAM
Mr. Phillips reported that his committee met twice to consider the proposal to change the size and composition of the Faculty Senate. The committee wished to bring two issues to the attention of the Senate and make eight amendments to the proposal, four of which were substantive. The two issues, he continued, were already covered by Mr. Jaumé in his report, so he would only mention them briefly: they concerned (1) the problem of finding enough willing Senators to fill committee seats, and (2) the problem of holding a number of elections for at-large School Senators within a relatively short time to meet the calendar requirements.

Mr. Phillips then read the first proposed substantive amendment to the proposal: 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.

Mr. Phillips asked the Senate for unanimous consent to accept this amendment. Unanimous consent was granted.

Mr. Phillips read the second proposed substantive amendment and asked for unanimous consent that it be accepted: 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.

Larry Krasnoff (at-large and chair of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance) interjected, saying that he wished to accept all of the amendments from the Committee on the By-Laws and the FAM. He announced that IT is working on the problem of getting adequate software to run multiple elections, and that IT thinks a solution can be found. He added that is was important to vote for the best electoral system and not to get hung up on technical issues.

The Senate gave unanimous consent to accept the second substantive amendment.

The Senate then gave unanimous consent to accept the remaining two of the four substantive amendments, which follow below (see Appendix II for the amended complete proposal):

Third substantive amendment: 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.

Fourth substantive amendment: 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.”

The Senate gave unanimous consent to accept following four non-substantive amendments from the Committee on the By-Laws and the FAM:
First non-substantive amendment: 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.

Second non-substantive amendment: 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

Third non-substantive amendment: 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.”

Fourth non-substantive amendment: 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.

At the conclusion of Mr. Phillips’ report, Speaker Kelly reminded the Senate that all by-laws changes approved by the Senate must also be approved by the faculty.

Next, Mr. Krasnoff wished to respond to each of the points raised by the Nominations and Election Committee’s report. He first thanked the Nominations and Election Committee and the By-Laws and FAM Committee for their reports. Regarding issue one, Mr. Krasnoff did not think there was any ambiguity in the proposal about how the apportionment process works. He said that the method of apportionment presented in Table One reflected the intention of his committee (ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance), though if the Senate wished to go with the method reflected in Table Two, that was its prerogative. His committee thought that the method in Table One—in which priority is given to apportionment based on the percentage of faculty in Schools with respect to the overall number of faculty in the College—was fairest. If departments become the main determinant in apportionment, then Schools with many small departments are unduly favored and there is even an incentive to create more departments. What is the impact on small Schools with the method of apportionment intended by his committee? Since the percentage of seats for each school is guaranteed in their proposed system, small schools are protected in terms of representation and even given a boost from the current system. As for the problem of Schools having more departments than the Senate seats allotted to them based on percentage of faculty, Mr. Krasnoff said that he would propose that in such cases all the Senators in those Schools be elected as at-large Senators.

With regard to issue two (the committee issue), Mr. Krasnoff urged that the Senate deal with that bigger issue of what the size and composition of the Senate should be. Don’t let the smaller issue drive the bigger one. As he had earlier commented on issue three (the timing problem and the problem of running multiple elections), he moved on to issues four (the
question of when to count faculty for apportionment purposes) and five (the problem of how to deal with faculty with joint appointments). Mr. Krasnoff said that these are matters that can be dealt with independently of the motion before the Senate, and are not unique to the proposed apportionment method. As for issue six (the possibility that the proposed system would result in a slower turn-over rate in the Senate), Mr. Krasnoff did not think it was major concern. He also thought that imposing any term limits on Senators was undemocratic, and that we should let people who are good at governing and legislating do what they are good at. With regard to issue seven (the concern over the elimination of college-wide Senate seats), he did not think that, given the size of the College today, it was realistic to cling to the category of college-wide seats. It would be better to focus on Schools where you can have contested and more meaningful elections. He concluded by reminding Senators that the proposal deals with both the size and composition of the Senate. If Senators feel that the proposed sized of the new Senate is too small, they can increase it, while still retaining the proposed apportionment system.

Mr. Krasnoff then made a motion that would address the problem of Schools having more departments than the number of Senators apportioned to them. He moved that the following sentence be added at the end of Article IV, Section 2A: “If a school should have more departments than its apportionment of senators, then all of that school’s senators shall be elected at-large by the faculty in that school.” The proposed amended was seconded.

