Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate

Tuesday, 3 May, 2011 at 4:00 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Announcements from the Speaker of the Faculty

3. New Business

   Resolution Concerning the Tenure and Promotion Process at the College of Charleston
   (see http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php)

4. Constituents’ Concerns

5. Adjournment
Resolution Concerning the Tenure and Promotion Process at the College of Charleston

Whereas, The bylaws of the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston invest the President with the power of final approval for all appointments, promotions in rank, conferrals of tenure and terminations of faculty members,

Whereas, The Faculty/Administration Manual establishes comprehensive procedures by which the review of faculty members for tenure and promotion are to be conducted,

Whereas, The procedures established in the Faculty/Administration Manual place the final authority in the tenure review process and the faculty grievance process with the President in accordance with the bylaws of the Board of Trustees,

Whereas, The Faculty/Administration Manual establishes the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion, which plays an essential role by providing peer review of individual cases and a check of consistency of standards across the entire college, to advise the President before he issues his final decision in tenure and promotion cases,

Whereas, The Faculty/Administration Manual establishes the Faculty Hearing Committee, which plays an essential role by monitoring the integrity of the tenure and promotion process, to advise the President before he issues his final decision in cases where discrimination, violation of academic freedom, or violations of due process may have resulted in a negative tenure decision,

Whereas, In one case this year, President Benson took the extraordinary step of reversing his own decision after the final tenure decision had been issued and before the faculty grievance procedure was able to reach its conclusion,

Whereas, Such an extraordinary step lies outside the procedures established by the Faculty/Administration Manual and risks undermining the integrity of the tenure and promotion system,

Be it resolved, That the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston urges the President to refrain whenever possible from circumventing the tenure and promotion process established in the Faculty/Administration Manual,

And be it resolved, That the Faculty Senate urges that, if an extraordinary situation demands a review of a tenure and promotion case outside of the established procedure, the President take action in the case only after seeking the advice of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion or the Faculty Hearing Committee,

And be it resolved, That the Faculty Senate views that the extraordinary step taken this year by President Benson has undermined the integrity of the tenure and promotion process and that the Faculty Senate hereby urges the President and the Provost of the College of Charleston to take every step necessary to work with the faculty to secure the integrity of the tenure and promotion process.
From: Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 5 April, 2011 at 5 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda
1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the 1 March 2011 Minutes
3. Reports
   The Speaker
   The President
   The Provost
   --Insertion of merit categories into the FAM (see website for supporting documents)
   --Sabbaticals (see website for supporting documents)
4. Old Business
   A. First Year Experience
      --Motion of the Advisory Committee on the First-Year Experience to clarify the FYE requirement (Draft of catalog language, information only)
5. New Business
   A. Committee on Nominations and Elections
      --Election of Senate Committees
   B. Nominations for Committee on Nominations and Elections
   C. Curriculum Committee
   D. Academic Standards Committee
      --Motion to change policy on concentrations and minors
   E. Committee on General Education
      --Mathematical Reasoning and Analysis: Change requirement and new approval criteria
   F. Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs
G. By-Laws Committee
   -- Motion of the By-Laws Committee to adopt new cover letter to the FAM
   -- Motion of the By-Laws Committee to change FAM IV.C = Policy 7.4.3
      (Statement of Academic Freedom)
   -- Motion of the Bylaws Committee to change the term of the Speaker of the
      Faculty and Faculty Secretary

H. Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review
   -- 5 Motions to Amend Standards in the FAM Governing T&P for Library Faculty
   -- Motion to Amend Standards in the FAM Governing Promotion to Senior
      Instructor
   -- Proposed Changes in Tenure/Promotion Guidelines

I. Resolution to Support Bike and Pedestrian Lane Across the Ashley River Bridge

J. Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Committee: End of the Year Report

K. Academic Planning Committee: Report on Online Education (see website)

L. Presentation of Degree Candidates

6. Constituents’ Concerns

7. Adjournment

**Minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site:
http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php**
Old Business:

A. First Year Experience

Motion of the Advisory Committee on the First-Year Experience to clarify the FYE requirement.

Introduction and Rationale:

In a meeting on March 13, 2007, the Faculty Senate approved a proposal that every entering student be required to complete a First-Year Experience (FYE), whether in a First-Year Seminar (FYSR) or a Learning Community (LC). The original motion left several key issues undefined. Now that the requirement is scheduled to formally begin for students entering the College in the Fall of 2011, it is necessary to clarify the requirement. This motion establishes a clear and specific requirement for entering students.

Motion:

Beginning in the Fall semester 2011, all entering first year students (Freshmen Admits, Honors Freshman, Provisional Admits, International Freshman Admits, GED Freshman), Transfers Students from two and four-year institutions with less than one year of college experience, and Conditional/Non-Conditional Readmits with less than one year of college experience are required to complete a First-Year Experience (FYE).

Students required to complete a First Year Experience do so by completing a First-Year Seminar (FYSM), a Learning Community (LC), or an Honors College First Year Experience course.

Students required to complete a First Year Experience must complete it within their first three consecutive academic terms. Once students begin the FYE, they must be continuously enrolled until they have completed the requirement.

- For students entering in the Fall, the consecutive academic terms include Fall, Spring, and Summer.
- For students entering in the Spring, the consecutive academic terms include Spring, Summer, and Fall.

Students who fail to complete the requirement in their first three academic terms, must satisfy the requirement by continuously enrolling in a Learning Strategies class until they successfully pass the course.
Draft of Catalog Language:

Addition to Liberal Arts and Sciences General Education Requirements

First Year Experience: All students who have completed less than one year of college when they enter the College of Charleston must complete a First-Year Seminar (FSYM) or a Learning Community (LC) during their first year. (Further information on completing the requirement can be found in the First Year Experience section)

Note: The material below on FYE should no longer appear in the Student Support Services Section, but should be listed with Academic Regulations, since it is a requirement for graduation for the majority of students.

First Year Experience

843-953-2017
www.cofc.edu/fye
fye@cofc.edu

The First Year Experience is designed to provide students with the skills that are necessary for success at the College of Charleston. All students who have completed less than one year of college when they enter the College of Charleston must complete a First Year Seminar (FSYM), Learning Community (LC), or an Honors College First Year Experience course during their first year. FYE course descriptions, credit hours and the requirements that each course will satisfy can be found in the First-Year Experience Academic Guide for 2011-12 or at cofc.edu/fye.

A First Year Seminar, a Learning Community, or an Honors College First Year Experience course will satisfy elective, general education, or major requirements. A First-Year Seminar (FSYM) focuses on topics within or across academic disciplines of study. First-Year Seminars are small courses (generally between 20-25 students), with narrow topics of study, taught by roster faculty members. A Learning Community links two or more courses, often around an interdisciplinary theme or problem. All Learning Communities and some First-Year Seminars include a weekly Synthesis Seminar. The Synthesis Seminar includes an hour of discussion and reflection led by a Peer Facilitator who is an upper-level student at the College. Most FYE courses contain social events and class trips that allow FYE students to get to know faculty and peers outside of the classroom.

Successful completion of the First Year Experience is part of the general education curriculum that is required for graduation. Students required to complete a First Year Experience must complete it within their first three consecutive academic terms. For students entering in the Fall, the consecutive academic terms include Fall, Spring, and
Summer. For students entering in the Spring, the consecutive academic terms include Spring, Summer, and Fall. Once students begin the FYE, they must be continuously enrolled until they have completed the requirement. Students who fail to complete the requirement in their first three academic terms, must satisfy the requirement by continuously enrolling in a Learning Strategies class until they successfully pass the course.
New Business:

C. Faculty Curriculum Committee
April 5, 2011 Meeting
List of Proposals Approved by the Committee
(All curricular proposals along with supporting
documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

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

Comparative Literature
New Course CPT390: Special Topics in Comparative Literature
(Includes Change of Minor to include this course)

Biology
New Course BIOL353: Hormones & Behavior (cross-listed with PSYC353)

Honors
New Course HONS159: Honors Astronomy I
New Course HONS159L: Honors Astronomy I Lab
New Course HONS160: Honors Astronomy II
New Course HONS160L: Honors Astronomy II Lab
New Course HONS167: Introduction to Sociology
Change of Course HONS390: Special Topics (changing to HONS280, 281, 282, 380, 381, 382)
New Course HONS280: Honors Special Topics Course
New Course HONS281: Special Topics in the Humanities
New Course HONS282: Special Topics in the Social Sciences
New Course HONS380: Interdisciplinary Special Topics
New Course HONS381: Interdisciplinary Special Topics in the Humanities
New Course HONS382: Interdisciplinary Special Topics in the Social Sciences

Anthropology
Change of Course ANTH201: change title, eliminate prerequisites
Change of Course ANTH205: eliminate prerequisites
Change of Course ANTH210: change title
Change of Course ANTH328: eliminate cross-listing with HIST
Change of Course ANTH381: change of prerequisites
Change of Course ANTH399: change of prerequisites
Change of Course ANTH490: change of prerequisites
Change of Course ANTH493: change of reference in course description
New Course ANTH336: Osteology & Forensics
New Course ANTH382: Student Research Apprenticeship
New Course ANTH383: Student Academic Apprenticeship
Delete Course ANTH351: Urban Anthropology
Delete Course ANTH357: Political Anthropology

Sociology
Change of Course SOCY101: change description
Change of Course SOCY102: change description

II. Program Changes:

Astronomy
New Course ASTR260: NASA Space Mission Design w/
New Course ASTR260L: NASA Space Mission Design Lab
New Course ASTR 460L: NASA Space Mission Design Leadership Lab
New Course ASTR210: Black Holes in the Universe
New Course ASTR410: Black Holes – Advance Topics
Change of Major (BA): Adding above courses + PHYS298 as electives
Change of Minor: Adding above courses + PHYS298 as electives

Geology & Env Science
Change of Major (BA): Adding ASTR/GEOL260, 260L, 460L as electives (max 3 cr)
Change of Major (BS): Adding ASTR/GEOL260, 260L, 460L as electives (max 3 cr)
Change of Minor: Adding ASTR/GEOL260, 260L, 460L as electives (max 3 cr)

Physics
Change of Major (BA): Adding ASTR/PHYS260, 260L, 460L as electives
Change of Minor: Adding ASTR/PHYS260, 260L, 460L as electives
Change of Major (BS, Astrophysics): Adding ASTR410 and ASTR460L as electives

Psychology
Change of Course PSYC386 Psychopharmacology: change title
Change of Course PSYC387 Clinical Neuropsychology: change title
New Course PSYC353: Hormones & Behavior (cross-listed with BIOL353)
Change of Minor (Neuroscience): Adding PSYC353 as elective

Mathematics
Change of Major (BS, Applied Mathematics Track): adding 400-level course option
Change of Major (BS, Statistics Education Track): adding MATH475 as elective
Linguistics

Change of Minor: Replace PHIL215/216 with PHIL120, Change catalog language

Computer Science

And Computing in The Arts

Change of Course CSCI123 Website Design: change course number
Change of Course CSCI223 Website Programming: change course number
Change of Course CITA 295 Seminar: add prerequisites
Change of Course CITA495 Capstone: add prerequisites
Delete Course CSCI 223: Computer Programming II Lab
Change of Major (BS, Computer Science): adding MATH350

German and Slavic Studies

New Course LTRS110: Russian Folktales in Translation
Change Minor (Russian Studies): add LTRS110
Change of Major (German): Require a proficiency exam for graduation

Biology

Change Major (BS, Biology): add MATH250 or equivalent
Change Major (BA, Biology): add MATH250 or equivalent
Change Minor: add MATH250 or equivalent
Change Major (BS, Marine Biology): add MATH250 or equivalent
Change Major (BS, Biology w/ Concentration in Molecular Bio): add MATH250 or equivalent
Change Major (BS, Teaching Education Program): add MATH250 or equivalent
Seminar, BIOL 453 Special Topics, BIOL 455 Seminar in Molecular Biology, BIOL 499 Bachelor's Essay
Change of Course (adding MATH250): BIOL 305 and 305L Genetics, BIOL 310 General Microbiology, BIOL 312 and 312L Molecular Biology, BIOL 313 and 313L Cell Biology, BIOL 321 General and Comparative Physiology, BIOL 322 Developmental Biology, BIOL 342 Oceanography, BIOL 343 Animal Behavior, BIOL 353 Hormones and Behavior (pending approval of new course proposal), BIOL 397 Research Experience in Biology.

French

Change of Major: Adding prerequisites, add sentence to description, Require a proficiency exam for graduation
Change of Minor: Adding prerequisites
Change of Course FREN313: French composition and grammar, change title & description
Change of Course FREN314: French conversation, change description
Change of Course FREN432
Change of Course FREN435
Change of Course FREN437
Change of Course FREN482
Delete Course FREN433
Delete Course FREN436
Delete Course FREN438

English

Change of Major: correct wording in catalog, add ENGL226, 309, 310 (see attached)
Change of Minor (Creative Writing): correct wording in catalog, add ENGL226, 309, 310 (see attached)
Change of Major (English/Secondary Education): refined to reflect new English major
Change of Course ENGL341: no title given, change title & description
Change of Course ENGL350: Major Authors, change catalog description
Change of Course ENGL360: Major Literary Themes, change catalog description
Change of Course ENGL395: Special Topics, change credit hour allowance
New Course ENGL 226: Survey of World Literature
ENGL 309: English Language Grammar and History
ENGL 310: Theories of Teaching Writing
ENGL 361: Studies in Literature in History Pre-1700
ENGL 362: Studies in Literature in History 1700-1900
ENGL 363: Studies in Literature in History 1900 to present
ENGL 364 Studies in Difference and Literary Tradition
ENGL 365: Studies in Cultural Studies
ENGL 366: Studies in Writing, Rhetoric and Language
ENGL 450: Senior Seminar in Major Authors
ENGL 460: Senior Seminar in Major Literary Themes
ENGL 461: Senior Seminar in Literature in History Pre-1700
ENGL 462: Senior Seminar in Literature in History 1700-1900
ENGL 463: Senior Seminar in Literature in History 1900-present
ENGL 464: Senior Seminar in Difference and Literary Tradition
ENGL 465: Senior Seminar in Cultural Studies
ENGL 466: Senior Seminar in Writing, Rhetoric and Language
ENGL 470: Senior Seminar in Major Literary Genres
ENGL 490: Senior Seminar in Film

International Studies
Change of Minor (Asia Concentration): add courses
Change of Minor (Africa Concentration): add courses
Change of Minor (Europe Concentration): delete POLS326, POLS346

Hispanic Studies courses
Change of Minor (Spanish): add SPAN320 and reduce to two other req’d
Change of Major (Spanish): Require a proficiency exam for graduation

Health & Human Performance courses
Change of Minor (Coaching): change number of hours from 18 to 19 hours.

III. New Majors:
None
D. Academic Standards Committee

Motion of the Academic Standards Committee to change policy on Concentrations and Minors

Introduction / Rationale:

The current policy on concentrations and minors dates back to the early 1980s. Since that time, many new programs of study have been developed that require concentrations within the major. This proposal aims to update the policy to better reflect the current curriculum of the College, allowing students to complete a concentration within their major field of study, while also having the option of completing up to two academic minors. The proposed changes maintain the prohibition against double-counting of courses between minors and concentrations.

Current Policy:

A degree-seeking student may elect to pursue a program of study organized around a particular theme within the major discipline (a concentration) or outside the major discipline (a minor). Either program must include a minimum of 18 hours selected from a formally designated group. At least nine hours in the minor at the 200 level or above must be earned at the College of Charleston. Successful completion of such a program of study requires a grade point average of at least 2.0 in all courses taken which comprise it. Credit may be received for up to two concentrations or minors, and courses used to satisfy the requirements of one may not be applied toward a second.

These courses may be selected from a single department or from several, and interdisciplinary courses may be included. Students must formally declare the concentration area or minor with the individual department in order to have the transcript reflect credit for work done in that concentration or minor.

Revised Policy (with changes underlined):

A degree-seeking student may elect to pursue a program of study organized around a particular theme within the major discipline (a concentration) or outside the major discipline (a minor). Either program must include a minimum of 18 hours selected from a formally designated group. At least nine hours in the minor at the 200 level or above must be earned at the College of Charleston. Successful completion of such a program of study requires a grade point average of at least 2.0 in all courses taken which comprise it. Credit may be received for up to two minors. Courses used to satisfy the requirements of a concentration or minor may not be applied toward another concentration or minor.

These courses may be selected from a single department or from several, and interdisciplinary courses may be included. Students must formally declare the concentration area or minor with the individual department in order to have the transcript reflect credit for work done in that concentration or minor.
E. Committee on General Education

Changes to an Existing General Education Requirement

Current Gen Ed Requirement:

**Mathematics or Logic**

Six semester hours in mathematics or logic (any combination).

Proposed Change to Requirement:

**Mathematical Reasoning and Analysis**

Two approved courses (at least six hours in total) in mathematical reasoning and analysis, excluding combinations of courses tagged for overlapping mathematical content. To enroll in these courses, students must have a working knowledge of algebra, as demonstrated by placement score or completion of Math 101. (See [http://advising.cofc.edu/general-edu/index.php](http://advising.cofc.edu/general-edu/index.php) for a list of approved courses and excluded combinations)

Explanation

The Committee on General Education recently formed a working group of faculty from across campus to study our general education requirement in mathematics, and to recommend approval criteria for courses seeking gen ed credit in mathematical reasoning and analysis. The working group developed a consensus proposal for those approval criteria, which the Gen Ed committee has now adopted. Part of the working group’s recommendation, however, was that courses with significant overlap in mathematical content should not both count toward the requirement. For example, the working group recommended that it should not be possible to meet the requirement by taking Math 104 (Elementary Statistics) and Math 250 (Statistical Methods), or Math 105 (Calculus for Business and Social Sciences) and Math 120 (Introductory Calculus).

Such a restriction, however, requires a change to the Gen Ed requirements, which now say that any two approved courses can count toward the requirement. The working group is therefore asking the Gen Ed committee to include this restriction in the requirement.

1. What learning outcomes will be used to assess the accomplishment of this competency?
As the working group’s report made clear, all courses for gen ed mathematics credit will be assessed by assignments that require students to (1) model phenomena in mathematical terms; (2) apply the models to answer questions and establish results; and (3) demonstrate an understanding of the supporting theory apart from any particular application. We are simply asking that the committee also review the particular mathematical content of approved courses for overlap with existing courses.

2. How does this proposed change in the General Education requirement reflect best practices in the relevant field(s) of study (attach bibliography or literature review if necessary)

The working group had already reasoned that each course taken for gen ed credit in mathematics should expand a student’s knowledge of mathematics (see approval criterion #3). Since the second of two courses with overlapping mathematical content would not substantially expand the student’s mathematical knowledge, it follows that it should be excluded from gen ed credit in mathematics. This proposal is in line with requirements at many other liberal arts and sciences schools. A review of gen ed curricula reveals that such schools typically require two or more courses in mathematics or quantitative reasoning, and specifically state that the requirement may not be satisfied by taking two introductory statistics courses, for example. It is also typical for schools to offer several calculus sequences covering similar material at different levels, and restrict credit given for overlapping courses from different sequences.

