Minutes of the Special Faculty Senate Meeting on 3 May 2011

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 3 May 2011, at 4:00 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium) for a Special Meeting that had been called by Faculty Speaker Darryl Phillips. After Speaker Phillips called the meeting to order, he said that if there were no objections, Terence Bowers, the former Faculty Secretary, would serve as Faculty Secretary Pro-Tem in the place of Sarah Owens, the current Faculty Secretary, who could not be at the meeting. No objections were voiced.

The purpose of the meeting was for the Senate to consider the “Resolution Concerning the Tenure and Promotion Process at the College of Charleston,” which Claire Curtis (Humanities and Social Sciences) and eight other Senators co-sponsored. After informing the Senate that (in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order) only the main motions voted on in this meeting would be recorded in the minutes (and not the details of the debate), the Speaker outlined the rules that would govern discussion on the resolution.

Speaker Phillips then read the proposed resolution, which appears as follows:

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.

After amending the proposed resolution, the Senate voted on and approved it by voice vote. Here is the final form of the approved amendment:

**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 believes this action to have undermined the integrity of the tenure and promotion process at the College of Charleston,

*And be it resolved,* That the Faculty Senate urges the President to refrain from circumventing established tenure and promotion procedures and grievance processes in the future,

*And be it resolved,* That should some extraordinary situation arise demanding late executive review of a tenure and promotion case outside established procedures, the Faculty Senate urges the President to first consult the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion or the Faculty Hearing Committee,

*And be it resolved,* The Faculty Senate hereby urges the Board of Trustees, 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.

The Senate, having concluded the business of the Special Meeting, adjourned at 6:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers  
Faculty Speaker Pro-Tem
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 12 April 2011

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 12 April 2011, at 5:07 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). This was a continuation of the April 5 meeting.

The Speaker asked the Senate if there were any objections to the Provost making a few announcements. There were no objections.

The Provost introduced Dr. Penny Brunner, the new Director of Assessment in the Office of Accountability, Accreditation, Planning and Assessment. Ms. Brunner brings a wealth of experience in assessment, accreditation, strategic planning, teaching, and administration to the College. She was very successful in her previous position as Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness at Sienna College in NY. She has also worked at other institutions in the U.S. and abroad. Among other degrees, she received her Doctorate in Higher Education Administration from the University of Tulsa.

The Provost invited everyone to the Celebration of Faculty that will take place on Monday April 25 in the Stern Center Ballroom from 4:00 to 6:00PM. We will recognize our distinguished faculty award recipients, newly named emeriti faculty, and others who have passed a major career milestone, and we will honor all faculty.

G. By-Laws Committee

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

Scott Peeples, Secretary of the By-Laws Committee, introduced the following motion:

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)*

The Speaker clarified that if the Senate approved this proposal now then the cover letter would be included at the FAM next year. The Senate voted on the cover letter for the FAM, which was approved without discussion.

Mr. Peeples introduced the next motion:

**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.

*An 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.
The Speaker explained that this is a motion to recommend a change to the FAM. If the Senate approves this proposal then Mr. Phillips will sponsor it and will submit it to the Provost for consideration. The Senate voted on the motion to change FAM IV.C = Policy 7.4.3 (Statement of Academic Freedom), which was approved without discussion.

Mr. Peeples introduced the next motion:

**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)

The Speaker explained that this motion to change the term of the Speaker of the Faculty and Faculty Secretary was up for discussion, but not a vote at this time because it is a proposal to change the Faculty by-laws. After tonight’s meeting it would be referred back to By-Laws Committee where they will review it and it will come back to the Senate in the fall. There was no discussion.

**H. Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review**

Deborah Boyle, chair of the committee, introduced the following 5 motions:

**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.

The Speaker explained that today we are voting only on the recommendation. If endorsed by the Senate then he will send this to the Provost to make a policy change. Garrett Mitchener (at-large) asked about the T & P process for librarians. Do we have any feedback from librarians about these motions? Ms. Boyle said that they submit packets like everyone else, and the intent here is to make things clearer. James Williams (guest) said the librarians reviewed these motions and they support this. Ms. Boyle said she also discussed this with David Cohen (Dean of the Library). The Senate voted on the Motion to Amend the introductory section to VI.C, “Third Year Review, Tenure and Promotion of the Library Faculty” in the FAM, which was approved.

**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 **exemplary performance** in the area of professional competency.
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.

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).

Claire Curtis (at-large) asked about the tenure criteria for instructional faculty and wanted to know the difference between promise and high promise (under tenure standards it says high promise). Ms. Boyle said they did not notice this so she cannot answer the question.

Ms. Curtis said she would like to make an amendment to the motion to add the word *high* before *promise* in section two, which was seconded.
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 high promise for continued professional growth and development.

The amendment received a second, and discussion followed. Beverly Diamond, Senior Vice Provost, said “high promise” is usually met by publications in academic journals. In this case “high” is not before “promise” because librarians do not need to meet these criteria. Ms. Curtis said she liked that argument. Other Senators said they believed the word “high” was appropriate and should belong in the motion.

The Senate voted on the amended motion (adding the word “high” before “promise”) to amend the criteria for tenure for librarians (section VI.C.4.b, p. 114 of the FAM), which passed. (There was a call for a division of the house, but after a recount it was clear that the amended motion passed).

**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** 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 instructional faculty (see VI.A.4.a, p. 101).

The Senate voted on the motion to 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), which was approved without discussion.

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

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, meeting 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.

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).

The Senate voted on the motion to amend the criteria for promotion to the rank of Librarian III
(section VI.C.4.c, p. 115 of the FAM), which was approved without discussion.

**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
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.

The Senate voted on the motion to amend the criteria for promotion to the rank of Librarian IV (section VI.C.4.d, p. 115-116 of the FAM), which was approved without discussion.

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 College, and, where appropriate, to the community.

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.
Mike Duvall (English) said he agrees with the motion, but if a department should want to require “department advising” as part of their standard would the other criteria listed here cover that? Ms. Boyle said that it would not be required anymore; however, departments can add requirements, but they have to file them with Academic Affairs. He wanted to know what if someone petitioned that they did not meet a certain requirement because it was not in the FAM. Ms. Boyle replied that a department can have its own tenure requirements and a chair has the right to assign service activities. Mr. Pothering wanted to know if this has been a problem in recent years for people coming up for senior instructor. Ms. Boyle said no, but they have essentially ignored this point.

The Senate voted on the motion to eliminating “departmental advising” standard for promotion to Senior Instructor, which was approved.

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)
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.

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
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 e 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.
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.

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.
(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.

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

(h) 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.
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.
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. 

\[\text{D. Procedures for Third-Year Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty}\]

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. (Rev. April 2009)

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)

Elizabeth Martínez-Gibson (at-large) had a question about colleague letters (p. 33 of agenda) within departments. The Speaker responded that this was already in the FAM and that we were only discussing the proposed changes. Mr. Mitchener wanted to know if the underlining (on p. 40) represented an insertion. Ms. Caveny said the underlines are insertions. This was a section moved from elsewhere for consistency. Bob Mignone (guest) wanted to know if the By-Laws Committee would look at this as well. The Speaker said we could send this to the By-Laws Committee. We can vote now or refer it.

Bill Manaris (Computer Science) asked why the heading, "Tenure-Track and Tenured" is included in: (p. 28) "A. Third-year Review, Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-Track and Tenured Instructional Faculty" and NOT in: (p. 47) "C. Third-Year Review, Tenure and Promotion of the Library Faculty." Ms. Caveny responded that the clause "Tenure-Track and Tenured" is included in p. 28 to differentiate from: (p. 40) B. Third-Year Review and Promotion of Instructors and Renewal of Senior Instructors. The section which starts on p. 47 applies to both instructors and tenured/tenure-track faculty, unlike the earlier sections, where the two groups of instructional faculty are addressed separately.

The Senate voted on the proposed changes in tenure/promotion guidelines, which were approved.

2 Deadlines for earlier stages of the review process are prior to March 1 and are announced by Academic Affairs each year.
Resolution to Support Bike and Pedestrian Lane Across the Ashley River Bridge

See Senate website for a copy of the resolution.

The resolution sponsored by Mr. Mitchener was seconded. Mr. Mignone said Tom Bradford, head of Charleston Moves, asked if the College would support this effort for bikes and pedestrians. Student Government President Isaiah Nelson informed him that the student government had supported it unanimously. Robert Westerfelhaus (at-large) wanted to know if the lane was only on the bridge or leading up to the bridge. Mr. Mignone said the bikes would not enter the lane until right at the bridge. There will be a dedicated wooden causeway up to the bridge. Margaret Hagood (at-large) wanted to know what sort of barricade is in the plan for protecting pedestrians and cyclists. Mr. Mignone said he does not know the design. The Speaker asked everyone to focus on the resolution at hand. Vince Benigni (Communication) said networks of safe routes (as stated in the resolution) should mean that it will be safe.

The Senate voted on the Resolution to Support Bike and Pedestrian Lane Across the Ashley River Bridge, which was approved unanimously.

Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Committee: End of the Year Report

Lynn Cherry, chair of the committee, said that in the fall semester her committee conducted a campus survey to find out what is going on currently as far as assessment. They surveyed all departments, majors and minors and then prepared a report. They found that assessment within majors in a 50-50 proposition; some are doing it and others are not. Nonetheless, they were pleased that many were conducting assessment. Also, the committee had 2 members who served on the search for the new Director of Assessment. Next year’s chair will be working with Ms. Brunner to negotiate how her office with collaborate with the committee. Ms. Cherry has been working with Ms. Curtis in regards to assessment of General Education. Their two committees need to work together so that there is no duplication and also so that the Gen. Ed. committee would not feel overwhelmed about assessment. Lastly, recently the committee has started to ask our colleagues to survey faculty at other institutions. Specifically the committee wants to learn
about how other institutions assess Deans, Provosts and Presidents; to find out how they do it. In their preliminary findings they have discovered that at some universities, faculty members are involved in evaluations of their Chairs, and many faculty are asked to evaluate their Deans. Next year’s committee will continue with this task.

After her report Ms. Cherry took questions. Mr. Mitchener asked if her report was posted. She said not yet, but it will be posted on the Faculty Senate website.

**Academic Planning Committee: Report on Online Education (see website for report)**

Ms. Eichelberger (chair) urged everyone to take a look at the full report posted on the website. The committee learned a lot about online education. Today she wanted to only highlight some of the main points from the report.

She said that her committee was very interested in finding out what the College was currently doing with online education. Several years ago a previous committee came to the Senate with a resolution that was opposed to all types of online education. She does not endorse that resolution because things have changes. Her committee learned from their research that an online course does not have to be any better or any worse than a course taught face to face. They were concerned, however, when looking at the Strategic Plan that the College was hoping to use online education as a big revenue generator. Their study proved that a good course would be very labor intensive for the professor. Professors who teach online summer courses, for example, are given a stipend because they recognize how difficult this is. She thinks that summer school is doing a good job at supporting professors—each faculty member is assigned a technology specialist. She said that the technology used in these online summer courses could also be re-purposed and incorporated into traditional semester long classes. Her committee came to the conclusion that faculty should be aware that these courses are labor intensive and that they come with some risks. Attrition is possible because students have to be very self motivated to succeed in these classes. Summer school provides a lot of information and help for professors on these issues. She stressed that in order for a course to be successful and to further our high quality institution then it is not going to be a means for making more money. Her committee believes that there should be some faculty oversight on online education. They still do not have a formal motion. They do not know who yet, but someone or committee should be in charge of this. The next Speaker, Ms. Cherry, should think about this. Right now online education is confined to summer school and they like that model, but who knows what is going to happen in the future.
Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) wanted to know if the committee knew about any other institutions that are managing successful remote classrooms (for example, a professor using video to broadcast a lecture). Burton Callicott (at-large) said that he had participated in a class of that type at another institution. Ms. Eichelberger said it would be difficult to provide large groups of students with individualized feedback; that is precisely what is needed for a course to be successful.

Scott Peeples (at-large) asked about the process for teaching an online course. Does a new course have to be approved by a committee? Ms. Eichelberger said there is no set process as of yet. Further, there is no way of knowing if a transfer student has taken an online course for credit at another institution. Melissa Hughes (at-large) had trouble envisioning the criteria that a committee would use to evaluate an online course. She is not comfortable with a committee telling her how she should teach a course. Ms. Eichelberger said she understands this, but their concern is that these courses are expensive and labor intensive. Faculty members have an important role to play in being vigilant. The Curriculum Committee should be involved in the process at some point.

Mr. Mitchener said that IT (Instructional Technology) is already stressed and for this reason he thinks an online course might not be possible in some situations. For example, he was unable to find a classroom with 38 computers for his calculus classes. Ms. Eichelberger said that there is the feeling that we need more instructional technologists. She said now in the summer there are more possibilities. James Williams (guest) said that with advance notice, IT can provide support. Ms. Eichelberger said there can be problems on the student’s end with technology too. The College should invest in this. Mr. Williams said they have mobile carts to extend technology that can bring in 20 extra laptops, for example.

Ms. Eichelberger hopes that everyone will read this report. Other institutions are doing a lot more than us and we can learn from them.

**Presentation of Degree Candidates:**

The Speaker explained that we used to present the degree candidates at our Spring Faculty meeting, but when we did away with that meeting we did away with the ritual. This will now be a new ritual of the Faculty Senate.
The Provost then made the following motion: “Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends to the Board of Trustees that candidates certified by the Registrar’s Office as having completed all requirements be awarded degrees at commencement.” The resolution was approved by proclamation.

Constituents’ Concerns

Ms. Cherry reminded everyone about the Friday May 6 Graduate commencement and the May 7 undergraduate ceremonies for commencement. She encouraged everyone to attend these graduation ceremonies. It means a tremendous amount to our students to see the faculty at commencement.

Mr. Manaris said that some catalog changes have not been implemented. This has happened with two changes. Can we have a check box at the end of the process to say that the change has been implemented in the catalog? This would bring closure. The Speaker said there are procedures in place to make this happen. Cathy Boyd (Registrar) said that they are preparing this week to send out the catalog changes for a last edit. Now is the time to let them know of any changes. Department Chairs are responsible to look at these catalog changes. She said that this is the best process and that it is much more effective than paperwork. She explained that her office reads the Senate minutes to find out about changes to the catalog. She believes that this is much more effective than a signature system since sometimes it takes weeks after a Senate meeting for the paperwork to finally arrive at her office.

Ms. Curtis offered thanks to Mr. Phillips for all he has done these past two semesters as Speaker.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:16 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 5 April 2011

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 5 April 2011, at 5:05 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Darryl Phillips, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of March 1, 2011 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Darryl Phillips, the Speaker, began his report by mentioning that we have a very long agenda. He said that we do have the room until 9:00PM this evening and we can continue the meeting next Tuesday April 12.

The Speaker took a few minutes to thank the following people: Sarah Owens – Faculty Secretary, Heather Alexander – Faculty Secretariat; George Pothering – Parliamentarian; Claire Curtis – Speaker Pro Tem; and Spencer Williams – Student Office Assistant. He said that it has been an honor to serve as Speaker and a pleasure to work with the faculty, the President, the Provost, and other administrators. He has learned a lot. He thinks it is important to recognize the hundreds of people who are working together to improve the College of Charleston.

Mr. Phillips said that the year started out very strong with the Strategic Plan but then “fizzled” with the rollback of tuition due to the building moratorium. He wanted to emphasize, however, that plan B has been one of incremental change. The following report focuses on incremental change at the College.

Smaller Faculty Senate: Although the Speaker said he voted against it, he believes that the 50 member Senate is a positive change. We have become more efficient, but at the same time we have taken time to revise proposals.

Changes to Faculty Committees:

- Working more closely with Administrators: (for example, Bob Cape, now attends Educational Technology meetings)

- Adjusting our bylaws to give faculty a role in proposals to terminate programs: The Speaker said he is glad that we have a mechanism in our bylaws so that we can have a voice. We are preparing ourselves for the next couple of years.

- Having more continuity on committees: RoxAnn Stalvey, Chair of Nominations and Elections, added a new question to the committee service survey - if you would like to continue on the same committee.

Changes to make our governance system more effective:

- Orientation materials for the Faculty Senate (even sample motions) are now posted on the Senate website. This includes short descriptions for all faculty committees. Now faculty members will have something to look at before they fill out the committee
surveys (what is the workload, etc.) People can make informed decisions. Before we had no systemic way of sharing information.

- The Speaker is working on drafting materials for the Faculty Senate. As of now there is no orientation guide on how to be a Senator.