Deanna Caveny (guest and interim Assoc. Provost) thought that the word “apportionment” might create some ambiguity and suggested that the phrase “apportionment of” be replaced by “apportioned.” The suggestion was accepted by unanimous consent. (The proposal to change the Senate, containing both approved and pending amendments, can be found in Appendix II).

Bev Diamond (Interim Provost) remarked that there could be a problem in one department dominating the Senate seats of a School. Claire Curtis (Political Science) responded by pointing out that, were that situation to occur, then that department would still best reflect the views of the School, as the Senators would have been elected by the faculty of the whole School. Reid Wiseman (at-large) thought a better and simpler system would be to have each department guaranteed a Senator and have twenty at-large Senators. Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism) said that he would prefer to let each school make its own decision as to how to deal with the problem that the amendment seeks to address. Mr. Krasnoff remarked that Mr. Litvin’s idea would just mean that the deans decide because currently we don’t have a democratic decision-making process in the Schools.

Mr. Jaumé, noticing that the hour was late and that many Senators had departed, moved to adjourn, which was then seconded. The Senate adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
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.
School
Department
Course/Sector
Course Title

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 interest in the subject.
    Comments.
    SA
    A
    N
    D
    SD

Instructor

11. The instructor communicated enthusiasm showed enthusiasm for teaching the subject.
    Comments.
    12. The instructor showed interest in the learning and development of students as individuals.
    Comments.
    SA
    A
    N
    D
    SD
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14. Overall, this instructor is an effective teacher.

15. Overall, this is a **good** course.

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
    - 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
APPENDIX 2

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 members 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, appointed 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.

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;

(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
Art i cle IV,  Se cti on 3B . 1. c. 6.  As t he mot i on from t he Ad Hoc  C ommi ttee i ndi cat e s, st ri ke  t he  si xt h dut y of t he  C ommittee on Nomi nations a nd El ecti ons,  but  a dd i n its p lace  "Conduct elections for at-large school senat ors." We assume t his was an oversi ght.

We also propose the followi ng four non-substan tive ch an ges:

1. At  Art i cle IV,  Se cti on 2A,  re move  "a nd t he  Li bra ry"  i n t he sec ond se nt e nc e. Si nc e t he  Li bra ry ha s no forma l  i nt e ra l  de pa rt me nt s, t he re a re  no di sti nct  set s of  de pa rt mel a rge  se nat ors a s wit h t he  sc hool s. He nc e, t he ca se for t he  Li bra ry i s bett e r de sc ri be d by t he  fi rst  se nt e nc e al on e.

2. A cha nge of re fe re nce i n Article IV, Secti on 2D. 3 due t o t he in ser tio n  o f  a n ew  compositi on clause at section A of t his same section;

3. For cl a rity a nd c om pl ete ne ss at  Art i cle IV,  Se cti on 2D. 4,  re move  t he  pa re nt heti cal  " ve ri fyi ng Se na t e a pport i onme nt  a nd vot e r eli gi bi lit y;  c onst ruc t i ng,  di st ri but i ng,  co llecti ng  a nd va li dati ng ba ll ot s, a nd c e rt i fyi ng re sul t s" a nd a dd t he  fol l owi ng i n  pa re nt he se s a ft e r t he  dut y de sc ri be d at  Art i cle IV,  Se cti on 3. B . 1. c. 6:  " ve ri fyi ng  Se nate apporti onme nt and candi date and voter eligibility; const ructi ng,  di st ri but i ng,  c ol l ecti ng a nd vali dati ng ba ll ot s, a nd ce rti fyi ng re s ul t s";

4. A cha nge  of fa ct  at Art icle IV,  Se cti on 3B . 1. c. 4.  The re  a re  now 16,  not  5,  fa c ul t y  el ec te d  t o t he  C oll e ge Honor B oa rd by M a rc h 15.  8 se rve  on t he  boa rd a nd 8 se rve  a s  a dvi s or  t o  st ude nt  s calle d  t o  a ppe a r  be fore  t he  boa rd;  a nd  

The  mot i on t o a me nd  a ppe a r s  bel ow.  C ha nge s t o the  B y-l a ws a re  de not e d by  st ri ket hrough a nd unde rl i ne  t o  i ndi cate  st ri cke n  it ems  a nd  a ddi ti ons,  re s pe cti vel y.