3. Anticipated impact of implementation (consider here issues such as transfer credit, AP credit, whether the course will be a pre-requisite for other courses, etc.)

Very little at the present time. The excluded pairs of courses are seldom if ever taken in combination by current students for gen ed credit.

4. Suggested start date, if approved (please note that the start date may be impacted by advising and registration dates)

2012-2013.

Proposal for new approval criteria

Competency: mathematical reasoning and analysis
Approval Criteria

To receive General Education credit in mathematical reasoning and analysis, a course must:

1. Have as its primary purpose the modeling of phenomena in mathematical terms.

2. Study the theory supporting the modeling at a level of abstraction sufficient to deduce results about the mathematical objects (such as sets, probability distributions, graphs, algorithms, formal languages, functions, etc.) arising from the theory.

3. Expand the students' knowledge of mathematics beyond what is required by MATH 101 and any of the course's prerequisites.

If the proposed course has a significant overlap in mathematical content with another course, then those courses may not be taken in combination for general education credit. For example, it should not be possible to meet the requirement by taking Math 104 (Elementary Statistics) and Math 250 (Statistical Methods), or Math 105 (Calculus for Business and Social Sciences) and Math 120 (Introductory Calculus).

Learning Outcomes

Students completing their coursework in mathematical reasoning and analysis should be able to:

1. Model phenomena in mathematical terms.

2. Apply the models to answer questions and establish results.

3. Demonstrate an understanding of the supporting theory apart from any particular application.

These competencies should be assessed by the assignments in approved courses.
F. Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for Faculty Senate April 5th Meeting
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

Proposals to Change a Graduate Course – MAT in Special Education:
EDFS 748: Field Experience in the Instruction of Exceptional Children
EDFS 710: Introduction to Exceptional Children and Youth
Permission to Cross-list with EDFS 345

EDFS 740: Characteristics of Students with Learning Disabilities
Permission to Cross-list with EDFS 352

EDFS 750: Characteristics of Individuals with Mental Disabilities
Permission to Cross-list with EDFS 353

Proposals to Delete a Graduate Course – MAT in Special Education
EDFS 738: Field Experiences with Students with Emotional Disabilities
EDFS 758: Field Experiences with Individuals with Mental Disabilities

Proposal to Change a Graduate Program – MAT in Special Education

Proposal to Change a Graduate Program – MS in Mathematics
Combined 5-year B.S./M.S. in Mathematics

Proposal to Change a Graduate Course – MS in Environmental Studies
EVSS 646: Graduate Course Seminar

Proposal for a New Graduate Course – MS in Environmental Studies
EVSS 632: Social Science Methods in Environmental Studies

Proposal to Change a Graduate Program – MS in Environmental Studies

Proposal for a New Graduate Policy – Leave of Absence

Proposal for a Graduate Policy Change - Graduate Grade of “U”
G. By-Laws Committee

Motion of the By-Laws Committee to adopt new cover letter to the FAM

Introduction and Rationale:
With the launch of the College of Charleston Policy Website this year, the By-Laws Committee began to examine the relationship between the Faculty By-Laws, the FAM, and official College Policies. This proposed cover letter aims to clarify established procedures for making changes to the Faculty/Administration Manual and to establish a new statement of principles governing changes to the FAM. If approved by the Senate and by the Provost, the proposed new cover letter would be included at the front of the Faculty/Administration Manual. Specifically, this cover letter aims to:

1. Summarize existing procedures to change the By-Laws of the Faculty and Faculty Policies.
2. Introduce new guidelines that define the role of the Speaker of the Faculty as a sponsor of changes to Faculty Policies.
3. Establish a new statement (based on past practices) of how changes are made to materials in the FAM that are not contained in the By-Laws of the Faculty or in Faculty Policies (Miscellaneous Material).
4. Clarify the role of the By-Laws Committee in maintaining the FAM.
5. Establish a new statement of principles about changes to the FAM.

Proposed new cover letter:

STATEMENT ON CHANGES
TO THE FACULTY/ADMINISTRATION MANUAL:
This cover letter summarizes the procedures for changing the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM). The Faculty/Administration Manual brings together in one place policies, procedures, and statements that relate to faculty members and academic administrators at the College of Charleston. Three different types of documents are included in the FAM, and a different procedure is used to make changes to each section. In all cases, the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual (By-Laws Committee) maintains the FAM and incorporates all changes. Each year a revised version of the FAM is posted by the Provost by August 15. Changes made to the FAM in the course of the year are reflected in a log that is maintained and publicly posted by the By-Laws Committee with the assistance of the Faculty Secretariat.

By-Laws of the Faculty. The By-Laws of the Faculty establish the faculty governance structure at the College. Article VI of the By-Laws sets out the formal procedure for amendments. Amendments may be introduced through the Faculty Senate and then ratified by vote of the faculty, or be brought to the faculty directly at an extraordinary meeting of the faculty and ratified by vote.
Faculty Policies. Many policies concerning the appointment, evaluation, conduct and duties of faculty members and unclassified administrators in the Academic Affairs Division have the status of college-wide policies. Official copies of these policies are housed in section 7 of the College of Charleston Policy Website (http://policy.cofc.edu) and are included in the FAM for convenience of reference. A formal procedure for amending these policies is set out on the Policy Website. All changes to these policies must be directed through the Provost to the President. Changes may be initiated by the Provost. Requests from the faculty to change these policies must be brought to the Senate for consideration. Only changes approved by vote of the Senate or by vote of the faculty in an extraordinary meeting will be officially sponsored by the Speaker of the Faculty. The Speaker of the Faculty must formally submit these changes to the Provost for consideration. The Speaker of the Faculty will inform the Faculty By-Laws Committee of all changes that have been approved by the President. The Faculty By-Laws Committee is charged with maintaining the FAM to reflect all changes in official policies.

Miscellaneous Material. The FAM includes materials describing the history of the College of Charleston, the administrative organization, and other matters that are not part of the By-Laws of the Faculty and are not official policies of the College of Charleston. Changes to these materials may be made by the Provost, normally after consulting with appropriate faculty committees and seeking the advice of the Faculty Senate. The faculty, through a committee and/or by vote of the Faculty Senate, may recommend to the Provost changes to these materials. The Faculty By-Laws Committee is charged with maintaining the FAM to reflect all changes to these miscellaneous materials.

Statement of Principles about Changes to the FAM.
The By-Laws of the Faculty can be changed only by vote of the faculty. The Provost has the authority to act alone to recommend to the President changes to Faculty Policies and to make changes to the Miscellaneous Materials. The Provost normally will seek the advice of appropriate groups of the faculty before changes are made. The Provost will inform the faculty of any change made to material included in the FAM. The Faculty By-Laws Committee is charged with maintaining the FAM to reflect all changes.

(Drafted and Approved by the By-Laws Committee 3/16/2011)  
(Approved by the Provost 3/25/2011)
Motion of the By-Laws Committee to change FAM IV.C = Policy 7.4.3
(Statement of Academic Freedom)

Introduction and Rationale:

In the 2006 case Garcetti v. Ceballos, the Supreme Court ruled that public employees making statements as part of their official duties are not protected by the First Amendment rights that apply to private citizens. Although public universities were not specifically addressed by the Garcetti decision, the case raises questions about the academic freedom of faculty members. In light of the ruling, it is no longer clear that faculty speech on issues such as hiring, evaluation, promotion, curriculum, and administrative policies is protected.

As a response to the Garcetti decision, public universities across the country are revisiting their statements on academic freedom. Traditionally these statements have addressed freedom in the areas of research and teaching; the professional service work of faculty members at public institutions had not been included as it was believed that this area was protected by the First Amendment.

This motion aims to update the College of Charleston’s statement of Academic Freedom to ensure that faculty members have the freedom to speak on topics important to the academic community. Provided that the faculty member’s actions do not violate the College’s Code of Professional Conduct and Statement of Professional Ethics, the faculty member should be protected.

Current Policy with proposed amendment in underlined italics:

POLICY 7.4.3 Statement of Academic Freedom = FAM IV.C

2. Statement of Academic Freedom

The faculty member is entitled to full intellectual freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of his or her other academic duties; but undertaking research for pecuniary return must be based upon a prior understanding with the academic administration of the institution, and requires written authorization by the President before it may be undertaken. (See Art. X.I.)

A faculty member is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his or her subject, but must not introduce into teaching controversial matter which has no direct relation to the subject.
A faculty member is entitled to freedom to address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of any agency of institutional governance. The faculty member’s action is free from institutional discipline or restraint, save for statements or actions that violate the College’s Code of Professional Conduct and Statement of Professional Ethics (Policy 7.4.2=FAM IV.B).

The College faculty member is not only a member of a learned profession and an officer of an educational institution but also a citizen. When a faculty member speaks or writes as a private citizen, he or she is free from institutional censorship or discipline. However, the special position of a college faculty member in the community carries with it special obligations. As a person of learning and an educational officer of the College, a faculty member is expected to bear in mind that the public may judge the academic profession and the College of Charleston by his or her utterances. Hence, a faculty member is required at all times to be accurate, to exercise appropriate restraint, to show respect for the opinions of others, and to make every effort when writing or speaking as a private citizen to indicate that he or she is not an institutional spokesperson.

(Approved by the By-Laws Committee 2/16/2011)
Motion of the Bylaws Committee to change the term of the Speaker of the Faculty and Faculty Secretary

Change to Bylaws Article III, Section 1, D (term of office for the Speaker of the Faculty) and Article III, Section 2, D (term of office for the Faculty Secretary)

Introduction and purpose of change:
The change in bylaws would redefine the term of office for the Speaker and Faculty Secretary to run from July 1 through June 30. This change would bring the terms of office for these positions in line with administrative appointments at the College and would allow for a smooth transition during the summer months.

As this motion to change the Bylaws is being brought to the Senate by the Bylaws Committee at the final meeting of the year, the proposal will be referred back to the Bylaws Committee, and then brought before the Senate at the first meeting in the Fall. At that time, the Senate will debate and vote on the motion. This procedure, as required by our Bylaws, will ensure that a Bylaws Committee with different members will consider this motion and report their views to the Senate.

If approved, the proposed changes would go into effect for the 2012-2013 term.

Proposed change with new wording indicated in *italics underline*:
Article III, Section 1, D:
The term of office for the Speaker of the Faculty shall be one year, beginning the day after *spring commencement July 1*. No speaker may serve more than three consecutive terms.

Article III, Section 2, D:
The term of office for the Faculty Secretary shall be one year, beginning the day after *spring commencement July 1*. No Faculty Secretary may serve more than three consecutive terms.

If approved, the proposed change would go into effect for the 2012-2013 term.

Rationale:
July 1 – June 30 would put the Speaker and Faculty Secretary on the same calendar as department chairs and other administrative faculty appointments. This also matches the budget year at the College. The new speaker and secretary and the out-going speaker and secretary would have time in the summer to transition, making the transition less hectic for the new speaker than is currently the case. Both the outgoing speaker and the new speaker could attend the June Board of Trustees meeting. The date change would solve administrative problems such as the payment of the Speaker’s stipend (which is currently paid July 1 – June 30) and approval of the Administrative Assistant’s timesheet (which is tied to the Speaker’s status in the computer system, which is tied to the Speaker’s stipend, which is tied to the budget year).

The past two Speakers of the Faculty, the Speaker-elect, and the current Speaker all support the change.

*(Motion approved by the Bylaws Committee 3/16/2011)*
H. Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review

Motions to Amend Standards in the Faculty-Administration Manual Governing Tenure and Promotion for Library Faculty

Submitted by the Advisory Committee for Tenure, Promotion and Third Year Review
March 24, 2011

Motion 1
Amend the introductory section to VI.C, “Third Year Review, Tenure and Promotion of the Library Faculty” in the Faculty-Administration Manual (p. 109).

Currently, the second paragraph of this section (p. 109) reads:

In considering tenure and promotion for a professional librarian, the Dean’s assessment of the candidate will carry particular weight with the Provost and the President, who require that the Dean submits an independent evaluation and recommendation, together with the complete dossier prepared by the library faculty’s evaluation panel, after he or she has reviewed the packet that includes colleague opinions.

Proposed Change:
Delete the entire paragraph.

Rationale:
In a parallel section of the FAM concerning tenure and promotion for instructional faculty (VI.A, pp. 91-2), there is no suggestion that the assessment of a Dean should carry particular weight with the Provost and President. This change would make the role of the Dean of the Libraries consistent with the role of other Deans in tenure and promotion decisions.

Motion 2
Amend the criteria for tenure for librarians (section VI.C.4.b, p. 114 of the FAM).

Proposed Changes:
In the criterion regarding professional competency, change the requirement from “sustained effectiveness” to “exemplary performance.” In the criterion regarding service, replace the current language with language parallel to that used in the section of the FAM regarding the tenure and promotion of instructional faculty (VI.A.4.a, p. 101)

The proposed changes are indicated in bold:

b. Tenure for Librarians
The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for tenure for library faculty.

(1) Tenure for library faculty requires sustained effectiveness and exemplary performance in the area of professional competency.

(2) Continued vitality as librarians is intimately associated with scholarship and related professional activities. Traditional publication is not the only medium through which the library profession exchanges information and research findings, although librarianship possesses a growing body of scholarly literature. Workshops, symposia, seminars, meetings of regional and national organizations, et cetera, are also major means of communication within the discipline. Therefore, a candidate’s contributions in these areas should be considered the equivalent of traditional scholarship. In addition, there must be clear evidence of promise for continued professional growth and development.

(3) There should be active and sustained participation in service to the College and, where appropriate, to the community. There should be active and sustained service to the College or there should be active and sustained service in the candidate’s professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.

Rationale:
These changes would make the section on specific criteria consistent with language appearing earlier in the FAM. In particular, the introductory section on tenure and promotion for librarians (VI.C., pp. 108-9) states that “Tenure and promotion require substantial evidence of consistently high performance in professional competency, professional growth and development, and service. In addition, evidence of exemplary performance is required in the professional competency area.” To require “exemplary performance” in one part of the FAM but “sustained effectiveness” in another makes these standards difficult to apply. Changing the later language to “exemplary performance” makes the standard clearer, and emphasizes the particular importance of professional competency for the tenure and promotion of librarians.

The change in the language regarding service would make the standard for tenuring librarians parallel to the standard for tenuring instructional faculty (see VI.A.4.a, p. 101).

Motion 3
Amend the criteria for Third-Year Review and promotion to the rank of Librarian II (section VI.C.4.a, pp. 113-114 of the FAM).

The proposed changes are indicated in bold:

a. Promotion to the Rank of Librarian II/Third-year Review
Promotion to the rank of Librarian II is awarded simultaneously with the third-year review. A third-year review should substantiate whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made. A third-year review may be conducted for untenured librarians at other ranks. The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to Librarian II and/or third-year review.

1. Promotion to the rank of Librarian II requires evidence of progress toward meeting the tenure requirement of **sustained effectiveness** or **exemplary performance** in the area of professional competency.

2. Continued vitality as librarians is intimately associated with scholarship and related professional activities. There must be clear evidence of progress toward meeting the tenure requirement for professional growth and development. Traditional publication is not the only medium through which the library profession exchanges information and research findings, although librarianship possesses a growing body of scholarly literature. Workshops, symposia, seminars, meetings of regional and national organizations, et cetera, are also major means of communication within the discipline. Therefore, a candidate’s contributions in these areas should be considered the equivalent of traditional scholarship.

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

**Rationale:**
Whatever the standards for tenure for librarians happen to be, the language in the section on Third Year Review and promotion to Librarian II (which is awarded simultaneously with a successful Third Year Review) should be parallel, since the point of the Third Year Review is to ensure that the candidate is showing “evidence of progress toward meeting the tenure requirement.” Assuming the first change in Motion 2 is made (changing “sustained effectiveness” to “exemplary performance” in the standards for tenure for librarians), the same change should be made here.

The language in the second criterion (describing acceptable forms of scholarship) currently repeats information given in the standard for tenure. In stating that the candidate for Third Year Review and promotion to Librarian II must show progress towards the scholarship requirement for tenure, this standard is, in effect, directing the candidate to that requirement. There is no need to state the requirement for tenure in the requirement for Third Year Review/promotion to Librarian II.

The change in the language regarding service would make this standard consistent with that for
Motion 4
Amend the criteria for promotion to the rank of Librarian III (section VI.C.4.c, p. 115 of the FAM).

The proposed changes are indicated in bold:

c. Promotion to the Rank of Librarian III

The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to Librarian III. Evidence of exemplary professional competency and significant achievement in the area of professional growth and development, or service is required.

(1) Promotion to the rank of Librarian III requires sustained and significant effectiveness exemplary performance in the area of professional competency.

(2) There must be clear evidence of high promise for continued quality of scholarship and professional activities. Since peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality, typically the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications). Traditional publication is not the only medium through which the library profession exchanges information and research findings, although librarianship possesses a growing body of scholarly literature. Workshops, symposia, seminars, meetings of regional and national organizations, et cetera, are also major means of communication within the discipline. Therefore, a candidate’s contributions in these areas should be considered the equivalent of traditional scholarship. All evidence should be evaluated rigorously.

(3) There should be active and sustained participation in service to the College and, where appropriate, to the community. There should be active and sustained service to the College or there should be active and sustained service in the candidate’s professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.

Rationale:
In 2003-04, the Faculty Senate approved adding to the criteria for tenure and promotion for instructional faculty that “Evidence of exemplary performance is required in at least one of the specified professional competency areas” (although this change was not actually made to the FAM until 2007). The requirement was further revised by the Faculty Senate in 2009, when it was modified to read (for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor) “Evidence of either
exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development is required” and (for promotion to Professor) “Evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in all three areas is required.” Our recommendation is to make the requirements for promotion to Librarian III more consistent with the requirements for instructional faculty by adding similar language. The FAM’s definitions of the library faculty state that “Librarian III is a rank held by those who have been recognized by the College as having demonstrated excellence in professional library performance and have given evidence that they will make further significant contributions as librarians to the College and community” (III.D.2.b, p. 55). Given this definition, it is reasonable to require that a candidate show “exemplary professional competency” as well as “significant achievement” in one of the other two competency areas.

In the statement of the criterion of professional competency, the change from “sustained and significant effectiveness” to “exemplary performance” would make this standard consistent with the statement in the introductory section on tenure and promotion for librarians (VI.C., pp. 108-9), which states that “Tenure and promotion require substantial evidence of consistently high performance in professional competency, professional growth and development, and service. In addition, evidence of exemplary performance is required in the professional competency area.” To require “exemplary performance” in one part of the FAM but “sustained and significant effectiveness” in another makes these standards difficult to apply. Changing the later language to “exemplary performance” makes the standard clearer, and emphasizes the particular importance of professional competency for the tenure and promotion of librarians.