Adjustments to the curriculum (including General Education): Claire Curtis as chair of the Committee on General Education has been making incremental changes. Tonight there are many curricula changes.

- FYE requirement is being phased in. Susan Kattwinkel, Director of the First Year Experience (FYE), has done an outstanding job with this program.

The following items are coming up on the agenda or this week:

- Cover letter to the Faculty/Administration Manual: This is a proposal from the By-Laws Committee. Currently there is no statement of how changes to the FAM are made. This cover letter brings together, for the first time and in one place, all the procedures. It also makes sure that By-Laws Committee is in charge of editing.

- Statement on Academic Freedom: This recommendation is really important for faculty members. Our free speech had been called into question by the Supreme Court. We need to make sure that faculty members are protected when they speak openly about tenure and promotion and other professional service issues.

- Change to the Faculty Speaker & Secretary’s term: The Speaker said this is a perfect time to do this since he does not have a vested interest. The proposal is to start the term on July 1. The one year term will be on the same calendar as other administrators. Past and the future speakers all have approved this change.

Mr. Phillips finished his report by saying we need to continue to encourage incremental change in the years ahead. We can make sure the College is still headed in the right direction.

There were no questions at this time.

The President

President Benson thanked everyone and agrees with the Speaker’s assessment of the state of the College. Because of the building moratorium, we had to roll back our tuition last September 29 and thus modify the Strategic Plan. Despite this setback, the President thinks it has been a very good year. He thanked Darryl Phillips for all his hard work as Speaker of the Faculty.

The President listed three things that he would cover in his report: a summary of a speech that he gave last week to the Metro Chamber of Congress, the new Governor and the state budget.
1) Last Wednesday Mr. Benson spoke to the Chamber as he has done every year since becoming President of the College of the Charleston. This year his speech was much more upbeat and positive. He said that the new Governor recognizes that the College does a lot for economic development for the State. He talked about all that the state’s universities do for the economy: real estate, hiring, and promoting for this whole region. He emphasized to the business community that we can do even more with their help. Faculty members can serve as speakers, advisors, and also offer technical and creative support. He asked what Charleston would be like without the 4 institutions in the local area. Charleston is a college town. We have 50,000 faculty, staff, and students in Charleston. The 4 presidents meet regularly (recently they have brought in the President of Trident Tech to make 4). He said that the 4 institutions have already started to do some purchasing and procurement together. We are independent, but working closely together. This speech is available on the link to the Office of the President on the CofC website.

2) At the recent Town Hall meeting the President talked about Governor Haley. He has met with her a number of times and finds her bright, intense, friendly and approachable. He said that it behooves us to get close to her. He recognizes that she is very important, but at the same time she is only one voice and that the State Legislature has a lot of power. The business community says that our economy is at the bottom, but things are getting better. The budget is also at the bottom, but should be moving up. The President can see the light at the end of the tunnel. Governor Haley invited all the presidents to Colombia to talk about higher education. She wanted to talk about funding and said she wants it to be more predictable. The academic leaders should run the universities and not the legislators. The 13 presidents were very excited about this news. This is performance based funding. Governor Haley cited 4 main factors that would factor into performance based funding: graduation rates, in-state vs. out-of-state enrollment, job placement for graduates and economic development (if we do well, in these areas then we will receive more dollars). The presidents want to add a fifth factor: recruitment of under-represented students. With the guidance of Brian McGee and Steve Osborn, the President and others want to know what performance based funding really means. Who are you going to compete against? All types of institutions? Other universities or just ourselves? Or some combination? Who sets the goals? The President and his staff proposed an approach that would lock in next year’s budget as a base that would not be touched. Performance funding, should be based on the new money, but not on the current funding (that would be chaos). There are several approaches to split up the money. The actual funding model has yet to be decided. Governor Haley “threw the ball” to all the presidents to figure it all out. She wants to start applying this for 2013.

3) President Benson said the State has a 700 million dollar hole in its budget. We do not know our cut yet, but one figure estimates 6%. That translates into a 1.1 million dollar cut; one, according to the President, that we can handle. Despite the cuts, the House is thinking about giving the College 1.7 million dollars as one-time money for building maintenance. Although we have been affected by the tuition drop, he thinks we can handle these cuts. Tax revenues are up and things are getting better. The President ended his report by stating that faculty and staff salaries, along with the base budget are his
highest priorities. This has been hard, but he has learned a lot. Before the tuition cut, we were doing very well – that money would have gone to salaries – but we are going to find more money for these 3 things. He said that the Strategic Plan is irrelevant if we do not take care of our people.

The President opened the floor for questions. Claire Curtis (at-large) asked about the performance based funding. She wanted to know about the system that would allow us to keep our basic allocation and who is the “we” that the President was talking about. The President asked Mr. McGee (Chief of Staff and Senior Policy Advisor in the Office of the President) for his input on this question. Mr. McGee said that several university presidents have endorsed a model that has a base budget plus the performance budget.

Bob Mignone (guest) stated that we had performance funding 15 years ago. In one sense it is good to compete against research universities when it comes to in-state out-of-state students, but that overall it is tricky. The President said that the Legislature loves to talk about in-state out-of-state. At the College we take every single qualified South Carolina student. If you are a resident of SC you have a much higher chance of getting into this institution. The Governor said that if it is better for your institution to increase your out-of-state, then do it. For example, we now have approximately 38% out-of-state students. If we increase out-of-state enrollment we will lose state money, but gain tuition dollars. According to Governor Haley, that decision is up to us.

Jon Hakkila (guest) said that the College has worked hard to form our own identity. He hopes that performance incentives do not take away our identity, like increasing class size. The President responded that we will not let this happen. We may get to set our own goals (according to the Governor).

The Provost

Provost Hynd said that he has enjoyed working with the Speaker this year. He thanked everyone at the Office of the Academic Affairs. He has a great staff and this has been a team effort. He then gave the following end of the year report.

The Provost listed the following accomplishments from the 2010-11 Academic Year:

• Full Year Sabbatical Policy: It has been shown that full year sabbaticals have saved the College money. Next week at the board of Trustees we want to get approval to make this a permanent policy (full year sabbatical at two third’s salary).

• School Level Strategic Priorities (part of the Strategic Plan): This Provost’s view is that we can all be positive advocates for the College. Parents have mentioned to him that the CofC is of very high quality and good value for their money. He said we are all part of
the team. We want to offer college level courses to high school students. Specifically we are going to work with Wando High School. This will be a great recruitment tool.

• International/Study Abroad Activities: The College wants to recognize the faculty who participate in these programs. Last fall he hosted a reception for students and faculty. There was a wonderful poster session at that event. We rank 40 in the US among masters-level institutions of students who go abroad. 27.5% of our students study abroad.

• Online Course Evaluations: There have been some challenges, such as the low response rates, but we have good suggestions on how to improve them. These evaluations should only be one component in the promotion process.

• Collaborations Across Campus: We have many groups collaborating at the College and in the local area. For example, collaborations between the Avery Institute, African Studies, and Carolina Lowcountry and Atlantic World (CLAW) have worked together to create synergy and scholarship. They promote scholars and students are attracted to them.

• New Degree Programs: Our new programs include an MBA, Computing in the Arts and Jewish Studies. A total of 700 students on campus self identify themselves with the Jewish faith. We need to promote these programs.

• Tenure and Promotion: The evaluation process has been completed. 65 faculty members went up for consideration.

The Provost then spoke about how the College is “moving forward.” He listed some of the ongoing and upcoming initiatives.

• An increase in state recruitment with a focus on under-represented students: If these students are qualified then they will get into the College.

• Expand opportunities for collaboration with higher education institutions and business partnerships: For example expand collaboration with Trident Tech, and businesses such as Boeing.

• Continue to build advancement team and increase prioritized fundraising efforts: We have alumni who are out there and doing extraordinary things. This is also true for many of our current students.

• Focus on building strong academic programs consistent with need and strategic priorities: We want to continue to build strong academic programs, but we have to evaluate for costs and need.

• Build research infrastructure and faculty support: We want to build the infrastructure for faculty, some of whom have won external funding (and should be commended for their efforts).

• Develop capability to go online with Tenure & Promotion: we want to digitize all documents for tenure and promotion (no more large three ring binders).
• Increase communication internally and externally about student and faculty accomplishments: The Provost wants to make sure that we have some appreciation for things that “fly under the radar.” He wants to promote what we do and what our students do. We are looking forward to a magazine to promote these academic projects.

• 32 searches currently underway: 20 job offers have currently been made. The Provost knows of institutions that have frozen hires and closed programs. We are doing well in this regard. We have a new Chair coming in Classics.

The Provost then opened the floor to questions. Ms. Curtis asked about online course evaluations and wanted to know what was happening this semester for better response rates. The Provost asked Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, to respond to this question. The AAPA office (Accountability, Accreditation, Planning & Assessment) has done some focus groups with students. Among other things they are sending the message to students about the evaluations through the Student Government President Isaiah Nelson, campus television, and the student newspaper. Posters have been made with pictures of faculty members for different schools, talking about how the professors use the evaluations. Some students think that the evaluations take too long. Academic Affairs will be getting together a faculty committee to consider whether the form could be shortened. We hope to include faculty members who were involved in the ad hoc committee that developed the questions.

After the questions and answers, the Provost added that the campus will be launching a Campus Master Plan Initiative. We will be able to share our thoughts and initiatives – with the goal to meet instructional and academic needs. We will be hearing more about this in the future.

**Old Business:**

**A. First Year Experience**

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

Christopher Korey, Chair of the First Year Experience (FYE) Committee, introduced the following motion and catalog language.

**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.

The Speaker reminded Senators that we are focusing now on the motion, and not the catalog language.

Irina Gigova (at-large) said she has two concerns. She is concerned about the summer. Financial aid and dorm contracts do not extend into summer and this troubles her. Her second concern is pedagogical. She thinks that allowing the students to fail the course 3 times is excessive. Why not limit it to two times? She said that if a student fails three times then maybe they should not be in college. She proposed the following amendment to the main motion:
Proposed Amendment to FYE Motion:

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

- For students entering in the Fall, the consecutive first academic terms year includes Fall, and Spring terms, and Summer.
- For students entering in the Spring, the first consecutive academic terms year includes Spring, Summer, and Fall terms.
- All students have the option of completing an FYE course in the summer.

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

The amendment to the main motion was seconded.

Ms. Kattwinkel said (as a point of information) that one of the reasons for the summer classes is that there are relatively few courses in the spring. This way, if a student took a course in the spring and failed, they could then take it in the summer. Melissa Hughes (at-large) said she is teaching in the spring. As of now a student might decide to take the class, but without the summer they have only one chance to complete the course. Ms. Curtis added that the motion says that a student must be continuously enrolled. If they take the class in the fall then they have to take it in the spring. But, the students who take the class in the spring should have another chance in the summer. Ms. Kattwinkel said that the summer classes will be taught primarily online – so this would not affect the housing issue. She also stated that if the students pass the first time then they would not have this problem.

Ms. Gigova said she is concerned about the commitment of faculty to teach the summer courses. Mr. Korey said there are faculty members who are interested in teaching these courses. Mr. Hakkila said we are going to run into issues about summer school funding; for example, that a class needs a certain number of students to make full salary. Ms. Curtis said that with this motion, you still have to offer summer courses. Scott Peeples (at-large) said that the amendment to the motion is confusing.

Lynne Ford, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration, said that the FYE advisory committee has spent a lot of time on this proposal. The main goal is to get the students enrolled early. The message is that this is foundational for incoming students. We do
not want sophomores doing the FYE. A very small number of students fail these courses. A student can still can credit for the FYE even after failing the course – it is the faculty’s right to decide. Some more discussion ensued regarding the proposed amendment (most of it for clarification and much of it repeating the same points above).

The Faculty voted on Ms. Gigova’s amendment. The majority was opposed and it did not pass.

The Speaker asked the Senate to return to the motion.

The Senate voted on the main motion to clarify the FYE requirement which was approved without further discussion.

New Business:

A. Committee on Nominations and Elections
   --Election of Senate Committees

Ms. Stalvey gave the following report from the Committee on Nominations and Elections.

Fun Facts:

- 182 Standing committee seats for 2011-12
- 207 Faculty provided information for our committee
- 194 Faculty were willing/able to serve in 2011-12
- 25 Senators completed the online survey
- 7 Senators and 61 Faculty total selected “Any” as one of their choices

Volunteers by School:

Arts – 10
Business – 14
Education – 20
HSS – 79
Languages – 24
Standing Senate Committee Nominees:

Academic Planning
  Senators: Burton Callicott, Sara Frankel, E. Moore Quinn, and Jeffrey Yost
  Non-Senators: Alex Kasman, Nancy Nenno, and Robert Perkins

Budget
  Senators: Julia Eichelberger, Linda Jones, and Paul Young
  Non-Senators: Jane Clary, Chad Galuska, Matthew Rutter, and Kendra Stewart

By-Laws
  Senators: Mikhail Agrest and Scott Peeples
  Non-Senators: Glenn Lesses

Standing College Committees:

- List of nominees were sent by email. For a copy contact: stalveyr@cofc.edu
- Run-off election will be held for Graduate Education.
- General Education Committee needs a Business School Representative.
- Next year’s N&E election begins tomorrow (April 6).

Concern of Our Committee:

- Number of Senate Standing Committees did not adjust when Senate was restructured.
- Traditionally, Senate committees are filled with a majority of Senators.
- 11 out of 50 Senators must serve on Senate Committee.

The Speaker declared that the above nominees for uncontested committees were all elected by acclamation. He reminded the Senate that the Committee on General Education needs a representative from Business to serve on the committee. He is still accepting nominees.

Ms Stalvey also reported that the Nominations Committee was concerned about the feasibility of the March 15 deadline to fill committees. The committee had trouble meeting this deadline. This is a problem because Department Senators are not elected until March 15.

The Speaker gave a special thanks to Ms. Stalvey for striving to meet the deadlines. He reminded everyone that starting tomorrow (April 6) there would be a run-off election for the Graduate Committee. He also said that committees should make sure that they have a new chair in place before the end of the semester.
B. Nominations for Committee on Nominations and Elections (2011-2012)

The Speaker said he had sent out a solicitation for volunteers several weeks ago. He has collected the following 10 names. He asked for additional nominations from the floor. None were offered, so declared the nominations closed. Starting tomorrow (April 6) there will be an online election tomorrow to select 7 out of these 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Bartel</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaure de Buron</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annalisa Calini</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Goodier</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Hittner</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hao Chen Liu</td>
<td>Economics &amp; Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Nenno</td>
<td>German &amp; Slavic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Olejniczak</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katina Strauch</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Thomas</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jannette Finch, Co-Chair of the Committee, introduced the following proposals:

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 CPLT390: 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

The Senate voted on all of the course change proposals from Comparative Literature, Biology, Honors, Anthropology and Sociology, which were approved without discussion.

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
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
Topics in Neuroscience, BIOL 447 Seminar in Neuroscience, BIOL 448 Bachelor's Essay in Neuroscience, BIOL 449 Biology of Coral Reefs, BIOL 450 Problems in Biology, BIOL 451 Problems in Marine Biology, BIOL 452 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
Change of Minor (Spanish): add SPAN320 and reduce to two other req’d courses
Change of Major (Spanish): Require a proficiency exam for graduation

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

The Senate voted on all the program changes from Astronomy, Geology & Env. Science, Physics, Psychology, Mathematics, Linguistics, Computer Science and Computing in the Arts, German and Slavic Studies, Biology, French, English, International Studies, Hispanic Studies, and Health and Human Performance, which were approved without discussion.

III. New Majors:

None
D. Academic Standards Committee

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

Jason Overby, chair of the committee, gave the following report.

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.
Some discussion ensued regarding the revised policy (most of it for clarification). Various Senators wanted to know how this policy would affect their own departments. Mr. Overby reminded Senators that the essence of this policy is that students cannot “double dip” course for minors. This does not place any new restrictions on concentrations, majors or tracks within majors.

Ms. Gigova proposed the following amendment which was seconded.

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 one may not be applied towards a second; 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.

Much of the same discussion as before ensued about this proposed amendment. Senators wanted to know how the proposed amendment would affect their own departments. Some found the amendment confusing.

The Faculty voted on Ms. Gigova’s amendment. The majority was opposed and it did not pass.

The Speaker asked the Senate to return to the motion.

The Senate voted on the main motion to change policy on Concentrations and Minors, which was approved without further discussion.

E. Committee on General Education

Claire Curtis, Chair of the Committee on General Education, introduced the following proposal.

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.