Amend Article IV, Secti on 2, of the B y-La w s  as  fo llo w s :

Se cti on 2.  Composition  and  Election

A.  Compo si ti on.   T he re  s hall be 50 Fa c ul t y Se nat ors,  a pport i one d by t he  pe rc e nt a ge  of  fa c ul t y i n eac h sc hool  (i n cl udi ng t he  Li bra ry).   T he re  s hall  be one  se nat or el ecte d  by  e ac h  a cademic  de pa rtme nt,  w i t h t he  re mander  of  a  sc hool ' s  se nat ors  el ecte d  at-l arge  b y  t he  fa c ul ty  i n t hat  sc hool .  If  a sc hool  s houl d  ha ve  m o re  de pa rt me nt s  t ha n  it s  apportione m e n t  of  apport io ne d  se nat o r s,  th en  a ll o  f  t h at  s c ho o l' s  se nat o r s  s hall  be el ecte d  at-l lar ge  b y  t he  fac u l ty  i n t hat  sc ho o l .

A.  Elig ib ility . A Fa c ul t y Se na t or  m ust  be  a  ful t ime tenure d,  ten u re-t r ac k,  Inst ruct or,  o r  Se ni or Inst ruct or  empl oyee  of  t he  C oll e ge  who  has  c ompl ete d  a t le as t  t hree  yea rs  of  serv ice  at  the  Co lleg e,  a nd  who  n orma lly  te ach es  a t le as t  t hree  con tact  h ours  pe r
semester or the equivalent in assigned research or who is a full-time professional librarian. With 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 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 these elections 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 appointment 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:

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-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 candidates and...
eligibility; constructing, distributing, collecting and validating ballots, and certifying results.)
The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 15 September 2009, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order. The minutes of the April 7, 2009 Faculty Senate meeting and the April 21, 2009 meeting (which was a continuation of the April 7 meeting) were approved. The Senate also approved the minutes of the Spring 2009 Faculty meeting (held on April 13). The Speaker pointed out that because faculty meetings are no longer regularly held, and because some of the key functions of those faculty meetings now occur in the Senate, the Senate was the appropriate body to approve the minutes of the last regularly held faculty meeting.

Election of 2009 – 2010 Speaker Pro Tem: Bob Mignone (Mathematics) nominated Julia Eichelberger (at-large) to be Speaker Pro Tem. No further nominations were made, and the Senate elected Ms. Eichelberger as Speaker Pro Tem.

Reports

The President

President Benson began his remarks by thanking the faculty for their work. The faculty is the College, he said, and the work faculty do (teaching, research, etc.) is what makes the College special. He also thanked Senators for being leaders.

The President said he would cover the following topics in his report: the Strategic Plan, budget cuts, and faculty pay.

Strategic Plan: President Benson said that the plan was in the final stages of development and approval. A draft has been sent to the Board of Trustees, whose members will provide feedback on it. That feedback will be incorporated into a revised draft, which will be returned to the Board of Trustees for final approval. The President added that he has been pleased with the process, which has been both bottom-up and top-down, and is looking forward to communicating the details of the plan and implementing it. He thanked all those who have been involved in developing it.

The President stressed that the success of the plan hinges on establishing a new financial model, which is outlined in the plan. We can’t do the plan without adequate revenues, which won’t come from the state. The new financial model will help us obtain the necessary revenue, mainly through tuition increases and having the right mix of in-state and out-of-state students (perhaps something around a 50-50 mix). The President stressed that the state has not adequately funded us—especially recently. So we must do something about it, and that’s what the new financial model does. The Board of Trustees is supportive of the new model, but some delicate work is still required to get it in place. The President said that he was 90% sure it would be agreed on by October.

Budget Cuts: The President reported that the last budget cut cost us one million dollars and over the past thirteen months, we have lost ten million dollars in budget cuts. The President
said that he is not blaming the legislature, given the recent economic downturn. But the legislature, he continued, should have done something over the past twenty years to better support higher education. In the 1980s, about two-thirds of the operating budget was provided by the state, now its contribution is down to around 12%.

The President reported that various state colleges have reacted differently to these budget cuts and the long-term decline in state funding, and some are planning for future increases in state funding. We at the College are planning for no state support, the President said. However, he encouraged all faculty to speak out on this decline in state support for higher education. While there has been some support for K-12 education, the President said that we mustn’t separate K-12 from higher education. They are all of a piece. He added that the issue of state support for higher education will be very important for the next governor.