The deletion of the language describing alternative forms of scholarship indicates that the requirements for promotion to this level of librarianship are importantly different from the criteria for tenure. According to the standards of the discipline, librarian scholarship may take the form of participation in workshops, symposia, professional meetings, and so on, and so these are therefore considered to be appropriate forms of scholarship for tenure. Tenure for librarians at the College of Charleston has historically not required the publication of peer-reviewed scholarly articles. However, it is reasonable to expect such scholarship for promotion to a higher rank.

The change in the language regarding service would make this standard consistent with that for instructional faculty (see VI.A.4.a, p. 101).

**Motion 5**

Amend the criteria for promotion to the rank of Librarian IV (section VI.C.4.d, p. 115-116 of the FAM).

The proposed changes are in bold:

* d. Promotion to the Rank of Librarian IV
Promotion to the rank of Librarian IV requires evidence of continuing quality professional competency, research professional growth and development, and service. The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to Librarian IV. Evidence of exemplary performance in the area of professional competence and significant achievement in the areas of professional growth and development, and service is required.

(1) Promotion to the rank of Librarian IV requires exemplary professional competency.

(2) Since Because Librarian IV is the highest rank, there must be clear evidence of continuing quality scholarship. Since Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore, typically the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications). Traditional publication is not the only medium through which the library profession exchanges information and research findings, although librarianship possesses a growing body of scholarly literature. Workshops, symposia, seminars, meetings of regional and national organizations, et cetera, are also major means of communication within the discipline. Therefore, a candidate’s contributions in these areas should be considered the equivalent of traditional scholarship. In addition to scholarship, sustained professional activity is expected. All evidence should be rigorously evaluated.

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

Rationale:
The introductory section describing the tenure and promotion of the library faculty (VI.C, p. 109) refers to the three competency areas as “professional competency,” “professional growth and development,” and “service.” This is also true of the subsection headings; VI.C.1 is “Professional Competency,” VI.C.2 is “Professional Growth and Development,” and VI.C.3 is “Service.” It is therefore incongruous to mention “research” in the introductory paragraph of VI.C.4.d.

The rationale for introducing a requirement of “exemplary performance” in professional competency and “significant achievement” in the other two competency areas is similar to that given for the change recommended in Motion 4. The requirements for tenure and promotion of the instructional faculty were changed by the Faculty Senate in 2003-4 and 2009; our recommendation is to make the requirements for promotion to Librarian IV more consistent with the requirements for instructional faculty by adding similar language. According to the FAM’s
definitions of the library faculty, “Librarian IV is the highest academic library rank and is held by those librarians who have been recognized for their outstanding performance and for contributions to the discipline of librarianship, for their continuous professional growth and development, their commitment to the wellbeing of the College through their involvement in institutional activities, and their service to the wider community. Typically they will also have gained recognition in librarianship at the regional, national, and/or international levels” (III.D.2.b, p. 55). Given this definition, and given that the requirements for promotion to Professor are to show either exemplary performance in one area or significant achievement in all three, we think it is reasonable to require that a candidate for promotion to the highest library rank show “exemplary professional competency” as well as “significant achievement” in one of the other two competency areas.

Adding the requirement that there be scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications) is intended to make this criterion analogous to the criterion (in Research and Professional Development) for promotion to the highest rank for the instructional faculty (Professor). Likewise, the change in the requirement for service is recommended to make this criterion analogous to the service criterion for promotion to Professor.

**Motion to Amend Standards in the Faculty-Administration Manual Governing Promotion to Senior Instructor**

Submitted by the Advisory Committee for Tenure, Promotion and Third Year Review
March 24, 2011

**Motion**

We recommend eliminating “departmental advising” standard for promotion to Senior Instructor.

The relevant passage is at VI.B.1 (p. 103):

**B. Promotion of Instructors**

1. Specific Criteria for Promotion to Senior Instructor

   The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to Senior Instructor:
   a. Promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor requires sustained exemplary performance in teaching.
   b. There should be active and sustained participation in departmental advising programs.
   c. Continued vitality as a teacher is intimately related to professional development. There must be clear evidence of promise for continued development in pedagogy.
   d. There should be active and sustained participation in service to the
Rationale:
This language is a relic of an older system at the College, before undeclared students were advised professionally at the advising center. We believe that whether or not Senior Instructors should participate in advising of majors should not be a college-wide requirement, but a decision left up to individual departments.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN TENURE/PROMOTION GUIDELINES
March 24, 2011

Explanation of changes, with justifications:
• Section VI.A has been retitled to indicate those faculty to whom it applies, tenured and tenure-track faculty.
• Section VI.B has been reorganized to make it more parallel to sections A and C. The first paragraph now duplicates information from A and C. The second paragraph is a statement parallel to statements in A and C. The third paragraph was taken from a different part of section B; and a statement about renewal was added. This section has also been retitled to more accurately reflect what it addresses.
• Section VI.B.2.(5).(b) was added, as it exists in sections A and C.
• Those items in Section VI.B.5 that were not moved to the preamble of Section VI.B have been removed, as they are addressed in Section VI.D on procedures.
• Other miscellaneous changes for clean-up and clarification.

VI. EVALUATION OF FACULTY

A. Third-year Review, Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-Track and Tenured Instructional Faculty

The President retains the power of approval for third-year review determinations, conferrals of tenure, and promotions. The Provost, acting in accordance with the provisions stated in this Faculty/Administration Manual, is
responsible for making the final recommendation to the President in respect to all such matters.

Tenure and promotion require substantial evidence of consistently high professional competence in teaching, research and professional development, and service. In addition, evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the three specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development is required. Tenure is a long-term commitment by the College; it is not merely a reward for work accomplished, but it is an award given with the expectation that consistently high professional competence will continue. (Rev. April 2009)

A third-year review should substantiate whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made. There should be evidence of effective teaching, a continuing research program, and active participation in service. A candidate should be informed in detail of any weakness that, if not corrected, might lead to a negative tenure decision. If there are serious doubts as to whether the candidate will be able to meet the criteria prior to a required tenure decision, a recommendation against retention should be given.

A tenure decision is made only once, no later than the sixth year. Up to two years credit toward tenure and promotion may be awarded at the time of initial appointment for teaching and research on a full-time basis at other four-year and graduate colleges and universities or for full-time employment at faculty positions of special status at the College of Charleston. A person receiving the maximum of two years credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fourth year at the College. A person receiving one year of credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fifth year at the College. (Rev. April 2007)

Six years in rank is normally required for an Assistant Professor to be eligible for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Seven years in rank is normally required for an Associate Professor to be eligible for promotion to Professor.

In exceptional cases a faculty member may wish to petition for early tenure or promotion provided the action has the prior written approval of the Provost, the Dean and the Departmental Chair.

Faculty are evaluated in the three categories of Teaching Effectiveness, Research and Professional Development, and Professional Service to the Community. Because teaching is the primary responsibility of any faculty member, evidence of effective teaching is expected for tenure and for promotion. Because research and professional development are essential to the mission of the
College, evidence of a sustained research program and a continuing scholarly commitment must be provided for tenure and for promotion. Because faculty should be contributing members of the College community and, where appropriate, the community at large, evidence of service to the community is expected.

While quantifiable data (numerical items from student evaluations, numbers of papers published, number of committees, etc.) are important, decisions about tenure and promotion must ultimately rely on sound professional judgment.

What follow are the general standards and evidence that remain constant throughout the four levels of institutional evaluation, namely third-year review, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor.

1. Teaching Effectiveness
   a. **Standard**

   Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty at the College of Charleston. Teaching involves communicating knowledge to students and fostering in them the intellectual curiosity necessary to continue the quest for knowledge. The effective teacher exhibits a sustained concern for teaching, which is reflected in teaching materials, classroom performance, academic advising, critical evaluation of students, and adequate preparation of students for later undergraduate and/or graduate work. Course materials should be well-conceived, well-organized and well-written. Students should be exposed to current scholarship or research in the field, if appropriate. Student evaluations should be consistently good. A teacher should be prepared to provide sound advice to students and to newer colleagues on academic matters.

   b. **Evidence** (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include:

   (1) Chair’s evaluations since faculty member has been in rank. Chair must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate’s being considered for promotion/tenure.

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

(Ins. April 2007)

(3) Evaluatee’s narrative of teaching philosophy, methodology, and accomplishments in teaching, advising and other similar activities.

(4) Recent graduate evaluations on teaching: either all majors or a sample of at least 40 students selected randomly from among all majors in the department who have graduated within the past five years and whom the candidate has taught; additional students whom the candidate has taught, who need not be majors in the department, may be added by the candidate in consultation with the Chair. Students must list all courses taken from the evaluatee and the grade(s) received in these courses. In addition, the student must sign the form or letter used for evaluation. The Chair must designate which students are recommended by the evaluatee. In cases where a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than 40 graduates, the Department Chair should indicate that this has occurred. In these cases it may be appropriate to substitute evaluations from non-majors.

Without exception, each Department’s graduate evaluation form shall include a standardized section designed only to provide and solicit demographic information about each individual graduate completing the form. This standardized section of the form shall be designed and distributed each year by the Office of Academic Affairs and must be used without alteration by each department.

(Ins. April 2007)

Recent Graduate Evaluations are optional for Third-Year Review and may be requested by the departmental evaluation panel or the candidate.

(Rev. April 2007)

(5) Student ratings and summaries:
(a) Student ratings from all courses evaluated. Student course evaluations will be completed for every section of every course, every semester, with the exception of a course that has only one student enrolled. If it is a department’s policy to require the inclusion of the comments portion of the student ratings, the department must develop procedures for collecting and reviewing this portion of the student ratings form. A copy of the procedures should be on file in the Provost’s Office. In the absence of these procedures, a faculty member undergoing review may choose to include these comments as part of the packet, having explained in his or her narrative about teaching whether all the comments or a selection of the comments have been included.

(b) The Summary Rating for all courses in the Department for each semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder with the summary student evaluations. The summary ratings for the department will be distributed to the faculty in the department each semester. (Rev. April 2007)

(6) Evidence of teaching effectiveness may also include but is not limited to:

(a) Syllabi, reading lists or bibliographies, policy statements, grading procedures, course goals and objectives.

(b) Samples of evaluatee-prepared and/or supplementary course materials.

(c) Samples of tests, exams, essays or other assignments.

(d) Participation in curriculum development.

(e) Participation in interdisciplinary courses and programs.
(f) Participation in peer coaching activities and/or observation of classroom performance by colleagues.

(g) Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops and field trips.

2. Research and Professional Development

a. Standard

Research and professional development are essential to a professor’s ability to carry out the College’s educational mission. Research and professional development involve the various activities that increase the faculty member’s knowledge and that exemplify scholarly or artistic expertise. It includes, but is not limited to, original contributions to the discipline, creative activities in practice and performance in the fine arts, research in pedagogy, and appropriate studies within and outside one’s specialties. The professional educator undertakes research for scholarly or creative production, to maintain currency in the content of courses taught, and to improve pedagogical techniques. The professional educator sustains professional contact with colleagues and engages in continuing professional activities to upgrade and augment existing skills or develop new ones.

b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include:

(1) Evaluatee’s narrative of research and professional development activities.

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

ii. Optional evaluation of research and professional development includes:

   □ letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions evaluating research and professional development and
independent external reviews of research. Departments that choose to conduct such external reviews must follow the process outlined here.

Instructions for External Reviews of Research: Candidates should submit the names of at least three professionals from outside the College by late August. Evaluation panel chairs, in consultation with departmental panel members, should present additional names of external reviewers in order to obtain no fewer than two and no more than five independent reviews of the quality of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements. The candidate's suggested reviewers may be sources of additional reviewers independent of the candidate's list. No more than half of the reviews should be secured from the candidate's own list. The candidate is allowed to strike one name from the panel chair's list. The external reviewers chosen should be appropriately qualified to conduct an independent review of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements.

After the external reviewers have been determined, a cover letter from the panel chair should accompany the review materials sent to them, stating that the College seeks a review of the quality of a candidate's research and professional development and not merely a testimonial to the candidate's accomplishments. A copy of the candidate's academic curriculum vitae and copies of the relevant scholarly and/or creative works agreed upon by the candidate and evaluation panel chair should be sent to each of the outside reviewers. Copies of the relevant portions of the Faculty/Administration Manual about
research and professional development as well as any additional departmental criteria on file in the Office of the Provost should be included. Additional supporting review materials may also be submitted by the panel chair or the candidate, provided that these materials are included in the packet.

Reviewers should be asked to identify what relationship, if any, they have with the candidate and to return their review in a timely manner for the deliberations of the departmental panel. To make it possible that reviews are available prior to those deliberations, external reviews must be solicited sufficiently in advance of panel deliberations.

The panel chair must include in the candidate's packet: (1) a description of the process by which the outside letters were obtained, (2) each reviewer's institutional and departmental affiliation, and rank or other institutional title, a description of the academic specialization of the reviewer, and other relevant information about the reviewer, which may be useful to those unfamiliar with the field, (3) a copy of the letter of solicitation by the panel chair, and (4) the confidential outside reviews.

(Ins. April 2007)

(3) Chair's evaluations since faculty member has been in rank. Chair must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate's being considered for promotion/tenure.

(4) Evidence of scholarship may include but is not limited to:

(a) professionally published scholarly books

(b) academic journal articles

(c) chapters in scholarly books
(d) edited volumes
(e) review essays
(f) creative literary and artistic works and other creative works
(g) research grants
(h) conference papers
(i) reviews of candidate’s books, performances, etc.
(j) scholarly reviews by candidate of books, performances, etc.
(k) invited or juried exhibits, concerts, performances, etc.
(l) technical reports
(m) textbooks, workbooks, study guides and other published pedagogical materials
(n) draft manuscripts
(o) professional bibliographies

(5) Evidence of professional activities may include but is not limited to:

(a) serving as an officer or a member of a board or committee of an international, national, regional or state professional organization
(b) serving on an editorial board of a scholarly journal
(c) reviewing manuscripts for journals and publishers; evaluating proposals for granting agencies
(d) chairing or serving as a discussant on a panel at a professional meeting
(e) preparing grant proposals and reports
(f) conducting professional workshops, seminars, and field trips
(g) participating in professional meetings, seminars, workshops, field trips, etc.
(h) undertaking post-doctoral studies
(i) receiving fellowships and awards
(j) serving as a professional consultant

3. Professional Service to the Community

a. **Standard**

Service to the College and/or community falls within the responsibilities of a faculty member and is essential to the fulfillment of the College’s responsibilities to the academic community and to the attainment of institutional goals. Each faculty member is expected to cooperate in supporting the mission and the goals of the department and the College. Service includes involvement in standing or ad hoc committees of the College faculty, in departmental committees or offices, and in special committees or task forces.

Service includes working with student organizations and non-academic advising; working with community, state, regional or national organizations; utilizing professional expertise; and working on institutional advancement projects.

b. **Evidence** (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include but is not limited to:

(1) Evaluatee’s narrative of service activities.

(2) Departmental and extra-departmental colleague letters:

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

(Ins. April 2007)

(3) Chair’s evaluations since the faculty member has been in rank. Chair must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate’s being considered for promotion/tenure.

4. Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

What follow are minimum criteria for tenure and promotion. Each department may develop additional appropriate criteria, which must be written, available and on file in the Office of the Provost.

a. Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is normally awarded simultaneously with tenure. The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The Associate Professor will normally hold the highest appropriate terminal degree. Evidence of exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development is required.

(Ins. April 2007; Rev. April 2009)

(1) Tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor require sustained effectiveness in teaching.

(2) There must be clear evidence of high promise for continued quality scholarship and professional activity. Since peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality, the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). All evidence should be evaluated rigorously.

(3) There should be active and sustained service to the College or there should be active and sustained service in the candidate’s professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.
b. **Tenure for Associate Professors**

A faculty member hired as an untenured Associate Professor must meet the same criteria for tenure as in section a (immediately above). Evidence of exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development is required.

(Ins. April 2007; Rev. April 2009)

c. **Promotion to the Rank of Professor**

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of continuing quality teaching, research and service. The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to Professor. The Professor must hold the highest appropriate terminal degree. Evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in all three areas is required.

(Ins. April 2007; Rev. April 2009)

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

(Rev. April 2009)

(2) Because Professor is the highest rank, there must be clear evidence of continuing quality scholarship. Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professional evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). In addition to scholarship, sustained professional activity is expected. All evidence should be rigorously evaluated.

(3) There should be active and sustained service to the College. Leadership should be demonstrated either in college service or in the candidate’s professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.

d. **Tenure for Professors**

A faculty member hired as an untenured Professor must meet the same criteria for tenure as in section a (immediately above).
5. Nomination of Instructional Faculty to a Higher Rank

When a faculty member becomes eligible for nomination to a higher rank, a nomination may be submitted in the form of a petition from one or more of the following:

a. the Department Chair, after consultation with the tenured members of the department, to the Provost;

b. a majority of the tenured members of the department to the Provost;

c. the individual faculty member to the Provost;

d. the Provost to the Department Chair;

e. the Dean to the Department Chair.

Normally, a petition nominating a faculty member to a higher rank should be made not later than August 15 of the academic year in which a decision on promotion is to be made. The faculty member will then be evaluated under the provisions outlined in Art. VI.D. entitled “Procedures for Third-Year Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty.”
(Rev. April 2007)

It should be clearly understood by all faculty members that promotion does not come automatically after the passage of a fixed period of time, but it is recognition of outstanding performance and service at the College.

B. Third-Year Review and Promotion of Instructors and Renewal of Senior Instructors

The President retains the power of approval for third-year review determinations, conferrals of tenure, and promotions. The Provost, acting in accordance with the provisions stated in this Faculty/Administration Manual, is responsible for making the final recommendation to the President in respect to all such matters.

A third-year review should substantiate whether satisfactory progress toward promotion to Senior Instructor has been made.
Promotion to Senior Instructor is awarded to eligible instructors at the College of Charleston for meritorious achievement in the three areas: teaching, professional development and service. A promotion decision is made only once normally in the sixth year. A review for renewal as Senior Instructor normally takes place every fifth year.

1. Specific Criteria for Promotion to and Renewal as Senior Instructor

   The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to and renewal as Senior Instructor:

   a. Promotion to and renewal in the rank of Senior Instructor requires sustained exemplary performance in teaching.

   b. There should be active and sustained participation in departmental advising programs.

   c. Continued vitality as a teacher is intimately related to professional development. There must be clear evidence of promise for continued development in pedagogy.