The Speaker reminded the Senate that this proposal has two parts and we will be voting on it as a package.

Ms. Gigova asked if this is what the students will see in the catalog. Mr. Phillips said we are here for policy, not actual catalog language. Ms. Eichelberger, on behalf of Academic Planning, said she thinks it is appropriate that the Gen-Ed Committee should be doing this all the time and in the future. She commended the committee.

Mr. Phillips reminded people that all faculty committees are welcome to post information on the Senate website.

Alex Kasman (guest) wanted to make sure that the criteria for these courses were clear. Rob Dillon (at-large) asked Mr. Kasman if he supported the motion as written. Mr. Kasman said yes, so long as this is done uniformly for everyone.

Garrett Mitchener (at-large) said he formed part of the working group that examined this proposal. He plans to vote for it, but at the moment there is not a list of approved courses. Ms. Curtis said that this does not go in effect until 2012/13—and that is why. A list of courses will be developed next year. Linda Jones (at-large) said she was on the working group, but wants to
know if Logic is included. Ms. Curtis said that in the future Philosophy will bring PHIL 120 to Gen-Ed; they believe it meets the criteria.

The Senate voted on the proposal from the Committee on General Education in regards to Mathematical Reasoning and Analysis (change requirement and new approval criteria), which was approved.

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)

Silvia Rodríguez-Sabater, Committee Chair, introduced the following proposals.

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

The Senate voted on the proposals for the MAT in Special Education (to change graduate courses and delete graduate courses) which were approved without discussion.

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

The Senate voted on the proposals to change the graduate programs (MAT in Special Education and MS in Mathematics), which were approved without discussion.

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

The Senate voted on the proposals from the MS in Environmental Studies to change a graduate course, add a new course, and change a graduate program, which were all approved without discussion.

Ms. Rodríguez-Sabater explained that the following policies were for information only (descriptions can be found on Senate website).
Proposal for a New Graduate Policy – Leave of Absence

Proposal for a Graduate Policy Change - Graduate Grade of “U”

There was a motion to adjourn which was seconded. The Senate was adjourned at 7:16 pm. The rest of the meeting was continued the following week on April 12, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 1 March 2011

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 1 March 2011, at 5:05 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Darryl Phillips, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of February 8, 2011 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Darryl Phillips, the Speaker, said he had a very short report: two announcements and a reminder. He first congratulated Lynn Cherry who has been elected to serve as Speaker of the Faculty. He said that her job starts the day after commencement. He then introduced Meridith Gould – the new Director of Diversity Education and Training. She has a background in Sociology and is on the verge of completing a Ph.D. She will be working with faculty across the College. Further, she will be creating workshops for students and staff members. The Speaker encouraged everyone to take advantage of Ms. Gould – this is a new position to help us all. She is an important part of our diversity initiative across campus.

The Speaker reminded Senators that March 24, 2011 is the deadline for agenda submission for our April meetings. He said that we should plan on using the overflow meeting. He encourages faculty committee chairs, if they are so inclined, to make an end of the year report to the Senate. If committee chairs are interested in giving a report then they should contact the Faculty Secretary to secure a spot on the agenda.

There were no questions at this time.

The Provost

Provost Hynd started his report by saying he has appreciated working with the current Speaker, Darryl Phillips, and that he is looking forward to working with Ms. Cherry.

The Provost announced that Dr. Penelope (Penny) Brunner, currently working for Sienna College in NY, has been hired as the new Director of Assessment. He expects that she will begin work in April.

The Provost referred to a lecture (the previous night) regarding Computers in the Arts. He congratulated the organizers for the success of that event.

Provost Hynd reported that a week ago the Deans attended a CASE workshop on development and institutional advancement for Deans. At the event they learned about fundraising and development at other institutions. He said we are all part of the advancement team (institutional advancement). The Deans will be working with Department Heads on this. Despite the economic crisis the Provost believes this is a good time to be announcing a campaign. The Development Office is doing a feasibility study to see how potential supporters will react to our Strategic Plan and fundraising campaign.
Provost Hynd reported that the Promotion and Tenure Process is moving forward and will be completed soon.

There were no questions at this time.

New Business

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)

Silvia Rodríguez-Sabater, Committee Chair, introduced the following proposal.

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

Mr. Phillips said that the proposal for an English Language Institute is being presented to the Senate as an information item. This committee has taken on the task of reviewing non-credit programs at the College. He said that this is a good opportunity for discussion.

Claire Curtis (at large) asked about the rationale of the Institute in connection with the Strategic Plan. How does this relate to the development of online courses? Ms. Rodríguez-Sabater responded that there will be an online component on Fridays. But, the majority of the classes are not online.

Julia Eichelberger (at-large) asked about the self-supporting aspect of the proposal and how it will work. Ms. Rodriguez-Sabater said that the information is on page four of the proposal. She said that a program is only required to declare that it is self supported, but they do not need to present a budget if that is the case. She said they had a concern about space because the Institute wanted to hold the classes on the main campus, but they did find space in the Bell building.

Ms. Eichelberger said it would be helpful to know the formula that these programs use in order to be self-supporting. She also wanted to know what level of English do these potential students have and how would that be assessed. Ms. Rodriguez-Sabater referred to page two of the document that says an ESL test will be given to students and based on that test they will be placed accordingly. She said that there were questions from her committee regarding the use of the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language). Many thought that was a better measurement, but in the end they went with the ESL Exam. Ms. Eichelberger thinks this is a
wonderful opportunity and that in principal it is a good idea. Ms. Rodriguez-Sabater said it is a work in process.

Mr. Phillips commented that we have posted the policies about these non-credit programs on our website. He thinks it is outstanding that we are having more faculty oversight of these initiatives. Ms. Rodriguez-Sabater has done a terrific job as chair of the committee.

---

**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)*

Jen Wright, Co-Chair of the Committee, introduced the following proposals:

**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**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>New Course: EDFS428: Procedures for Teaching Students with Disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change of Major Requirements, Special Education (to substitute new course for EDFS427)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Curtis asked about the syllabus and wanted to know if this is about learning disabilities. Bob Perkins (Teacher Education) said that he is going to speculate that the title of the new course meant to say “Learning Disabilities.” Ms. Wright confirmed that this was a mistake on the agenda and should read “Procedures for Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities.”

The Senate voted on the program changes for Education, which was approved.
Honors  New Course: HONS100: Beyond George Street
Change of Major Requirements, Honors (to add course as req'd for all incoming freshmen)

Chris Starr (at large) asked if this is similar to Honors Interdisciplinary Creative Exchange (ICE). Trisha Folds-Bennett, Honors College Associate Dean, said yes.

The Senate voted on the program changes for Honors, which was approved.

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)

The Senate voted on the program changes for Classics, which was approved without discussion.

III. New Majors:

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

Ms. Eichelberger said that the Budget and Academic Planning Committees are both in support of this new major.

The Senate voted on the new major for Math, which was approved.

C. Committee on General Education

Claire Curtis, Chair of the Committee on General Education, introduced the following proposals (see website for complete information):

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

Ms. Curtis said that her committee looked at the whole proposal and had agreed that the Honor’s proposal met the requirements for the First Year Experience (FYE) – the same as regular students. She said one nice feature is that students who have tested out of Honor’s Academic Writing can have the opportunity to take a FYE with non honor’s students. She said that the
Honor’s FYE makes sense because overall the honor’s students live together, and take classes together.

The Senate voted on the Honors FYE (Curricular Package from Honors), which was approved.

The Senate voted on giving Classics 203 Special Topics - Humanities credit, which was approved.

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)

Christopher Korey, Chair of the First Year Experience (FYE) Committee, gave the following report.

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.

After the report Mr. Korey introduced the following motion:

**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.

Mr. Phillips thanked the committee and Susan Kattwinkel, Director of the FYE.

Scott Peeples (at large) wanted to know more about the Learning Strategies course. Ms. Kattwinkel said that the course is taught out of Undergraduate Academic Services. She said it is a learning skills course for students who have failed the course and required for students who are on academic probation (there is a mix of students).

Melissa Hughes (at large) asked about the criteria for completing a Learning Community. Mr. Korey said that there is an academic component. Ms. Kattwinkel said that it will lie in the hands of the faculty teaching the course. Ms. Curtis wanted to know how many students are failing these courses. Ms. Kattwinkel said that they are failing at a slightly lower level than regular
classes. Heath Hoffman (guest) asked if there is any age limit for these classes. He gave the example of returning veterans from Afghanistan. He said that they fall into the age group of twenty to thirty-year olds and might not need this type of experience. Ms. Kattwinkel said that there is a waiver process. If they already have life experiences then they can petition for the waiver. Vince Benigni (Communication) said he assumes that first year always means freshman, but he wanted to know about transfer students. Mr. Korey said currently it means freshman, but in the future, it might be appropriate to have an experience for transfer students.

Rob Dillon (at large) asked if students can take first year classes as sophomores or juniors. Mr. Korey said no. Mr. Dillon pointed out that the motion does not say that a freshman has to take the FYE in his or her first year. The Speaker said that the new motion does have different wording from the motion passed in 2007. He thinks this new motion will clarify things. Mr. Korey said that this is to clarify the motion from March 13, 2007. The new motion also takes into account the proposal from the Honor’s College.

Mr. Phillips asked for discussion on the text of the motion. Mr. Dillon read the motion aloud. He wanted to know if it clearly states that students must take the FYE as freshman. Ms. Curtis said yes, it does say that. Ms. Hughes said there is potential confusion – the motion leads one to believe that if a student did not take the FYE in the first year then they could take Learning Strategies the second year.

Ms. Hughes gave the following wording for an amendment to the motion (new wording is underlined).

**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. If unsuccessful in the first two attempts in After the first year, students may satisfy the First Year Experience requirement by successfully completing a Learning Strategies course.

The amendment was seconded, and discussion ensued.

Ms. Kattwinkel said she likes the motion. It helps students from jumping to the conclusion that they could take a Learning Strategies course instead of the FYE.

Bill Manaris (Computer Science) proposed alternative language to the motion. Mr. Phillips reminded Senators that we were discussing the amendment to the motion (proposed by Ms. Hughes). Ms. Ford said that we want to insure that the students enroll some time during their first two semesters. Robert Westerfelhaus (at-large) said that the wording is still unclear and that students might not make a second attempt during their first year.
Studies) said that even if this is passed, she would like to suggest another idea. Ms. Hughes asked to withdraw her proposed amendment. It was seconded and the amendment was withdrawn from consideration.

The Speaker said we were back to discussing the main motion. Ms. Kattwinkel proposed alternative wording to amend the motion. Ms. Hughes then proposed the following amendment suggested by Ms. Kattwinkel. It was seconded.

**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 who are required to complete a First Year Experience must make 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.

Ms. Eichelberger asked where this language is going. What is going to appear in the catalog? The Speaker said we are only approving the precise wording of the requirement and the logistics will be worked out later. Ms. Eichelberger said we should do the wordsmithing when we approve the wording for the catalog. He agrees in spirit, but if you look back at the meeting in 2007, the motion was messy. In the past we have approved the policy itself, but some wordsmithing is okay as long as it does not change the spirit of the motion. Mr. Korey said that that this will help clarify how things will work functionally. He thinks this is separate than “how.” Cathy Boyd, Office of the Registrar, said that since we are approaching the deadline for the catalog (about six weeks after the April Senate meeting) it would be helpful to know where the wording will come for the catalog.

Mr. Phillips said that this motion will add some detail to the motion from 2007. Most importantly it talks about students who fail and what happens. The second paragraph addresses that issue. Jim Newhard (Classics) said that if this wording is to provide guidance, he is not sure that this motion captures the intent. He said that it is missing that you have to compete the FYE in the first year and that you get two opportunities to do that. He is not comfortable with the motion. Brian McGee (guest) said that we have not been consistent with revisions to the catalog in the past. Looking at our history, motion language from the Senate does not always translate into the catalog. He thinks there is a challenge with this motion in regards to registering for the two courses in the first year. Mr. McGee doubts we would expel a student if he or she did not do this.
Claire Curtis does not think this version makes it clear. We should put it in far blunter terms. She is against it because it is confusing.

Rob Dillon thinks it is clear and he likes it.

George Pothering, Senate Parliamentarian, referred to a person who signs up for a class and then withdraws. Is that considered an attempt? The Speaker said no.

The Faculty Senators voted on the proposed amendment to the motion (the second one). The amendment was not approved.

The Senate went back to considering the main motion. Mr. Phillips said we could ask the committee to come back with catalog language. Mr. Westerfelhaus made a motion to send the FYE Motion back to the committee so that they can do the wordsmithing. He said that the committee should provide us with catalog appropriate language. The motion was seconded.

Ms. Hughes asked for a point of clarification. What will the committee be doing? Drafting a new motion or drafting catalog language from the motion or both? Ms. Eichelberger thinks that these are two separate tasks and that they need to do both.

Ms. Curtis said this is a bit confusing. She suggested voting now on the main motion (since most people seem to like the spirit of it) and then asking the committee to bring back catalog language. Mr. Benigni agrees with Ms. Curtis. The FYE Committee wants to know if we agree on the spirit. Ms. Kattwinkel said that as director, she would rather not pass a motion without exact language. This language goes to SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools). She thinks the committee can get it right. She would rather we come back with both motion and catalog language. Ms.Cormack said that the second sentence is grammatically problematical. Mr. Westerfelhaus said that Ms. Kattwinkel’s point is well taken. Mr. Starr supports the motion. He also said that it should not be held hostage by the antique print schedule for the College catalog (Amazon can deliver a book in 24 hours).

The motion to send the issue back to the Advisory Committee on the First-Year Experience was approved by the Senate. The Committee’s charge is to polish the motion (adding language so that it reflects the fact that students have to take the FYE Classes during their first year at the College of Charleston). The committee is also charged with drafting separate wording (reflecting the motion) that could be included in the catalog.

Mr. Korey asked about the agenda deadline for the next meeting. Mr. Phillips said it is March 24, 2011.

Constituents’ Concerns

There were no concerns at this time.
The Senate was adjourned at 6:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

    Sarah E. Owens

    Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 8 February 2011

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 8 February 2011, at 5:04 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Darryl Phillips, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of January 18, 2010 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Darryl Phillips, the Speaker, said that we have a light agenda, but that some of the items were substantial.

He reported that the Board of Trustees is still in executive session. They are meeting today to discuss the President’s contract.

The Speaker then reported on the following five topics:

ELECTIONS

Mr. Phillips reminded everyone about the email from RoxAnn Stalvey, Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections. Faculty elections are currently underway for At-Large school senators, Faculty Secretary, and Faculty Speaker. Also, faculty can vote on three by-laws changes that were approved by the Senate last month. Voting remains open for one week – until Tuesday, February 15. He said that it is a little tricky to access Cougar Trail, but you can access it from the Senate webpage or the email link that Ms. Stalvey sent out.

EMPLOYEE RISK ASSESSMENT

The Speaker reported that almost exactly one year ago, an armed professor took the lives of several faculty members at the University of Alabama, Huntsville. For a number of years colleges across the country, including the College of Charleston, have had processes in place to respond to, and hopefully prevent, student violence on campus. He said that many of us are familiar with the “Students of Concern” Committee. The Huntsville incident pointed to the need for a similar group to assess the risk of violent behavior from employees of the College. A taskforce, chaired by Director of Public Safety Paul Verrecchia, has been working since the summer to develop a procedure. The Committee, of which Mr. Phillips has been a part, has now completed a draft of an “Employee Risk Assessment” policy. He quoted from the document itself:

The purpose of this Policy to promote the personal safety of College Employees and the safety of the greater College Community by providing an effective, efficient and fair process whereby the risks of harm to persons may be assessed and appropriate remedial measures taken in a timely manner.
Mr. Phillips said that this is tricky business. The draft policy that has been developed maintains a very careful balance between the privacy rights of all employees, the special rights of faculty members, and concerns for the safety and welfare of the whole college community. The draft policy has been sent to the Faculty Welfare Committee for their input – and he encourages anyone who may be interested to contact Marie Ferrara (who is chairing Welfare), and plan to attend their meeting when the policy is discussed. He thanked Chief Verrecchia for leading this effort – we are far ahead of other institutions in working to address potential employee risks.

BYLAWS / FAM

The Speaker has been working with the Senate By-Laws Committee in recent months to develop a statement on Changes to the Faculty / Administration Manual that they hope to have included as a cover letter to the FAM in future years. This cover letter summarizes and clarifies the procedures for changing the FAM. He said that surprisingly, this is rather arcane knowledge that has not been clearly set out before now, despite the importance of the FAM in the professional lives of faculty members at the College. They hope also to include within this cover letter a statement of principles about changes to the FAM – a sort of memo of understanding between the faculty and academic administrators about working together when changes to the FAM are proposed. The statement is currently being reviewed by the Provost, and they hope to bring the proposal to the Senate for consideration and ratification by the end of this semester.