**Faculty Salary:** The President acknowledged that faculty salaries are low, and reported that because of the bad economy there were no raises this year for regular faculty. However, he reported that the salary for adjuncts has been increased by 10%, though even with the increase adjunct salaries are still “pitiful.” The President said that he was surprised that anyone would go through all the work of preparing for classes, teaching classes, grading tests and papers, and so on for such low pay. He also pointed out that historically the College has not much invested in its faculty, and that by comparison the Citadel, our neighbor, has historically invested more in its faculty. One doesn’t have to look at peer institutions out of state to see the disparities between faculty salaries here and those at other institutions. On an optimistic note, the President said that he expects to see improvement in faculty salaries within the next twenty-four months. Putting in place a merit-pay structure has been an important step and will help the Board of Trustees approve future raises.

**Questions and Answers:** Tim Carens (English), picking up on the comment that the College would be planning for no state funding, asked if the President really thought that state support would go to zero. The President replied that it probably won’t go to zero, but that we are not very far from zero now. He thought that state funding would likely drop below 10%. He pointed out, too, that as the College gains revenue through grants and tuition increases, the percentage of state funding in the operating budget would continue to decline. It was not prudent to bet on an increase in state funding. It is wise to assume it will go down.

Rob Dillon (Biology), noting that the College had the highest tuition-rate increase (in terms of percentage) of any school in the state, asked what the effect was on admission applications. The President answered that applications went up, which shows both that we can raise tuition when required, and that our school has some real strengths that are attractive to the public. He added that after the tuition increase was announced, the College did not cave to political pressure to lower the increase, as some other schools did.

Rick Heldrich (at-large) asked if the new model is that of a private school—and if it isn’t, what is the model? President Benson responded that the goal is not to become a private school, but to model ourselves along the lines of certain largely self-supporting public colleges, such as Miami University, Ohio. The President added that in the state we are seventh in terms of tuition prices; so there are six other state institutions that charge more. He
Irina Grigova (at-large) noted the historically low endowment of the College and wondered if there have been any developments on that front. President Benson acknowledged that the endowment is low and will be low for a while yet, but he said George Watt is building a good network to improve the situation. Nevertheless, it will still take five to ten years for that networking building to bear significant results. He remarked also that even at the best-endowed institutions, the endowment doesn’t help that much with the operating budget. If it could take care of 5%, that would be great. But we will need a substantially larger endowment than we have now to get to that point.

The President thanked Senators for their questions and invited everyone to the next C of C town hall meeting on Oct. 1.

The Provost

Interim Provost Bev Diamond began by welcoming back the faculty to the College for a new semester. She then reported that a two-year pilot program for a new sabbatical policy (first developed by former Provost Elise Jorgens) is being implemented this year. The new policy allows faculty to take a full year’s sabbatical leave at two-thirds pay or a one-semester leave at full salary. If enough faculty take the full year, then there will be no additional cost to the College. The aim is not to increase the amount of money going toward sabbaticals, but to find more efficient ways of using the money in order ultimately to strengthen the research productivity of faculty. She encouraged faculty to consider the full-year sabbatical option.

Provost Diamond reported that 85 to 90 students and one faculty member have or are suspected of having the H1N1 flu virus. However, so far those afflicted have recovered fairly quickly, within 48 to 72 hours. The Provost added that the precautionary measures of the “flu-buddy” system seem to be working well.

The Provost reported that she has decided to end the online course evaluation pilot project, which has been going for three semesters, because the “blended” system, which included paper and online evaluations, was causing some problems, especially with respect to tenure and promotion issues. She also noted that there were concerns over the low response rate of the online evaluations and the slow processing time required for the blended system. She said that she and Speaker Kelly would ask four faculty committees to review the pilot program and to offer input on whether to stick with the paper system or go completely with an online system, and that Academic Affairs would then make a final decision.

Next, the Provost said that she and Bob Cape are working on the acquisition and development of a new learning-management system. “Angel” is one system being considered. However, it was recently purchased by Blackboard, which runs WebCT, and the consensus is that Blackboard is not a good company; so other options are being explored.
The Provost next addressed the issue of storing grades so that they are secure. Her office, in collaboration with Bob Cape’s, is seeking to find a system that improves upon WebCT. Various programs are being considered. One key feature they share is that they store grades off campus. The Provost invited faculty to suggest programs that they think would be useful.