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

2. Teaching Effectiveness

   a. **Standard**

   Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty at the College of Charleston. Teaching involves communicating knowledge to students and fostering in them the intellectual curiosity necessary to continue the quest for knowledge. The effective teacher exhibits a sustained concern for teaching, which is reflected in teaching materials, classroom performance, academic advising, critical evaluation of students, and adequate preparation of students for later undergraduate work. Course materials should be well conceived, well organized and well written. Instructors should be accessible to students both inside and outside of class, provide frequent constructive feedback to students, and involve them actively in the learning process. Instructors should attempt to use a variety of teaching techniques including innovations involving modern technology, where appropriate, and maintain currency in the pedagogy of their disciplines. Students should be
exposed to current scholarship or research in the field, if appropriate. Student evaluations should be consistently good. An instructor should be prepared to provide sound advice to students and to newer colleagues on academic matters.

b. **Evidence** (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include:

1. Chair’s evaluations since faculty member has been at the College.
2. Internal and/or external colleague statements on teaching.
3. Evaluatee’s narrative of teaching philosophy, methodology, and accomplishments in teaching, advising, and other similar activities.
4. Recent graduate evaluations on teaching: either all majors or a sample of at least 40 students selected randomly from among all majors in the department who have graduated within the past five years and whom the candidate has taught; departments may choose to use a sample of at least 40 graduates selected randomly from among students in service courses taught by the evaluatee. Additional students whom the candidate has taught may be added by the candidate in consultation with the Chair. Students must list all courses taken from the evaluatee and the grade(s) received in these courses. In addition, the students must sign the form or letter used for evaluation. The Chair must designate which students are recommended by the evaluatee. In cases where a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than 40 graduates, the Department Chair should indicate that this has occurred. In these cases it may be appropriate to substitute evaluations from non-majors.

5. **Student ratings and summaries:**
   
   (a) Student ratings from all courses evaluated. Student course evaluations will be completed for every section of every course, every semester, with the exception of a course that has only one student enrolled. If it is a department’s policy to require the inclusion of the comments portion of the
student ratings, the department must develop procedures for collecting and reviewing this portion of the student ratings form. A copy of the procedures should be on file in the Provost’s Office. In the absence of these procedures, a faculty member undergoing review may choose to include these comments as part of the packet, having explained in his or her narrative about teaching whether all the comments or a selection of the comments have been included.

(b) The Summary Rating for all courses in the Department for each semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder with the summary student evaluations. The summary ratings for the department will be distributed to the faculty in the department each semester. (April 2011)

(6) Evidence of teaching effectiveness may also include but is not limited to:

(a) Syllabi, reading lists or bibliographies, policy statements, grading procedures, course goals and objectives.

(b) Samples of evaluatee-prepared and/or other supplementary course material.

(c) Samples of tests, exams, essays or other assignments, including some graded work.

(d) Participation in curriculum development.

(e) Participation in interdisciplinary courses and programs.

(f) Participation in peer coaching activities and/or observation of classroom performance by colleagues. Each department will develop a procedure for peer observations of candidates for promotion to Senior Instructor.
Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops and field trips.

Participation in departmental advising as directed by the Department Chair.

3. Professional Development

a. **Standard**

Professional development is essential to an instructor’s ability to carry out the College’s educational mission. Professional development involves the various activities that increase the faculty member’s knowledge and exemplify pedagogical or artistic expertise. It includes, but is not limited to, research in pedagogy, appropriate studies within and outside one’s specialties, and creative activities in practice and performance in the fine arts. Instructors maintain currency in the content of courses taught and in pedagogical techniques. They sustain professional contact with colleagues and engage in continuing professional activities to maintain, upgrade, and augment existing skills or develop new ones.

b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include:

(1) Evaluatee’s narrative of professional development activities.

(2) Internal and/or external colleague statements on professional activities.

(3) Chair’s evaluations since faculty member has been at the College.

(4) Evidence of professional development may include but is not limited to:

   (a) serving as an officer or a member of a board or committee of a local, state, regional, national or international professional organization;

   (b) chairing or serving as a discussant on a panel at a professional meeting;
(c) preparing grant proposals and reports;

(d) conducting professional workshops and seminars;

(e) participating in professional meetings, seminars, workshops, et cetera;

(f) completing graduate studies or course work relevant to professional competency;

(g) receiving fellowships and awards;

(h) serving as a professional consultant;

(i) attending workshops, symposia, meetings of regional and national organizations, et cetera;

(j) producing scholarly and creative works that are pedagogical in nature, such as media productions, and compiling significant bibliographies, guidebooks, catalogs, study guides, textbooks or workbooks;

(k) all activities appropriate at the professorial ranks.

4. Professional Service to the Community

a. Standard

Service to the College and/or the community falls within the responsibilities of a faculty member and is essential to the fulfillment of the College’s responsibilities to the academic community and to the attainment of institutional goals. Each faculty member is expected to cooperate in supporting the mission and the goals of the department and the College. Service includes holding departmental offices, serving on departmental committees, and participating in campus and community activities related to the College and to one’s professional role. It also includes involvement with standing or ad hoc committees of the College, and special committees or task forces. Service includes working with student organizations and non-academic advising; working with community, state, regional or national
organizations; utilizing professional expertise; and working on institutional advancement projects.

b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include but is not limited to:

(1) Evaluatee’s narrative of accomplishments in service while in the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor.

(2) Internal and/or external colleague statements and letters of testimony. The letters shall be solicited by the panel chair. Authors of letters shall be agreed upon by both the panel chair and the evaluatee.

(3) Chair’s evaluations since the faculty member has been at the College.

5. Procedures for Third-Year Evaluation and Promotion of Instructors

a. Introduction

The third-year evaluation is a significant decision point in an instructor’s career at the College of Charleston. The result of the third-year evaluation is a decision whether to reappoint an instructor.

Promotion to Senior Instructor is awarded to eligible instructors at the College of Charleston for meritorious achievement in the three areas: teaching, professional development and service. A promotion decision is made only once normally in the sixth year.

Eligibility requirements and nomination procedures are outlined in Art. VI.A.

By August 15, each Department Chair should provide the appropriate Academic Dean and the Provost with a list of faculty members to be considered. (Rev. April 2007)

The instructor undergoing third-year evaluation or promotion to Senior Instructor must prepare and submit a packet of evidence to demonstrate that he/she met the standards and criteria for this level of evaluation during his/her first two and one-half years at the College.
b. **Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member’s Contribution to the Packet**

A faculty member shall submit to the chair of the departmental evaluation panel by the announced deadline a packet containing a current **curriculum vitae** and evidence assembled to demonstrate that the standards and criteria have been met.

c. **Standards, Criteria and Evidence**

See Faculty/Administration Manual, Art. VI.B., Promotion of Instructors.

d. **Composition of the Departmental Evaluation Panel**

See Faculty/Administration Manual, Art. VI.D. Procedures for Third-Year Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty.

C. **Third-Year Review, Tenure and Promotion of the Library Faculty**

The President retains the power of approval for third-year review determinations, conferrals of tenure and promotions. The Provost, acting in accordance with the provisions stated in this Faculty/Administration Manual, is responsible for making the final recommendation to the President in respect to all such matters.

In considering tenure and promotion for a professional librarian, the Dean’s assessment of the candidate will carry particular weight with the Provost and the President, who require that the Dean submits an independent evaluation and recommendation, together with the complete dossier prepared by the library faculty’s evaluation panel, after he or she has reviewed the packet that includes colleague opinions.

Tenure and promotion require substantial evidence of consistently high performance in professional competency, professional growth and development, and service. In addition, evidence of exemplary performance is required in the professional competency area. Tenure is a long-term commitment by the College; it is not merely a reward for work accomplished, but it is an award given with the expectation that consistently high performance will continue.
Promotion to the rank of Librarian II (if necessary) is awarded simultaneously with the third-year review. A third-year review should substantiate whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made. There should be evidence of effective professional competency, a continuing research and development program, and active participation in service. A candidate should be informed in detail of any weakness that, if not corrected, might lead to a negative tenure decision. If there are serious doubts as to whether the candidate will be able to meet the criteria prior to a required tenure decision, a recommendation against retention should be given.

A tenure decision is made only once, no later than the sixth year. Up to two years credit toward tenure and promotion may be awarded at the time of initial appointment for previous professional library experience elsewhere, or for full-time employment at professional library positions of special status at the College of Charleston. A person receiving the maximum of two years credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fourth year at the College. (Rev. April 2007)

Three years in rank is normally required for a Librarian I to be promoted to a Librarian II (which is done simultaneously with the Third-year Review). Six years in rank is normally required for a Librarian II to be promoted to a Librarian III. Seven years in rank is normally required for a Librarian III to be promoted to a Librarian IV. In exceptional cases a librarian may wish to petition for early tenure or promotion provided that action has the prior written approval of the Provost and the Dean.

Librarians are evaluated in the three categories of professional competency, professional growth and development, and professional service to the community. Because professional competency is the primary responsibility of any librarian, evidence of exemplary professional competency is expected for tenure and promotion. Because professional growth and development are essential to the mission of the College, evidence of a sustained quality research program and a continuing scholarly commitment must be provided for tenure and promotion. Because librarians should be contributing members of the College community and, where appropriate, the community at large, evidence of service to the community is expected.

While quantifiable data are important, decisions about tenure and promotion must ultimately rely on sound professional judgment.

What follow are the general standards and evidence that remain constant throughout the five levels of institutional evaluation, namely third-year review, tenure and promotion to Librarian II, III and IV.
1. Introduction

The third-year evaluation is a significant decision point in a faculty member’s career at the College of Charleston. The result of the third-year evaluation is a decision whether to reappoint a faculty member. For a faculty member with two years of credit toward tenure, a third-year evaluation will take place in the fall semester of the third year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place in the fall of the fourth year. For a faculty member with one year of credit toward tenure, a third-year evaluation will take place in the fall semester of the third year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place in the fall of the fifth year.

(Rev. April 2007)

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

(Ins. April 2007)

Tenure and promotion are awarded to eligible faculty at the College of Charleston for meritorious achievement in the three areas of teaching (for library faculty, “professional competence”), research and professional development, and service. Tenure is awarded to faculty to assure that they have freedom in teaching, research and extramural activities and a sufficient degree of economic security to make teaching at the College of Charleston attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and society.¹

After the expiration of a probationary period, which is stated in the initial employment and is normally six years (some faculty are hired with up to

two years credit for teaching in other institutions of higher education), faculty should become eligible for consideration for tenure and, upon its reward, should be terminated only for adequate cause. (Rev. April 2007)

Eligibility requirements and nomination procedures are described in Section VI.A. Candidates are reminded that these time-in-rank requirements are minimal. The established criteria for promotion to the various ranks are also minimal requirements. In particular, faculty are encouraged to seek promotion to professor when they feel confident about their eligibility and performance, not merely because minimal requirements are met.

By August 15, each Department Chair should provide the appropriate Academic Dean and the Provost with a list of faculty members to be considered. The Dean of Libraries should provide a list of eligible library faculty members to the Provost. (Rev. April 2007)

The faculty member undergoing third-year evaluation must prepare and submit a packet of evidence to demonstrate that he/she met the standards and criteria for this level of evaluation during his/her first two and one half years at the College.

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

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

3. Standards, Criteria and Evidence. See Faculty/Administration Manual, Art. VI in Sect. A (for Tenure-Track and Tenured Instructional Faculty), Sect. B (for Instructors and Senior Instructors), and Sect. C (for Library Faculty).

4. Composition of the Departmental Evaluation Panel

For each faculty member to be evaluated, an appropriate departmental evaluation panel will be formed to make a summary presentation to the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries concerning the
candidate. The Chair of the department will provide the appropriate Academic Dean with the names of the panel members and Chair as soon as possible. Any member of the department who is being considered for promotion will deliberately disqualify himself or herself from serving on his or her own panel or that of a colleague who is being considered for promotion to the same or higher rank within his or her department.

The departmental evaluation panel will be composed of at least five tenured faculty members. All tenured departmental faculty will serve on the evaluation panel. Exceptions for faculty on sabbatical or leave are described in Art. X.A. The appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries may sit with the departmental evaluation panel throughout the review process; however, he/she is not required to sit with the departmental evaluation panel.

Where the department consists of five or more tenured faculty members, one tenured faculty member from outside the department shall be added to the panel. If a department is reviewing more than one candidate for tenure, promotion or third year evaluation, the same individual from outside the department sits with the departmental panel members for all cases, unless the department has six or more candidates due for panel evaluation. In such cases, departmental members of the panel may appoint no more than two extra-departmental panel members to sit with the panel in different cases, with the cases divided such that a single extra-departmental panel member shall serve in all cases under review for the same rank. If a department’s membership is such that the panel has fewer than five members, additional tenured members of the faculty, from related fields if possible, will be selected to give the panel a total membership of five. In all cases, each year vacancies in the evaluation panel will be filled by having the departmental members of the panel provide a slate of potential evaluation panel members to each of the candidates for third-year reappointment, tenure and promotion who will rank order the slate first to last. The slate will consist of at least five names or twice the number of positions on the panel to be filled (whichever is larger). The rankings of all candidates will be averaged and the panel will be completed by offering the positions to the highest ranked candidates until the panel is completed.

Where there are no members of the department eligible to serve on the panel, all members of the department will meet and select by majority vote a slate of 10 tenured faculty (from related fields if possible) and present it to the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries. The appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries will appoint the five
members of the panel from the slate and will designate one of the five to serve as the panel chair.

When unusual circumstances justify and where requested by the Department Chair, the evaluatee, the evaluation panel, the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries or the Provost, the Provost may appoint an outside advisor to assist the evaluation panel in its task. Ideally, said advisor will be a tenured faculty member in the evaluatee’s discipline from another institution of higher education.

After consultation with the evaluatee, Department Chair, all members of the panel, and the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries, the Provost will define in writing the role and extent of participation in the process of their outside advisor and furnish copies to all parties.

5. Departmental Evaluation Panel Chair

If the Department Chair is a member of the panel, then he/she is the panel chair. If the Department Chair is not a panel member, the panel chair will be the senior departmental member serving on the panel. The senior departmental member is the one of highest rank who has held that rank longest while at the College. Because the Library does not have a Department Chair, the tenured Library faculty will elect a departmental evaluation panel chair.

6. Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel

The departmental evaluation panel will base its recommendation on the following information:

a. Faculty member’s contribution to the packet assembled by the candidate himself/herself to provide evidence that he/she meets the criteria for teaching, research and development, and service.

b. Letters by the departmental colleagues addressing whether the evaluatee has met the stated criteria. Normally, all tenured faculty members in a department, excluding the department chair, must provide colleague evaluation letters; however, any member of the department may submit a colleague letter except that candidates do not write letters of evaluation on their departmental colleagues who are being evaluated for the same purpose. Colleagues should study thoroughly the candidate’s contributions to the packet before writing their colleague letters. Colleague letters should be explicit and detailed and should
address the criteria. To say “the candidate meets the criteria” is inadequate. College of Charleston personnel are to treat these colleague letters as confidential. They shall be available only to those authorized to use them as part of the evaluation process. (Rev. April 2007)

c. Student Rating Averages from all courses evaluated and Summary Ratings for all courses in the Department or Program. (Normally, course evaluation ratings are included by the candidate in the packet; however, some or all of these documents may be provided by the department chair in the event the candidate is unable to do so.) (Rev. April 2007)

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

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

Extra-departmental colleague letters are optional for third-year review and may be requested by the departmental evaluation panel or the candidate. (Rev. April 2007)

e. All annual evaluation narratives and rating letters, as well as any letters that the evaluatee has written in response to the annual evaluations.

f. Recent graduate evaluations addressing the criteria shall be solicited by the panel Chair. Each department shall have established procedures to be used by evaluation panels for the solicitation of recent graduate evaluations. A written statement of this procedure shall be on file in the appropriate Academic Dean and the Provost’s office. Recent graduate evaluations are optional for Third-Year Review and may be requested by the departmental evaluation panel or the candidate. (Rev. April 2007)
g. A personal interview of the candidate by the department evaluation panel.

h. Such other data and interviews as the panel feels would be valuable.

7. Reporting Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel

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

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

(Rev. April 2009)

The panel chair shall forward the panel’s statement to the appropriate Academic Dean by the announced deadline. In the case of tenure and promotion recommendations, this deadline is typically at the end of October. In the case of third-year reappointment recommendations, this deadline is typically near mid-January.

(Rev. April 2007; Rev. April 2009)

8. Dean’s Role for Third-year Candidates

The appropriate Dean shall review the faculty member’s packet and the departmental evaluation panel’s recommendation, interview each candidate, and notify the candidate in writing of his/her recommendations. The Dean shall submit his/her recommendations in writing to the Provost and forward all materials to the Provost’s Office by the announced deadlines, which are typically at the end of January.
9. Dean’s Role for Tenure and Promotion Candidates

The appropriate Dean will review the evaluation panel recommendations and the candidate’s packet and may choose to interview candidates. The Dean will notify the candidate in writing of his/her recommendations. The Dean shall provide her/her recommendations in writing to the Provost and forward all materials to a designated room for review by the Provost and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-year Review by the announced deadlines, which are typically at the end of November.

(Rev. April 2007; Rev. April 2009)

10. Faculty Advisory Committee Action

The Provost shall make packets of all candidates for tenure and promotion available to the members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review. The Faculty Advisory Committee shall notify each candidate in writing of its recommendation by the announced deadlines.

The Committee shall also review third-year candidates on all negative departmental recommendations or if requested to do so by the candidate, any member of the departmental panel, the appropriate Dean or the Provost. In cases where the Dean’s decision is different from the departmental evaluation panel or the departmental evaluation panel vote is negative, he/she shall refer the case to the Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee for their recommendations. The Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee shall interview each candidate for third-year reappointment when the departmental panel or the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries recommendation is different from the departmental evaluation panel or the departmental evaluation panel vote is negative.

(Rev. April 2009)

The Provost’s recommendations for all reviews and the Faculty Advisory Committee’s recommendations in cases where they act shall be submitted in writing to the President by the announced deadlines.