ORIENTATION MATERIALS

As outlined in his January newsletter, the Speaker said that one of his goals for this year is to develop orientation materials for faculty committees. In the next few weeks he will be contacting all faculty members who are currently serving on committees to ask for some feedback about their committee work. He plans to collect information about major duties and activities of the committees, meeting patterns, work-loads, and advice for future committee members. Working with this basic information, the Speaker will develop brief overviews of the committees that will be posted on the Senate website. Such overviews ought to be valuable in their own right, especially in educating faculty members new to committee service about the duties and demands of the position. He hopes that in the long term these materials will be expanded in the future and eventually be developed into handbooks and guides for all of our faculty committees. He said that his is one of the recommended practices for faculty governance across the country and we fall short.

According to the Speaker, for this initiative to be successful it will take the input of everyone serving on committees. When we receive the request for information, he asked that we please take a few minutes to respond. There are 6 questions. It’s a short one page online survey. This will come out in the next week to 10 days.
Lastly the Speaker said he wanted to take just a few minutes to talk about the diversity initiative underway across campus and the draft diversity strategic plan that we have the opportunity to comment on this evening.

He reminded the Senate that several years ago we were asked to complete a campus climate survey. He said that some of us might recall this survey – it generated quite a bit of controversy as we were asked to rate on a 7-point scale our perceptions of people of different racial and socio-economic groups. He does not doubt that the intentions of the survey were good, though the execution was awkward. At the end of the survey some demographic information was collected. The Speaker said that he was able to identify himself as a gay, white, male. But then, from his point of view, came a serious problem. He found himself limited in his choices: he could identify himself as single, married, divorced, or widowed, but nowhere on the form was he able to indicate that he was living with his same-sex partner (and had been for well over a decade). He thought this was odd. Mr. Phillips asked, “Shouldn’t a diversity survey be interested in this information?” He said that at the very least the Diversity Office that generated the survey should care enough about inclusiveness to offer “partnered” as a choice. The response was that this information was too sensitive, too private. He noted that the most “radical and subversive” of agencies, the U.S. Census Bureau, has been collecting this information about all Americans for the past decade. He thinks information is important for the College to collect. He said we ought to know about employees whose same-sex partners are without the benefits that married partners of faculty and staff enjoy. To the best of his knowledge, no efforts have been made to collect this data, and collecting this information is an important starting point to instituting changes on campus. He thinks that perhaps the Campus Climate survey itself contributed to a hostile climate.

He said that some of us might have noticed in the most recent issue of the Portico newsletter, the cute, Valentine’s Day inspired quiz to match-up campus couples. He said this was well intentioned, but in his opinion, very poorly executed. We were asked to match up white heterosexuals. This was a real missed opportunity to celebrate the diverse range of couples across the campus. The Speaker contacted the editor immediately to share his reaction. As with the campus climate survey, he looked at this issue of the Portico and did not see diversity. Further, he commented that he did not see the type of place that he knows the College of Charleston can be and can become.

Mr. Phillips said that these are just a few of the bumps in the road towards diversity that he has experienced as an “admittedly privileged upper-middle class white male” at the College. It is hard for him to imagine the much more severe and serious obstacles that others have encountered. He has no doubt that he has unknowingly contributed to some of the problems himself. We all make mistakes.
He said that this evening, and in years to come, we all will have the opportunity to contribute to the College’s diversity strategic plan. He said that it takes the active participation of all of us to achieve true diversity. He encouraged everyone to take the time to think about the type of place you want the College of Charleston to become. He asked everyone to please speak up and point out the problems that you see. Please do your part to achieve that vision of a more diverse institution. He said that his may be our one opportunity in our careers here to make this a better place. We should all work together to make a plan we can all achieve in the next decade.

There were no questions.

**The Senior Vice Provost**

Beverly Diamond, Senior Vice Provost, began her report by saying that Provost George Hynd is not here tonight because he is visiting our study abroad programs in Spain and France. She said that she had three main topics that she would cover in her report: status of new programs, assessment of programs and sabbaticals.

**Status of New Programs:**

Ms. Diamond said that the Provost has put a limited moratorium on new program proposals. The Office of the Provost is holding off on programs that are only in the early stages. However, if a program has already submitted its planning summary to the CHE, then it can still go forward.

Ms. Diamond explained that the Provost decided to do this for several reasons. She commented that it was unfortunate that the development of the strategic plan and consequent enthusiasm for new programs coincided with budget difficulties and a loss of resources. However, CHE and the Board of Trustees want to know why we are adding new programs and not cutting programs. Her Office will do a cost assessment of programs this spring. The Provost thought it would be beneficial to put the limited moratorium on new proposals for these reasons.

Ms. Diamond further explained that the programs that had already passed the Senate last year were originally supposed to go before the Board in January, 2011. The Provost held off on presenting those proposals. Instead, at the Board of Trustees’ meeting they took the time to talk about how programs are assessed. Issues such as costs and how we manage course enrollments were covered. For example, if the courses offered by a program are all full, then we are making money with that program. They also talked about the internal process of program review. Ms. Diamond said that some people were concerned and disappointed that the new programs did not go before the Board. She said that they thought this kept the programs from be implemented in the fall.

Ms. Diamond said that for new programs to be implemented they have to meet a specific set of deadlines. She referred to the bottom row of the table “Commission Approval Processes” (posted on Senate website). She pointed out that any new programs approved by the Board in January
would not have come before CHE until May 5, 2011. She said that we cannot implement a program until it has been officially entered in the catalog and that a program being approved by the CHE in May cannot be entered in the catalog because of production guidelines. Thus, these new programs would not have been implemented until a year from that date. She said that in order to have a program implemented by the following fall, we have to get proposals to CHE by November 15. The Board must then approve them at its October meeting. As a result, the Senate has to have had approved the proposals in September for them to be implemented a year later. Realistically, she said this would have to have happened the previous April.

Ms. Diamond asked if there were any questions.

Steve Litvin (Hospitality & Tourism Management) asked what is program. Ms. Diamond responded that programs are generally majors or changes to the major that require Board of Trustees and CHE approval.

Godwin Uwah (guest) wanted to know if the moratorium will affect minors. Ms. Diamond said that she needed to clarify this with the Provost but did not think so.1 Ms. Caveny added that it does not affect program changes like course requirements. Ms. Diamond said there would be certain exceptions.

Chris Starr (at-large) asked: How does the 18 month approval time line, driven in part by the catalog publication cycle, affect the College’s ability to compete with USC, Clemson and other universities who want to enter our area/market? Mr. Starr said that the College needs to have the ability to adapt programs more quickly, and particularly those programs that support the economic development of the area and the state. Any part of the publication cycle that is in the control of the College should be examined for reengineering or abandoned for a newer and more competitive solution. Ms. Diamond said that in exceptional cases, the Senate could approve a program in October and the Board could approve it at their October meeting but that this option was not generally available to programs because of the lead time needed to send materials to the Board before their meetings.

Gretchen McLain (Theater) confirmed that since her proposal already has a summary it will move forward to CHE.

Claire Curtis (at-large) wanted to know if the catalog is always so set and if this is common. She asked if it would make a difference if the catalog were on-line. Ms. Curtis said that the fall is when a lot of work gets done in the Senate, but that it should be the opposite, that we should start the process in the spring. The Speaker said that this is essential information and we all need to be aware of this. He said we need to target for future years and we will have this calendar included

1 The Provost has decided that the moratorium will apply to minors that are not close to the end of the development phase as well.
in the minutes (see website). Ms. Diamond said that maybe the Curriculum Committee should have some continuity that would allow it to bring programs to the Senate in September.

Jim Newhard (Classics) asked about the moratorium and if other institutions were taking a similar approach. Ms. Diamond responded that some institutions are terminating programs but she did not know that other institutions had instituted a moratorium on new programs. She said that we need to look at our majors and minors and decide which ones do not serve a purpose anymore. This would make a statement to CHE.

Assessment of Programs:

Ms. Diamond said that we are returning to focus on program assessment. We are currently searching for both an Associate Vice President for Institutional Planning and Assessment (due to Pam Niesslein’s retirement) and a Director of Assessment. Hopefully these new people will be hired soon and be able to assist in writing the 2012 SACS report. She said that we as an institution are not doing enough assessment. To remedy this problem the Provost’s Office is asking departments to begin a discussion of student learning outcomes. What do we want our majors to know when they graduate? Which courses satisfy these student learning outcomes? In addition to beginning this discussion for their programs, every program and department should have a specific plan for the fall semester that would include three program level outcomes that they can appropriately assess. Data will be gathered and in the spring there will be an analysis of this data. The ultimate goal is to improve programs, not to measure how well they are doing.

Sabbaticals

Ms. Diamond ended her report with an update on sabbaticals. For two years the pilot program has awarded two thirds pay for full year sabbaticals. The estimated costs for 2008—2009 were $180,000 and for 2010 over $200,000. The request was based on the notion that it would save the College money. This year the cost dropped to $80,000 and we saved about $100,000. Next year 20 out of 35 requests are for a full year. At this point the estimated for costs are about $60,000. The Provost will ask the President to put this pilot in place on a permanent basis.

Garrett Mitchener (at-large) asked about the resources that will be given to the Director of Assessment. He wanted to know about time, staff, and the ability to collect all of this data. Ms. Diamond answered that the faculty will be developing the faculty assessment. She used an example from Math, saying that a professor would use their own final exam as a tool for assessment. That professor would then report the data to the Assessment Office. This does not have to require a lot of time. Mr. Mitchener said that this will create more work for the faculty. Ms. Diamond responded that this is work that the faculty should already be doing this and that it is important. Mr. Mitchener asked if we were going to submit a hand written page of notes or if there is going to be a central data base. She said that the details have not been worked out yet and we do not have enough information at this point. She thinks there are departments that are already doing this.
New Business

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)

Silvia Rodríguez-Sabater, Committee Chair, introduced the following proposals.

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

The Senate voted on these two proposals, which were approved without discussion.

Report and Discussion of Draft Copy: President's Diversity Commission's Strategic Plan for Diversity

Joe Kelly, Committee Co-Chair, gave a brief report on the President’s Diversity Commission’s Strategic Plan for Diversity. The Speaker reminded everyone that this was for discussion only and that the Senate would not be voting on the plan today.

Mr. Kelly started out his report by giving some background information on the plan. He said that the President of the College of Charleston had appointed a commission of approximately 30 members, including Ms. Diamond and Mr. Phillips. Mr. Kelly is the co-chair with John Bell-O-
Ogunu. They have been meeting since September. He reminded the Senate that what we are discussing today is still a draft. He said that it is a bit premature to bring this to the Senate because the Commission still has not voted on it. However, it will be good to have feedback from the Senate, also from SGA, the Academic Council, and different committee groups. Mr. Kelly hopes that the commission will be voting in March. A proposal will then be sent to the President, and ultimately to the Board. He hopes that implementation of the plan will begin next fall. He added that the Welfare Committee and Academic Planning should discuss the plan and make a formal report back to him or Mr. Bello-Ogunu. Mr. Kelly then opened the floor for questions, saying that he valued comments so that he could address them in the plan.

Ms. Curtis asked about the development of the goals, in particular, why the commission chose these goals. Mr. Kelly said they looked at diversity plans from other institutions. These 5 goals emerge regularly. Further, they have 6 subcommittees that somewhat correspond to the goals.

Irina Gigova (at-large) had a question in reference to goal 2 (p. 8) and the specific action to “Appoint Diversity Faculty Recruiter for each School.” She thinks this is an artificial position that is not very useful. Mr. Kelly said that the idea is that this person would help multiple departments recruit for the schools. Ms. Gigova thinks it would be very hard for one person to know all the schools. She does not think this is a good use of funding. She wanted to also address another issue regarding the History Department and including foreigners as part of diversity. Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, said that we still need to work on this issue, but she said for the past 3 years the College pays application fees for certain types of visas. The H1B Visa is fairly standardized for new hires, but things for spouses such as work permits, are considered the responsibility of the employee. Ms. Gigova said that in their department, they have been told to carefully consider foreign applicants because of the fees. Ms. Caveny said we should be very careful not to discriminate due to costs. Ms. Caveny said that we need to be thoughtful, and make informed decisions.

Vince Benigni (Communication) had a question concerning the upper level administration and how involved they are in decision making. He wanted to know if this document could apply to the Board of Trustees. Mr. Benigni said that there is a lack of diversity on the Board, and that this is very obvious when we see the members sitting on the stage at events. He added that people talk about this. Mr. Kelly responded that he cannot promise that Board will be included in this document.

Ms. Curtis referred to p. 9 of the document. She wanted to know if the idea was to only help faculty spouses with employment concerns for campus jobs. She thought that it would be beneficial to help spouses find employment off-campus too. She then asked about Goal 3 in reference to training faculty at various levels, best classroom practices, and diversity training. It was not clear to her why under the category of “Cost/Resource” each one was either blank or said existing staff. Ms. Curtis said that there is no existing staff doing this type of faculty development. Mr. Kelly said that this person is only expected to do diversity training. He explained that the faculty is part of the problem of diversity. Mr. Kelly gave an example from his personal classroom experience. He said that letting students form their own groups is not the best practice because the two African American’s get excluded. We are doing damage, without knowing it (this is his own experience). He said that the new hire in the Diversity Office has
expertise in this field. She has already suggested that our target numbers of getting the entire faculty training in 3 years is not realistic.

Ms. Caveny said that in regards to the new hire, Meridith Gould, Director of Diversity Education and Training, it is their belief that Ms. Gould should also work with Faculty Development. Ms. Caveny said they are planning to get back to the Faculty Development Center.

Mr. Kelly drew attention to the handout with bullet points that he passed out at the beginning of the meeting (see Senate website for “Additions to the Draft Diversity Strategic Plan”).

Bill Manaris (Computer Science) said we should not exclude job applicants if they are foreigners.

Julia Eichelberger (at-large) referred to the bottom of p. 25 “Establish comprehensive support services for international students at CofC.” She said there is a need for more help in regards to non-native English speakers. She said that most of us do not have an expertise in ESL. We do not offer a course for these students. She thinks we need to help their English language skills and that this will help with retention. Mr. Kelly said that he will discuss this with Andrew Sobiesuo, Associate Provost for International Education and Director of the Center for International Education. Ms. Rodríguez-Sabater said a proposal just came to the Graduate committee for a non-credit course to help with English language skills for international students (called the English Language Institute).

Ms. Eichelberger asked about the International House and whether CofC students will live there too. She thinks it would be great to make it multicultural, but also make it available to international students.

Mr. Kelly asked everyone to look at curriculum issues because these things will come back to the Senate. Mr. Phillips commented that when this commission got started we had a different financial model. He said the plan includes ambitious budget items. Mr. Kelly responded that he has not had any conversations about money. No one has said to scale back yet. He said that he thinks the President is committed to the issue. The Speaker said that the proposal is not all about the money, some things do not require money.

Martha Stackel (Library) asked if people of Asian descent are considered minorities. Mr. Kelly said yes, but he is not an expert. He said the term minority generally refers to: African Americans, Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans (AALANA). Most times minorities are underrepresented groups, but that does not address sexual orientation or the issue of women. Mr. Kelly added that we have a lack of women at the upper echelon of administration.

Mr. Mitchener had two comments. He does not see much information about retention. He worries because certain minority groups have problems and need extra support. He referred to page 5 and outreach to high school level – he thinks this is good. Mr. Mitchener said some high school graduates are not prepared for college and we can help them. Ms Ford said that the College now has a TRIO Student Support Services Grant, known on campus as ROAR Scholars, to provide academic support, mentoring and financial aid to first generation, low income, and/or
disabled students. We now have three TRIO programs, Upward Bound, Student Support Services, and McNair for this group of students.

Mr. Litvin, spoke about the language referring to faculty “spouses.” He suggested changing the wording to “partners” in reference to the issues raised in the Speaker’s report.

Mr. Kelly said that comments could be sent to him up until mid March. He would appreciate feedback.

Constituents’ Concerns

There were no concerns at this time.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:34 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 18 January 2011

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 18 January 2011, at 5:04 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Darryl Phillips, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of December 7, 2010 were approved as circulated (with minor edits submitted via email).

Reports

The Speaker

Darryl Phillips, the Speaker, began his report by wishing everyone a happy New Year. He had several announcements:

There is a Board of Trustees meeting this week. He will keep the Senate informed as to any new developments.

He reminded everyone that the deadline for nominations for Speaker, Secretary, and At-Large Senators is February 1. Last year our voting was a month delayed, this year we are trying to stick to the deadline.

Lynne Ford, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration, is heading an ad hoc committee to review the catalog. This is a big project because the catalog has a lot of inconsistencies. For example, there are things that the Senate has approved, but have yet to make it into the catalog. The ad hoc committee will work with appropriate faculty committees if changes are needed. This may take up to a year or more to complete.

The President’s Commission on Diversity is working on a draft strategic plan. This will come to the Senate for information only. There will be an opportunity for comments and discussion, but not a formal vote.

The Speaker ended his report and left the floor open for questions.

Rob Dillon (at-large) wondered if the faculty had been asked for input in the evaluation of the President. The Speaker said no, but is thinking about drafting a proposal for the faculty to have input in regards to extending contracts. He has discussed this with Tom Heeney (Assoc. Prof. of Communications & local AAUP Chapter Secretary-Treasurer). He thinks this is appropriate.

The Provost

Provost Hynd said that this has been an action packed year. He can personally testify that Darryl Phillips is doing a very good job at representing the faculty.

He began his report by discussed two important issues: the budget situation on campus (the short-fall in revenue) and the issue regarding in-state and out-of-state students.
The Budget: There is a 2.3 million dollar shortfall in the budget which resulted in a reduction in the amount of monies for faculty salary adjustments, new positions, etc. The cuts are slowing us down, but the President continues to be committed to faculty salaries. The larger budget situation of the state of S.C. affects our university. Before leaving office Governor Sanford recommended about a 100 million dollar cut, but he also talked about the amount of reserves that universities keep. There are 259 million dollars in reserves across S.C. ($190m USC, $27.8m Clemson, and $1.9m CofC). If these cuts are tied to reserves this would be putting pressure on our ability to handle emergencies. Governor Haley can cut state support, but the good news is that it is only 8.5 percent of our total budget and will not hurt as much as other universities around the country. Our financial situation is as good as it could possibly be in this financial climate. The Provost said that Steve Osborne’s office (Executive Vice President for Business Affairs) is doing a great job at handling this.

In-State versus Out-of-State Students: The Provost addressed the debate over in-state versus out-of-state students. He said that approximately 37.5 - 38 percent of our students are from out-of-state. According to the Provost, in many ways these students are subsidizing the relatively low in-state tuition. The point is that the Commission for Higher Education would like to put together representatives on how to address our need for out-of-state students. The Provost finds it compelling that 30 percent our out-of-state students who graduate, end up staying in SC.

Board of Trustees: The Provost said that Greg Padgett, the new chair of the Board of Trustees, is doing a good job. Their schedule has been revised so that some of the board members can also attend the meetings for Academic Affairs and Finance. This Thursday at Academic Affairs they will try to educate the Board about the due diligence to consider program proposals. The Provost commented that this is a terrific opportunity to show the Board that we are considering programs before they see them. For example, we consider student demand, recruitment, and employment upon graduation. There is a lot of data analysis conducted before proposals are sent to the Board.

Announcements: The Provost announced that there is a Study Abroad Fair on Wednesday February 2 from 9-3:00pm on the Cougar Mall. He said that this is important for all of us and we should encourage our students to attend.

The Tenure and Promotion Committee should be concluded by mid-February. They are doing a great job.

The Provost spoke about the Candle Light Vigil held at the College for Martin Luther King Day. He said this is an important way for us to remember all he has done. Also this morning there was a celebration at the Gaillard Auditorium. The main speaker was Charles Bolden of NASA.

The Provost ended his report and left the floor open for questions.

Scott Peeples (at-large) asked for an update on school-wide Tenure and Promotion Committees. The Provost answered that the School of Education has already started their own discussion. He said that this is a very important matter and does not want to move forward without doing due diligence. He is having conversations with Academic Affairs on this and has also talked to the Speaker. The Provost said that he will keep us informed on how they will move forward. The Speaker responded that any changes should follow the model of faculty committees that we
already have. He said that they would then have to go through our bylaws process and later through the Senate.

Melissa Hughes (at-large) asked about study abroad programs and wanted to know if she can advertise programs in places like Kenya. Beverly Diamond, Senior Vice Provost, answered yes. She said that there is a permission form - the same for Israel. Ms. Diamond said that Martin Perlmutter, Director of Jewish Studies, has been very helpful in providing forms that other institutions use.

Vince Benigni (Communication) wanted to know if there would be grant specialists to assist faculty and students to secure travel funding. The Provost said that this is on “the radar screen.” He wants to hire people to help and believes we need an advancement person in every school. The Provost said there is a group that gets together on a monthly basis to talk about grant opportunities. Susan Anderson, Assistant Vice President for Research, and others keep in touch about proposal development. He is aware of this issue.

David Desplaces (Marketing & Supply Chain Management) asked for an estimated timeline for student course evaluations from last semester. Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, said that she thought the faculty reports were going to be ready on Friday, but they were not quite ready. She said that today she will send an email about how to find the reports on MyCharleston –there is a link to see them. She proceeded to explain the four things that we would see concerning our evaluations: individual reports for each course, a second report that mimics photocopies of student responses, a department report and a campus wide report. The individual reports contain means and medians for our classes. Clair Curtis (at-large) asked about the timing issue. Ms. Caveny said that in the future, release of the reports will be faster. This time they have had to work out the bugs. In the future the evaluations will be available shortly after grades are due.

Old Business

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)

Below appears the text to change the bylaws of the Educational Technology Committee as presented at the December Senate meeting. It is followed by the Bylaw’s Committee report with discussion by the Faculty Senate at the end.
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 handled 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.
Mr. Peeples, Secretary of Bylaws Committee, gave the report.

The Senate voted on the motion to change the Educational Technology Committee's Bylaws: Change to Bylaws Article V, Section 3, B, 16 (The change would update the bylaws to reflect the two new positions of Chief Information Officer and the Director of Teaching and Learning Technology and allow for closer collaboration between the faculty committee and administrative staff), which was approved without discussion.

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)

Below appears the text to change the bylaws of the Academic Planning Committee as presented at the December Senate meeting. It is followed by the Bylaw's Committee report with discussion by the Faculty Senate at the end.

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.

Mr. Peeples gave the report and the rationale for the amendment to the original motion.

Julia Eichelberger, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, wanted to clarify why they had used this language. This way, she said that the committee would have shared governance with Academic Affairs. She noted that they had discussed this with Academic Affairs and they wanted this language.

The Senate voted on the amendment to delete the sentence, which was approved.

The Senate voted on the main motion to change the composition of the Academic Planning Committee in the By-Laws, Article V. Section 2, B, 1 (“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”), which was approved without discussion.

**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)

Below appears the text to change the bylaws of the Graduate Education Committee as presented at the December Senate meeting. It is followed by the Bylaw's Committee report with discussion by the Faculty Senate at the end.
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.

Mr. Peeples gave the report.

The Senate voted on the motion to change the Curriculum Committee's Bylaws: Change to Bylaws Article V, Section 3, B, 2 (To give the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs a formal role in reviewing proposals to terminate academic programs), which was approved without discussion.
New Business

C. 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)

Silvia Rodríguez-Sabater, Committee Chair, introduced the following proposals.

--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)

The Senate voted on these two proposals, which were approved without discussion.

Constituents’ Concerns

There were no concerns at this time.

The Senate was adjourned at 5:51 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens

Faculty Secretary
The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 7 December 2010, at 5:04 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Darryl Phillips, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of November 2, 2010 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Darryl Phillips, the Speaker, began his report with two announcements:

- I.T. has set up a new procedure for our on-line directory on the CofC web page. This is designed to protect the College while maintaining public access (we’ve had problems in the past with security). The Speaker referenced a recent email explaining the new procedure from Bob Cape, Senior Vice President of Information Technology.

- Nominations and elections committee is working on setting up a vote on the bylaws (the vote should happen during exams – before we break for the holidays).

The Speaker said that despite the recent budget cuts, he had some good news. Last month he went to Washington D.C. with Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and Tom Heeney (Assoc. Prof. of Communications & local AAUP Chapter Secretary-Treasurer) to attend a Conference on Shared Governance sponsored by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). He thanked the Provost for encouraging him to attend and paying for the travel. He is impressed by our situation at the College of Charleston. He learned at the conference that we are flourishing compared to many institutions. He shared with the Senate the following five points that demonstrate the College of Charleston’s strengths.

**College of Charleston strengths** (many of the points set out as best practices by the AAUP):

- Bylaws of our faculty are very strong and controlled by the faculty (unlike other institutions where bylaws may be changed without consulting the faculty). We have been reviewing them periodically, for example, this evening we have three items coming up for consideration.

- Faculty members have rights to Hearing & Grievance Procedures before Faculty peers. The committee structure is staffed entirely by faculty members. The Speaker has served on the Hearing Committee and knows that it’s an onerous task, but it is also very positive and important that we have a system of appeal to our peers.

- Strong and active Faculty Senate and Faculty Committee structure. Part of the strength is due to our independent faculty election system and our independent appointment system that relies on the Faculty Nominations & Election Committee.

- Faculty control the curriculum at the College of Charleston. The year and a half that the Senate spent debating changes to the General Education was a sign of strength,
even though we decided not to make a change. It demonstrates the thoughtful consideration that we give to curricular matters.

- Faculty representatives have direct and regular contact with the Provost, President, and Board of Trustees. There are institutions where the faculty has fought for years to be able to attend Board of Trustees’ meetings.

The Speaker then quoted a guiding principle of the AAUP: “Faculty recommendations ought to be concurred with by the administration except with compelling reasons which should be explained in detail.” He thinks that we do a remarkably good job at living up to this recommendation from the AAUP. We ought to celebrate this.

**Points that we need to work on** (The Speaker commented on five major points):

- Develop orientation guides for committee chairs & new senators. We do a lot of “reinventing the wheel.” We should write up some basic guidelines. For the Faculty Senate we should have a 2 page guide for new Senators. The same for all of our committees.
- Make certain that Nominations & Elections Committee plays a role in faculty appointments to committees whenever appropriate and that faculty committees are not by-passed in favor of administratively controlled committees. We should honor the system that we have established and stick to our policies whenever appropriate, especially for major committee assignments. An example has been in the area of IT where we have recently had two separate committees at work – the Faculty Educational Technology Committee and another working group of faculty department representatives organized by Mr. Bob Cape, the College’s CIO. To eliminate the duplication, this year Mr. Cape has been attending meetings of the Faculty Educational Technology Committee and plans to eliminate his working group. A proposal to change the Bylaws to include the CIO as a member of the Faculty Educational Technology Committee is on the agenda tonight. This should serve as a model for eliminating other duplications across campus.
- Faculty members need to be able to e-mail the faculty (especially important for faculty leaders). This might sound easy but it has been problematic. The Faculty list-serve does not include all faculty members, new faculty have to opt in – it’s not automatic – and many faculty members have opted out. Perhaps this is why we have low turnout in votes, or committee solicitation that happens every spring. We need a list serve that reaches all members of the faculty.
- Clarify amendment procedures for the FAM (all three parts of FAM). Perhaps develop a statement of Faculty/Provost relations and principles. There is a bylaws part, a policies part and there is a third part of the FAM which is informational/procedural. We should have procedures on how to make changes to the FAM. We need a shared understanding of this document. This is the right time to
come up with some principles between the Faculty and the Administration – especially with the Provost.

- Develop a new statement on Freedom of Speech / Academic Freedom in light of 2009 Garcetti Supreme Court case. The implication of this case is that state employees do not have protected status if they criticize their employer. Because of this case we might not be protected, even as university employees. For example, if you came to the Faculty Senate and criticized the administration you might not be protected. But, this is part of our job and responsibility as faculty members at the College of Charleston. The Speaker suggested that we take steps to protect our role in shared governance of the institution. In the months ahead we should revisit Freedom of Speech / Academic Freedom statements written in the FAM.

**Things to look out for down the road:**

- Relationship of schools to the college as a whole and the role of faculty within schools. The school structure is barely present in the FAM. We need shared governance at the school level. We don’t have any policies to guide the school-wide committees. Some of our best practices as mentioned in the beginning of the report are lacking at the school-level. This is an important issue and during the next five to 10 years we need to make sure that our bylaws extend to the new reality of the schools across campus.

The Speaker ended his report by saying that he would be delighted to talk with anyone further about these issues.

There were no questions.

**The Provost**

Provost Hynd said that AAUP was a great opportunity and thrilled that Darryl Phillips and others could go to that meeting. He also wanted to thank the Speaker of the Faculty, Mr. Phillips and Joe Kelley (as the former Speaker), for helping to guide him during his first eleven months at the College. He said that it has been a wonderful year and they are outstanding. He thanked everyone for making this a terrific year.

The Provost gave an update on the budget. He noted that many university employees attended the Town Hall Meeting with the President so he did not want to take too much time repeating things that have already been covered. In brief, he said that the lowering of the tuition by 7% resulted in an 80% level for market adjustments, approximately eight-hundred thousand dollars for Faculty Adjustment raises. He said that the College is going to continue to add and supplement scholarships to our high quality students. We have had a bump in the road, but we are still moving ahead.
Provost Hynd noted that eighteen million dollars of College funding comes directly from the state, but would not be surprised if there is another budget cut. We have to wait to see what the governor decides to do. The good news is that there have been no conversations about furloughs or layoffs. We are well managed by Steve Osborn and the President. The outlook looks good. We will continue to pursue the Strategic Plan. The CHE (Commission on Higher Education) expressed continuing concern over duplication of programs. He emphasized that the curriculum resides with the faculty. He commended the Department of Communication which only has had 3 Chairs in 11 years – this speaks to its success as a department. He said that it is up to us at the department level to look at our curriculum. We have to meet the needs of our students and their learning objectives.

The Provost announced that Gregory Padgett is the new board member of the Board of Trustees. He is going to be very active and is committed to moving the College forward. Mr. Padgett wants to communicate our story to others. We are thrilled to have him on the Board. He is replacing Marie Land.

Provost Hynd said that three initiatives/aspirations will be launched next semester. These are all based on the assumption that we have a terrific faculty. Our job is to make sure that the faculty stays here. We need to do a better job at informing the community about our faculty, even amongst professors and schools. He said that these three aspirations come out of Academic Affairs. First, starting in the spring, he would like to put out an email once a month from the Office of the Provost. This would be a means to communicate things that are going on in the academic world like research and scholarship. Second, he wants to do a better job at keeping us up-to-date in a more formal sense – the Provost report could be more formal. Every quarter he would like to present a formal PowerPoint report to the College about such things as grants and the CHE. We will have a running narrative about what is happening at all levels. Third, he is interested in spreading the news of our accomplishments (available in our annual reports). We do not do a good job getting this information out of our departments. He actually reads the annual reports; they are points of pride for him. He would like to develop a publication to highlight research, teaching and civic accomplishments. We could send this to our state legislators. He wants to celebrate what we are doing. Provost Hynd is looking forward to working with the Speaker on this.

Claire Curtis (at-large) had two questions about the on-line evaluation form. First, does his office intend to survey students to find out why they didn’t respond. Second, what should we tell untenured faculty about these low response rates. The Provost answered the second question first. He would tell younger faculty that it’s important to know that the greatest hurdle for tenure and promotion should come from the department level. Faculty should not be judged solely on their student evaluations. As you move up the levels, there is a system set in place of due process. Ms. Caveny answered the question in regards to response rates. She is also disappointed. There was a surge at the end. They did extend the evaluation deadline until midnight tonight. They are focusing now on reporting. Before next semester, they are going to contact students and then select students who did and did not do the evaluations. There will be follow up. She said that they want to pull in faculty and students and create some focus groups.

Jen Wright (guest) commented that she has a colleague at another institution where students who responded to the evaluations could get grades early as an incentive. That institution had an 80% response rate. Ms. Caveny said they will have that conversation. Beverly Diamond, Senior Vice
Provost, said there is very little time between grades and graduation. At most it’s a day. The Provost said SGA (Student Government Association) is trying to get the students more engaged and to incentivize the students. Ms. Caveny said that the data gathered in the student on-line evaluations seems to be more qualitative. Some of the student responses are more thoughtful.

Ms. Wright asked about promoting our research through conferences and travel. She does feel supported in travel. Is travel a discussion? The Provost said this is an ongoing discussion. He does not have a fast answer, but he is aware of the problem.

**New Business**

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)

Brenton LeMesurier and Christopher Vinson, Co-chairs of the Educational Technology Committee, introduced the following motion. (Please note that this is the same motion listed on the agenda).

**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

- **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.

- **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

(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
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 handled by the Dean of Libraries, and provide avenues of communication more than the President’s Information Technology Council.

Ms. Curtis asked: who is the director of Teaching Learning and Technology? Mr. Vinson replied that Monica Harvey is the interim director. Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) asked about our tech needs not directly related to this committee. Do they come to this committee? Mr. LeMesurier replied that they can, but the rules don’t specify this.

With no further discussion, the motion was referred to the Bylaws Committee.

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)

Julia Eichelberger, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, introduced the following motion. (Please note that this is the same motion listed on the agenda).

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.

There was no discussion by the Senate. The motion was referred to the Bylaws Committee.

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)
Silvia Rodriguez-Sabater, Committee Chair, introduced the following proposals.

--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.
There was no discussion by the Senate. The motion was referred to the Bylaws Committee.

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

The Senate voted on the change to the Master of Science in Environmental Studies, which was approved without discussion.

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)

Jannette Finch, Co-Chair of the Committee, introduced the following proposals:

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: JPN101, 102, 201, 202
- Hebrew: 101, 102, 201, 202

Psychology Development

New Course – PSYC375 Topics in Child and Adolescent Development

Change of Courses – changes to catalog descriptions for:
- PSYC211: Psychological Statistics
- PSYC220: Research Methods
Gretchen McLaine (Theater) had 3 questions in regards to the 4 hour language courses. How does the change effect the total hours needed for graduation? Does this change mean 4 hours less for graduation? Could you have 4 contact hours and 3 credits? Mary Beth Heston (guest) said that the students taking these courses would earn 4 hours and yes, they would take up elective credits for graduation. She explained that in terms of scheduling, most languages at the College offer optional one-hour conversation courses. For those courses the fourth hour is scheduled at a different time from the regular class. This is the model they will use. Students are already putting in enormous amounts of hours into these classes now and this would reward them with an extra credit hour.

The Senate voted on the course changes for International and Intercultural Studies and Psychology Development, which were approved.

II. Program Changes:

Sociology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change of Major – change of requirements, including:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 new course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 390: Senior Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 changed courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 102: Contemporary Social Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 103: Sociology of the Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 109: Special Topics in Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 492: Advanced Field Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 260: Development of Social Thought,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 271: Introduction to Social Research,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 272: Making Sense of Sociological Data,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 331: Society and the Individual,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 332: Collective Behavior,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 335: Aging and the Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 336: Death and Dying,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 337: Prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 339: Special Topics in Social Psychology,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 340: Medical Sociology,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 341: Criminology,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 342: Juvenile Delinquency,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 344: Social Gerontology,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 345: Social Policy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 346: Environmental Sociology,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 348: Sociology of Alcohol and Drugs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 349: Special Topics in Social Problems,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 351: Urban Sociology,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 352: Population and Society,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 355: Science, Technology and Society,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY 356: Sociological Perspectives on Religion,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Senate voted on the change of major and minor for Sociology, which was approved without discussion.

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).

The Senate voted on the change of major for Computer Science, which was approved without discussion.

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

Irina Gigova (at-large) asked what will fulfill the Russian Studies minor requirement if Pols 326 is deleted. Claire said a class was in the works and it will be on Transitional States.

The Senate voted on the change of major and minor for Political Science, which was approved.

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

The Senate voted on the change of major for Anthropology, which was approved without discussion.

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

The Senate voted on the change of minor for English, which was approved without discussion.

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) (Withdrawn from agenda)

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
The Speaker asked the Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, Julia Eichelberger, to give a brief report on the committee’s assessment of this proposal. Ms. Eichelberger said that the committee thinks it is a sound proposal. The committee supports it. She wanted to clarify a couple of things. There are some introductory courses that introduce students to Public Health. They take a method’s course. There is a capstone experience which brings everything together. They get placed in an internship. There are not that many undergraduate degrees in Public Health and this is a very strong program with a Liberal Arts core. This a good fit for the school.

The Speaker asked a member of the Budget Committee, Jim Newhard (Classics), to give a brief report on the committee’s assessment of this proposal. He said that the committee foresees no problems or financial effects.

Philip Jos (Chair of Political Science) said that his department was concerned about the Health Policy class. Mr. Jos applauds the program, but thinks this is still a large menu and there are some issues to be resolved. How does the advising process work with students, how will students move through the program? And the internship process? Will it be directed by one professor or a collective? Deb Miller (guest) said that the Department of Health & Human Performance has not worked out all the issues with the internship yet. They want to add a Health Policy course. It’s an interdisciplinary degree, inviting other faculty to participate. They invite everyone to get involved. She meets with students and the on-site internship employer. All faculty members advise students. They encourage students to become bilingual or trilingual. They want to lead in the State with this undergraduate degree. A BA in policy is very exciting and they want to become more inclusive. This is a great recruiting tool for new faculty. Students are already clamoring for this major. They want to encourage study abroad. This is a global major.

The Senate voted on the new Public Health majors, which were approved.
E. Committee on General Education

Claire Curtis, Chair of the Committee on General Education, introduced the following proposals (same as listed in the agenda):

--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.
Ms. Eichelberger asked two questions: could the system give a general humanities credit designation and would that designation go automatically to all FYSM courses. Ms. Curtis said that the answer to the first is yes and to the second is no – the General Education Committee will evaluate the courses that request humanities (and social science) credit. Mr. LeMesurier asked if this meant that someone could get 9 of their 12 credits taught by the same professor in the same department. Ms. Curtis said yes.

Ms. Wright asked about the learning communities. What happened to them? Ms. Curtis responded that learning communities are taught with courses already in the system under discipline specific acronyms and are granted humanities (or social science) credit the same way any course would be.

Garrett Mitchener (at-large) wanted to know if there were other courses that count as general humanities classes? Ms. Curtis said she believed yes, there are special topics or transfer courses that count.

Cynthia Lowenthal (Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences) wanted to know if there were workload implications. Ms. Curtis responded that there were no workload implications to how the FYSM humanities designation is made. Ms. Cormack said that she does see workload implications for FYSM, especially since Religious Studies is such a small department. She probably will not teach a seminar because it will not get Religious Studies credit.

The Speaker reminded Senators that they were off topic and that we needed to focus on the original proposal.

Susan Kattwinkel, Director of the First-Year Experience, clarified that the course could count as part of the major if you department decides that it should. There is much more potential for gain than loss.

Mr. LeMesurier wanted to know if the system could code the classes as General Humanities designation. Ms. Curtis said yes. Some general discussion on coding ensued.

The Senate voted on this General Education Proposal (First-Year Experience) which was approved.

**--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
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.

Mr. Newhard asked that the catalog language be made all-inclusive.

Brian McGee (guest) asked about transfer courses at a 3-hour level. Ms. Heston said it would depend on a placement test. The student would get the same number of transfer credits, but would be placed in the appropriate level – they have to complete the requirements of the classes but not the credits.

Steve Litvin (Hospitality & Tourism Management) proposed that maybe 202 should be optional. Ms. Curtis said that he could bring this as a proposal to the committee. She said that the idea is to get them to 202.
David Desplaces (Marketing & Supply Chain Management) asked about the mechanics of the Banner System and how this would work with transfer students. Ms. Curtis does not see this as a problem. Elizabeth Martinez-Gibson (at-large) commented that we want these students to be able to compete nationally with other students. They need these extra credit hours to achieve the national competency level. She said that students deserve these extra credit hours for the time they put into these languages.

Mr. Newhard clarified that the discussion was off topic since we have already passed this. We should only be discussing the General Education proposal.

Rob Dillon (at-large) called the question. The Senate voted unanimously to call the question.

The Senate voted on this General Education Proposal (Changes to an Existing General Education Language Requirement) which was approved.

**Constituents’ Concerns**

Mr. LeMesurier commented (for information) that IT has decided that some campus mail lists, like events and sports, will be on a bulletin board on My CofC. There will still be email as an option, but the main way to learn about these events is on these bulletin boards.

Ms. Cormack wanted to know if we will still receive the emails. Mr. LeMesurier said yes.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:48 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens

Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 2 November 2010

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 2 November 2010, at 5:03 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Darryl Phillips, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of October 5, 2010 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Darryl Phillips, the Speaker, said that his report would be brief. He mentioned that several Senators had requested that people speak louder during the meetings. He asked everyone to please remember to introduce themselves before speaking and to use their “best teacher voice.” He recommended that people sit in the middle of the room, especially if they have trouble hearing others.

The Speaker reported on the Board of Trustees meeting which was held on October 14 and 15. He presented the petition of the faculty concerning the Building Moratorium at the Academic Affairs subcommittee meeting on Oct. 14, and the following day to the full Board on Oct. 15. The petition was signed by 175 faculty members and 82 staff. Student Government Association President, Isaiah Nelson, presented a resolution of the SGA that also urges the Trustees to stay the course on tuition and the strategic plan.

The Trustees seemed pleased to have the input of the faculty and students. Several trustees stressed that they find themselves put in a very challenging situation as they balance the interests of the College constituencies, the State Legislature that appointed them, and the people of the state at large. They took no action on the tuition at the October meeting, but they may meet before the start of the spring semester to consider the question of tuition and the building moratorium.

The Speaker reported on the college-wide “Quality and Efficiency” program. When the Board approved the tuition adjustment in June they asked that a process be put in place to examine systematically divisions of the College. The President has asked each division to develop a “Quality and Efficiency” program that will seek ways to improve the substance of what we do, while also improving efficiency. Beverly Diamond, Senior Vice Provost, will be chairing the review committee for Academic Affairs. The Academic Affairs committee will be comprised of both administrators and faculty members.

The Speaker encouraged everyone to place their book orders for the spring semester. This is an economic issue for many of our students. This can keep the costs down for our students. In these challenging economic times, this is a simple thing that we all can do to help.

The Speaker spoke briefly about the North-Campus outreach efforts and guidelines for developing non-credit programs. He said that Sue Sommer-Kresse, Vice-President for Community Relations, has developed new guidelines for non-credit courses. He said that these would be presented later in the meeting by the Graduate Education Committee as an informational item. The goal is to stream-line the process for developing non-credit courses for the community – an opportunity for us to serve the community better and an opportunity to be
entrepreneurial. He encouraged everyone to think about ways that they might contribute. Tonight we would be hearing about non-credit course from Computer Science, but there are many opportunities to get involved. The speaker mentioned examples such as a Classics “great books” course.

There were no questions.

The Provost

Provost Hynd thanked the Speaker for summarizing what happened at the Board of Trustees meeting.

He said that the Office of the Provost often receives proposals for CHE (Commission on Higher Education). CHE continues to be very interested in the cost of new programs. We need to pay special attention to the costs, especially in this political climate. CHE wants to be fiscally responsible. The Provost said that he will be working with programs and their proposals to make sure they meet the requirements of CHE.

In additions to the Speaker’s report, the Provost gave some more information about the Board of Trustees’ meeting. He said that we still do not know about lowering the tuition (7 percent). Until that issue has been resolved there will be no faculty raises.

He thanked people who are raising money for the College. He has been working with Steve Osborn on where to put this money because it is not always appropriate to put it in the Foundation. When appropriate he wants to fundraisers to have access to the money that they helped raise.

The Provost announced that we are going to try to move forward on the Strategic Plan. He said that the plan still is to build the faculty and the infrastructure of the College. In 2004 there was a Master Plan that approved a number of projects. Out of the 18 that were listed, 11 have been achieved – that translates into 65%. Now there is an effort underway to redo the Master Plan. Hopefully by the beginning of the next calendar year, we will know what resources we will have to support our programs.

In less than two weeks the College will be using the on-line course evaluation system. Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, explained that they are in the process of announcing this new system to the students. The evaluation period will be three weeks long starting on November 15.

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) said that previously we had been advised not to hand out evaluations after returning important end of the semester assignments and pointed out that this would no longer be possible. Clair Curtis (at-large) asked how would we get a high response rate? Ms. Caveny explained that the three week period will help. We have to send the message to students that this is important. Students will get messages if they haven’t completed all of their evaluations. There will be informational banners on the campus and in the cafeteria. Faculty should announce this new procedure in class. Brian Lanahan (at-large) said that we will only get responses from students who either love or hate their professors. He compared the system to “Rate Your Professor.com.” He asked: why not hold grades, until they do it? Ms. Caveny said that this is not a possibility. David Desplaces (Marketing & Supply Chain Management) asked
how this new system would affect people coming up for tenure. Ms. Caveny said that this would be taken into account in the evaluation processes. She added that we will have the same types of reports as the past, like departmental reports. Mr. Desplaces recommended that the Provost send some kind of guidelines to departments. Provost Hynd said that it was an interesting idea and that he would consider it. Bill Manarlis (Computer Science) commented that this is a new instrument and that we don’t know yet what it means. It would be interesting to do a study, between both systems. Ms. Diamond said that this could be done at the departmental level. Richard Lavrich (Chemistry) wanted to know if faculty could get a list of students who responded, but the Provost said this isn’t possible. The Speaker said that we do have mechanisms in place, if there are problems we can send it to committees, but this is something that has been in the works for many years. Vince Benigni (Communication) commented that we need to use social media networks to advertise the new system to the students. Ms. Caveny said that they are working with Student Government Association President, Isaiah Nelson, to get word out to the students and they are advertising on Facebook. The Provost thanked Ms. Caveny for all her hard work on this.

The Provost announced that Sue Sommer-Kresse is at the North Campus. She is now going to be the interim Lowcountry Graduate Center Director. They are in the process of putting out an ad for a new director. He thanked Ms. Sommer-Kress and added that the Provosts from MUSC and the Citadel are thankful too.

The Provost wanted to know how many Senators have their Greg Mortenson tickets. He recommended that anyone interested in the event should see Lynne Ford (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration) on their way out.

Steve Litvin (Hospitality & Tourism Management) asked if there was any update on the School of the Building Arts. The Provost answered that we are still waiting.

Provost Hynd ended his report by thanking the Speaker for his hour-long discussion with the Post and Courier (there were no negative quotes).

Old Business

A. Motion to Change to the Composition of the Faculty Compensation Committee in the By-Laws, Article V. Sect. 2.8.17

Submitted by the Faculty Compensation Committee: Calvin Blackwell, Chair

Below appears the text to change the composition of the Faculty Compensation Committee as presented at the October Senate meeting with the motion to alter Article V. Sect. 2.8.17 of the by-laws. This is followed by the Bylaw's Committee report with discussion by the Faculty Senate at the end.

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.
Scott Peeples, Secretary of Bylaws Committee, gave the report and the rationale for the amendment to the motion.

The Senate voted on the amendment to the motion, which was approved without discussion.

The Senate voted on the motion to change the composition of the Faculty Compensation Committee in the By-Laws, Article V. Sect. 2.B.17 (Composition: Seven faculty members. In addition, the Provost (or the Provost’s designee) is a non-voting ex officio member), which was approved without discussion.
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)

Below appears the text to change the Curriculum Committee’s Bylaws as presented at the October Senate meeting with the motion to change the Bylaws Article V, Section 3, B, 8. This is followed by the Bylaw’s Committee report with discussion by the Faculty Senate at the end.

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.
Mr. Peeples, Secretary of Bylaws Committee, gave the report.

Ms. Cormack asked if there was anything in the FAM or the Bylaws that would give the Curriculum Committee authority over the Provost. The Speaker responded no, that we can only act in an advisory role.

The Senate voted on the motion to change the Curriculum Committee's Bylaws: Change to Bylaws Article V, Section 3, B, 8 (To review and make recommendations concerning proposals for the termination of programs brought to the committee by the Provost), which was approved.
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)

Below appears the text to change the Bylaws of the Budget Committee as presented at the October Senate meeting with the motion to Change to Bylaws Article V, Section 2, B, 2. This is followed by the Bylaw’s Committee report with discussion by the Faculty Senate at the end.

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.

Mr. Peeples, Secretary of Bylaws Committee, gave the report.

The Senate voted on the motion to change the Bylaws of the Budget Committee: to add new duty to Bylaws Article V, Section 2, B, 2 (To review and make recommendations concerning the potential budgetary impact of proposals for the termination of programs brought to the committee by the Provost), which was approved without discussion.

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

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

Below appears the text to change the FAM presented at the October Senate meeting with the motion to Change the FAM, Section VIII, A “Faculty Responsibilities to Students”. This is followed by the Bylaw's Committee report with discussion by the Faculty Senate at the end.

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)

4.3. 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 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.

409. 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 [End p. 154] 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.

10. 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.

11. 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 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 by the Registrar’s Office.

The Speaker reminded the Senate said that we are in an advisory capacity.

Mr. Peeples, Secretary of Bylaws Committee, then gave the report and the committee’s recommendations.

In reference to the first amendment, Ms. Curtis, wondered if redundancy is potentially useful? Rob Dillon (at-large) commented that Ms. Curtis had used redundancy to make her point.

The Senate voted on the first amendment to the motion, which was approved.

The Senate then voted on the second and third amendments to the motion, which were approved without discussion.
Some discussion ensued concerning the main motion. Mike Duvall (English) referred to the section that “final exams must be retained for two years.” He said that faculty in his department expressed concerns about storing work for two years. Ms. Cormack said she believed this to be state law. The Speaker agreed. Ms. Caveny confirmed that there is a state policy that professors must keep graded student work for two years. Idee Winfield (at-large) commented that as we learn to use the new system of OAKS we will find that it is designed to keep this type of material. Ms. Caveny added that OAKS is better than Web CT because it is easier to manage and store data. Professors will be getting help using this system.

Mr. Litvin asked: who is the “relevant campus authority” when it comes to rescheduling final exams? Mr. Peeples said that the Bylaw’s Committee discussed this question. The wording that refers to rescheduling is for a whole class, not for individual students (that would be up to each professor’s discretion).

The Senate then voted on the main motion (with amendments) to change the FAM, Section VIII, A “Faculty Responsibilities to Students”, which was approved.
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.

Ms. Curtis explained that the Senate could not vote on the above resolution last month, but now it can. She hoped that the Senate would endorse this resolution. The Senate already voiced its opinion with its petition and could now do so again by voting yes on this resolution.

Garrett Mitchener (at-large) asked: what would happen to this referendum if the Senate approved it? Ms. Curtis said that we can use it to inform the Board of Trustees. We can tell people in Columbia that the Faculty Senate is opposed to the Building Moratorium. The Speaker said that he would send it on to the State Budget and Control Board.
The Senate voted on the Referendum Concerning the Building Moratorium, which was approved.

New Business

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

Silvia Rodríguez-Sabater, Committee Chair, introduced the following proposals.

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

Mr. Litvin commented that in the Business School they do these types of seminars/courses all the time. He wanted to know if they would now have to go through the Senate.

Ms. Sommer-Kresse said that the policies were developed with the Strategic Plan. The goal is to centralize this process and to support a registration process through our electronic system. This way, continuing education units can be awarded. The goal is to encourage more outreach to the community. She does not think the policies require that everyone use this system. She wants to benefit the faculty and not be a burden.

The Speaker said that this is an enhancement, an add-on to what some professors are already doing. Now there will be someone handling marketing. There is a support system in place and it is a wonderful service. He reminded everyone that these proposals are for information only and not for approval from the Senate. This falls under the “Special Programs” charge of the
committee. Ms. Ford said that this charge from the committee had fallen through the cracks. Irina Gigova (at-large) asked whether these courses are a semester or do they vary in duration? Ms. Rodriguez-Sabater answered that the nine courses that they approved are from two different tracks. She said there is a need for these courses in the community. They do not have to follow the semester format because they are non-credit. For example, they can be on a Saturday or only one evening.

Faculty Curriculum Committee

Jen Wright, Co-Chair of the Committee, introduced the following proposals:

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

Elizabeth Martinez-Gibson (at-large) commented that the Linguistic Minor Program would be affected by this program change, but she said that it is o.k. because she reviewed PHIL120 and it will serve as a substitute.

The Senate voted on the change of major and minor for Philosophy, which was approved.

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)
The Senate voted on the change of major and minor for Historic Preservation & Community Planning, which was approved without discussion.

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

The Senate voted on the change of major for Psychology, which was approved without discussion.

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

Bob Perkins (at-large) clarified that this course will also serve as a graduate course.

The Senate voted on the change of major for Teacher Education, which was approved.

**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)

The Senate voted on the change of major and minor for Art Management, which was approved with discussion.

**Economics & Finance**
- Change of Major (ECON) – changing the electives requirement

The Senate voted on the change of major for Economics & Finance, which was approved without discussion.

**Theater (Dance)**
- Change of Minor (DANC) – changing the requirements (to fit with the new BA)

The Senate voted on the change of minor for Theater (Dance), which was approved without discussion.

**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)

The Speaker asked the Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, Julia Eichelberger, to give a brief report on the committee’s assessment of this proposal. Ms. Eichelberger said that the committee thinks it is a sound proposal. The committee supports it.

The Speaker asked the Chair of the Budget Committee, Kendra Stewar, to give a brief report on the committee’s assessment of this proposal. She said that the committee foresees no problems or financial effects.

Melissa Hughes (at-large) asked whether the enrollments in the Biology would change since it is one of the prerequisites. Would more students be coming into these classes? Michael Flynn, Chair of the Department of Health and Human Performance, said that this is currently a concentration that is turning into a major. He said that the enrollments should not change.

The Senate voted on the new major in Health and Human Performance, which was approved.

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 I (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)
The Speaker asked the Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, Ms. Eichelberger, to give a brief report on the committee’s assessment of this proposal. Ms. Eichelberger said that the committee thinks it is a sound proposal. It fits the Liberal Arts environment of the College of Charleston. The committee supports it.

The Speaker asked the Chair of the Budget Committee, Ms. Stewart, to give a brief report on the committee’s assessment of this proposal. She said that the committee sees no problems or financial effects. They did take into account that there are some projected costs for the first five years, but they thought that these were reasonable based on projected enrollments.

Ms. Curtis asked: how many faculty members are there in Dance? Gretchen McLain (guest) said that she is the only full-time Dance faculty member. There are three adjuncts.

The Senate voted on the new BA in Dance, which was approved.

**Committee on General Education**

Claire Curtis, Chair of the Committee on General Education, introduced the proposals from Philosophy. There is a new course: Symbolic Logic which is requesting General Education Status. This course will fulfill the Math/Logic requirement. She also introduced a change to the Math requirements.

Ms. Gigova confirmed with Ms. Curtis that the students would have to do at least one Math class.
Ms. Curtis introduced the new course, COMM 215, which would fulfill the General Education requirement for Social Sciences.

The Senate voted on these proposals, which were approved.

**Constituents’ Concerns**

Ms. Curtis made the recommendation that we try to avoid having Senate meetings on Election Day. The Speaker responded that this is a problem every year. He said that our Bylaws state that we should have our Senate meetings on the first Thursday of every month, but that we can look into changing the Bylaws.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

    Sarah E. Owens
    Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 5 October 2010

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 5 October 2010, at 5:02 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Darryl Phillips, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of September 14, 2010 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Darryl Phillips, the Speaker, began by saying that his report would be brief, but that a lot of information would be forthcoming in his on-line newsletter. He reminded the Senate of the recent news that there is a building moratorium until tuition is reduced to 7 percent. The Board of Trustees will be meeting next week and it will be a top agenda item for them. Ultimately this is their decision. He wanted to reiterate (something that he spoke about in the last Senate meeting) the need for faculty to speak up and to emphasize the role of high quality education in South Carolina. Our bylaws state that a motion must be circulated one week in advance, so the resolution that will be introduced this evening cannot be voted on. He concluded his report. There were no questions.

The Provost

Provost Hynd opened by saying that he really enjoys working with Darryl Phillips. They discuss a lot of issues and he appreciates his advocacy of the faculty. He thanked everyone for coming this evening. He gave the Senate several updates. Last week on September 29 there was a dinner for international studies hosted by Andrew Sobiesuo. They celebrated study abroad, invited students to participate and to present posters. It was a way to thank faculty and recognize the work that the advisors have done for study abroad.

The Provost said that the Deans are going to review the priorities for each school and that they will be discussing this with department chairs. He wanted to encourage department chairs to be part of the advancement team for fundraising and grants. He said that we are going forward with the Strategic Plan. The administration is in the process of using the CUPA median as a tool to evaluate market adjustments and to achieve the median salaries. He is working with the Deans to make adjustments to salaries especially at the mid and top levels. In reference to the possible tuition cap, he said that as far as he knows they are going to move forward on market adjustments. Provost Hynd said that if the Board of Trustees decided to reduce the tuition back down to 7 percent it would mean a decrease in 2.3 million dollars. However, Steve Osborn told him that they will move forward with market adjustments. He recommended that the faculty read editorials in different newspapers other than the Post and Courier. After reviewing other local papers, like that of Spartanburg, he thinks there is support for higher education in this state. He emphasized that we need to keep moving forward and to follow the strategic plan. We invested years in drafting this plan and although it might take a little longer to achieve its goals, it will be worth it.

Provost Hynd ended his report by saying that he would be delighted to visit departments and to meet the faculty. If interested please pass on this information to Chairs so they can set up a visit. There were no questions.
New Business

The Speaker clarified that proposals to the bylaws must be introduced first at the Senate, then sent to the Bylaws Committee, and then will come back to the Senate. He said that the procedure to change the FAM (Faculty Administration Manual) is somewhat different. Any change introduced to the Senate to change the FAM is not automatically sent to the Bylaws, but the Senate can move that it be reviewed by the Bylaws. He said that the Senate votes to make recommendations to change the FAM and submits the recommended changes to the Provost. The Provost then reviews them and sends them on to the senior executive team.

Faculty Compensation Committee

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

Calvin Blackwell, Chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee, introduced the following motion. (Please note that this is the same motion listed on the agenda).

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.

-----

Comments from Senate:

Scott Peeples (at-large) asked if the additional committee member would be appointed from the Provost Office. Harlan Hodges (Management & Entrepreneurship) expressed concern that “this could be anyone.” The Speaker said that this is in keeping with the wording of the bylaws for other committees. Beverly Diamond, Senior Vice Provost, said the Provost would appoint the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs (continuing what has been done in the past). With no further discussion, the motion was referred to the Bylaws Committee.

Faculty Curriculum Committee

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

Jannette Finch, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, introduced the following motion. (Please note that this is the same motion listed on the agenda).

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.

-----

Comments from Senate:

Amy McCandless, Dean of the Graduate School, asked if there should be a parallel motion from the Graduate Committee. She said that this would be a good idea since there are many similarities between these committees. Silvia Rodríguez-Sabater, Chair of the Graduate Committee, responded that it will be on the agenda for the next Senate meeting.

Anthony Williams (Philosophy) made the comment that he doesn’t understand why this motion did not come from the Academic Planning Committee. Ms. Finch said that by going through the Curriculum Committee there will be more communication. The Speaker said that Academic Planning is looking at a similar proposal. Bob Perkins, former chair of the Curriculum Committee, added that all new programs go through both committees.

Claire Curtis (at large) asked whether the termination of programs only comes from the Provost or whether others are involved in this process. The Speaker responded that the Provost makes the recommendation to the Board of Trustees and they make the cut. In the future, with the implementation of these motions, we as faculty would have more of a role to play.

Idee Winfield (at-large) asked for clarification of the meaning of “program.” Are these majors or minors? What do we mean by program? The Speaker said it will be sent to Bylaws for discussion.

Paul Young (Mathematics) asked what sparked all of this. What’s the background? The Speaker said he had spoke about this issue in his report at the last Senate meeting. He briefly explained that it had to do with the termination of the Masters program in Bilingual Legal interpreting. Faculty committees did not have a say.
The Provost said that he is in favor of this motion. He supports increased communication – this is a nice check, where things might be overlooked. Brian McGee (guest) commented on the unique role of the Provost bringing someone to the Curriculum Committee, but he is not sure about how this differs from the way things were done in the past.

With no further discussion, the motion was referred to the Bylaws Committee.

**Budget Committee**

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

Linda Jones, representative of the Budget Committee, introduced the following motion. (Please note that this is the same motion listed on the agenda).

**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.

Comments from Senate: No discussion. The motion was referred to the Bylaws Committee.

---

**Academic Standards Committee**

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

**Jason Overby**, Chair of the Academic Standards Committee, introduced the following motion. (Please note that this is the same motion listed on the agenda).

**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 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 [End p. 155] 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.

-----

**Comments from Senate:**

The Speaker said this motion would not automatically be sent to the Bylaws Committee unless we have a motion. Mr. Peeples moved that this be sent to the Bylaws, which received a **second**. His motion **passed**.

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

Silvia Rodríguez-Sabater, Committee Chair, introduced the following proposals. The Senate voted on all the proposals, which were **approved without discussion.**
*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

---

**Faculty Curriculum Committee**

Jannette Finch, Chair of the Committee, introduced the following proposals:

1. **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

The Senate voted on all the course changes, which were approved without discussion.
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).

The Senate voted on the change of major for the BS in Economics, which approved without discussion.

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).

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) commented that this change would not allow students to use this course for double dipping.

The Senate voted on the change of major for the BA in Religious Studies, which was approved.

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
Delete Course (2012) COMM210, COMM213, COMM220, COMM221, COMM222, COMM230, COMM235, COMM240, COMM245, COMM285, COMM320, COMM322 COMM324, COMM326, COMM327, COMM329, COMM331, COMM332, COMM335, COMM337, COMM340, COMM360, COMM365, COMM370,
The Speaker said that since this is a complete overall of the major he had asked the Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, Julia Eichelberger, to give a brief report on the committee’s assessment of this proposal. Ms. Eichelberger said that the committee wanted to make sure that the change of the major in Communication would work out and not adversely impact students. They discussed the proposal at length and are very happy with it. It is carefully designed and a nice fit for a liberal arts institution. The committee supports it.

The Speaker asked Linda Jones, representative of the Budget Committee, to give the committee’s assessment of any budgetary implications. She said that there are none.

Ms. Curtis asked if the two year long course proposed for the major would only be offered in the fall to spring sequence. Beth Goodier, Chair of the Department of Communication, said that these courses would be offered at many different times.

Mr. Williams asked whether the ethic’s course (COMM315 Ethical Communication) was an applied ethics course. Robert Westerfelhaus (at-large) replied, yes, to some degree.

The Senate voted on the change of major for the BA in Communication, which was approved.

**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

The Speaker said that since this is a new major he had asked the Chair of the Academic Planning Committee and the representative from the Budget Committee to give a brief report on the committees’ assessment of this proposal. Ms. Eichelberger said that Academic Planning carefully looked over the proposal. The committee questioned at first whether increasing specialization within a major was appropriate for the College. The committee learned, however,
that Psychology wants a major that will fit better with our institution. Academic Planning supports it completely. Ms. Jones said that the Budget Committee had no concerns about budgetary implications.

Melissa Hughes (at-large) asked about labs. She was concerned about the elimination of the lab in the new major. The BS keeps the lab in Psychology, but the BA eliminates it. Rhonda Swickert (guest) responded that in the BA the research methods class ensures an empirical experience. It also includes writing a research paper. There have been changes to the prerequisites to upper division courses and now a more rigorous stats course is required. There is a theoretical review paper of the literature. These things do not show up on the curricula documents. The department has given an exit interview and by surveying the students, they have learned that about 18-20 percent plan to go on to graduate studies.

The Senate voted on the new major in Psychology, which was approved.

**Committee on General Education**

Claire Curtis, Chair of the Committee on General Education, introduced the Honor’s Chemistry Proposals. These honors courses will fulfill the science requirement for General Education.

The Senate voted on these proposals, which were approved without discussion.

**Constituents’ Concerns**

Claire Curtis, along with a select group of professors, put together the following resolution to show the faculty’s support of the Strategic Plan. This proposal protests the building moratorium placed on the College if it does not lower its tuition increase.

“The College of Charleston faculty affirm 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 increased. A significant amount of our tuition increase will be devoted to increasing financial aid, making access to undergraduate education fairer for everyone. There is no evidence that by holding our current tuition increase below 7%, we would be significantly increasing 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 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.”

Ms. Curtis noted that the Board of Trustees would be meeting next week. Because of their upcoming meeting she wanted to hear suggestions about how to get this message to the Board (since we could not officially vote on the proposal today at the Senate).

Vince Benigni (Communication) said that there should be a student component in the resolution. We need the students to rally behind this message. Ms. Curtis responded that the student government was discussing their own resolution. They were meeting at the same time as the Senate and their bylaws allowed them to vote on the matter. Ms. Hughes, wanted to know if we could vote no or in an electronic poll later in the week? Ms. Cormack wondered if we could take an informal poll. The Speaker responded no to these questions. Instead he encouraged everyone to sign the document. Mr. Peeples added that this could be presented as a petition from the faculty. Senators could circulate the text and collect signatures in their departments. Ms. Curtis said that this could have a stronger impact because there would be signatures from more than just senators.

David Desplaces (at-large) suggested that some additional wording be added to the end of the proposal that would state that we are not only professors but taxpayers and citizens of South Carolina.

Jen Wright (guest) asked if we have the numbers to back up this document. Ms. Curtis said that they could be easily produced.

Garrett Mitchener (at-large) said he “felt in the dark” about our budgeting system. He doesn’t feel qualified to argue the point in this resolution. He wondered why we are charging students higher tuition so that we can reduce their tuition. He’s confused by that wording. Ms. Curtis said that 3 million dollars will be used to help our financial aid. There is redistribution going on here. Brian Lanahan (at-large) said that in an accounting sense, we are on firm ground since South Carolina spends very little on education.
Irina Gigova (at-large) said that we should send this letter to students’ parents and explain it to them. We should try to unite all the schools in the state. Now the governor separates us into good and bad schools.

Ms Curtis ended by saying that she will add the line about “residents/taxpayers” to the resolution. She will email information to faculty and staff.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens

Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 14 September 2010

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 14 September 2010, at 5:00 P.M. in ECTR 116. After Darryl Phillips, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of April 6 and 13, 2010 were approved as circulated.

Announcements and Information (The Speaker)

The Speaker

Faculty Speaker Darryl Phillips began his announcements by thanking George Pothering for serving as parliamentarian. He reminded everyone that they should introduce themselves before speaking. He asked all the senators to initial the attendance roster and announced that attendance will be posted on the Senate website.

The Speaker is delighted to be here and commented that he is already a third of the way through his term. He expressed his gratitude to Joe Kelly and to Heather Alexander for helping him learn this new position. He already has been working closely with the Provost and others in Academic Affairs as well as faculty across campus on a number of initiatives and is looking forward to a productive year.

Update on Faculty Governance / Shared Governance: The Speaker noted that this is our first meeting as a 50 member Senate. He thanked RoxAnn Stalvey, Chair of Nominations and Elections, for conducting all of the elections for replacements. The faculty committees are reminded to include student members and ex-officio members. The Speaker hopes to work with student government to elect student members in advance in future years. For the ex-officio members, he reminded everyone that they are full participating members and they are important. There are currently several proposals for bylaws changes that will be coming before the Senate in the future, for example, adding senior administrators as ex-officio members on committees. The Speaker stated that the Senate and committees should not just be reactionary, but that they can take initiatives on measures. Currently there are 183 faculty members serving on faculty committees or boards. In addition, there are 50 senators at the College of Charleston. This is a fantastic testament of faculty service, but there is room to become more efficient. He recommended that everyone read Larry Krasnoff’s ad hoc committee report on reforming faculty governance—posted on the faculty website. He then thanked Heather Alexander, Faculty Secretariat, for expanding our website which now hosts archives, committee reports and agendas. He noted that any committee can post items. This will improve efficiency and transparency.

Diversity at the College: There is a new committee called the “President’s Commission on Diversity, Access, Equity and Inclusion.” This commission is charged with developing an Institutional Diversity Strategic Plan and it includes faculty, staff and students at the college. In August the Board of Trustees, approved a new anti-discrimination policy at the College. The Speaker encourages us to read it over. Both the commission and the new policy are positive steps towards making us a more diverse and inclusive community.
Board of Trustees Meetings: There are two items to report from the Board of Trustees meetings: 1) The first, the Speaker said he already reported in the June newsletter, but warrants repeating. In June the Trustees terminated the Masters Program in Bilingual Legal Interpreting. He was surprised that the faculty governance structure was not involved in the process, but learned that there is no formal provision in our bylaws for faculty committees to review proposals to terminate academic programs. He spoke to Provost Hynd about adding a statement to our bylaws to give faculty a voice in the review in the termination of academic programs. The Provost is in favor of drawing on our expertise. This led to a proposal now sitting with four committees to review the bylaws. The Curriculum, Budget, Academic Planning, & Graduate Education committees are considering a change to their charges. The Speaker remarked that this is a positive example of shared governance and a timely wake-up call. We need to guarantee that we as faculty play a role in such decisions. He said that working together with the Provost is a win-win situation. 2) The Budget: A decision was made to increase tuition for all students by approximately $1300 and is an important first step towards realizing specific goals of the Strategic Plan – including faculty merit salary increases. President Benson was an advocate for the increase of tuition and also salary. The public reaction, however, has been negative with the press and the politicians. The Speaker stated that we need to be advocates for the College – we have to play a role – we have to educate ourselves and then use our talents to set the record straight about education in South Carolina. We need to point out that state support has been reduced by 45 percent, but that quality education matters and is central to South Carolina’s economic future. The Speaker pointed out that we rank 16th out of 18 peer institutions for salaries. Faculty did not receive raises last year, but 15 of our peers increased their salaries. We are not alone since nationwide funding for higher education has declined for decades. Higher education trends have allocated more resources to administrators and not educators. The Speaker quoted the NY Times to show this trend:

In 1976 there were, on average, 42 full-time administrators and 65 professors for every 1,000 college students.

In 2008, that number had risen to 84 administrators at the same time that the number of full-time faculty members dropped from 65 to 55.

He ended his report by emphasizing the need to make sure that the resources at the College support the core mission of educating our students.

Since there were no questions after his report, the Speaker introduced the President.

Reports

The President

President Benson started out by saying that he was very pleased to be here. He said that we are off to a great year with a vibrant and strong freshman class. He is proud of our high ranking by Parade Magazine. He reported that we have 37 new tenure track and 19 visiting faculty. This morning he attended Rhonda Mack’s Marketing and Researching class, and it was good to be back in the classroom.
The President does not think we should worry too much about the negative press. Instead, we need to move ahead and focus on our Strategic Plan. He said to forget the Post and Courier and focus on our Strategic Plan. In his view the Post and Courier is extremely conservative, critical of higher education, and has not changed its pitch in years.

The President continued by saying that he wants to update us on some of the things that he has written in his newsletter.

**Strategic plan:** The President said that we are moving ahead with the Strategic Plan with the funding from the tuition increase. He is concerned about financial aid and is committed to helping our students. We are behind our peer institutions in this regard. This year 3 million dollars will be used for financial aid, a 25% increase in one year. He thanked the financial aid office for helping make this happen. He stated that in order to “get back in the ball game” our goal is to get up to 26 million. Tuition money is also being used in the hiring of key faculty. In regard to the hiring of administrators, the proportion is the same now as it was a decade ago. He stated that salary adjustments for faculty will come directly from the tuition increase. Technology upgrades and student programs will also be getting funding. The Board of Trustees supports this.

**Facilities:** In reference to the Randolph Hall restoration, the President thinks it should be done by the end of October (give or take a month or two). Dixie Plantation is in phase one. This 4.1 million dollar project, using stimulus money, is very exciting. In phase one, renovation of the barn and John Henry Dick’s studio as a museum, will take place. The next phase will involve the building of research stations. Eventually there will be an area where students can live and a conference center. The Sottile Theater’s marquee is being renovated. The Board of Architectural Review gave its approval last spring. The President says that the new neon design will give it a look from the 1920’s. Also the new marquee will give the College a greater presence on King Street, something that is currently lacking. The renovation of 5 College Way and 72 George are underway. These expensive projects cost 1.8 and 1.2 million dollars respectively. The President cited the many challenges of living in a historic district. The College is the largest promoter of historic preservation in the city of Charleston. The College does not get State money for this, and yet it is very important. Future capital funding priorities include the renovation of the Holling’s Science Center, the completion of the 2nd floor of the new Science Center, the renovation of the Simmons Center and of Grice Marine Lab. He remarked that it would be a shame if all these projects were stopped.

**Fund raising:** The President believes that fundraising works best when ideas come from the bottom up. He wants ideas to flow from staff, faculty and on up to the higher administration. The Deans are encouraged to get much more involved in fund raising. Provost Hynd has been working with them and a retreat was held. When appropriate, roster faculty should be involved and can engage donors. We need to look for more donors through corporate foundations. He noted that we are building for the future. The College does not have a lot of alumni. We are putting into place the apparatus that will tap into future alumni. The College has a bright future. He also mentioned that the College is in the process of launching a national fundraising campaign, but that this has not been made public yet.

**Diversity:** The President spoke about the new “President’s Community Advisory Board.” It has 18 members, the majority being African American. He hopes that this minority contingent will assist him to
engage and help the community. He hosted a dinner for the board at his house and all agreed that diversity should not only be African Americans, but all different minority groups.

**Goals of the Strategic Plan:** The President cited his commitment to the third core value of the Strategic Plan: “The history, traditions, culture and environment of Charleston and the Lowcountry that foster distinctive opportunities for innovative academic programs and relationships that advance our public mission in the city of Charleston, the state of South Carolina and the world.” He went on to say that we are concerned about the port and the environment. Those assets shape and define our institution. He wants to be involved in the local community and its improvement. He spoke about the Gaillard Auditorium and its renovation project. The Gaillard was built in 1968 and “is tired.” The mayor proposes a 142 million dollar renovation project which has several parts. President Benson supports this. With the proximity to our campus, we should be engaged in this project. This is a wonderful opportunity for faculty to connect with arts’ programs and tourism at this facility. He is involved with the stakeholders committee, and the Gaillard Campaign Organizing Committee which is fundraising for these renovations. The President is also involved with Symphonic Music. He lamented how the symphony closed its doors last spring. Now the College has plans to help support the symphony, but he did not want to speak more on this topic because it is still confidential.

The president opened the floor for questions. Idee Winfield (at-large) asked about future renovations of Maybank. Steve Osborne (Senior VP for Business Affairs) responded that this is a project further down on the list. Garret Mitchener (at-large) asked about whether the Office of Institutional Diversity had expanded its area on the first floor, how this related to the plan to have Computer Science move to Robert Scott Small, and what was planned for the classroom vacated by Admissions. Beverley Diamond, Senior Vice Provost, responded that although the Campus Master Plan for Space would be revisited in the near future, the plan to move Computer Science was still in place, and that the classroom vacated by Admissions was being renovated as a classroom.

**The Provost**

Provost Hynd started out by saying that he appreciates the opportunity to follow the President. He has already been here for 9 months and is thrilled to be here.

This has been an exciting summer. Kay Smith was awarded a Fulbright to Hong Kong. The Chinese Government is modifying their education system and she’s helping them. He thanked Susan Morrison (Associate Provost for Operations and Administration) and Lynn Ford (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration) for taking two half-time positions in the Provost office.

The Provost thanked Dean Cynthia Lowenthal, chair of the search committee to select a new Dean for the School of Sciences and Mathematics. This was a successful search and he again thanked her and the committee. Michael Auerbach, the new Dean of the School of Sciences and Mathematics will join us on November 1. Mr. Auerbach will take over the position after spending the past nine years with the Desert Research Institute (DRI) in Reno and Las Vegas, Nevada.
Provost Hynd is energized by the Strategic Plan. The Board of Trustees, working alongside of the President, is supportive of the plan. He said it’s important for him to work with the Speaker and the Faculty Senate. Many issues such as the evaluation of the curriculum, workload and space, all require faculty input. He is looking forward to this academic year.

The Provost updated the Senate on the “market adjustment” and said that 1 million dollars have been set aside to adjust inequities in faculty salaries and staff benefits. He said that the merit evaluation is very important and that Department Chairs and Deans will work together in this process. He hopes that these raises will show up in the last paycheck in October.

Provost Hynd spoke about the College of Building Arts. He reminded the Senate that the College had contemplated the possibility of taking over its students, but since the last Senate meeting, this is not going to happen. He said that Lt. Gen. (Ret.) Colby M. Broadwater (the President) is pursuing accreditation for the College of Building Arts at this time. Provost Hynd believes that there are some good opportunities for collaboration in the future with the College of Building Arts.

He cited the objectives for this next year: internationalization and study abroad. He stated that MBA program has an international component. 25% now of our current graduates have some international experience. Andrew Sobiesuo, Assistant Provost for the Center of International Education, is taking the lead to recognize faculty who take students abroad. The College has money for students to go abroad and we should encourage our students to do so.

The Provost spoke about school level promotion and tenure committees. He thinks this will improve communication within schools. He wants to develop this, but said there will still be the college level committee – ensuring due process.

This coming year there will be an evaluation of units, programs, and departments to see how effective they are. The allocation of faculty time is very important so that they can pursue scholarship opportunities. He said that we need to continue to build and support our research and support for scholarship. The Office of Research & Grants Administration is putting together wording about the College that can used in a cut and paste fashion on grant applications. This will be put on their website for faculty to use.

The Provost wants to build our administrative bench. Faculty should view administration as an exciting prospect. Associate Deans should communicate with each other and should feel like they are part of a team. Deans should now be spending 30-40% of their time for institutional advancement. They are finding friends, alumni and corporations that can invest in the College of Charleston.

The Provost ended his report by saying that this is going to be a great year. He is looking forward to working with The Speaker Darryl Phillips.

The Provost opened the floor to questions. Garrett Mitchener (at-large) asked: how do you build the administrative bench? The Provost answered that they are a variety of ways. Everyone has different talents and is respected for their expertise. Some faculty members have leadership qualities that can benefit different units. Mr. Mitchener wanted to know how we find out about these opportunities. The
Provost responded that the Deans should keep us informed. The Provost wants to foster these administrative positions for faculty and encourages us to pursue them.

Scott Peeples (at-large) asked about the job of Associate Deans. Will they have more authority and emphasis on fundraising? The Provost responded that they will have more authority. He wants them to be the go-to person for Department Chairs. This will be more of a leadership position.

Brian Lanahan (at-large) said that as a young faculty member he has questions about different types publications. Where do decisions get made? Are articles better than chapters or vice versa? The Provost responded that these types of decisions should be made at the department level, but then the big committee should be used as a form checks and balances. He cited the example of English versus Astro-Physics: these publications are quite different.

Rob Dillon (at-large) asked: what is the greatest weakness at the College and how is the hiring of Associate Deans going fix that? The Provost answered that there will be no new hiring of Associate Deans at this time.

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) expressed her concern about departments in different schools. She said that school division is becoming a wall. For example, she expressed concern that faculty in Humanities and Social Sciences might not have the same funds as in Languages, Cultures and World Affairs? She said that there are too many committees, but this was more of a comment than a question. The Provost said he thinks it’s good to have these school and department committees, especially for the Tenure and Promotion process.

Clair Curtis (at-large) expressed her concern about a 1 week course for one credit in the business school. What if these courses conflict with schedules of other courses? She is disturbed by the awarding of $1000 scholarships to the top 4 students in those classes. The Provost responded that he is aware of these concerns. He is working with the Dean of Business to resolve them and to move forward.

Dr. Vince Benigni, Faculty Athletics Representative

Vince Benigni started out by saying that he was appointed a year ago to the position of Faculty Athletics Representative. He said that any time a faculty member has a concern or issue about athletes that they should please inform him or his department. He noted that Dr. Bill Moore held this position for years and these are tough shoes to fill, but this is an important duty. It is a fact that sporting events, like the winning of a basketball tournament, bring positive recognition to the College. He thanked all of those involved in the program, Student Athlete Faculty Experts (SAFE). He told the Senate to keep their eyes open for “My Faculty Days” this fall. Student athletes will be giving faculty tickets to their particular sporting events. This is a way of saying thank you. He encouraged everyone to come out and watch the games. He said that there will be a committee meeting this week to address the issue of athlete absences. He ended his report by thanking the Senate.
New Business

Election of Speaker Pro Tempore

Claire Curtis (at-large) was nominated by Idee Winfield (at large) for the position of Speaker Pro Tempore. Ms. Curtis accepted the nomination and was elected by unanimous vote.

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

Silvia Rodriguez-Sabater, committee chair, introduced the proposals for New Graduate Courses - MAT in the Performing Arts: Theatre Concentration – 6 new courses

* 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

The Senate voted on all the proposals, which were approved without discussion.

Constituents’ Concerns

Julia Eichelberger (at-large) expressed her concern about students’ email access. She said that some of them could not submit papers via email. The official college email does not work. Ms. Cormack said there are problems with Banner to send class emails. Brian McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Policy Advisor in the Office of the President, responded that Student Council brought these concerns to the President and they are being addressed. Margaret Hagood (at-large) asked about a timeline. Mr. McGee said that the College would like to have this resolved by the end of the calendar year. The College is looking into the possibility of Google as an email alternative, but it is complicated. Irina Gigova (at-large) commented that Oaks might be a helpful way for students to submit papers.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:47 PM.

A reception sponsored by Academic Affairs was held in the ECTR Lobby.
Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens

Faculty Secretary