The Provost reported that her office sent out a memo listing the dates of religious holidays, which, she observed, generated much discussion on the campus listserv. She stressed that the Department of Justice requires the College to accommodate students with respect to their religious practices and has brought suit against institutions for non-compliance. We are just complying with the law in this matter, she said, and she urged faculty to follow both the letter and spirit of the law. She pointed out, too, that in the previous academic year the Faculty Senate passed a motion approving the religious accommodation policy. She also thanked Larry Krasnoff for his remarks on the issue that were circulated on the campus listserv.

The Provost concluded her report by announcing that the final draft of a new Modified Duties Policy is nearly complete. The Faculty Welfare Committee has seen the most recent draft, which she and Tom Trimboli, the Sr. VP for Legal Affairs, have developed, and a final document should be ready for October Senate meeting.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked the Provost how many faculty would have to take the full-year sabbatical for the new policy to work. About four to five, answered the Provost.

**The Speaker**

Speaker Kelly announced that George Pothering would serve as the parliamentarian this year. He next reported that the Priorities Committee, of which he is a member, has met a couple of times to set up a process by which faculty involvement in budget planning and review could happen. The committee devised the plan to form a large committee consisting of people from the Academic Council and Budget Committee and other faculty. In the future, faculty will be represented by the Speaker, the chairs of the Budget and Academic Planning Committees, and four other elected representatives. The Speaker said that he was excited about this new committee and the way it will allow faculty to have input into the budget and planning processes. He saw the formation of the committee as a significant development and said it is part of a larger project to re-shape faculty governance. The proposal for a new, smaller Faculty Senate is another significant piece of this project.

A Senator then asked if there had been developments in the Provost search. Speaker Kelly replied by first thanking those faculty who participated in the process of interviewing the candidates. He said that the Search Committee reviewed the written comments on the candidates, held a forum in which faculty were invited to offer additional comments, then conferred and made a recommendation to the President. The Speaker asked if the President would like to add anything, and the President replied that he is taking the recommendation under advisement.

**Larry Krasnoff, ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance**
Mr. Krasnoff began his report by saying that last year Speaker Kelly and he agreed that the Senate needed to be modernized and to adapt to the growth of the College and to other changes, such as the expansion of schools. He also observed that because of the College’s growth, the number of departmental Senators has significantly increased, while the number of at-large Senators has remained the same. As a result, their proportions are much altered from what they were when the Faculty Senate came into existence. He said, too, that the Faculty Senate is the least effective part of faculty governance and is not well integrated with the administrative part of the College or other parts of the governance system. Such ineffectiveness needs to be changed. He agreed that the creation of the Priorities Committee was an important step forward in that it would allow the administrative part of the College to hear what faculty think and want. That sort of two-way communication is what we want.

He said, too, that we should try to eliminate or reduce the “gadfly role” of the Senate, where issues are raised but without influencing them. As a start to making the Senate more effective, his committee proposes to change the size and composition of the Senate. This is the biggest and most controversial proposal likely to come from the committee. Making the Senate smaller, in the way the committee proposes, would align it with the Senates of other colleges and universities and make it more effective. Mr. Krasnoff added that because the motion entails a change in the by-laws, before the Senate votes on the proposal, it will be forwarded to the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual for review, as the by-laws require.

At this point, Mr. Krasnoff asked for unanimous consent that the proposal submitted to the Senate be replaced by a slightly revised version. He explained that the new version contained just one change in section D.2 of the original motion. A sentence was added that stipulates that putting together a list of candidates will be conducted by the deans of each school, rather than the Nominations and Elections Committee, which is a college-wide committee. Since the at-large Senators will represent schools, it is more appropriate that the deans of schools assemble the candidate lists, rather than a college-wide committee. Mr. Krasnoff added that though the revised proposal designates deans to put together candidate slates, self-nominations are allowed as well. Unanimous consent was granted by the Senate.

Speaker Kelly asked all committees interested in the proposal to discuss it and present a report at the next meeting.

Jeffrey Diamond (History) said that he appreciated the effort on the part of the Speaker and the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance to make the Senate more effective and to better integrate it into the other parts of the campus governance system, but he wished to know how reducing the size of the Senate would make it more effective. Darryl Phillips (at-large) said that in his experience serving on the Nominations and Elections Committee, it was difficult to find enough people to serve in the Senate. With respect to that problem, he views the proposal to reduce the size of the Senate as useful.