(Rev. April 2009)
11. Provost’s Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion Candidates

After the Advisory Committee has made its written recommendation to the President, the Provost may interview the candidate as part of his/her independent evaluation of the candidate. The Provost’s recommendation shall be submitted in writing to the President by the announced deadlines.
(Rev. April 2009)

12. President’s Decision

The President shall make a final determination within 2 weeks after she/he receives recommendations from all of the following: the department evaluation panel, the appropriate Dean, the Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Provost. All such recommendations shall be submitted to the President no later than March 1 of each year. In addition to these recommendations, the President shall also have access to, and may consider, other materials used by any or all of the foregoing during the course of their respective evaluations. Once a final decision is made by the President, and within the 2 weeks after the last recommendation is received by her/him, the President shall inform the candidate, the Provost, the Dean, and the evaluation panel chair in writing, of her/his decision.
(Rev. April 2009)

2 Deadlines for earlier stages of the review process are prior to March 1 and are announced by Academic Affairs each year.
A RESOLUTION:

FOR THE RE-DEDICATION OF A LANE ON THE LEGARE BRIDGE OVER THE ASHLEY RIVER FOR USE BY PEOPLE ON FOOT AND ON BICYCLES

WHEREAS the City of Charleston, Charleston County (and its Parks and Recreation Department), and the State of South Carolina have made it a priority to establish a network of safe routes for pedestrians and bicyclists, for practical and recreational users, whether they are commuters, people doing errands, those who don’t own cars or wish to moderate their use of cars, and the religiously devout for whom use of automobiles on the Sabbath is off-limits, and

WHEREAS the lack of a safe crossing over the Ashley River for a Battery2Beach Route, linkage to the West Ashley Greenway, the East Coast Greenway, to downtown Charleston and a multitude of neighborhoods remains a critical gap in connectivity for such people on foot and on bicycles, forcing many to use substandard and unsafe routes, and,

WHEREAS The US Department of Transportation “encourages bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on bridge projects including facilities on limited-access bridges with connections to streets and paths,” and,

WHEREAS the people of the Greater Charleston area and tourists alike have embraced the example set by the bicycle and pedestrian accommodations on the Arthur Ravenel Jr. Bridge, making it a highly-visible and unique attraction for both sightseers, commuters and citizens seeking healthy exercise, and,

WHEREAS there is widespread acknowledgement of the health and environmental advantages afforded by alternative forms of transportation, as well as a recognition that accommodating such forms of transportation is now a priority measurement of a city’s ability to attract new business, new residents, and tourists, and,

WHEREAS analogous Rte. 17 southbound (opposite direction) traffic is adequately provided for by three lanes on a parallel bridge,

NOW THEREFORE WE herewith register our support the City of Charleston’s proposal to re-dedicate one of four northbound Route 17 lanes over the Legare Bridge for the use of pedestrians and bicyclists, and herewith urge officials on all levels of government to take whatever action is necessary to expedite this project.
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From: Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 1 March, 2011 at 5 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the 8 February 2011 Minutes

3. Reports
   The Speaker
   The Provost

4. New Business
   A. Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs
   B. Curriculum Committee
   C. Committee on General Education: Proposal from Honors for the Honors First Year Experience and new course from Classics for Humanities credit (See website for supporting documents)
   D. First Year Experience: Requirement Implementation Update
      --Report of the Committee
      --Motion of the Advisory Committee on the First-Year Experience to clarify the FYE requirement

5. Constituents’ Concerns

6. Adjournment

**Minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site:
http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php
A. Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for Faculty Senate March 1st Meeting
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

--Proposal for a Non-Credit Program: English Language Institute

B. Faculty Curriculum Committee
March 1, 2011 Meeting
List of Proposals Approved by the Committee
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

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

HONS163/164/263/264 are being renumbered as HONS191/192/293/294 (courses have already been approved by the FCC and Senate but the numbering was not available).

All new courses are included under Program Changes below.

II. Program Changes:

Education
New Course: EDFS428: Procedures for Teaching Students with Disabilities
Change of Major Requirements, Special Education (to substitute new course for EDFS427)

Honors
New Course: HONS100: Beyond George Street
Change of Major Requirements, Honors (to add course as req’d for all incoming freshmen)

Classics
New Course: CLAS 203: Special Topics
Change of Minor Requirements, Classics (add CLAS 105 and 203 to approved courses)
Change of Major Requirements BA, Classics and all AB degrees (add CLAS 105 and 203 to electives)
III. New Majors:

MATH  New Major: 36 hour BA
Does not involve any new, changed, or deleted courses

C. Committee on General Education

-- Proposal from Honors for the Honors First Year Experience and new course from Classics for Humanities credit (See website for supporting documents).

D. First Year Experience: Requirement Implementation Update

Committee Members: Christopher Korey, Chair (Biology), Michelle Futrell (Athletics), Sofia Agrest (Mathematics), Maureen Hays (Sociology and Anthropology), Adam Mendelsohn (Jewish Studies), Amy Rogers (Chemistry and Biochemistry), Phillip Powell (Library), Susan Kattwinkel (FYE, non-voting), Lynne Ford (Academic Affairs, non-voting), Jeri Cabot (Student Affairs, non-voting), Mindy Miley (New Student Programs, non-voting), Kay Smith (AE, non-voting on Sabbatical)

Committee Report

An academic first year experience will be required in the 2011-12 academic year. One of the crucial steps towards implementation is setting the criteria by which students who are entering the College are identified as needing to fulfill this requirement. Once these students are identified, the next challenge is to create the criteria by which completion of the requirement will be judged. This update summarizes the progress that the FYE Director and the First Year Experience Advisory Committee has made in creating the framework for the full implementation of the First Year Experience in the 2011-12 academic year.
IDENTIFYING FIRST YEAR STUDENTS

The motion approved by the Senate on March 13, 2007 was as follows:

Appendix 2. Motion that every entering student be required to complete a First-Year Experience (FYE), whether in a First-Year Seminar (FYSR) or a Learning Community (LC) (as amended)

The term “entering student” is broadly interpreted to mean any student entering the college. This would include true freshman coming directly from high school as well as transfer students from 2-year and 4-year institutions. However, some transfer students come to the College with several years of college experience and would not be candidates for our First Year Experience program requirement. Although not part of the official motion in the Senate, the QEP First Year Experience document provides some further recommendations in regards to the specific students that would be exempt from the FYE:

No student may enroll who has earned (at the College or as a transfer student) more than 30 credit hours, excluding AP and dual enrollment credits earned while in high school.

The charge presented to the Director of the First Year Experience, Dr. Susan Kattwinkel, and the First Year Experience Advisory Committee was to create a system that will ensure the efficient implementation of the FYE requirement. In this case, creating a workflow that would identify those incoming students (true freshman and transfer students) who would require the FYE and those, because of previous college experience, which do not. The exploration of implementation strategies quickly showed that in practice the 30 credit hour threshold criteria in the QEP document was not practical for implementation. There are several reasons for this. One, the transfer credits of an incoming student (AP, IB, College) are not in the Admission’s database at the time when the decision regarding FYE would be made so they cannot be used to determine if an incoming student has completed a year of college. Even if this information was available to use at Admissions, there are often many incoming students who are true freshman who transfer in 30+ credits and would be marked as exempt under this cutoff when in fact they should be enrolled in an FYE course.
In light of this, the Director and the FYE Advisory Committee worked with Advising, Admissions, the Registrar, and the Faculty Speaker to examine all aspects of the admissions process to create a strategy to identify all the incoming students that will be required to complete a First Year Experience. The process that was created will be implemented in two phases.

**Phase I (2011-2012 Academic Year)**

- All true freshman, Honors freshman, provisional freshman, international freshman, and GED freshman will be automatically identified and tagged in the computer system as requiring a First Year Experience. These students are easily identified by admit type in the Admissions database and the process can be completely automated. This step will capture ~1942 incoming freshman.

- The ~740 transfer students, most of who are not considered freshman, cannot at this point be dealt with automatically by the computer system. There is no data field that can be easily used to identify transfer students with less than a year of college in the Admissions database. To remedy this, the FYE office and the Advising office will work together to identify those transfer students who would require a First Year Experience course. All transfer students from 2-year and 4-year institutions meet individually with an advisor when they are admitted to the College. In these meetings, advisors will flag those transfer students that have had less than a year of college and notify the FYE Director to enroll them in an FYE course. This should capture the ~222 incoming freshman transfer students.

- The ~132 readmit students will be screened by the FYE office and Advising. The conditional readmit students will be screened during the STEP Workshop process and true freshman will be required to take an FYE course. The non-conditional readmits will be screened by the FYE office to identify freshman students that will need to take an FYE course. Screening of these students will capture the ~11 students that are freshman in the readmit category and will require a FYE course.

**Phase II**

- The Phase I process will automate the identification of a majority of incoming first year students that will require an FYE course. Close coordination between the FYE office Advising, and Admissions will screen the rest of the incoming student population. Optimally, it would benefit the program to be able to identify a more automated way to screen the 2-year and 4-year college transfer students to pick out first year students. Over the next one to two years, the Director and FYE Advisory Committee will work with Advising, Admissions, and the BATTERY Project to determine if an automated process can be created to screen these students. The results of these discussions will be presented to the Faculty Senate at a later date.
COMPLETING THE FYE REQUIREMENT

All incoming first year students will have the option of taking either a First Year Seminar or a Learning Community during the Fall or Spring semester of their Freshman year. For the coming 2011-12 academic year there are sufficient seats to provide all non-Honors College freshman with an FYE course. Specifically, there will be 48 FYSM courses and 43 Learning Communities offered next year.

In addition, there will be 4 Learning Communities offered this coming summer as part of the SPECTRA program. In total, there are ~2236 seats available to incoming first year students who are not part of the Honors College.

Honors students will have a separate First Year Experience course. For the past several years, Susan Kattwinkel, Kay Smith and the First Year Experience committee have been working with John Newell and Trisha Folds-Bennett to create an academic experience that fulfills the FYE requirement and the unique curricular requirements of the Honors College. This proposed program has been successfully piloted with the Honors ICE course, which is currently required for Honors students in their first semester. The Honors First Year Experience will be a learning community that consists of Honors Academic Writing, an Honors Seminar, and their new Beyond George Street course. The FYE committee unanimously agreed that the Honors College had developed a rigorous academic experience that fulfills the goals and requirements of the college-wide FYE. We fully supported the submission of the final proposal to the College-wide Curriculum Committee.

Once students have enrolled in their FYE course, the final hurdle is successfully completing the experience. For most students this will not pose a problem. Some students, either by receiving a failing grade or withdrawal from a course, will not complete the requirement in their first attempt. The committee reviewed all the different predicted scenarios to create the following framework to ensure students complete the FYE requirement by the end of their first year.

1. If a student takes a course in the Fall and fails to complete the FYE requirement, they will have the Spring OR the Summer to complete the requirement. If they fail in both attempts, they will be enrolled in Learning Strategies the following Fall.
2. If a student enters in the spring semester as a true Freshman, they will have the Spring AND the Summer to fulfill the FYE requirement. If they fail in both attempts, they will be enrolled in Learning Strategies the following Fall.

3. If a student enters in the Fall and elects not to take an FYE course that semester, they will have the Spring AND the Summer to fulfill the FYE requirement. If they fail in both attempts, they will be enrolled in Learning Strategies the following Fall.

Motion of the Advisory Committee on the First-Year Experience to clarify the FYE requirement.

Introduction and Rationale:

In a meeting on March 13, 2007, the Faculty Senate approved a proposal that every entering student be required to complete a First-Year Experience (FYE), whether in a First-Year Seminar (FYSR) or a Learning Community (LC). The original motion left some key issues undefined. Now that the requirement is scheduled to formally begin for students entering the College in the Fall of 2011, it is necessary to clarify the requirement. This motion establishes a clear and specific requirement for entering students.

Motion:

Students required to complete a First Year Experience do so by completing a First-Year Seminar (FYSM), a Learning Community (LC), or an Honors College Learning Community that includes the new Honors First Year Experience course.

All students required to complete a First Year Experience will be allowed two attempts to successfully complete the requirement during their first year. After the first year, students may satisfy the First Year Experience requirement by successfully completing a Learning Strategies course.
From: Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 8 February, 2011 at 5 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the 18 January 2011 Minutes

3. Reports
   The Speaker
   The Associate Provost

4. New Business
   --Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

   --Report and Discussion of Draft Copy: President's Diversity Commission's Strategic Plan for Diversity (see Senate website for draft copy – Senators will receive a hard copy).

5. Constituents’ Concerns

6. Adjournment

**Minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site:
http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php
Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for Faculty Senate February 8th Meeting
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

New Course Proposals and Changes:

--Proposal to Change a Graduate Program
   Master of Education in Teaching Learning and Advocacy (MTLA)
   Requirement Change

--Proposal for a New Graduate Course
   MATH 555 Bayesian Statistical Methods

   Permission to Cross List a Graduate Course MATH 555 Bayesian Statistical Methods with MATH 455 Bayesian Statistical Methods
From: Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 18 January, 2011 at 5 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the 7 December 2010 Minutes
3. Reports
   The Speaker
   The Provost
4. Old Business
   A. Motion to change the Bylaws Article V, Section 3, B, 16 (bylaws of Educational Technology Committee)
   B. Motion to change the Bylaws Article V, Section 2, B, 1 (bylaws of Academic Planning Committee)
   C. Motion to change the Bylaws, Article V, Section 3, B, 2 (bylaws of the Graduate Education Committee)
5. New Business
   A. Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs
6. Constituents’ Concerns
7. Adjournment

**Minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site:**
http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php
A. Motion to change the Bylaws Article V, Section 3, B, 16 (bylaws of Educational Technology Committee)

Submitted by Brenton LeMesurier and Christopher Vinson, Co-chairs of the Educational Technology (from the 7 December Senate Meeting and referred to the Bylaws Committee)

Purpose of change:

The change would update the bylaws to reflect the current administrative structure at the College and allow for closer collaboration between the faculty committee and administrative staff.

Current bylaws:

16. Educational Technology Committee

(6) Composition: Seven faculty members and one student. No more than two members may come from any one academic department. Non-voting ex-officio members are the Provost and the Dean of Libraries.

b. Duties:

(6) To review annually the status of support for faculty and student use of educational technology, which includes the use of computers, audio-visual media, the Internet, and telecommunications;

(2) To consider and plan long-range academic use of educational technology for teaching and learning;

(3) To receive from the faculty, or from any school or department, recommendations or suggestions that may aid in the appropriate use of educational technology, promote efficient services, and encourage increased use of educational technology;

(4) To advise the Provost on basic policy for faculty use of educational technology;

(5) To advise the Dean of Libraries on the allotment of funds for implementation of educational technology. (Rev. Oct. 2000)

(6) To serve as regular members of the President’s Information Technology Council, representing the faculty in strategic and tactical information technology policies, projects, and planning. It is stated as a goal that the committee membership should include a faculty member from each academic school, one from the graduate school, one from the library, and a student. (Approved April 2005)
Proposed changes: (proposed changes are indicated by underlined italics):

16. Educational Technology Committee

(6) Composition: Seven faculty members and one student. No more than two members may come from any one academic department. Non-voting ex-officio members are the Provost (or the Provost’s designee), the Chief Information Officer (or the CIO’s designee), and the Director of Teaching, Learning and Technology, and the Dean of Libraries.

b. Duties:

(6) To review annually the status of support for faculty and student use of educational technology, which includes the use of computers, audio-visual media, the Internet, and telecommunications;

(2) To consider and plan long-range academic use of educational technology for teaching and learning;

(3) To receive from the faculty, or from any school or department, recommendations or suggestions that may aid in the appropriate use of educational technology, promote efficient services, and encourage increased use of educational technology;

(4) To advise the Provost on basic policy for faculty use of educational technology;

(5) To advise the Chief Information Officer, Dean of Libraries, on the allotment of funds for implementation of educational technology and on educational technology policies, projects, and planning.

(6) To serve as regular members of the President’s Information Technology Council, representing the faculty in strategic and tactical information technology policies, projects, and planning. It is stated as a goal that the committee membership should include a faculty member from each academic school, one from the graduate school, one from the library, and a student.

Rationale:

The by-laws need to be updated to reflect changes in the administrative structure of the College, in particular the creation of the two new positions of Chief Information Officer and Director of Teaching and Learning Technology. These positions for one thing take over duties previously handle by the Dean of Libraries, and provide avenues of communication more than the President’s Information Technology Council.

By-Laws Committee Report:
The By-Laws Committee supports this motion to change the by-laws.

B. Motion to change the Bylaws Article V, Section 2, B, 1 (bylaws of Academic Planning Committee)

Submitted by Julia Eichelberger, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee (from the 7 December Senate Meeting and referred to the Bylaws Committee)

We propose the following changes to the duties of this committee.

Current description of Academic Planning Committee’s duties:

1. Academic Planning Committee
   a. Composition: Seven faculty members and one student. The Provost is a non-voting ex-officio member.

b. Duties: To consider and recommend long-range academic programs and goals for the College. To this end, the committee shall gather information from such administrators, academic schools and departments, committees, program directors, and other individuals as are advocating new programs and goals, and it shall gather such budgetary information as would be necessary to evaluate the economic feasibility of such new programs and goals. In this work the Academic Planning Committee shall work closely with the Budget Committee. The Chair of the Academic Planning Committee or her or his representative shall attend meetings of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. (Rev. May 2009)

Proposed change, with added wording underlined:

1. Academic Planning Committee
   a. Composition: Seven faculty members and one student. The Provost is a non-voting ex-officio member.

b. Duties: To consider and recommend long-range academic programs and goals for the College. To this end, the committee shall gather information from such administrators, academic schools and departments, committees, program directors, and other individuals as are advocating new programs and goals, and it shall gather such budgetary information as would be necessary to evaluate the economic feasibility of such new programs and goals. In this work the Academic Planning Committee shall work closely with the Budget Committee. The committee shall also review and respond to plans brought to the committee by the Provost concerning the termination of programs, and shall gather such information as would be necessary to evaluate the impact of program termination upon the College’s academic mission. One or more members of the Academic Planning Committee shall serve on committees convened by the Provost for the
purposes of long-range planning and budgeting for the College’s academic programs. The Chair of the Academic Planning Committee or her or his representative shall attend meetings of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. (Rev. May 2009)

**Rationale:** This change recognizes the committee’s role in the review of termination of programs. It also notes this committee’s role on other faculty-administration planning committees convened by the Provost (e.g., the Planning and Priorities Committee). The Committee has discussed this proposed new language with the Provost’s office.

**By-Laws Committee Report:**

The By-Laws Committee recommends the following amendment to the proposed change:

Delete the second sentence of the proposed new language.

b. Duties: To consider and recommend long-range academic programs and goals for the College. To this end, the committee shall gather information from such administrators, academic schools and departments, committees, program directors, and other individuals as are advocating new programs and goals, and it shall gather such budgetary information as would be necessary to evaluate the economic feasibility of such new programs and goals. In this work the Academic Planning Committee shall work closely with the Budget Committee. The committee shall also review and respond to plans brought to the committee by the Provost concerning the termination of programs, and shall gather such information as would be necessary to evaluate the impact of program termination upon the College’s academic mission. One or more members of the Academic Planning Committee shall serve on committees convened by the Provost for the purposes of long-range planning and budgeting for the College’s academic programs. The Chair of the Academic Planning Committee or her or his representative shall attend meetings of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. (Rev. May 2009)

**Rationale:** The Academic Planning Committee’s involvement in long-range planning is already spelled out in the first sentence of (b.) Duties. However, requiring the Provost to appoint members of this committee to other committees is beyond the purview of Faculty By-Laws.

**C. Motion to change the Bylaws, Article V, Section 3, B, 2 (bylaws of the Graduate**
Education Committee)
Submitted by Silvia Rodríguez-Sabater, Chair of the Graduate Education Committee
(from the 7 December Senate Meeting and referred to the Bylaws Committee)

Purpose of change:
The change in bylaws would give the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs a formal role in reviewing proposals to terminate academic programs.

Proposed change:
Add new duty to Article V, Section 3, B.2.b:

(6) To review and make recommendations concerning proposals for the termination of programs brought to the committee by the Provost

Rationale:
Although the Graduate Education Committee plays an important role in the approval process for the development of new courses and programs, the bylaws do not assign to the committee a formal role in the review of proposals to terminate academic programs.

There are good reasons for including the Graduate Education Committee in the process for terminating academic programs. Faculty members on the committee have significant expertise in evaluating the curricula of academic programs. Furthermore, to carry out its duties effectively, the Graduate Education Committee needs to be informed in a timely way of the termination of programs. Finally, by including faculty in the review process, the best principles of shared governance would be upheld and controversies surrounding terminations of programs may be avoided.

Although the final decision to terminate programs would remain with the Provost and the Board of Trustees, it would be a logical extension of its duties to include the Graduate Education Committee in an advisory role in the process for terminating academic programs.