Michael Phillips (at-large) asked if the software was sophisticated enough to run different elections for different schools. In past years, it has not been. Mr. Krasnoff replied that he did not think the technological challenge would be a problem. Following up on his question, Mr.
Phillips said that there are also issues concerning the timing of the elections, which adds another layer of complexity. Mr. Krasnoff responded that the majority of seats would still be departmental and thus elections would be held within departments. Echoing Mr. Darryl Phillips, he thought the major challenge was to find enough people to be Senators. If you can find people who want to be in the Senate, they will be motivated and likely to get things done.

Dana Cope (Sociology/Anthropology) asked whether the number of Senators was determined by the total number of faculty, and whether the proportion of Senators with respect to schools would be the same as now. Mr. Krasnoff said the proportion would change. Given that each department will have one Senator, he likened that portion of the Senate to the U.S. Senate: just as each state gets two Senators regardless of its size, so too will each department get one Senator regardless of size. He likened the at-large portion of the Senate to the U.S. House of Representative: just as the number of representatives each state has is determined by the size of its population, so too the number of Senators allotted to each school will be determined by the number of faculty in each. However, he said that the proposed system could benefit small schools: whereas in the current system most of the at-large Senators tend to come from large schools, in the proposed system small schools will be guaranteed a minimum percentage of Senators. But as Evan Parry (Theatre) noted, larger schools will still have more Senators, and the overall effect will be a decrease the overall number of representatives for faculty. He wondered if the committee ever envisioned a true proportional system of representation. Mr. Krasnoff said that the plan for selecting at-large Senators based on schools is intended to provide an accurate representation of different viewpoints of faculty.

Hugh Wilder, ad hoc Committee on Developing and Evaluating Teaching

Mr. Wilder began his report by explaining that the ad hoc Committee on Developing and Evaluating Teaching is divided into four sub-committees, and that his sub-committee (chaired by Martin Jones who is on sabbatical this semester) was charged to review the current course/instructor evaluation form, which was created in the early 1990s. Members of the sub-committee also included Ray Barclay (Assoc. VP of Institutional Research) and Pam Niesslein, (Assoc. Dean of Accountability, Accreditation, Planning, and Assessment). In reviewing the current form, the sub-committee decided to recommend changing it. Mr. Wilder said that one issue with the current form is that it has never been subjected to validity and reliability tests. A key feature of the sub-committee’s proposal is that the new form would first undergo a two-year pilot study to see if it yields valid results.

Mr. Wilder next highlighted some “Guiding Principles” used by the sub-committee, which are listed in the written report provided to Senators. He began by stating that the sub-committee developed the new form with the aim of enhancing its value as a summative assessment instrument, since that is how that it has primarily been used at the College. However, he stressed that the sub-committee recognizes that faculty want useful instruments for formative purposes, and it encourages the development of such instruments. Mr. Wilder then drew attention to the first guiding principle, which lists a number of dimensions often cited to be central to teaching effectiveness (e.g., instructor’s enthusiasm, organization, breadth of coverage), and noted that the proposed form seeks to cover the majority of these dimensions in an efficient way. Next, pointing to “Principle 6,” he said that the committee focused only
on the content of the form and has chosen not to address administrative issues, such as how the form is to be administered (online vs. paper) or how it will be used in tenure and promotion processes. Pointing to “Principle 7,” Mr. Wilder said that the sub-committee agreed that the form should be used in conjunction with other kinds of assessment measures.

Next, Mr. Wilder summarized the process the sub-committee went through in its review of the evaluation form. The sub-committee reviewed a lot of the secondary literature on instructor evaluations and looked at best practices employed by other institutions. It relied heavily on Herbert Marsh's Student Evaluations of Educational Quality (SEEQ) instrument. In revising the form, the sub-committee thought it would be good to preserve some questions from the current form. It also decided to include the SGA questions that are on the current form.

Next, Mr. Wilder discussed some of the details of the form. He noted that the formatting would likely change, and that the way the form appears now to Senators is not how it will probably appear if it is approved and administered to students. He pointed out that item #14 is similar to what we have in the current form, that item #15 is slightly different, and that items #1 to #12 are similar to what is found in the SEEQ instrument.

As the sub-committee was not authorized to make a formal motion to adopt the form, Mr. Wilder requested that a Senator make the motion. Jaap Hillenius (at-large) moved to adopt the form for a for two-year trial pilot program. His motion received a second. Debate on it ensued.

Laquita Blockson (Management and Entrepreneurship) thought that since the form was mainly an instrument to evaluate courses, that the order of the key words in the title (“Instructor” and “Course”) ought to be reversed. She moved to amend the document by changing the form’s title from “Instructor and Course Evaluation Form” to “Course and Instructor Evaluation Form.” Her motion received a second. The Senate voted, passing the amendment.

George Pothering (Parliamentarian) asked whether, given the fact that the proposed form borrows heavily from the SEEQ instrument, the College would need to cite and even pay the developer of the instrument, should the form be adopted. Ray Barclay (guest and Assoc. VP of Institutional Research) said that he didn’t think so, given that the borrowed items on the proposed form constitute a small subset of the SEEQ instrument. But, replied Mr. Pothering, “we hammer students” for failing to comply with the standards of attribution. Might there be a problem, if we don’t acknowledge our key source? Mr. Barclay still didn’t think there was a problem. Many colleges borrow from forms of other colleges. If a whole form or most of form were borrowed, then there might be issues regarding attribution and payment.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) suggested that the size of the boxes for each item ought to be the same so as not to send students a misleading visual cue that some items are more important than others. Mr. Wilder agreed that that was an important point and that whoever does the final layout of the form needs to take such matters into account. He re-iterated that the sub-committee concerned itself with the form’s content, not its look.
Dana Cope (Sociology/Anthropology) asked whether the sub-committee had any discussion of the concept of “central tendency.” Mr. Wilder answered no. Mr. Cope said this was an important issue with respect to the validity of how the results are interpreted. These forms gather non-parametric data, which means, Mr. Cope explained, that the calculation of average values is virtually meaningless. The appropriate measure of central tendency should be the median (not mean). In fact, that measure can be improved if we throw out high and low scores for sample sizes smaller than twenty or twenty-five. Not doing that skews the meaning of the data, as is the case with our current form. That is why people now perceive a score of 5.7 as better than a 5.4, when it is in fact not necessarily better. Though other colleges also process the data retrieved from evaluation forms as we do, they too are doing it wrong. He added that he brought up this issue when the Senate originally approved the current form, and feels it must be brought up again and addressed. He moved that the evaluation instrument calculate only medians and not means. His motion received a second.

Bob Mignone (Mathematics) asked Mr. Barclay to comment on this issue. Mr. Barclay pointed out that this was really a reporting question. It concerns how the data gathered from the form are deployed, and is not really about the content of the form. Institutional Research, he continued, is trying to find better ways to report the data, and it is hoped that we will have more flexibility in the administrative realm with reporting methods. Mr. Wilder echoed Mr. Barclay’s point about the distinction between content and interpretation/reporting. His sub-committee, he re-iterated, focused on content only. To look at how the data is reported or interpreted would have exceeded the sub-committee’s charge. That may be, replied Mr. Cope, but we still need to address the issue. Moreover, the issues of what sort of data the form seeks to gather and how the data are processed are intertwined. Mikhail Agrest (Physics/ Astronomy) agreed, adding that we need to understand how the form will be processed and used before we approve it. Mr. Krasnoff thought Mr. Barclay’s point was valid, which therefore might make Mr. Cope’s amendment out of order. He urged the Senate to vote down the proposed amendment now, noting that Mr. Cope’s concerns could be addressed at another time.

Reid Wiseman (at-large) asked why both parameters (means and medians) could not both be used. Jeffrey Diamond (History) suggested that, since the form is directly used in tenure and promotion decisions, the Committee on Promotion, Tenure, and Third-year Review should vet the form and think through the implications raised by Mr. Cope’s amendment. Rob Dillon (Biology) said that he was sympathetic with Mr. Cope’s amendment and thought he made a strong point. But he also thought that the issue raised by the amendment might not be germane now. The issue in part hinged on the meaning of the word “validity.” If the sub-committee’s contention is that the “validity” of the proposed evaluation instrument is greater than the current instrument, and that its “validity” is based on means, then Mr. Cope’s amendment would be germane. Mr. Barclay responded that many items chosen to be in the form for the pilot study have been tested extensively and thus have a history behind them. Do they have central tendency in them and is it based on medians, asked Mr. Dillon? Mr. Barclay answered that they do, but that there are also things beyond central tendency that one must look at when doing a validity analysis.
At this point, Garrett Mitchner (Mathematics) suggested that Martin Jones, chair of the sub-committee, who has expertise in some of the areas raised in the discussion, produce a second proposal dealing with the reporting and interpreting issues. Mr. Cope then offered to withdraw his proposed amendment, given the concerns voiced about the timing and relevancy of his amendment. Mr. Pothering, the Parliamentarian, said that that could not be done. The Senate then voted on Mr. Cope’s motion, which failed.