By-Laws Committee Report:
The By-Laws Committee supports this motion to change the by-laws.
Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for Faculty Senate January 18th Meeting
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

--Proposal to Change a Graduate Course:
Master of Arts in Teaching in Middle Grades
EDEE 515 Middle School Organization and Curriculum
Change: Separate the course into graduate and undergraduate levels

--Permission to Cross-List a Graduate Course:
Cross-List EDEE 515 (Graduate) with EDMG 415 Middle School Organization and Curriculum (undergraduate)
From: Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 7 December 2010 at 5 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the 2 November 2010 Minutes

3. Reports
   The Speaker
   The Provost

4. New Business
   A. Educational Technology Committee
      --Motion to change the Bylaws Article V, Section 3, B, 16 (bylaws of Educational Technology Committee)
   
   B. Academic Standards Committee
      --Motion to change the Bylaws Article V, Section 2, B, 1 (bylaws of Academic Planning Committee)

   C. Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs
      --Motion to change the Bylaws, Article V, Section 3, B, 2 (bylaws of the Graduate Education Committee)
      --Proposal to change a Graduate Program (see website for supporting documents)

   D. Faculty Curriculum Committee
      --List of course and program proposals approved by the committee

   E. Committee on General Education
      --First Year Experience Proposal
      --Change the language requirement to reflect the 4 hour change in Asian languages and Hebrew (see website for complete supporting documents)

5. Constituents’ Concerns

6. Adjournment

**Minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site:
http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php
A. **Motion of the Educational Technology Committee to change the committee’s bylaws**

Change to Bylaws Article V, Section 3, B, 16 (bylaws of Educational Technology Committee)

**Purpose of change:**

The change would update the bylaws to reflect the current administrative structure at the College and allow for closer collaboration between the faculty committee and administrative staff.

**Current bylaws:**

16. Educational Technology Committee

a. Composition: Seven faculty members and one student. No more than two members may come from any one academic department. Non-voting *ex officio* members are the Provost and the Dean of Libraries.

b. Duties:

1. To review annually the status of support for faculty and student use of educational technology, which includes the use of computers, audio-visual media, the Internet, and telecommunications;

2. To consider and plan long-range academic use of educational technology for teaching and learning;

3. To receive from the faculty, or from any school or department, recommendations or suggestions that may aid in the appropriate use of educational technology, promote efficient services, and encourage increased use of educational technology;

4. To advise the Provost on basic policy for faculty use of educational technology;

5. To advise the Dean of Libraries on the allotment of funds for implementation of educational technology. (Rev. Oct. 2000)

6. To serve as regular members of the President’s Information Technology Council, representing the faculty in strategic and tactical information technology policies, projects, and planning. It is stated as a goal that the committee membership should include a faculty member from each academic school, one from the graduate school, one from the library, and a student. (Approved April 2005)
Proposed changes: (proposed changes are indicated by *underlined italics*):

16. Educational Technology Committee

a. Composition: Seven faculty members and one student. No more than two members may come from any one academic department. Non-voting ex-officio members are the Provost (*or the Provost’s designee*), the Chief Information Officer (*or the CIO’s designee*), and the Director of Teaching, Learning and Technology, *and the Dean of Libraries*.

b. Duties:

(1) To review annually the status of support for faculty and student use of educational technology, which includes the use of computers, audio-visual media, the Internet, and telecommunications;

(2) To consider and plan long-range academic use of educational technology for teaching and learning;

(3) To receive from the faculty, or from any school or department, recommendations or suggestions that may aid in the appropriate use of educational technology, promote efficient services, and encourage increased use of educational technology;

(4) To advise the Provost on basic policy for faculty use of educational technology;

(5) To advise the Chief Information Officer *Dean of Libraries* on the allotment of funds for implementation of educational technology *and on educational technology policies, projects, and planning*

(6) To serve as regular members of the President’s Information Technology Council, representing the faculty in strategic and tactical information technology policies, projects, and planning. It is stated as a goal that the committee membership should include a faculty member from each academic school, one from the graduate school, one from the library, and a student.

Rationale:

The by-laws need to be updated to reflect changes in the administrative structure of the College, in particular the creation of the two new positions of Chief Information Officer and Director of Teaching and Learning Technology. These positions for one thing take over duties previously handle by the Dean of Libraries, and provide avenues of communication more than the President’s Information Technology Council.
B. Motion of the Academic Planning Committee to change the committee’s bylaws

Change to Bylaws Article V, Section 2, B, 1 (bylaws of Academic Planning Committee)

We propose the following changes to the duties of this committee.

Current description of Academic Planning Committee’s duties:

1. Academic Planning Committee
   a. Composition: Seven faculty members and one student. The Provost is a non-voting ex-officio member.

b. Duties: To consider and recommend long-range academic programs and goals for the College. To this end, the committee shall gather information from such administrators, academic schools and departments, committees, program directors, and other individuals as are advocating new programs and goals, and it shall gather such budgetary information as would be necessary to evaluate the economic feasibility of such new programs and goals. In this work the Academic Planning Committee shall work closely with the Budget Committee. The Chair of the Academic Planning Committee or her or his representative shall attend meetings of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. (Rev. May 2009)

Proposed change, with added wording underlined:

1. Academic Planning Committee
   a. Composition: Seven faculty members and one student. The Provost is a non-voting ex-officio member.

b. Duties: To consider and recommend long-range academic programs and goals for the College. To this end, the committee shall gather information from such administrators, academic schools and departments, committees, program directors, and other individuals as are advocating new programs and goals, and it shall gather such budgetary information as would be necessary to evaluate the economic feasibility of such new programs and goals. In this work the Academic Planning Committee shall work closely with the Budget Committee. The committee shall also review and respond to plans brought to the committee by the Provost concerning the termination of programs, and shall gather such information as would be necessary to evaluate the impact of program termination upon the College’s academic mission. One or more members of the Academic Planning Committee shall serve on committees convened by the Provost for the purposes of long-range planning and budgeting for the College’s academic programs. The Chair of the Academic Planning Committee or her or his representative shall attend meetings of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. (Rev. May 2009)
**Rationale:** This change recognizes the committee’s role in the review of termination of programs. It also notes this committee’s role on other faculty-administration planning committees convened by the Provost (e.g., the Planning and Priorities Committee). The Committee has discussed this proposed new language with the Provost’s office.

---

**C. Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs**

Proposals for Faculty Senate December 7th Meeting  
*(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)*

---

--Motion of the Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs to Change the Committee’s Bylaws

Change to Bylaws Article V, Section 3, B, 2 (bylaws of the Graduation Education Committee)

- Approved on October 22, 2010 by the Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs
- Presented for information to and reviewed by the Graduate Council on November 5, 2010 (FYI only, approval not needed)

**Purpose of change:**

The change in bylaws would give the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs a formal role in reviewing proposals to terminate academic programs.

**Proposed change:**

Add new duty to Article V, Section 3, B.2.b:

(6) To review and make recommendations concerning proposals for the termination of programs brought to the committee by the Provost

**Rationale:**
Although the Graduate Education Committee plays an important role in the approval process for the development of new courses and programs, the bylaws do not assign to the committee a formal role in the review of proposals to terminate academic programs.

There are good reasons for including the Graduate Education Committee in the process for terminating academic programs. Faculty members on the committee have significant expertise in evaluating the curricula of academic programs. Furthermore, to carry out its duties effectively, the Graduate Education Committee needs to be informed in a timely way of the termination of programs. Finally, by including faculty in the review process, the best principles of shared governance would be upheld and controversies surrounding terminations of programs may be avoided.

Although the final decision to terminate programs would remain with the Provost and the Board of Trustees, it would be a logical extension of its duties to include the Graduate Education Committee in an advisory role in the process for terminating academic programs.

New Course Proposals and Changes:

---Proposal to Change a Graduate Program

Master of Science in Environmental Studies – Requirement Change – Remove EVSS 680 as a Core Course
D. Faculty Curriculum Committee

List of Proposals Approved by the Committee
(All curricular proposals along with supporting
documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

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

International and Intercultural Studies
Change of Course for all Asian Language courses to 4-credit hour courses. These include:
- Arabic: ARBC101, 102, 201, 202
- Chinese: CHNS101, 102, 201, 202
- Hindi: HIND101, 102, 201, 202
- Japanese: JPNS101, 102, 201, 202
- Hebrew: 101, 102, 201, 202

Psychology
New Course – PSYC375 Topics in Child and Adolescent Development
Change of Courses – changes to catalog descriptions for:
- PSYC211: Psychological Statistics
- PSYC220: Research Methods
- PSYC250: Psychological Statistics and Research Methods

II. Program Changes:

Sociology
Change of Major – change of requirements, including:
- 1 new course
  - SOCY 390: Senior Seminar
- 35 changed courses
  - SOCY 102: Contemporary Social Issues
  - SOCY 103: Sociology of the Family
  - SOCY 109: Special Topics in Sociology
  - SOCY 492: Advanced Field Experience
  - SOCY 260: Development of Social Thought,
  - SOCY 271: Introduction to Social Research,
  - SOCY 272: Making Sense of Sociological Data,
  - SOCY 331: Society and the Individual,
  - SOCY 332: Collective Behavior,
  - SOCY 335: Aging and the Family
  - 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: Living in an Organizational World,
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.

6 deleted courses
SOCY 202: Social Institutions
SOCY 371: Quantitative Research Practicum
SOCY 372: Qualitative Research Practicum
SOCY 373: Social Network Analysis
SOCY 379: Special Topics Social Research.
SOCY 491: Sociology Capstone

Change of Minor – change of requirements

Computer Science
Change of Major – change of Discovery Informatics, Sociology Cognate
Required courses will now be:
SOCY 101: Introduction to Sociology or
SOCY 102: Contemporary Social Issues
SOCY 260: Development of Social Thought
SOCY 271: Introduction to Social Research
1 course from SOCY 330-369 or SOCY 390 (selected in consultation with the Cognate Director)
3 credit hours from SOCY 381: Internship, SOCY 382: Student Research Apprenticeship in Sociology, SOCY 399: Tutorial, SOCY 490: Independent Study or SOCY 499: Bachelor’s Essay (selected in consultation with the Cognate Director).

Political Science
Change of Major – change of electives involving 3 deleted and 3 new courses
Change of Minor (Political Science) – change of electives involving 3 deleted and 3 new courses
3 new courses
POLS 325: Chinese Politics
POLS 355: Global Political Theory
POLS 397: LGBT Politics

3 deleted courses
   POLS 311: Environmental Change and Management in the American West
   POLS 326: Soviet and Russian Politics
   POLS 346: Modern Ideologies

Change of Minor (Geography) – remove 1 course from electives

Anthropology
   Change of Major – change of requirements, including
   1 new course
   ANTH494: Field Work

English
   Change of Minor (Creative Writing) – change of requirements to bring in line with revised major

Health & Human Performance
   Change of Minor (Health) ** to be considered below with new Majors

III. New Majors:

Mathematics
   BA – a 36 hour major (no new or changed courses)

Health & Human Performance
   Public Health, BA – a 36-41 hour major
   Public Health, BS – a 44-47 hour major
   Involving:
   6 new courses
      HEAL 215: Introduction to Public Health
      HEAL 230: Global Health
      HEAL 350: Epidemiology
      HEAL 395: Biostatistics in the Health Sciences
      HEAL 460: Public Health Administration
      HEAL 495: Capstone Seminar
   1 changed course
      HEAL 257: Nutrition Education
   2 deleted courses
      HEAL 325: Worksite Health Promotion
      HEAL 390

   Change of Minor (Health) – change of requirements to benefit from new Public Health major courses
E. Committee on General Education

--First Year Experience Proposal

From: First-Year Experience Committee

Submitted by: Susan Kattwinkel, Director of the First-Year Experience – Question regarding Humanities’ requirement (submitted 10/27/10)

The FYE Committee would like for the Gen Ed committee to consider designating all qualified FYSMs (those determined each year by the FYE and Gen Ed committees to fulfill Humanities requirements) as general Humanities classes, not attached to any specific department. (The designation of General Humanities exists in the system and is used for several interdisciplinary classes.) FYSMs are designed to be interdisciplinary by nature, and a student’s academic diversity would not be unduly narrowed in such a circumstance.

Rationale:

1) FYSM classes are interdisciplinary in nature and the general humanities designation is most appropriate to them
2) FYSM classes are not usually counted in a major and therefore should not be counted as a discipline specific humanities course
3) FYSMs pose a problem for the new computer system – Banner – in regards to Humanities requirements. When the FYE was constructed, the old computer system, SIS, was able to categorize classes by class number. Therefore, the acronym FYSM was created, and course numbers were assigned to each academic department. This way, any FYSM course could be traced by the system back to its home department. That means that any course numbered, for example, FYSM105, was traced in the system back to Art History, preventing students from taking two Art History classes and FYSM105 and counting all three for Humanities credits. (Note: Gen Ed requirements state that of the four required Humanities courses, students cannot take more than two from any one department.) Unfortunately, this system does not work in Banner. Banner works solely on acronyms, and cannot trace course numbers back to individual academic departments. Therefore, there is no way in the system to prevent a student from taking three Humanities classes in one department if one of those courses is an FYSM. We can still mark in the system each semester which FYSMs should count as Humanities classes (after being approved by the Gen Ed committee), but we cannot prevent the situation mentioned above.
--Changes to an Existing General Education Language Requirement

Current Gen Ed Requirement: Foreign Languages, Classical or Modern: 0 – 12 semester hours: satisfactory completion of 202 or its equivalent, or demonstration of proficiency at that level.

Proposed Change to Requirement: The Asian Languages (Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese), as well as Hebrew, are proposing that all language instruction require 4 contact hours per week.

Thus, the change in terms of General Education would be that the catalog would read: Foreign Languages, Asian (Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, and Japanese) and Hebrew: 0-16 semester house: satisfactory completion of 202 or its equivalent, or demonstration of proficiency at that level.

The following courses would be affected:

ARBC 101, 102
ARBC 201, 202
CHNS 101, 102
CHNS 201, 202
HIND 101, 102
HIND 201, 202
JPNS 101, 102
JPNS 201, 202
HBRW 101, 102
HBRW 201, 202

Explain how this new requirement will improve student acquisition of the proposed General Education Competencies checked in the table. Please address each of the questions below.

What methods will be used to assess the acquisition of these competencies?

The methods used to assess acquisition of these competencies will not be affected; that is, students will be regularly evaluated by both written and oral quizzes, tests, assignments, and class projects that assess oral comprehension, acquisition of vocabulary and grammar, and skills in writing and reading. This change will facilitate higher attainment of all aspects of proficiency by providing students with 1/3 additional class time in which to master their language skills. Because the additional hour will be integral to the course the curriculum will be set by the Instructor of Record, who will oversee and work closely with the adjunct teaching the fourth hour.
How does this proposed change in the General Education requirement reflect best practices in the relevant field(s) of study (attach bibliography or literature review if necessary)

This initiative is in keeping with Goal I of the College of Charleston Strategic Plan to enhance the Undergraduate Academic Core by supporting foreign language initiatives that "intensify introductory and intermediate language courses and expand instruction in strategic languages." Arabic, Chinese, and Hindi are all considered strategic languages by the U.S. Department of State.

The Foreign Service Institute of the Department (FSI) of State has compiled approximate learning expectations for a number of languages based on the length of time it takes to achieve Speaking 3: General Professional Proficiency in Speaking (S3) and Reading 3: General Professional Proficiency in Reading (R3).

Category I languages include:

French and Spanish: 575-600 class hours.

German: 750 class hours

Approximately 40-45 class hours are accomplished per 3-credit hour language course per semester; this means that approximately 160-180 hours are completed by the end of a core-curriculum sequence.

Hindi and Hebrew: Category II (approximately 1100 hours needed to attain S3 and R3)

Mandarin, Arabic, and Japanese: Category III language (2200 class hours [3.67 X as long as French and Spanish; 2.93 X as long as German] (highest difficulty) by the FSI (Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State); a Category IV (highest difficulty) by ACTFL (American Council of the Teaching of Foreign Languages) and DLI (Defense Language Institute).

The College of Charleston languages curriculum does not attain these standards in any of our language courses; the information above is intended to indicate the relative number of hours required to attain certain proficiency levels in given languages. Increasing the contact hours in these Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs) will enable our students to better attain the skill levels of their peers in other Modern languages. Our students will be better prepared to advance in their language studies and to compete for scholarships, fellowships, and career opportunities.
The following are credit-hour designations for Chinese at other peer institutions:

Chinese 101-202

**SUNY-Potsdam**
3-credit hour courses

**Clemson**
101 & 102: 4 credit hours each (MWF: 1:25-2:15)
201 & 202: 3 credit hours each
*Their other languages have the same credit-hour designation.*

**Coastal Carolina**
NO Chinese

**USC**
3-credit hour courses

**Winthrop**
101 & 102: 4 credit hours each
201 & 202: 3 credit hours each
*Their other languages have the same credit-hour designation.*

**Wofford**
5-credit hour courses
*French, German and Spanish: 101 & 102, 3-credit hours; 201 & 202, 4-credit hours.*

**Francis Marion**
NO Chinese

**East Carolina University**
3-credit hour courses

**Converse College**
NO Chinese

**Truman State University** (Kirksville, MO)
101 & 102: 4 credit hours each
201 & 202: 3 credit hours each
*French, German and Spanish carry 3-credit hours each.*

**VMI** (Arabic)
3-credit hour courses for AR 101-202
Aspirational peer institutions typically require 4-6 contact hours for first and second year, and including:

Middlebury College
Williams College
The College of William and Mary

Anticipated impact of implementation (consider here issues such as transfer credit, AP credit, whether the course will be a pre-requisite for other courses, etc.)

The primary impact of implementation would be changing the current scheduling of courses. Our plan for implementation uses a scheduling model based on the schedules currently in place for Conversation classes that are offered as co-requisites for language classes; these depend heavily on adjuncts. While these Conversation classes - used throughout the language programs at the College - are currently elective courses, this proposal requires a fourth contact hour. Thus, our scheduling plan uses a model already in place, but the curriculum will be directly tied to all aspects of language acquisition and will be planned as part of the course syllabus. Currently approximately 10 - 15% of students take the elective Conversation hour

The impact on transfer credit would be minimal: most programs in these languages require 4-5 contact hours. Placement tests determine student levels of proficiency (not hours completed). Suggested start date, if approved (please note that the start date may be impacted by advising and registration dates)

We anticipate initiating this change by Fall 2011; advising and registration for this will begin in February - March 2011.
From:  Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary  
To:  Faculty and Staff  

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

Agenda  

1. Call to Order  

2. Approval of the 5 October 2010 Minutes  

3. Reports  
   The Speaker  
   The Provost  

4. Old Business  
   A. Motion to Change to the Composition of the Faculty Compensation Committee in the By-Laws, Article V. Sect. 2.B.17  
   B. Motion to Change to the Curriculum Committee’s Bylaws, Article V, Section 3, B, 8  
   C. Motion to Change the Budget Committee’s Bylaws, Article V, Section 2, B, 2 (bylaws of Budget Committee)  
   D. Motion of the Academic Standards Committee to change the FAM: Change to FAM, Section VIII, A “Faculty Responsibilities to Students” (p. 152-156)  
   E. Resolution Concerning the Building Moratorium  

5. New Business  
   Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs  

   Faculty Curriculum Committee  

   Committee on General Education  
   -- Proposals from Philosophy (a change to the logic requirement) and Communication (social science credit for Comm 215). See website for supporting documents  

6. Constituents’ Concerns  

7. Adjournment  

**Minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site:  
http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php
A. Motion to Change to the Composition of the Faculty Compensation Committee

in the By-Laws, Article V. Sect. 2.B.17

Submitted by the Faculty Compensation Committee: Calvin Blackwell, Chair

Purpose:

To change the composition of the Faculty Compensation Committee by adding an additional member. This additional member will be ex officio, non-voting, and designated by the Provost.

Action:

Amend Article V. Section 2.B.17.

Current Version:

17. Faculty Compensation Committee

a. Composition: Seven faculty members.

Proposed Amendment:

17. Faculty Compensation Committee

a. Composition: Seven faculty members plus a non-voting, ex officio member selected by the Provost.

Discussion and Rationale:

The primary reason to change the composition of the committee is to improve the committee’s effectiveness. First, this new arrangement would give the committee greater access to the provost’s office. Whatever complaints, comments, and recommendations the faculty have will be more likely to be acted upon if they are communicated via a direct representative instead of through an easily ignored committee report. Second, the provost’s office has access to tremendous resources and data, many of which are unfamiliar or unknown to the committee members, and this knowledge will help the committee do its work more effectively. Third, a closer relationship will help the committee monitor the provost’s office more closely through regular contact with the provost’s designee. Fourth and finally, this arrangement will promote shared governance, which ultimately will help the faculty become more influential in how the College is run.

There are some potential drawbacks to this proposal, but they can be handled adequately. Sometimes the committee may want to discuss topics in privacy, without having to worry about how the discussion will be relayed back to the administration. This concern can be addressed by creating a sub-committee, consisting of only faculty representatives, which can meet privately without the provost’s designee. As long as these meetings are announced to all committee members (including the provost’s designee), there is nothing improper with the formation of such a sub-committee.
BY-LAWS COMMITTEE REPORT:

The By-laws Committee supports this motion to change the by-laws. However, we recommend the following amendment to modify the wording of the proposal (regarding the composition of the committee).

a. Composition: Seven faculty members. In addition, the Provost (or the Provost’s designee) is a non-voting ex officio member.

Rationale for the amendment: We support the change to the by-laws. The wording as amended would be consistent with other committee composition descriptions, and it clarifies that the Provost has the option of serving on the committee or designating someone else to serve.
B. Motion of the Curriculum Committee to Change the Committee’s Bylaws.

Change to Bylaws Article V, Section 3, B, 8 (bylaws of Curriculum Committee)

Purpose of change:

The change in bylaws would give the Curriculum Committee a formal role in reviewing proposals to terminate academic programs.

Proposed change:

Add new duty to Article V, Section 3, B.8.b:

(4) To review and make recommendations concerning proposals for the termination of programs brought to the committee by the Provost

Rationale:

Although the Curriculum Committee plays an important role in the approval process for the development of new courses and programs, the bylaws do not assign to the Curriculum Committee a formal role in the review of proposals to terminate academic programs.

There are good reasons for including the Curriculum Committee in the process for terminating academic programs. Faculty members on the committee have significant expertise in evaluating the curricula of academic programs. Furthermore, to carry out its duties effectively, the Curriculum Committee needs to be informed in a timely way of the termination of programs. Finally, by including faculty in the review process, the best principles of shared governance would be upheld and controversies surrounding terminations of programs may be avoided.

Although the final decision to terminate programs would remain with the Provost and the Board of Trustees, it would be a logical extension of its duties to include the Curriculum Committee in an advisory role in the process for terminating academic programs.

BY-LAWS COMMITTEE REPORT:

The By-laws Committee supports this motion to change the by-laws. The committee considered adding qualifiers such as “undergraduate” and “academic” before the word “programs,” but decided against including language that would limit which programs the Provost could bring to the committee for review and recommendations. That is, the committee wanted to keep broad, rather than to limit, the scope of this duty.
C. Motion of the Budget Committee to Change the Committee’s Bylaws

Change to Bylaws Article V, Section 2, B, 2 (bylaws of Budget Committee)

Purpose of change:

The change in bylaws would give the Budget Committee a formal role in reviewing proposals to terminate academic programs.

Proposed change:

Add new duty to Article V, Section 2, B.2.b (proposed change is indicated by underlined italics):

b. 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 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 and make recommendations concerning the potential budgetary impact of proposals for the termination of programs brought to the committee by the Provost. To review each annual College budget. The Chair of the Budget Committee or her or his representative shall attend meetings of the Budget Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Rationale:

Although the Budget Committee plays an important role in the approval process for the development of new programs, the bylaws do not assign to the Budget Committee a formal role in the review of proposals to terminate academic programs.

There are good reasons for including the Budget Committee in the process for terminating academic programs. Faculty members on the committee have significant expertise in evaluating academic programs. Furthermore, to carry out its duties effectively, the Budget Committee needs to be informed in a timely way of the termination of programs. Finally, by including faculty in the review process, the best principles of shared governance would be upheld and controversies surrounding terminations of programs may be avoided.

Although the final decision to terminate programs would remain with the Provost and the Board of Trustees, it would be a logical extension of its duties to include the Budget Committee in an advisory role in the process for terminating academic programs.
BY-LAWS COMMITTEE REPORT:

The By-laws Committee supports this motion to change the by-laws. The committee considered adding qualifiers such as “undergraduate” and “academic” before the word “programs,” but decided against including language that would limit which programs the Provost could bring to the committee for review and recommendations. That is, the committee wanted to keep broad, rather than to limit, the scope of this duty.

D. Motion of the Academic Standards Committee to change the FAM

Change to FAM, Section VIII, A “Faculty Responsibilities to Students” (p. 152-156)

Purpose of change:

The change in the FAM will result in a clarification of duties of faculty members with respect to Final Examinations and procedures surrounding the delivery of missed final examinations.

Proposed changes are indicated below in bold (red on electronic copy).

A. Faculty Responsibilities to Students

1. Advising

A faculty member’s role at the College of Charleston includes academic advising. Academic advising requires a commitment to assist students in taking responsibility for their own intellectual and life skills development. Advising should become less intrusive, mandatory and necessary, and more collegial over time as students mature in their academic program and life skills. Effective academic advising by faculty requires the ability and willingness to make oneself available to students and colleagues for learning support purposes. It also requires familiarity with College programs, degree requirements, academic and support services, student development stages, administrative policies, and regulations related to academic performance.

2. Course Objectives

At the beginning of each term, instructional staff members are responsible for stating clearly and in writing the instructional objectives of each course they
teach. It is expected that each instructional staff member will direct instruction toward the fulfillment of these objectives and that examinations will be consistent with these objectives. Instructional staff members are responsible for ensuring that the content of each course they are assigned to teach is consistent with the course descriptions approved by the Faculty Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning or the Graduate Council and published in the current College of Charleston Undergraduate Catalog, or the Graduate School of the College of Charleston Catalog.

3. Final Grades

Instructional staff members are responsible for informing students in their classes in writing of the methods to be employed in determining the final course grade and of any special requirements of attendance that differ from the general attendance policy of the College. At the request of the student, a faculty member should make available information and/or an evaluation of the student’s progress prior to the drop date. [NOTE: THIS SECTION HAS BEEN MOVED TO #11 BELOW]

43. Disclosing and Retaining Graded Exams and Papers

Papers must be graded and returned within a sufficiently appropriate time to make the examination a part of the student’s learning experience. Final examinations must be retained for six months to two years to provide the opportunity for review with the instructor if the student so desires.

54. Meeting Classes

All instructional staff members are required to meet their classes regularly and at scheduled times. In case of illness or any other emergency, the instructor will notify the Department Chair so that appropriate action may be taken. Faculty members may not shorten the stated length of instructional periods, nor reduce the number of instructional periods in the term, nor reduce the number of weeks over which the instructional periods are distributed without prior approval. [End p. 153]

65. Office Hours

Faculty members are required to publish and maintain a schedule of a reasonable number of office hours for student conferences. Office hours must be scheduled at times convenient to both students and instructors, with the additional option of prearranged appointments for students where there is a schedule conflict. The number of office hours is to be determined by the chair of the department. Each faculty member must file a schedule of office hours in the department office for reference and on his/her office door.

76. Office Hours During Registration

All faculty members who are responsible for academic advising are expected
to be in their offices at specified hours during the registration period for each semester in addition to the hours normally reserved for advising.

87. Books and Materials for Classes

The responsibility for ordering textbooks and materials for any given section of a course rests with the faculty member assigned to teach that section during a specific term. While it is true that some departments select an individual to act as textbook coordinator for book orders within that department, the ultimate responsibility rests with the individual faculty member.

98. Classroom Procedures

Each member of the faculty is responsible for controlling conduct of his or her classes. Student behavior is governed by the standards and regulations printed in the Student Handbook, a copy of which is given to each member of the faculty.

109. Class Attendance

Because class attendance is a crucial part of any course, students are expected to attend all classes and laboratory meetings of each course in which they enroll. During the first week of classes, instructors will announce and distribute their attendance policies, including criteria to be used in determining excused absences. The professor determines whether absences are excused or unexcused, whether make-up work will be permitted, and whether both excused and unexcused absences count in determining the basis for a grade of “WA.” If attendance is used for grading purposes, the professor is responsible for keeping accurate attendance records. Each student, whether absent or not, is responsible for all information disseminated in the course. If a student has more than the maximum allowed absences, as defined in the course syllabus, the professor may instruct the registrar to record a grade of “WA” for the student. The grade of “WA” is a failing grade. The procedure for assignment of this grade requires that the professor provide written notification to the Registrar on or before the last meeting day of the class. The registrar will then send a courtesy copy of the notice to the student. The student is responsible for keeping addresses current through the Office of the Registrar.

If students who participate in athletics competitions or other college-sponsored events want to be assured that they are in compliance with the faculty member’s attendance policy, they must provide written notification to all course instructors of dates and times when regularly scheduled classes and labs will be missed.

110. Religious Accommodation for Students

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

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

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

4211. Final Examinations and Final Course Grades

Prior to each final examination period, an examination schedule is published by the Registrar’s Office. Final examinations must be administered only at the time and in the place stated on the examination schedule, except by written permission of the relevant campus authority. Faculty who change a final examination time for a course without written permission to do so are in violation of College policy and may be required to return the final examination to its regularly scheduled time.

Re-examinations shall not be allowed.

An “X” grade is reported for the student who is absent from the final examination. If a student is absent from a final examination, the temporary mark of “X” may be assigned electronically by the instructor. It is the student’s responsibility to report the reason for his or her absence to the Director of Undergraduate Academic Services and the instructor of the course. If he or she does not do so within 48 hours after the examination, the grade is automatically converted to an “F.”

Generally, no re-examination may be administered. Once the final course grade has been submitted, the Director of Undergraduate Academic Services may not authorize a change of grade except on written statement by the
instructor that the grade was submitted in error. A statement of particulars must accompany the adjusted grade report. The forms to institute such a change are made available only in by the Registrar’s Office.

**Instructional staff members are responsible for informing students in their classes in writing of the methods to be employed in determining the final course grade and of any special requirements of attendance that differ from the general attendance policy of the College. At the request of the student, a faculty member should make available information and/or an evaluation of the student’s progress prior to the drop date.**

**Regarding final examinations and final course grades, if any policy document, syllabus, or examination schedule produced by a current or former employee of the College is in conflict with the relevant provisions of the Faculty/Administration Manual, the provisions of the Faculty/Administration Manual shall prevail. The Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (or the Provost’s designee) shall be responsible for the interpretation of these provisions for final examinations and final course grades.**

**Rationale for Changes:** A review of various College policies and procedures in numerous places (e.g., FAM, college catalog, college website, etc) revealed a bevy of conflicting information about the specific policies and procedures pertaining to missed final examinations. To provide consistent, clarified information to faculty concerning their roles in the event of missed final examinations, this change is proposed to the FAM.

**BY-LAWS COMMITTEE REPORT:**

The By-laws Committee recommends three amendments to section 11 of the original motion.

The first amendment is to eliminate redundancy. The committee recommends eliminating the phrase "to do so are in violation of College policy and"

Prior to each final examination period, an examination schedule is published by the Registrar’s Office. Final examinations must be administered only at the time and in the place stated on the examination schedule, except by written permission of the relevant campus authority. Faculty who change a final examination time for a course without written permission to do so are in violation of College policy and may be required to return the final examination to its regularly scheduled time.

The second and third amendments are to add the phrases “undergraduate” and “For undergraduate students” to clarify that the same policy is not in place for graduate students.
An “X” grade is reported for the student who is absent from the final examination. If an undergraduate student is absent from a final examination, the temporary mark of “X” may be assigned electronically by the instructor. It is the student’s responsibility to report the reason for his or her absence to the Director of Undergraduate Academic Services and the instructor of the course. If he or she does not do so within 48 hours after the examination, the grade is automatically converted to an “F.”

Generally, no re-examination may be administered. For undergraduate students, once the final course grade has been submitted, the Director of Undergraduate Academic Services may not authorize a change of grade except on written statement by the instructor that the grade was submitted in error. A statement of particulars must accompany the adjusted grade report. The forms to institute such a change are made available only in Registrar’s Office.
E. Resolution Concerning the Building Moratorium

The College of Charleston faculty affirms the value of a high quality education. The economic value of a college degree to the state of South Carolina is measured by the benefit the degree provides to the student and the future community where that graduate will reside. Over the past two decades, the College of Charleston has provided more and more students with a higher quality of education, even as our support from state funding has diminished.

The investments we have made, and the buildings we have built, have not been frivolous. Our library, our science center, our center for the arts, our campus housing — all of these were necessary for us to provide the kind of high quality, student-centered education that our students and parents have come to expect. They were necessary for an undergraduate population that has more than doubled at the same time that our state support has been reduced by two-thirds. We take pride in maintaining our many historic buildings, which have served and will continue to serve many generations of students. We also take pride in the College's fiscally responsible decisions to construct new buildings when new construction is less expensive to maintain.

What we offer is popular. Though we have raised our tuition, we remain one of the most affordable options for a liberal arts and sciences education in the nation. Applications, enrollments, and test scores have all risen. A significant amount of our tuition increase will be devoted to expanding financial aid, making access to undergraduate education fairer for everyone. There is no real evidence that by holding our current tuition increase below 7%, we would be significantly improving access to quality education in South Carolina. What is clear is that if we are not able to build the buildings that we need to serve our students, and if we are not free to raise revenue to compensate for cuts in state funding, we are resigning ourselves to a low revenue, low service model for our state.

We, as employees and residents of South Carolina, think South Carolina deserves better. We think we can best serve our state by making what we offer better: by offering a high value, high quality education, made affordable to everyone through generous financial aid. We therefore ask the state Budget and Control Board to rescind its building moratorium. And we ask our own Board of Trustees to remain committed to the financial model and educational aspirations of our President and our strategic plan.
Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for Faculty Senate November 2nd Meeting
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

New Course Proposals and Changes from Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs Approved by the Committee on September 17.

Reviewed by Graduate Council on October 8, 2010 (FYI only, approval not needed)

The following proposals and policies are for information only and do not require Faculty Senate approval:

Policies for Non-Credit Programs

Non-Credit Courses in Computer Science -
Microsoft NET Certification Track:
• NET Application Development Foundation
• NET Web Development
• NET Windows Application Development
• NET Service Communications Applications Development
• NET Data Access
  Microsoft SQL Certification Track:
• Microsoft SQL Database Development
• Microsoft SQL Implementation and Maintenance
• Designing Database solutions and Data Access using SQL
• Designing, Optimizing, and Maintaining a Database Server Infrastructure Using Microsoft SQL Server
Faculty Curriculum Committee  
November 2, 2010 meeting  
List of Proposals Approved by the Committee  
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

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

   Note: All course changes are a part of program changes and so are included below.

II. Program Changes: All program-change proposals will be voted on separately.

   Philosophy
   • Change of Major (PHIL) – Change in Symbolic Logic requirement
   • Change in Minor/Concentration/Track – Change in Symbolic Logic requirement
   • New Course PHIL120 Symbolic Logic
   • Deletion of two courses PHIL215 Symbolic Logic 1 and PHIL216 Symbolic Logic 2

   Historic Preservation & Community Planning
   • Change of Major (HPCP) – Adding HPCP305 Building Pathology and HPCP375 Landscape Design Studio to curriculum; add electives (HPCP298, HPCP418, HPCP419)
   • Change in Minor/Concentration/Track: add electives (HPCP298, HPCP375)
   • Change Course HPCP290 Preservation Conservation – add prerequisite (HPCP 199)
   • Change Course HPCP340 Preservation Project Planning – add prerequisites (HPCP 199 & 299)
   • New Course HPCP418 Historic Preservation Law (1 credit, 1/2 semester course)
   • New Course HPCP419 Historic Preservation Economics (1 credit, 1/2 semester course)

   Psychology
   • Change of Major (PSYC, BS) – following the approval of the new BA, change of major requirements

   Teacher Education
   • Change of Major (TEDU) – EDEE515 replaced with EDMG415
   • New Course EDMG415 Middle School Organization and Curriculum

   Art Management
   • Change of Major (ARTM) – Adding ARTM350 to Marketing major requirement options
   • Change of Minor – Adding ARTM350 to Marketing minor requirement options
   • Change Course ARTM340 – add prerequisite (ARTM310)
   • Change Course ARTM400 – add prerequisite (ARTM310, junior standing, or permission)

   Economics & Finance
   • Change of Major (ECON) – changing the electives requirement
Theater (Dance)
• Change of Minor (DANC) – changing the requirements (to fit with the new BA)

III. New Major:

Health and Human Performance
BS, Exercise Science (EXSC)
Includes the following new/changed courses:
• EXSC 201: Introduction to Health and Human Performance (to be cross-listed with PEHD201)
• EXSC 210 Concepts in Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription (Previously PEHD210)
• EXSC 330 Kinesiology (Previously PEHD330)
• EXSC 340 Exercise Physiology and Lab (Previously PEHD340)
• EXSC 401 Independent Study in Physical Education (Previously PEHD401)
• EXSC 433 Research Design and Analysis (Previously PEHD433)
• EXSC 438 Advanced Topics in Resistance Training and Conditioning (Previously PEHD438)
• EXSC 439 Advanced Topics in Exercise Physiology (Previously PEHD439)
• EXSC 444 Scientific Writing and Data Analysis
• EXSC 498 Capstone Experience in Exercise Science (Previously PEHD498)

Theater: Dance
BA, Dance (DANC) w/ concentrations in General Dance Studies or Performance
Includes the following new/changed/deleted courses:

New Courses
• DANC 285- Ballet I (2 credits; declared dance major; not repeatable for additional credit)
• DANC 385- Ballet II (2 credits; grade of C+ or better in DANC 285 or permission of instructor)
• DANC 237- Modern I (2 credits; declared dance major; not repeatable for additional credit)
• DANC 337- Modern II (2 credits; grade of C+ or better in DANC 237 or permission of instructor)
• DANC 235- Jazz 1 (2 credits)
• DANC 331- History of Western Dance (3 credits)
• DANC 332- Dance Improvisation and Choreography (3 credits; DANC 285 AND DANC 237 or equivalent)
• DANC 421- Applied Kinesiology for Dance (3 credits; not open to freshmen)
• DANC 441- Dance Capstone (3 credits; tailored by concentration and individual interest)
• DANC 437 Modern III (2 credits; open to performance track students only or permission of instructor)
• DANC 485- Ballet III (2 credits; open to performance track students only or permission of instructor)
• DANC 333- Dance Choreography II (3 credits; permission of instructor)
• DANC 330- History of Non-Western Dance (3 credits)
• DANC 351- Pedagogical Methods and Practice (3 credits; open to junior/senior dance majors only)
• DANC 422- Body Conditioning and Somatics (2 credits)
• DANC 442- Career Seminar in Dance (3 credits)

Deleted Courses
• THTR 338- Dance Ensemble
• THTR 332- Dance Choreography
• THTR 3310- Dance History
• THTR 339- Advanced Ballet

Changed Courses

• THTR 135- Beginning Jazz Dance = Beginning Jazz Dance for Non-Majors
• THTR 137- Elementary Modern Dance = Beginning Modern Dance for Non-Majors
• THTR 185- Beginning Ballet = Beginning Ballet for Non-Majors
• THTR 138- Intermediate Modern Dance = Intermediate Modern Dance for Non-Majors
• THTR 186- Intermediate Ballet = Intermediate Ballet for Non-Majors
From: Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary  
To: Faculty and Staff  

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 5 October 2010 at 5 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the 14 September 2010 Minutes

3. Reports
   - The Speaker
   - The Provost

4. New Business
   A. Faculty Compensation Committee
      -- Motion to change the By-Laws, Article V. Sect. 2.B.17 (the Composition of the Faculty Compensation Committee)

   B. Faculty Curriculum Committee
      --- Motion to change Bylaws Article V, Section 3, B, 8 (bylaws of Curriculum Committee)

   C. Budget Committee
      -- Motion to change the Bylaws Article V, Section 2, B, 2 (bylaws of Budget Committee): Review of proposals to terminate academic programs

   D. Academic Standards Committee
      -- Motion to change FAM, Section VIII, A “Faculty Responsibilities to Students” (p. 152-156)

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

   F. Faculty Curriculum Committee
      -- List of course and program proposals approved by the committee

   G. Committee on General Education
      -- Honor’s Chemistry Proposals (see website for supporting documents)

5. Constituents’ Concerns

6. Adjournment

**Minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site:
http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php
A. Motion to Change to the Composition of the Faculty Compensation Committee

in the By-Laws, Article V. Sect. 2.B.17

Submitted by the Faculty Compensation Committee: Calvin Blackwell, Chair

Purpose:

To change the composition of the Faculty Compensation Committee by adding an additional member. This additional member will be *ex officio*, non-voting, and designated by the Provost.

Action:

Amend Article V. Section 2.B.17.

Current Version:

17. Faculty Compensation Committee

a. Composition: Seven faculty members.

Proposed Amendment:

17. Faculty Compensation Committee

a. Composition: Seven faculty members plus a non-voting, *ex officio* member selected by the Provost.

Discussion and Rationale:

The primary reason to change the composition of the committee is to improve the committee’s effectiveness. First, this new arrangement would give the committee greater access to the provost’s office. Whatever complaints, comments, and recommendations the faculty have will be more likely to be acted upon if they are communicated via a direct representative instead of through an easily ignored committee report. Second, the provost’s office has access to tremendous resources and data, many of which are unfamiliar or unknown to the committee members, and this knowledge will help the committee do its work more effectively. Third, a closer relationship will help the committee monitor the provost’s office more closely through regular contact with the provost’s designee. Fourth and finally, this arrangement will promote shared governance, which ultimately will help the faculty become more influential in how the College is run.

There are some potential drawbacks to this proposal, but they can be handled adequately. Sometimes the committee may want to discuss topics in privacy, without having to worry about how the discussion will be relayed back to the administration. This concern can be addressed by creating a sub-committee, consisting of only faculty representatives, which can meet privately without the provost’s designee. As long as these meetings are announced to all committee members (including the provost’s designee), there is nothing improper with the formation of such a sub-committee.
B. Motion of the Curriculum Committee to Change the Committee’s Bylaws.

Change to Bylaws Article V, Section 3, B, 8 (bylaws of Curriculum Committee)

**Purpose of change:**

The change in bylaws would give the Curriculum Committee a formal role in reviewing proposals to terminate academic programs.

**Proposed change:**

Add new duty to Article V, Section 3, B.8.b:

*(4) To review and make recommendations concerning proposals for the termination of programs brought to the committee by the Provost*

**Rationale:**

Although the Curriculum Committee plays an important role in the approval process for the development of new courses and programs, the bylaws do not assign to the Curriculum Committee a formal role in the review of proposals to terminate academic programs.

There are good reasons for including the Curriculum Committee in the process for terminating academic programs. Faculty members on the committee have significant expertise in evaluating the curricula of academic programs. Furthermore, to carry out its duties effectively, the Curriculum Committee needs to be informed in a timely way of the termination of programs. Finally, by including faculty in the review process, the best principles of shared governance would be upheld and controversies surrounding terminations of programs may be avoided.

Although the final decision to terminate programs would remain with the Provost and the Board of Trustees, it would be a logical extension of its duties to include the Curriculum Committee in an advisory role in the process for terminating academic programs.
C. Motion of the Budget Committee to Change the Committee’s Bylaws

Change to Bylaws Article V, Section 2, B, 2 (bylaws of Budget Committee)

Purpose of change:

The change in bylaws would give the Budget Committee a formal role in reviewing proposals to terminate academic programs.

Proposed change:

Add new duty to Article V, Section 2, B.2.b (proposed change is indicated by *underlined italics*):

b. 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 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 and make recommendations concerning the potential budgetary impact of proposals for the termination of programs brought to the committee by the Provost.* To review each annual College budget. The Chair of the Budget Committee or her or his representative shall attend meetings of the Budget Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Rationale:

Although the Budget Committee plays an important role in the approval process for the development of new programs, the bylaws do not assign to the Budget Committee a formal role in the review of proposals to terminate academic programs.

There are good reasons for including the Budget Committee in the process for terminating academic programs. Faculty members on the committee have significant expertise in evaluating academic programs. Furthermore, to carry out its duties effectively, the Budget Committee needs to be informed in a timely way of the termination of programs. Finally, by including faculty in the review process, the best principles of shared governance would be upheld and controversies surrounding terminations of programs may be avoided.

Although the final decision to terminate programs would remain with the Provost and the Board of Trustees, it would be a logical extension of its duties to include the Budget Committee in an advisory role in the process for terminating academic programs.
D. Motion of the Academic Standards Committee to change the FAM

Change to FAM, Section VIII, A “Faculty Responsibilities to Students” (p. 152-156)

Purpose of change:

The change in the FAM will result in a clarification of duties of faculty members with respect to Final Examinations and procedures surrounding the delivery of missed final examinations.

Proposed changes are indicated below in bold (red on electronic copy).

A. Faculty Responsibilities to Students

1. Advising

A faculty member’s role at the College of Charleston includes academic advising. Academic advising requires a commitment to assist students in taking responsibility for their own intellectual and life skills development. Advising should become less intrusive, mandatory and necessary, and more collegial over time as students mature in their academic program and life skills. Effective academic advising by faculty requires the ability and willingness to make oneself available to students and colleagues for learning support purposes. It also requires familiarity with College programs, degree requirements, academic and support services, student development stages, administrative policies, and regulations related to academic performance.

2. Course Objectives

At the beginning of each term, instructional staff members are responsible for stating clearly and in writing the instructional objectives of each course they teach. It is expected that each instructional staff member will direct instruction toward the fulfillment of these objectives and that examinations will be consistent with these objectives. Instructional staff members are responsible for ensuring that the content of each course they are assigned to teach is consistent with the course descriptions approved by the Faculty Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning or the Graduate Council and published in the current College of Charleston Undergraduate Catalog, or the Graduate School of the College of Charleston Catalog.

3. Final Grades

*Instructional staff members are responsible for informing students in their classes in writing of the methods to be employed in determining the final course grade and of any special requirements of attendance that*
differ from the general attendance policy of the College. At the request of the student, a faculty member should make available information and/or an evaluation of the student’s progress prior to the drop date. (NOTE: THIS SECTION HAS BEEN MOVED TO #11 BELOW)

**43. Disclosing and Retaining Graded Exams and Papers**

Papers must be graded and returned within a sufficiently appropriate time to make the examination a part of the student’s learning experience. Final examinations must be retained for *six months* to *two years* to provide the opportunity for review with the instructor if the student so desires.

**54. Meeting Classes**

All instructional staff members are required to meet their classes regularly and at scheduled times. In case of illness or any other emergency, the instructor will notify the Department Chair so that appropriate action may be taken. Faculty members may not shorten the stated length of instructional periods, nor reduce the number of instructional periods in the term, nor reduce the number of weeks over which the instructional periods are distributed without prior approval. [End p. 153]

**65. Office Hours**

Faculty members are required to publish and maintain a schedule of a reasonable number of office hours for student conferences. Office hours must be scheduled at times convenient to both students and instructors, with the additional option of prearranged appointments for students where there is a schedule conflict. The number of office hours is to be determined by the chair of the department. Each faculty member must file a schedule of office hours in the department office for reference and on his/her office door.

**76. Office Hours During Registration**

All faculty members who are responsible for academic advising are expected to be in their offices at specified hours during the registration period for each semester in addition to the hours normally reserved for advising.

**87. Books and Materials for Classes**

The responsibility for ordering textbooks and materials for any given section of a course rests with the faculty member assigned to teach that section during a specific term. While it is true that some departments select an individual to act as textbook coordinator for book orders within that department, the ultimate responsibility rests with the individual faculty member.

**98. Classroom Procedures**

Each member of the faculty is responsible for controlling conduct of his or
her classes. Student behavior is governed by the standards and regulations printed in the Student Handbook, a copy of which is given to each member of the faculty.

109. Class Attendance

Because class attendance is a crucial part of any course, students are expected to attend all classes and laboratory meetings of each course in which they enroll. During the first week of classes, instructors will announce and distribute their attendance policies, including criteria to be used in determining excused absences. The professor determines whether absences are excused or unexcused, whether make-up work will be permitted, and whether both excused and unexcused absences count in determining the basis for a grade of “WA.” If attendance is used for grading purposes, the professor is responsible for keeping accurate attendance records. Each student, whether absent or not, is responsible for all information disseminated in the course. If a student has more than the maximum allowed absences, as defined in the course syllabus, the professor may instruct the registrar to record a grade of “WA” for the student. The grade of “WA” is a failing grade. The procedure for assignment of this grade requires that the professor provide written notification to the Registrar on or before the last meeting day of the class. The registrar will then send a courtesy copy of the notice to the student. The student is responsible for keeping addresses current through the Office of the Registrar.

If students who participate in athletics competitions or other college-sponsored events want to be assured that they are in compliance with the faculty member’s attendance policy, they must provide written notification to all course instructors of dates and times when regularly scheduled classes and labs will be missed.

110. Religious Accommodation for Students

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

The College acknowledges that religious practices differ from tradition to tradition and that the demands of religious observance in some traditions may cause conflicts with student schedules. In affirming this diversity, like many other colleges and universities, the College supports the concept of “reasonable accommodation for religious observance” in regard to class attendance, and the scheduling of examinations and other academic work requirements, unless the accommodation would create an undue hardship on the College. Faculty are required, as part of their responsibility to students and the College, to ascribe to this policy and to ensure its fair and full implementation.
The accommodation request imposes responsibilities and obligations on both the individual requesting the accommodation and the College. Faculty members are expected to reasonably accommodate individual religious practices. Examples of reasonable accommodations for student absences might include: rescheduling of an exam or giving a make-up exam for the student in question; altering the time of a student’s presentation; allowing extra-credit assignments to substitute for missed class work or arranging for an increased flexibility in assignment dates. Regardless of any accommodation that may be granted, students are responsible for satisfying all academic objectives, requirements and prerequisites as defined by the instructor and by the College.

4211. Final Examinations and Final Course Grades

Prior to each final examination period, an examination schedule is published by the Registrar’s Office. Final examinations must be administered only at the time and in the place stated on the examination schedule, except by written permission of the relevant campus authority. Faculty who change a final examination time for a course without written permission to do so are in violation of College policy and may be required to return the final examination to its regularly scheduled time.

Re-examinations shall not be allowed.

An “X” grade is reported for the student who is absent from the final examination. If a student is absent from a final examination, the temporary mark of “X” may be assigned electronically by the instructor. It is the student’s responsibility to report the reason for his or her absence to the Director of Undergraduate Academic Services and the instructor of the course. If he or she does not do so within 48 hours after the examination, the grade is automatically converted to an “F.”

Generally, no re-examination may be administered. Once the final course grade has been submitted, the Director of Undergraduate Academic Services may not authorize a change of grade except on written statement by the instructor that the grade was submitted in error. A statement of particulars must accompany the adjusted grade report. The forms to institute such a change are made available only in by the Registrar’s Office.

Instructional staff members are responsible for informing students in their classes in writing of the methods to be employed in determining the final course grade and of any special requirements of attendance that differ from the general attendance policy of the College. At the request of the student, a faculty member should make available information and/or an evaluation of the student’s progress prior to the drop date.
Regarding final examinations and final course grades, if any policy document, syllabus, or examination schedule produced by a current or former employee of the College is in conflict with the relevant provisions of the Faculty/Administration Manual, the provisions of the Faculty/Administration Manual shall prevail. The Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (or the Provost’s designee) shall be responsible for the interpretation of these provisions for final examinations and final course grades.

Rationale for Changes:

A review of various College policies and procedures in numerous places (e.g., FAM, college catalog, college website, etc) revealed a bevy of conflicting information about the specific policies and procedures pertaining to missed final examinations. To provide consistent, clarified information to faculty concerning their roles in the event of missed final examinations, this change is proposed to the FAM.

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

Proposals for the Faculty Senate 5 October, 2010 Meeting

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

Graduate Course Proposals

Proposal for a New Graduate Course – M. Ed. in Science and Mathematics for Teachers

SMFT 690 Capstone Project Development

Proposal to Change a Graduate Program – M. Ed. in Science and Mathematics for Teachers

Requirement Change ….. Require SMFT 690 to complete the degree
I. Course Changes: All course-change proposals will be voted on as a single group, unless a Senator wishes to isolate a specific proposal for discussion and a separate vote. Senators are asked to contact the Faculty Speaker or the Faculty Secretary in advance, if they wish to separate a proposal from the group. Of course, this action can also be done on the floor of the Senate.

Computer Science

Change of Course  CSCI222 Programming 1 Laboratory
Change of Course  CSCI325 Declarative Programming Languages
New Course  CSCI123 Website Design
New Course  CSCI223 Website Programming

Honors College

New Course  HONS163 Honors Chemical Principles: Atoms to Molecules +
            HONS163L Laboratory component
New Course  HONS164 Honors Organic Chemistry: Applications of Molecular Structure and Properties +
            HONS164L Laboratory component
New Course  HONS263 Honors Organic Chemistry: Reactions and Applications of Organic Compounds in Materials Science and Biology +
            HONS263L Laboratory component
New Course  HONS264 Honors Chemical Principles: Mathematical Treatment of Equilibrium and Kinetics, Introduction to Nuclear Chemistry +
            HONS264L Laboratory component

Hospitality and Tourism Management

New Course  HTMT354 Hospitality and Tourism Technology

II. Program Changes: All program-change proposals will be voted on separately.

Economics and Finance

Change Major  BS in Economics (Change in the requirements to allow ECON majors to take either DSCI232 or MATH350).

Religious Studies

Change Major  BA in Religious Studies (Change in sacred text requirement for RELS major, adding RELS310 as a course that will satisfy that requirement).
Communication

Change Major  BA in Communication (complete overhaul of major, see documents on the senate website).
Change Minor  Minor in Communication Studies (complete overhaul of minor, see documents on the senate website).
Delete Program  Media Studies minor
New Course  COMM110/111 Introduction to Communication Messages
New Course  COMM215 Communication, Identity, and Community
New Course  COMM310 Message Design and Influence
New Course  COMM315 Ethical Communication
New Course  COMM336 Addressing Problems in Context
New Course  COMM410 Analysis of Communication Practice
New Course  COMM480/481 Capstone in Communication
Change Course  COMM104 Public Speaking
Change Course  COMM211 Oral Interpretation
Change Course  COMM214 Media in the Digital Age
Change Course  COMM405 Independent Study in Communication
Delete Course  COMM223, COMM295, COMM304, COMM314, COMM333, COMM376, COMM380, COMM385, COMM407, COMM475, COMM476

III. New Major:  BA in Psychology (see documents on Senate website).

Change Course  PSYC307 Abnormal Psychology
Change Course  PSYC308 Psychology of Personality
Change Course  PSYC310 Social Psychology
Change Course  PSYC311 Developmental Psychology
Change Course  PSYC313 Sensation & Perception
Change Course  PSYC340 Nonverbal Communication
Change Course  PSYC388 Psychology of Substance Abuse
Change Course  PSYC378 Psychology of Language
Change Course  PSYC386 Psychopharmacology
Change Course  PSYC387 Clinical Neuropsychology
Change Course  PSYC390 Research Design and Interpretation
Change Course  PSYC370-PSYC499 all courses changing prerequisites
Change Course  PSYC460-PSYC468 all courses changing prerequisites
From: Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary  
To: Faculty and Staff  

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 14 September 2010 at 5 P.M. in Education Center 116.  

**Agenda**  

1. Call to Order  


3. Announcements and information (The Speaker)  

4. Reports  
   
   The Speaker  
   The President  
   The Provost  
   Dr. Vince Benigni, Faculty Athletics Representative  

5. New Business  
   
   Election of Speaker *Pro Tempore*  
   Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs  

6. Constituents’ Concerns  

7. Adjournment  
   
   Reception sponsored by Academic Affairs (ECTR Lobby)  

*All minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site: [http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2009-2010-archives.php](http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2009-2010-archives.php)*
Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for the Faculty Senate 14 September, 2010 Meeting

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

New Graduate Course Proposals:

Proposals for New Graduate Courses in the MAT in the Performing Arts: Theatre Concentration

- **THRE 610**: Theatre for Youth Literature
- **THRE 611**: Design with Schools in Mind
- **THRE 612**: Advanced Acting and Directing Techniques for the K12 Teacher
- **THRE 710**: Foundations Preschool and Elementary Theatre Education Methods
- **THRE 711**: Middle and Secondary Theatre Education Methods
- **THRE 712**: Community and the Theatrical Classroom