Discussion of the main motion to adopt the form for a two-year pilot period resumed. Mr. Darryl Phillips said that in general he likes the proposed form, but noticed that the question about how many times the instructor has missed classed, which is the current form, is not on the proposed form. Why is that, he asked? He would like to see it on the form because when he was a department chair, he found the information provided from the question to be useful. Mr. Wilder replied that he could not remember any discussion about this item in his sub-committee’s deliberations.

Mr. Darryl Phillips observed that item #8 seems to ask the students two different things, which would likely cause some confusion and result in skewed answers. He thus moved to change the wording in item 8 from “I have acquired valuable skills and knowledge” to “I have developed my skills and knowledge.” The proposed amendment received a second. Julia Eichelberger (at-large) asked whether specialists in these types of forms have crafted the questions. If so, then she would be loath to alter the wording. Mr. Wilder pointed out that his sub-committee has already revised the wording from the SEEQ instrument. John Huddleston (Religious Studies) said that if the SEEQ instrument has been proven to offer valid results, then why not just use that form? He cautioned against too much word-smithing. Ms. Curtis observed that the proposed amendment changes the intent of the question. The original wording focuses on the value of the skills and knowledge a student has learned; the proposed changed shifts the focus away to something else.

The Senate voted, passing Mr. Phillip’s amendment.

Debate on the original motion resumed. Michael Finefrock (History) remarked that in the current form there is a question about how many classes the student has missed. He said that information about how many classes the professor and the student have missed are intertwined and he moved to include both questions in the form. The motion received a second.

Martha Nabors (Teacher Education) expressed approval for the amendment and thought both questions would yield useful information. Mr. Mitchner thought it was reasonable to ask a student who is evaluating an instructor and a course to say how much of the course the student has attended. Mr. Krasnoff said that he was worried about all the questions fitting on a single sheet of paper. Adding questions makes that harder. He also was concerned that the boxes for comments would be of adequate size. Further, he was concerned about what the form would be used for. Would it be used, as Mr. Darryl Phillips seemed to imply, to check up on faculty? Also, do we now do correlations between student responses about instructors and their responses about attendance. With regard to this last point, he asked Mr. Barclay if that sort of thing is done. Mr. Barclay replied in the affirmative and said that including such
questions about student attendance and so forth, while they do increase the length of the form, are useful and important for testing the validity of the responses.

The Senate voted, passing Mr. Finefrock’s amendment.

Debate on the original motion resumed. Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism) remarked that his issue with the current form is that it is not always clear what the numbers signify: for example, is a 5.2 a meaningful difference from a 5.4? He wants to see a form that yields numbers that allow one to make meaningful distinctions. On a different issue, Mr. Mitchner said he would like a question that centered on the workload of a course and that asked students how many hours per week they put into the course. Responding to that idea, Mr. Barclay said that sometimes students can’t recall with precision how much time they spent on a course. Therefore such a question might yield inaccurate and “forced responses.”

Frank Cossa (Theatre) remarked upon the labeling and sequencing of various items on the form, noting that the question about the instructor’s enthusiasm (item #11) came shortly before the question about the instructor’s effectiveness as a teacher (item #14). Their proximity and the fact that item #14 came soon after item #11 seemed to suggest that teaching effectiveness is all about enthusiasm, when in reality it involves much more, such as organization and clarity of presentation—issues that are addressed in items #1 and #3, both spatially remote from the question on teaching effectiveness. Other Senators, while generally supportive of the proposed form, also echoed concerns about the sequencing and proximity of items as well as concerns about making the form too long and providing adequate space for comments. Bill Manaris (Computer Science) suggested that it would be useful for the Senate to look at a worked-up prototype of the form so that it could more effectively deal with these issues of layout, sequencing, and spacing. With regard to the issue of the form taking up more space than a sheet of paper, Mr. Mignone thought that it would not be an issue because the form, he believed, would likely be administered online.

Mr. Huddlestun asked whether the questions on the form were taken from the SEEQ instrument. Mr. Wilder answered that the questions were, but not the headings. We used many of the same individual questions, he said, but put some into different categories (i.e., under different headings) or created new categories for them.

It was now 7:00 P.M., and time to vacant the room to make way for a class scheduled to begin soon. Speaker Kelly said that debate on the motion on the proposed new evaluation form would resume at the next Faculty Senate meeting on October 6, 2009. The Senate adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary