From:  Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary
To:  Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 3 April 2012 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the 13 March 2012 Minutes (see [http:// facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php](http:// facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php))

3. Reports

   The Speaker
   The President
   The Provost

4. New Business

   A. Academic Standards Committee - Motion to change the hours requirement for a second bachelor's degree

   B. Faculty Curriculum Committee

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

   D. The Nominations and Elections Committee

   E. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual --Motion to amend the composition of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs --Motion to amend the composition and duties of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual.

   F. The Faculty Compensation Committee: End of Year Report

   G. The Faculty Welfare Committee: End of Year Report from two subcommittees (Merit and Annual Reviews for Faculty, and the Subcommittee on Adjunct Faculty Welfare)
H. Committee on General Education: End of Year Report
   (http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php)

I. Presentation of Degree Candidates

5. Constituents’ Concerns

6. Adjournment

**Minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site:
http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/index.php**
NEW BUSINESS

A. Academic Standards Committee

Motion of the Academic Standards Committee to change the Catalog

Change to Requirements for Second Bachelor’s Degree

Purpose of change:

The change in the hours requirement for a second bachelor’s degree will put the College of Charleston in compliance with SACS rules.

Proposed changes are indicated below.

Second Bachelor’s Degree

A student who has previously earned a bachelor’s degree from the College of Charleston and wishes to pursue further undergraduate work may either complete an additional major and have it noted on the permanent record (with date of completion)* or earn a second degree if it is different from the first (i.e., a B.A. if the first degree was a B.S. and vice versa**). This student must apply for re-admission for the second degree, and then:

• Must earn a minimum of 3031 additional credit hours (beyond the 122 currently required for degree) in residence at CofC.

• Meet all degree and College graduation requirements for the second degree program in the catalog under which he or she enters, or in a subsequent catalog.

• Meet all prerequisite and course requirements in the major field(s) for the second degree.
A College of Charleston student may earn more than one baccalaureate degree (i.e., B.A., A.B., B.S.) concurrently at the College of Charleston, if he or she meets the following requirements:

- Earns a minimum of 152 credit hours, including a minimum of 62 hours in residence at College of Charleston.
- Meets all degree and College graduation requirements for both degree programs.
- Meets all prerequisite and course requirements in two different major fields.

Students who hold a baccalaureate degree from another institution may earn a second baccalaureate degree at the College of Charleston by meeting the following requirements:

- Complete a minimum of 39 semester hours at the College of Charleston with at least 15 taken in the major field at the 200 level or above.
- Meet all prerequisite and course requirements in the major field and degree requirements for the second baccalaureate degree program.
- Earn a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 or higher in course work completed for the major and second baccalaureate degree programs. Some programs require a GPA greater than a 2.0; see specific major requirements in the "Schools" section of the catalog.

*CofC students completing a major in the same degree program previously awarded will not receive a second diploma. However, the permanent record (transcript) will reflect the additional major. In the case of multiple majors in different degree programs, the student will choose the degree to be earned and posted on the diploma if the student has not satisfied the requirements to be awarded more than one degree as noted above (earned less than 152 semester hours).

**Students earning an A.B. degree will earn that degree in place of the B.A. or B.S. normally earned with the major.

Rationale for Changes:

SACS Standard 3.5.2 requires that the number of hours for a second degree be a minimum of 25% of the hours required for the full degree. 25% of 122 hours is 30.5. This means that we need to round up from 30 to 31 and increase the additional credit hours required for a second degree by that amount.
B. Faculty Curriculum Committee

Faculty Curriculum Committee
For April, 2012 Senate Meeting

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

I. Course Proposals: All proposals involving only courses (new/changed/deleted) 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.

Arts Management
NEW COURSE: ARTM330 Music in the Marketplace

Communication
CHANGE COURSE: COMM 111 Introduction to Communication (change prereqs)
CHANGE COURSE: COMM 481 Capstone in Communication (change prereqs)
CHANGE COURSE: COMM214/214D Media in the Digital Age/Discussion (alter credit hours, provide more detailed catalog description)

Teacher Education
CHANGE COURSE: EDFS 201 Foundations of Education (change name from Introduction to Education)

English
CHANGE COURSE: ENGL342 Literature of the American Revolution and Early Republic (change name from Colonial and Revolutionary American Literature)
CHANGE COURSE: ENGL343 American Renaissance (change name from American Renaissance, 1830-1870)
CHANGE COURSE: ENGL359 American Poetry since 1945 (change name from Contemporary American Poetry)
NEW COURSE: ENGL345 Nineteenth-Century American Poetry

Mgmt & Entrepreneurship
NEW COURSE: ENTR451 Health Sciences Entrepreneurship

Health & Human Performance
CHANGE COURSE: Change PEHD440 to EXSC440 Biomechanics
DELETE COURSES (all replaced with ESXC equivalents):
- PEHD210 Concepts in Fitness Assessment & Exercise Prescription
- PEHD330 Kinesiology
- PEHD340 Exercise Physiology and lab
- PEHD401 Independent Study
- PEHD433 Research Design & Analysis
- PEHD438 Advanced Topics in Resistance Training & Conditioning
- PEHD439 Advanced Topics in Exercise Physiology and lab
• PEHD498 Capstone in Exercise Science
• PEHD440 Biomechanics
NEW COURSE: HEAL499 Bachelor's Essay

German & Slavic Studies
NEW COURSE: LTRS120 Window into Russia

Psychology
CHANGE COURSE: PSYC392 Scientific Foundations of Clinical Psychology (change prereqs)
CHANGE COURSE: PSYC344 Psychology of Substance Abuse (change prereqs)

Sociology & Anthropology
CHANGE COURSE: ANTH494 Field Work (change credit range)
CHANGE COURSE: Range of SOCY courses (SOCY271-SO CY369: change prereqs, add HONS167)

Archaeology
NEW COURSE: ARCH400 Archaeological Internship
DELETE COURSE: ANTH200 Archaeological Lab Methods
DELETE COURSE: ANTH381 Internship

II. Program Changes:

English
CHANGE PROGRAM: Move ENGL342 from Lit in History, Pre-1700's to Lit in History, 1700-1900
CHANGE PROGRAM: Add ENGL345 to Category 3 (Theme, Genre, or Author Centered Approaches)
CHANGE PROGRAM: Delete courses from requirements/electives (delete ENGL404 Independent Study from poetry and fiction options for Concentration in Creative Writing)

Mgmt & Entrepreneurship
CHANGE PROGRAM: Add ENTR451 Health Sciences Entrepreneurship to the ENTR concentration electives.

Film Studies
CHANGE MINOR: Delete COMM383 Media Criticism, COMM499 Writing a Screenplay, ARTH 340 Recent European Cinema, New Wave Cinema, or Film Noir/Neo-Noir; Add ARTH306 Studies in Modern, Contemporary, and Film Arts

French
CHANGE PROGRAM: Add FREN363 Advanced French Culture to list of reqs for literature and civilization survey courses. Add requirement of one French literature or civilization survey course and one Francophone literature or civilization survey course to the French major requirements.

CHANGE MINOR: Change requirements to FREN313, 314; ONE of FREN320, 326; ONE of FREN 321, 327, 363; One elective at the 300-level; one elective at the 400-level.
Health & Human Performance


German & Slavic Studies

CHANGE MINOR: Add LTRS120 to minor

Psychology

CHANGE PROGRAM: Change requirements for new BS from PSYC250 to PSYC250 or PSYC211/220

Economics & Finance

CHANGE PROGRAM: Delete MGMT319 Creation of New Business Enterprise, Add ENTR320 Principles of Entrepreneurship

Sociology & Anthropology

CHANGE PROGRAM: Add HONS167 to major, Delete FYSM163
CHANGE MINOR: Add HONS167 to minor, Delete FYSM163
CHANGE MINOR: Adding ARCH400 Archaeology Internship

III. New Programs:

Teacher Education

NEW PROGRAM: BA Major Foreign Language Education (cognate-major)

Marketing & Supply Chain Mgmt

NEW PROGRAM: BS in Marketing

Archaeology

NEW PROGRAM: BA in Archaeology (interdisciplinary cognate-major)

Economics & Finance

NEW MINOR: Real Estate Minor (expanding upon Real Estate Concentration for people outside major)
C. Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

Master of Arts in Communication

New Course Proposals:

COMM 500 – Introduction to Graduate Studies in Communication
COMM 514 – Social Media
COMM 680 – Seminar in Rhetoric

Course Title Change Proposal:
COMM 580 – Seminar in Communication (Special Topics)

Change to a Graduate Program – Master of Arts in Communication

Change to a Graduate Program – Master of Education in Languages (Termination of a Graduate Emphasis – French Track)

D. The Nominations and Elections Committee
E. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual

TITLE: Motion of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws 5.3.B.2.a: Composition of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs, adding two additional members (Provost or designee and Director of Continuing Education).

MOTION: Amend By-Laws 5.3.B.2.a as follows:

2. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

   a. Composition: Five faculty members, at least one of whom is also a member of the Graduate faculty. The Dean of the Graduate School is a non-voting ex-officio member of this committee. The Registrar is an ex-officio member. The Dean of the Graduate School, the Registrar, the Provost or designee, and the Director of Continuing Education are non-voting ex-officio members.

RATIONALE:

The Provost or designee and the Director of Continuing Education have been attending the committee members as guests. The addition to the Provost or designee as a non-voting ex-officio member would formalize his/her role in graduate curriculum matters. The addition of the Director of Continuing Education as a non-voting ex-officio member would keep the committee informed of new continuing education initiatives.
TITLE: Motion of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws 5.2.B.3: Composition and Duties of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual.

Motion: Amend By-Laws 5.2.B.3 as follows:

3. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
   
a. Composition: Three faculty members. Ex-officio members are the Speaker of the Faculty, the Faculty Secretary, and the Provost (or Provost’s designee). The Senior Vice President for Legal Affairs (or designee) is a non-voting, ex-officio member. (Rev. April 2007)

b. Duties:
   
   (1) To review any motions to amend the Faculty By-Laws and report to the Faculty Senate.
   
   (2) To review on a continuing basis the Faculty By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual;

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

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

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

RATIONALE: The change to the committee’s composition clarifies the non-voting status of the Senior Vice President for Legal Affairs or designee. The Senior Vice President for Legal Affairs sits on the committee to advise the committee on the legal ramifications of amendments under consideration, but is
not involved in the committee’s decisions in the way that the other ex officio members are.

Article VI, Section 1 of the By-Laws states that motions to amend or repeal the by-laws “shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the Senate its recommendations on the motion and any amendments at the next Senate meeting.” This amendment specifies that duty under the committee description, mainly to clarify for new and prospective committee members what the committee’s work includes.

F. The Faculty Compensation Committee: End of Year Report

G. The Faculty Welfare Committee: End of Year Report from two subcommittees (Merit and Annual Reviews for Faculty, and the Subcommittee on Adjunct Faculty Welfare)
COMMON REQUIREMENTS OF THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON’S
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

I. General Education Dimensions of Learning

(Based on College of Charleston’s Statement of Purpose For The Common Requirements and The Essential Learning Outcomes of the AAC&U’s Liberal Education & America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative.)

Dimension: Reasoning

Goal: Effective Reasoning

Common Learning Outcome Students will gain analytical and critical reasoning competency through the study of mathematical and scientific reasoning and analysis; social and cultural analysis; interdisciplinary analysis and creative problem-solving.

Measured by applying what is learned to pose and answer progressively more challenging questions.

Supporting Evidence for the competency of:

1. Scientific reasoning and analysis; knowledge of the natural world

The student...
...recognizes and explains appropriate scientific terms
...applies physical/natural principles to analyze and solve problems
...tests hypotheses using data and scientific reasoning
...identifies and analyzes a societal issue using scientific principles

2. Mathematical reasoning and analysis

The student
...models phenomena in mathematical terms
...applies the models to answer questions and establish results
...demonstrates an understanding of the supporting theory apart from any particular application

3. Social and cultural analysis; human behavior and social interaction

The student...
...uses appropriate methodology to formulate questions and evaluate evidence relevant to topics concerning human society and culture
...makes clearly reasoned interpretive explanations and judgments about human societies and cultures

4. Interdisciplinary analysis; creative problem solving

The student...
...applies multiple approaches to interpret complex phenomena
...understands the interconnectedness of knowledge that comes from separate disciplines
...develops new insights and/or innovations by viewing phenomena from multiple perspectives

In order to meet the Effective Reasoning goal, each approved course for a specific competency must assess the measure via one or more items of supporting evidence for that competency.

Dimension: Knowledge

Goal: Integrative Knowledge

Common Learning Outcome Students will gain historical and cultural perspectives, including knowledge of human history and the natural world; artistic, cultural and intellectual achievements; human behavior and social interaction; perspectives and contributions of academic disciplines.

Measured through engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring.

Supporting Evidence for the competency of:
1. **Human History**

   The student...

   ...demonstrates knowledge of human history by interpreting primary source materials in their historical context.

2. **Artistic Achievement**

   The student...

   ...identifies and explains artistic achievements and recognize cultural and historical contexts that influence and are influenced by these achievements.

3. **Cultural Achievement**

   The student...

   ...describes and analyzes cultural achievements using multiple areas of knowledge to evaluate their social, historical, intellectual influence or their ethical dimensions.

4. **Intellectual Achievement**

   The student...

   ...describes and analyzes intellectual achievements using multiple areas of knowledge to evaluate their social, historical, intellectual influence or their ethical dimensions.

5. **Human Behavior and Social Interaction**

   The student...

   ...develops explanations for human behavior and social interaction using appropriate empirical evidence and social scientific methods of inquiry.

6. **Perspective and Contribution of Academic Disciplines**

   The student...

   ...learns the vocabulary of a discipline and applies it appropriately

   ...recognizes and explains concepts employed in the discipline
In order to meet the Integrative Knowledge goal, each approved course for a specific competency must assess the measure via one or more items of supporting evidence for that competency.

**Dimension: Perspective**

**Goal: Enriching Perspectives**

**Common Learning Outcome** Students will gain international and intercultural perspectives, including knowledge of international and global contexts; experiencing, understanding and using multiple cultural perspectives.

**Measured** through coursework, study abroad, and/or involvement with diverse communities and real world challenges that promote enriching experiences and personal reflection.

**Supporting Evidence for the competency of:**

1. *Knowledge of international and global contexts:*

   The student...
   ...
   ...demonstrates knowledge of a culture through an examination of the literary, creative, and/or intellectual achievements of one or more regions or countries other than the US
   
   **OR**
   ...
   ...displays linguistic and or cultural knowledge that enables the student to function more effectively within a culture other than the US.

2. *Experiencing, understanding, and using multiple cultural perspectives:*

   The student...
   ...
   ...analyzes contemporary interconnections between regions/countries through the exploration of one or more global issues, themes and/or conflicts
   
   **OR**
   ...
   ...demonstrates an appreciation of the beliefs/values of a culture different from the student’s own through direct engagement with that culture
In order to meet the Enriching Perspectives goal, each approved course for a specific competency must assess the measure via one or more items of supporting evidence for that competency.

**Dimension: Skills**

**Goal: Foundational Skills**

**Common Learning Outcome** Students will gain competency in research and communication in multiple media and languages, including proficiency in gathering and using information, effective writing and critical reading, oral and visual communication, foreign language.

**Measured** through extensive practice across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging projects and standards for performance.

**Supporting Evidence for the competency of:**

1. **Gathering and using information:**

   The student...

   ...evaluates how digital technologies shape information  
   ...navigates information-rich environment  
   ...assesses the strengths and limitation of local, national and global information sources  
   ...applies multidisciplinary strategies for finding, using and creating information  
   ...develops a functional search strategy for research purposes

2. **Effective writing and critical reading:**

   The student...

   ...recognizes the vocabulary of a discipline and applies it appropriately  
   ...recognizes and explains concepts employed in the discipline  
   ...communicates evidence in a well-organized argument  
   ...demonstrates and presents clear articulation of research results  
   ...synthesizes sources to present a persuasive argument

3. **Oral and visual communication:**
The student...
...creates oral and visual presentations that are appropriate for the situation and the audience
...interprets and employs visual images to communicate ideas and concepts

4. Foreign Languages

For Modern Languages:
The student...

...discerns the meaning of an unfamiliar passage written in the Target Language.

...explains the perspectives of another culture using authentic sources written in the Target Language of that culture for that culture.

...writes simple sentences and paragraphs in the Target Language about familiar topic

For Ancient Languages:
The student...

...discerns the meaning of an unfamiliar passage written in the Target Language.

...explains the perspectives of another culture using authentic sources written in the Target Language of that culture for that culture.

...translates into grammatically correct English, with the aid of a dictionary, an unfamiliar passage written in the Target Language.

In order to meet the Foundational Skills goal, each approved course for a specific competency must assess the measure via one or more items of supporting evidence for that competency.
II. Graduate Attributes of a Liberal Arts and Sciences Education

Goal: Personal and Ethical Perspectives

Common Learning Outcome Students will be encouraged to examine their own lives and be prepared to function intelligently, responsibly, creatively, and compassionately in a multifaceted, interconnected world.

Measured through alumni surveys and review of aggregate records

Supporting evidence for the disposition of:

1. Self-understanding, curiosity and creativity

The student will be encouraged to have experiences that ...

...promote awareness of personal temperament, approaches to learning that enable the student to succeed, and healthy ways to interact with others

...increase one’s desire to learn more about a subject or problem

...generate creative expression or innovative approaches to problems

2. Personal, academic, and professional integrity

The student will demonstrate

...personal honesty and accountability

...understanding of all dimensions of the Honor Code, including the responsible use of knowledge in academic settings

...understanding of integrity in the professional setting or academic discipline relevant to their major

3. Moral and ethical responsibility; community and global citizenship
The student will be encouraged to have experiences that …

...invite reflection on their own values and commitments and to understand why they hold them

...use their talents and /or education to serve others and learn to behave as responsible citizens

III. The Major

Goal: Advance Knowledge and Skills in Major Area of Study

Common Learning Outcome through a sequence of coursework that fosters intellectual growth and extends and builds upon the core curriculum, students will demonstrate advanced skills and knowledge of the discipline and the ability to transfer the skills and knowledge into another setting.

Measured through program assessment
From: Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 13 March 2012 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the 24 January and 7 February 2012 Minutes (see [http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php](http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php))

3. Reports

   The Speaker
   The Provost

4. Old Business

   Academic Planning Committee
   -- Motion of the Academic Planning Committee regarding the sizes of proposed new programs
   -- Motion of the Academic Planning Committee to further modify recently approved rules regarding the reporting of major sizes in the catalog

5. New Business

   -- Faculty Welfare Committee

   -- Faculty Curriculum Committee

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

6. Constituents’ Concerns

7. Adjournment

**Minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site:**
Old Business

TITLE: Motion of the Academic Planning Committee regarding the sizes of proposed new programs

INTRODUCTION:
Preparations are in place for our next SACS visit. In preparing for that visit, it was found that there are some things stated in the College catalog that are in fact false based on the way we have been doing business. The Academic Planning Committee was charged with addressing some of the catalog discrepancies, namely requiring departments to have a major of no more than 36 hours if they did not have one and to limit the maximum number of hours to 54 hours for majors. As a result, a three part motion was brought to the Senate at a previous meeting. The Senate split the motion into three parts, passing the first two and sending the third back to Academic Planning specifically dealing with the 36 hour requirement and the 54 hour maximum requirement. Since this happened at the end of the Senate meeting, part 3 of the proposal was sent back to Academic Planning. As a result of the Senate’s charge, we are proposing the following which was the item as amended by the Senate.

MOTION:
The following guidelines should be adopted as part of the approval process for new or changed majors.

• All proposals for new majors and change of majors are expected to include a demonstration that a student can meet the requirements for graduation in 4 years.
• All proposals for new majors and change of majors that affect the minimum or maximum number of hours must include the minimum and maximum hours and should justify their size.

[Note: If the proposal from the registrar to eliminate the requirement of listing a maximum number of hours should pass, the above should be amended accordingly.]
RATIONALE:

Part Three of the original motion deals with new or changed major proposals.

Bullet One specifies proposals of new or changed majors would need to be able to demonstrate how a student could complete the major in four years. Since these are undergraduate programs with an expectation that they could be completed in four years, advising and planning may be required to complete a large major in four years. The importance of this was noted in the January 17 discussions.

Bullet Two of the motion is formalizing what item two at the January 17, 2012 meeting that was approved requires for the upcoming catalog:

Each department specifies the number of hours in its major program or programs and the actual courses required. Each program listed in the catalog includes a clear articulation of the courses required to complete the major. Each program publishes a credit requirement range that includes the minimum and maximum credits required for the major. The minimum is calculated to exclude courses that may be waived by placement and reflect selection of any options that minimize credit hours required, but in all cases includes all required courses, including course prerequisites and cognate courses completed in another discipline or department. The maximum value is calculated to include all required courses, including course prerequisites and cognate courses completed in another discipline or department, as well as the maximum value in courses that carry variable credit. See specific major requirements in the “Schools” section of the catalog.

So that all new majors or changed majors meet the requirement of providing minimum and maximum ranges for the major, they will need to be provided during the major approval process, namely through submission of the proposal to the Faculty Curriculum Committee. This bullet makes sure new proposals will match language and provide the minimum and maximum numbers for the catalog so that they will meet the requirements of the item two which was approved. This Bullet does include all approved amendments from the January 17 Senate meeting.

The original proposal had a Bullet Three but it was not addressed at the January 17 Senate meeting due to time constraints. Although we could find no verification, the committee felt that the requirement in the catalog for a 36 hour major from departments who had majors of more than 36 hours was probably related to the liberal arts tradition of the College of Charleston which allowed students to have room in their program of study to explore other disciplines. Because this was tabled at the January 17 Senate meeting it was sent back to Academic Planning for reconsideration. Based on the understanding that
36 hours was basically arbitrary and any language such as “encourage” or even “strongly encourage” was essentially meaningless and in light of the fact that the College’s stated mission was to provide a strong liberal arts curriculum, we decided to drop the 3rd bullet. Most of our majors far exceed 36 hours. There are many reasons for that such as accreditation requirements and providing solid foundations for graduate school applications, to name a few. As a result, this is a requirement that is not being followed. Currently, the catalog only lists the School of Business programs as having exception to these rules but in reality, there are many majors that do not meet the catalog requirements.

Discussion in the Academic Planning meetings revolving around removal of this bullet included:

- The numbers for 36 hours is arbitrary. We could not find where or why 36 hours was chosen.
- There will always be programs that need more than 36 hours (Business and Education for accreditation reasons). Students getting degrees in these areas with only 36 hours of coursework would likely not be hired with that minimal background.
- If there is a requirement for 36 hour majors, there would be a proliferation of new programs that may not be needed by students at a time when there has been a moratorium on new programs because of perceived proliferation.

**TITLE:** Motion of the Academic Planning Committee (on behalf of registrar Cathy Boyd) to further modify recently approved rules regarding the reporting of major sizes in the catalog

**INTRODUCTION:**
The senate recently approved a proposal from our committee to provide specific guidelines for reporting the size of majors to students in the catalog. The new rules required that a range of values, from a minimum to a maximum, be listed. After attempting to implement this policy, the registrar returned to our committee with the following proposal to simply forget about the maximum. If this proposal should pass, the rules for computing the minimum will remain the same, but only the minimum will be reported (with a “+” to indicate that it is only a minimum possible value).

**Motion:**

1) The College of Charleston Catalog should state in a consistent format the range of credit hours required for each major. In calculating the credits required to complete a major, departments must report a range with a minimum and maximum value, the minimum number of credits a student would have to earn to complete the major requirements. The undergraduate catalog will display the minimum credit hours with a “+” sign after it to indicate that the number listed is the minimum and completion of the major could involve more credit hours, based on specific course selection.

- The minimum value in the range should exclude courses that can be waived by placement and should reflect choices available within the major requirements that minimize credit hours, but must otherwise include all courses and prerequisites, even those offered by another department (cognates) and those that could be counted towards a General Education requirement.

- The maximum value in the range should represent the total number of hours in required courses and their prerequisites, making selections that would maximize the number of hours taken and count all prerequisites and courses in other disciplines (cognates).

- Each program may add a statement advising students of the courses in the major that may also be used to satisfy General Education requirements. This statement will appear in the same location in the catalog directly beneath the range of credits required to complete the major. *(The major requirements template which the Registrar’s Office and Academic Advising and Planning have created does already include the following*
statement, “Courses within this major may also satisfy general education requirements. Please consult http://advising.cofc.edu/general-edu for more information.”

• These same rules will be considered a College-wide standard for specifying the size of a major as measured in required credit hours in other contexts as well.

Rationale:

The reason for this requested change is that, while the minimum number of hours required is fairly straightforward, the maximum can be very difficult to calculate in some majors, as it could require a circuitous route and unreasonable selection of courses with a maximum number which is higher than any student would choose in real life. Why post a number which would look ridiculous when the student is only required to have the minimum number? All courses which could be used to meet a major requirement will be listed, along with their prerequisites, so there will be transparency.

Also, the degree audit system will only display the minimum number of hours required for the major. After the hours are met, any outstanding major requirements will remain and the Major Block will not be checked as complete until all of the course (and other) requirements are met.

New Business
Report from Faculty Welfare

PROPOSED CHANGES IN TENURE/PROMOTION GUIDELINES
February 2012

Explanation of changes:

The formal conversations leading to these proposed changes began with a retreat, initiated by the Provost’s Office, in which deans, department chairs, and senior faculty leaders (who were serving or had served on Faculty Welfare, the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review, and related committees) responded to some general questions asking what sorts of changes they would like to see in our tenure and promotion guidelines and processes. The outcome of the second day of that retreat was a charge by that group to the Provost’s Office to develop proposals on specific topics. With that charge in hand, the Provost’s Office studied policies at a variety of other institutions, developed the requested proposals, and brought those back to the same senior leadership group via a workshop during the fall semester. With feedback from that workshop, the proposals were modified and shared with deans, department chairs, and select faculty committees: Faculty Welfare, the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review, and the faculty Committee on Bylaws and the FAM. Subsequent to those conversations, the Provost’s Office developed the specific changes in FAM language outlined below and brought that to Faculty Welfare and the Committee on Bylaws and the FAM, chaired by Marty Perlmutter and Scott Peeples, respectively.

The Provost’s Office will convene some faculty groups to further the development of additional proposals regarding the evaluation of teaching and research. Other than a change regarding outside reviews of research, the language below does not include any proposed FAM changes of that nature.

The specific outcomes of the retreat and subsequent conversations that are addressed in the proposed FAM changes below are:

• There was strong support, if not unanimous consensus, for communication to the candidate (and, as appropriate, the evaluation panel chair and dean) the basis of recommendations at every level of review.
• There was strong support for providing a means, at all levels of review, for requests for information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for determination of a recommendation.
• There was strong support for a formal review and approval of any proposed departmental and school guidelines by the Provost’s Office, with the Advisory Committee playing only a consultative role in this review. Additionally, regular reviews were requested.
• There was strong support for a requirement that each department develop a written policy on whether external review of research is required and that no solicitation of external reviews of research be allowed unless the FAM-expressed process for selecting reviewers is followed.
• There was strong support for providing the candidate the ability to correct errors of fact during various stages of the review. However, there were also expressed substantial concerns that these corrections ought to be short and that the distinction between errors of fact and professional judgment are not always clear.
• There are minor changes in the language on external reviews being proposed: to allow for more than five external reviewers and to clarify one aspect of the process of selecting those reviewers.

Changes marked in blue were proposed by the Provost’s Office (consistent with the tenure/promotion changes that had been created in consultation with the faculty) and were taken to Faculty Welfare and Bylaws. The burgundy changes were made based on consultation with Bylaws. The yellow highlighted changes were proposed last year and endorsed by the Faculty Senate.
PROPOSED CHANGES:

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)
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. The Departmental Evaluation Panel chair may solicit names of potential additional reviewers from people named on the candidate's list. No more than half of the reviews should be secured from the candidate's own list. The candidate is allowed to strike one name from the panel chair's list. The external reviewers chosen should be appropriately qualified to conduct an independent review of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements.

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

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

The panel chair must include in the candidate's packet: (1) a description of the process by which the outside letters were obtained, (2) each reviewer's institutional and departmental affiliation, and rank or other institutional title, a description of the academic specialization of the reviewer, and other relevant information about the reviewer, which may be useful to those unfamiliar with the field, (3) a copy of the letter of solicitation by the panel chair, and (4) the confidential outside reviews. (Ins. April 2007)

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

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

(a) professionally published scholarly books
(b) academic journal articles
(c) chapters in scholarly books
(d) edited volumes
(e) review essays
(f) creative literary and artistic works and other creative works

(g) research grants

(h) conference papers

(i) reviews of candidate's books, performances, etc.

(j) scholarly reviews by candidate of books, performances, etc.

(k) invited or juried exhibits, concerts, performances, etc.

(l) technical reports

(m) textbooks, workbooks, study guides and other published pedagogical materials

(n) draft manuscripts

(o) professional bibliographies

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

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

(b) serving on an editorial board of a scholarly journal

(c) reviewing manuscripts for journals and publishers; evaluating proposals for granting agencies

(d) chairing or serving as a discussant on a panel at a professional meeting

(e) preparing grant proposals and reports

(f) conducting professional workshops, seminars, and field trips
(g) participating in professional meetings, seminars, workshops, field trips, etc.

(h) undertaking post-doctoral studies

(i) receiving fellowships and awards

(j) serving as a professional consultant

3. Professional Service to the Community

a. **Standard**

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

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

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

(1) Evaluatee’s narrative of service activities.

(2) Departmental and extra-departmental colleague letters:

   i. Departmental colleague letters evaluating service are required.

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

   (Ins. April 2007)

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

4. Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

What follow are minimum criteria for tenure and promotion. Each department may develop additional-appropriate criteria, which must be written, available and on file in the Office of the Provost. Departments and schools may develop additional criteria. Any such proposed criteria will require review and approval by the appropriate academic dean and Provost's Office to ensure consistency with college-wide guidelines and procedures. Additionally, they shall be reviewed by the originating body every five years and will require review and approval by the dean and the Provost's Office when modified.

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 (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

....

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

....

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—C, 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)

If the panel’s written statement provided to the candidate contains an error of fact, the panel chair may correct this error through an addendum to the original panel statement (with notice to the candidate) or the candidate may provide a written correction for inclusion in the packet for consideration at higher levels of review within five working days of the provision of the recommendation. The written correction should be forwarded to the dean with a copy to the chair of the departmental panel. The written correction should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence.2

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 and interview each candidate. Information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested by the Dean from the Departmental Evaluation Panel chair or through that chair to the candidate. Requests should be written and responses should be brief and also in writing, addressing only the requested issue, and shall become part of the packet. The Dean shall interview each candidate.

The Dean shall provide the candidate and the chair of the departmental panel a copy of his/her assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the Provost. 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)

2 This and other changes in procedure to allow for the correction of errors of fact will be analyzed for the extent and appropriateness of their use after two years (AY2012-13 and AY2013-14) by Academic Affairs in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review and the Faculty Welfare Committee. These groups will jointly report this analysis to the Faculty Senate. These changes will sunset unless ratified partially or totally by Academic Affairs by Fall 2014.
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. Information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested by the Dean from the Departmental Evaluation Panel chair or through that chair to the candidate. Requests should be written and responses should be brief and also in writing, addressing only the requested issue, and shall become part of the packet. The Dean may choose to interview candidates.

The Dean will provide the candidate and the chair of the departmental panel a copy of his/her assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the Provost 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)

(Add as a new section)

10. Correction of errors in Dean’s Recommendation

If a recommendation provided to the candidate by a dean contains an error of fact, the dean may correct this error through an addendum to his/her original letter of recommendation (with notice to the candidate and chair of the departmental panel) or the candidate may provide a written correction for inclusion in the packet for consideration at higher levels of review within five working days of the provision of the recommendation. The written correction should be forwarded to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs with a copy to the dean and chair of the departmental panel. The written correction should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence.\(^3\)

40-11. 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,

\(^3\) This and other changes in procedure to allow for the correction of errors of fact will be analyzed for the extent and appropriateness of their use after two years (AY2012-13 and AY2013-14) by Academic Affairs in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review and the Faculty Welfare Committee. These groups will jointly report this analysis to the Faculty Senate. These changes will sunset unless ratified partially or totally by Academic Affairs by Fall 2014.
Promotion and Third-Year Review. The Faculty Advisory Committee shall provide the candidate, chair of the departmental panel, dean, and Provost a copy of his/her their assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the President 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 either the Dean’s decision recommendation is different from the departmental evaluation panel or the departmental evaluation panel vote is negative, he/she the Dean 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)

Information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested by the Chair of the Advisory Committee from the Dean, Departmental Evaluation Panel chair, or through that chair to the candidate. Requests should be written and responses should be brief and also in writing, addressing only the requested issue, and shall become part of the packet. Both the request for information and the response should also be sent, for information, to levels of review between the Advisory Committee and the responding body.

(move this next sentence to end of previous paragraph because it refers only to Third-Year Review cases and is already dealt with for tenure and promotion cases in the earlier paragraph.)

The Provost’s recommendations for all reviews and the Faculty Advisory Committee’s recommendations in cases where they act shall be submitted in writing to the President by the announced deadlines.
(Rev. April 2009)

If a recommendation provided to the candidate by the Advisory Committee contains an error of fact, the candidate may provide a written correction for inclusion in the packet for consideration at higher levels of review within five working days of the provision of the recommendation. The written correction should be forwarded to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs with a copy to the chair of the Advisory Committee, the dean and the chair of the departmental panel. The written correction
should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence.  

§11-12. 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) In all cases in which the Provost’s recommendation is negative or reverses an earlier decision, the Provost will provide a copy of his/her recommendation to the candidate, chair, dean, and chair of the Advisory Committee simultaneously with notice to the candidate of the President’s decision.

§12-13. 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)

---

4 This and other changes in procedure to allow for the correction of errors of fact will be analyzed for the extent and appropriateness of their use after two years (AY2012-13 and AY2013-14) by Academic Affairs in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review and the Faculty Welfare Committee. These groups will jointly report this analysis to the Faculty Senate. These changes will sunset unless ratified partially or totally by Academic Affairs by Fall 2014.  

5 Deadlines for earlier stages of the review process are prior to March 1 and are announced by Academic Affairs each year.
Faculty Curriculum Committee
For March, 2012 Senate Meeting

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


II. **Course Proposals**: All proposals involving only courses (new/changed/deleted) will be voted on as a single group, unless a Senator wishes to isolate a specific proposal for discussion and a separate vote. Senators are asked to contact the Faculty Speaker or the Faculty Secretary in advance, if they wish to separate a proposal from the group. Of course, this action can also be done on the floor of the Senate.

- **Art History**: NEW COURSE: ARTH287 New Media in Contemporary Art
- **English**: CHANGE COURSE: Change prerequisites for ENGL378 Fiction Writing II and ENGL377: Poetry Writing II
- **Latin American & Caribbean Studies**: NEW COURSE: LACS332 Latin American Politics and Society in Film
- **Psychology**: CHANGE COURSE: Change prerequisites for all PSYC46x labs (to be consistent with old prereqs while old BS remains in place)
- **Theatre**: CHANGE COURSE: THTR381 Stagecraft 2, THTR240 Costume 1, THTR209 Stagecraft 1, THTR27 Rendering for the Theatre, THTR383 Scene Design. Change prerequisites and edit descriptions. NEW COURSE: THTR230 Fundamentals of Theatrical Design, THTR345 Advanced Makeup & Hair Design
- **Philosophy**: NEW COURSE: PHIL210 Philosophy, Law and the Arts

III. **Program Changes**:

- **Discovery Informatics**: CHANGE OF MINOR: Deleting MATH355 Bayesian Statistical Inference (no longer offered) and adding MATH350 Statistical Methods II
- **Latin American & Caribbean Studies**: CHANGE MINOR: Add LACS332 to minor
- **International Studies**: CHANGE PROGRAM: 1) Add two courses to Int Studies Asia Concentration (in History/Politics section) -- POLI346 Politics of SE Asia and POLI365 International Relations of the Middle East 2) Under "International Politics, History, and Geography" requirement add HIST 102, 116, and HONS 130 as alternatives (would read HIST 104 or HIST 102 or HIST 116 or HONS130)
CHANGE PROGRAM: Add concentration to both majors. Concentration titled: Politics, Philosophy, and the Law (PPLW). Also, change major req's for PHI and PLOI majors from PHI 450 to PHI 450 or PPLW 400 and from PLOI405 to PLOI405 or PPLW 400

IV. New Programs:

Academic Affairs/College of North Chas Campus Bachelors of Professional Studies Program

Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for the Faculty Senate 13 March, 2012 Meeting

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

Master of Science in Accountancy:

Course deletion proposals:

- ACCT 513-Financial Statement Analysis
- ACCT 551-Corporate Transactional Data Management
- ACCT 552-Quantitative Analysis for Accountants
- ACCT 553-Advanced Corporate Transactional Data Management
- ACCT 554-Advanced Quantitative Analysis for Accountants
- ACCT 555-Information Technology Governance and Infrastructure Lifecycle Management
- ACCT 556-Protection of Information Assets

New course proposals:

- ACCT 599-Contemporary Accounting Issues
- ACCT 570-European Origins of Modern Accountancy (Study Abroad)
- ACCT 575-European Financial Markets (Study Abroad)
The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 7 February 2012 at 5 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order


3. Reports
   - The Speaker
   - The Provost

4. New Business
   --Faculty Curriculum Committee
   --Graduate Council – Modification of an existing degree program: Master of Public Administration (see [http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php](http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php))
   --Committee on General Education – Motion to approve criteria for the purpose of reviewing proposals from departments and programs requesting that individual courses and/or sequences be counted for General Education credit

5. Constituents’ Concerns

6. Adjournment

**Minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site: [http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/index.php](http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/index.php)**
New Business

Faculty Curriculum Committee
February, 2012 Meeting

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

I. Course Proposals: All proposals involving only courses (new/changed/deleted) 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.

History
Change Course (change pre-requisites for all upper-division courses)

Psychology
New Course PSYC335: Positive Psychology
New Course PSYC469: Advanced Developmental with Lab
Delete Course PSYC360-level labs (been replaced with 460-level labs)

Political Science
New Course POLI319: Special Topics in Public Policy

Economics & Finance
Change Course ECON350: Financial Markets in the US Economy (update description)
New Course ECON324: Game Theory

Biology
New Course BIOL412: Capstone in Molecular Biology

Women & Gender Studies
New Course WGST120: Studies in Women's and Gender Studies
New Course WGST420: Seminar in Women's and Gender Studies
New Course WGST499: Bachelor's Essay
Change Course WGST320: Special Topics in Women's and Gender Studies (change the course number)

Health & Human Performance
Change Course PEHD100 to PEAC100: Introduction to Fitness
Change Course PEHD115 to PEAC115: Physical Conditioning and Weight Training
Change Course PEHD116 to PEAC116: Beginning Golf
Delete Course PEHD112: Beginning Gymnastics

II. Program Changes:

History
Change Program (incorporate changes above)

Psychology
Change Program (incorporate new PSYC469 lab to the list of courses that satisfy the lab req)

Biology
Change Program (incorporate new course)
Women & Gender Studies Change Program (incorporate changes above)

Health & Human Performance Change Program (change credit hours for BS: Athletic Training from 54 to 52)

III. New Programs: NONE
Committee on General Education

MOTION: Approve the following criteria to be used by the Committee on General Education for the purpose of reviewing proposals from departments and programs requesting that individual courses and/or sequences be counted for General Education credit. The Committee on General Education will then forward their recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

NOTE: The approval criteria in this motion arose from a January 9, 2012 workshop organized for this purpose by the Committee on General Education and the Office of Academic Affairs. The workshop participants were solicited from the relevant schools and departments across campus.

Approval Criteria for Natural Science

The primary purpose of the course is the study of fundamental principles of natural or physical science.

To receive general education credit in natural science, a course must:

1) Provide experience in the practice of science as a part of a coordinated 2-course sequence, both with accompanying labs to provide appropriate depth.

2) Apply physical/natural principles to analyze and solve problems.

3) Be in a 2-course sequence that provides an appreciation for the impact science has on society.

Approval Criteria for First Year Writing

The primary purpose of the course is to teach academic writing.

To receive general education credit in first year writing, a course must:

1) Require that students generate a minimum of 20 pages of graded writing.

2) Require that formal writing make up at least 50% of the course grade.

3) Assign formal papers requiring students to construct persuasive arguments, analyze the arguments of others, and incorporate research material that includes persuasive evidence from experts.
4) Require that students analyze and evaluate numerous examples of academic writing, conduct library research, and incorporate academic research materials in their papers.

5) Provide several opportunities for individualized feedback by the instructor and revision by the student.

6) Have a course size of no more than 20 students.

Approval Criteria for Social Science

The primary purpose of the course is to provide explanations for human behavior, social interaction, and/or social institutions.

To receive general education credit in social science, a course must:

1) Provide a survey of a particular social science discipline or demonstrate ways in which the (more narrowly focused) material being covered in the course connects to other areas in the social sciences more generally.

2) Expose students to empirical evidence and the varieties of social scientific methods of inquiry.

3) Examine the impact the social sciences have on society.

Approval Criteria for Humanities

The primary purpose of the course is the examination of particular expressions of human culture in their social, historical, intellectual, aesthetic, or ethical dimensions.

To receive general education credit in humanities, a course must:

1) Analyze how ideas are represented, interpreted, or valued in these cultural expressions.

2) Examine relevant primary source materials as understood by the appropriate discipline(s).

3) Require students to interpret the material in writing assignments (or alternatives that require equally coherent and sustained analysis).
Approval Criteria for History

Pre-Modern History:

The primary purpose of the course is to develop knowledge of the history of human civilizations, societies, and cultures in the pre-modern era.

To receive general education credit in pre-modern history, a course must:

1) Develop knowledge of the history of human civilizations, societies, and cultures and an awareness of the historical experience through the study of the political, social, cultural, and intellectual aspects of the pre-modern era.

2) Require that students situate primary historical records in their contexts and use these sources to construct historical arguments.

3) Cover substantial historical developments and periods within the pre-modern period, rather than only specific episodes.

Modern History

The primary purpose of the course is to develop knowledge of the history of human civilizations, societies, and cultures in the modern period.

To receive general education credit in modern history, a course must:

1) Develop knowledge of the history of human civilizations, societies, and cultures and an awareness of the historical experience through the study of the political, social, cultural, and intellectual aspects of the modern era.

2) Require that students situate primary historical records in their contexts and use these sources to construct historical arguments.

3) Cover substantial historical developments and periods within the modern period, rather than only specific episodes.

Approval Criteria for Foreign Languages

The primary purpose of the course is to learn a language other than English.

To receive general education credit in foreign languages, a course must:

1) Require that students learn how to read, write, and understand languages other than English.
2) Require that students use languages other than English to learn about the perspectives of historical and/or modern cultures that can be obtained only through the language.

RATIONALE: Under Article V, Section 3, Part B, Paragraph 18 c (2), of the Faculty Organization and By Laws, the Committee on General Education’s Course approval procedures state: The Committee shall be responsible for publishing the approval criteria for each requirement, as well as proposal forms and instructions that may be used by any department or program. The department or program proposing the course is responsible for supplying evidence that the course fulfills the criteria that the Senate has approved for a particular requirement.

The Committee on General Education makes this motion in partial fulfillment of this requirement.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Approval Criteria for Mathematical Reasoning and Analysis Gen Ed Requirement (On April 5, 2011, the Senate approved changing the “Mathematics or Logic” general education requirement to the “Mathematical Reasoning and Analysis Requirement” along with the following reformatted Approval Criteria. What follows is being offered for information only and is not a part of this motion).

The course must have as its primary purpose the modeling of phenomena in mathematical terms.

To receive general education credit in mathematical reasoning and analysis, a course must:

1) 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.

2) Expand the students’ knowledge of mathematics beyond what is required by MATH 101 and any of the course’s prerequisites.

In addition, 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).
From: Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 17 January 2012 at 5 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the 6 December 2011 Minutes (see http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php)

3. Reports
   The Speaker
   The Provost

4. New Business
   --Faculty Curriculum Committee
   --Academic Planning Committee - Motion to Change the Rules Regarding Sizes of Majors and to Standardize the Reporting of Major Sizes in the Catalog

5. Constituents’ Concerns

6. Adjournment

**Minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site: http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/index.php**
New Business

Faculty Curriculum Committee
January, 2012 Meeting
List of Proposals Approved by the Committee
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

I. Course Proposals: None

II. Program Changes: None

III. New Programs:

Economics & Finance

New Program: BS, Finance
Change of Minor: change existing minor/concentration to reflect new major
Change of Course Proposals:
  - FINC313: Management of Financial Institutions
  - FINC382: International Financial Markets
  - FINC385: Principles of Risk Management & Insurance
  - FINC386: Risk Management
  - FINC410: Seminar in Finance

New Course Proposals:
  - FINC389: Financial Management Information Systems
  - FINC401: Fixed Income Investment Analysis
  - FINC402: Derivative Securities
  - FINC415: Advanced Business Finance
  - FINC418: Advanced Valuation and Corporate Financial Analysis
Academic Planning Committee

Motion to Change the Rules Regarding Sizes of Majors and to Standardize the Reporting of Major Sizes in the Catalog

Introduction:

In Fall 2011, it became evident that the rules appearing in the catalog describing the allowable number of credit hours for a major appear to be in conflict with the actual offerings. A related problem is that the sizes of majors are not clearly and consistently reported to students. At the request of the Registrar and the Speaker of the Faculty, the Committee was charged with making a recommendation to the Senate to address these problems.

Proposal:

1) The College of Charleston Catalog should state in a consistent format the range of credit hours required for each major. In calculating the credits required to complete a major, departments must report a range with a minimum and maximum value.

   • The minimum value in the range should exclude courses that can be waived by placement and should reflect choices available within the major requirements that minimize credit hours, but must otherwise include all courses and prerequisites, even those offered by another department (cognates) and those that could be counted towards a General Education requirement.

   • The maximum value in the range should represent the total number of hours in required courses and their prerequisites, making selections that would maximize the number of hours taken and count all prerequisites and courses in other disciplines (cognates).

   • Each program may add a statement advising students of the courses in the major that may also be used to satisfy General Education requirements. This statement will appear in the same location in the catalog directly beneath the range of credits required to complete the major.

   • These same rules will be considered a College-wide standard for specifying the size of a major as measured in required credit hours in other contexts as well (e.g. in item 3 below).

2) The catalog statement on Major Requirements (pp. 18-19, 2011-2012) is inaccurate and should be changed:
Current Language:
A major program requires at least 27 semester hours in one department. No major program, including interdepartmental programs, requires more than 54 semester hours in the major Academic Regulations area except business administration and accounting due to accreditation requirements. Every department that offers a major requiring more than 36 hours also offers a major of not more than 36 hours for the student’s choice, except those within the School of Business and Economics. Within these minimum and maximum limitations, each department specifies the number of hours in its major program or programs, and in some instances specifies the actual courses required. See specific major requirements in the “Schools” section of the catalog.

Revised Language:
A major program requires at least 27 semester hours. Each department specifies the number of hours in its major program or programs and the actual courses required. Each program listed in the catalog will include a clear articulation of the courses required to complete the major. Each program will publish a credit requirement range that includes the minimum and maximum credits required for the major. The minimum will be calculated to exclude courses that may be waived by placement and reflect selection of any options that minimize credit hours required, but in all cases will include all required courses, including course prerequisites and cognate courses completed in another discipline or department. The maximum value will be calculated to include all required courses, including course prerequisites and cognate courses completed in another discipline or department, as well as the maximum value in courses that carry variable credit. See specific major requirements in the “Schools” section of the catalog.

3) The following guidelines should be adopted as part of the approval process for new majors.

• A proposal is expected to include a demonstration that a student can meet the requirements for graduation in 4 years.

• Majors with a range minimum above 54 hours will be expected to justify this size (e.g. by reference to accreditation requirements or in comparison to national standards in that discipline).

• Every department will be encouraged to offer a degree with a range minimum of no more than 36 hours.

Rationale:
The lack of transparency in the catalog and in DegreeWorks regarding the sizes of majors and the apparent contradiction between the rules listed in the catalog and the actual offerings are problematic for both students and faculty. Importantly, they could theoretically also affect the College’s ability to be reaccredited. It is therefore clear that something must be done to address these issues, and it must be done prior to April 2012 in order to affect the catalog in time for our next SACS evaluation.
The APC selected the option outlined above from a large number of alternatives. Among the main determining factors in this decision were:

* It seems misleading to fail to consider prerequisites, cognates and courses outside of a given department as being part of the number of credit hours required by a program. The range of values as specified above is a more reasonable figure to provide a student who wishes to take the size of the degree requirement into account when selecting a major.

* If prerequisites and courses in any discipline are to be counted, then there are many programs existing on campus which would appear to be in violation of at least one of the two rules in the catalog setting an upper limit on the number of hours required by a major besides the two exceptions already noted in the catalog.

* Replacing the rules with looser guidelines will often achieve the same goals as the original rules while acknowledging the reality that disciplinary accreditation and preparing students in certain fields for employment/graduate school will justify many exceptions.
From: Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 6 December 2011 at 5 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the 1 November 2011 Minutes (see [http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php](http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php))

3. Reports

   - The Speaker
   - The Provost
   - Heath Hoffmann (Faculty Welfare Committee)
   - Bob Mignone (General Education Committee)

4. Old Business

   Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
   -- Motion of the By-Laws Committee to change/clarify eligibility to serve as a Senator
   -- Motion to change the FAM, VI.H.2, Post-tenure Review, Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member’s Packet

5. New Business

   -- Faculty Curriculum Committee

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

   -- Motion for the approval of degree candidates for the December graduation ceremony

6. Constituents’ Concerns

7. Adjournment

**Minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site:** [http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/index.php](http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/index.php)
Old Business

Motion of the By-Laws Committee to change/clarify eligibility to serve as a Senator.

Change to Article IV, Section 2, B (Eligibility to serve as a Senator).

Introduction and purpose of change:

This change in the by-laws would clarify that in order to be eligible to serve as a Senator, someone must be able to fulfill regularly the duties of the role.

Proposed change with new wording indicated in *italics underline*:

Article IV, Section 2, B:
A Faculty Senator must be a full-time tenured, tenure-track, Instructor, or Senior Instructor employee of the College who has completed at least three years of service at the College, and who normally teaches at least three contact hours per semester or the equivalent in assigned research or who is a full-time professional librarian. Without regard to teaching load, Department Chairs, Assistant Department Chairs, and Associate Department Chairs who otherwise would be members of the regular faculty are eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. (App. April 2005) Administrative officers, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Academic Deans, the Dean of the Honors College, Associate Deans, and Assistant Deans are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. Faculty members on Leave, *teaching away from the Charleston campuses, or for other reasons unable to attend Senate meetings regularly*, are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. (Rev. May 2009)

Rationale:

The immediate past Speaker had to consider cases about Senate eligibility for faculty who were teaching in College of Charleston overseas programs. Since the by-laws were silent about this issue, he asked the By-Laws Committee to consider it. Because there might be other cases besides teaching abroad in which a faculty member was unable to fulfill Senate duties, the motion includes more general language. Note that Article IV, Section 2, G as written already explains the process for replacing Senators who lose their eligibility during a term.
Motion of the By-Laws Committee to endorse a modified version of the Post-Tenure Review Committee’s motion from 1 November Senate meeting

Change the *FAM*, VI.H.2, Post-tenure Review, Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member’s Packet

Introduction and purpose of change (memo from By-Laws committee to Post-Tenure Review Committee’s motion):

The Faculty By-Laws Committee met on Oct. 21 to review your proposal to amend the FAM (VI.H.2), introduced at the October 4 Faculty Senate meeting.

We fully support your proposal to delete the reference to “exemplary teaching effectiveness,” which contradicts the description of a “superior” rating in section VI.H.6.a.1 (p. 136) of the FAM.

However, we recommend striking the other changes to section VI.H.2.a from the proposal for the following reasons:

1. The list refers to materials that the faculty member must assemble, and the faculty member is not responsible for providing a letter from the dean or a letter from the department chair. Those letters are described in the next section (VI.H.3, currently p. 134) of the FAM, “Recommendation by the Department Chair and the Dean.”

2. We believe the order in which items in the packet appear should be established by a memo generated by Academic Affairs and the Post-Tenure Review Committee at the beginning of the academic year. That level of detail (the order of the items) is more of a procedural concern rather than policy, and we believe the FAM should, as far as possible, be restricted to policy.

3. We deleted the sentence limiting the narrative to ten pages because we thought it would have the unintended effect of encouraging faculty to write longer narratives by suggesting that they should come close to the 10-page limit; and more generally because it’s a level of detail that we think is best left to a procedural memo.

4. In Item 9 of your proposal (Item 7 in our revision), we made further deletions to language currently in the FAM describing what constitutes evidence of scholarly merit, because that’s covered in Section VI.A.4.c and VI.A.4.d of the FAM. We believe it is better to reference these criteria than to duplicate them.

5. Finally, we changed the last item, concerning late packets, to a separate letter (VI.H.2.b) because it is not part of the list of materials candidates must assemble.
Proposed change with new wording indicated in *italics underline*:

H. **Post-Tenure Review**

1. **Introduction**

   A post-tenure review will be conducted for each tenured faculty member during the sixth year since her/his previous extra-departmental review.

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

   a. A faculty member shall submit to his/her Department Chair by the announced deadline a packet of material that must include:

   (Rev. April 2009)

   (1) A letter from the candidate indicating the rating for which he/she wishes to be considered.

   (2) **Letter from the dean with recommendations.**

   (3) **Letter from the department chair with recommendations.** For department chairs undergoing post-tenure review, a departmental post-tenure review panel with most senior tenured faculty writes this letter.

   (2) **Curriculum vitae.**
(3)(6) Statement from the candidate on teaching, research and service addressing accomplishments since the last review and future plans and goals. **This should be one narrative, no more than ten pages.**

(4)(7) Annual performance evaluations by the department chair during the period under review. In the event that a department chair is being evaluated, the dean's annual evaluations of the chair will be included instead.

(5)(8) Computer-generated student teaching evaluations (summary pages with numbers) for all evaluated courses taught by the candidate during the period under review.

(9) Other evidence of accomplishments in the competency areas:

Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore, the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). Candidates must provide evidence that the scholarly material submitted is peer reviewed, juried or professionally evaluated. On co-authored articles, the candidate must indicate the degree of contribution. Sample of course syllabi (no more than three).

(4)(6) **Candidates seeking a "superior" rating must furnish two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers concerning aspects of the candidate's teaching (or, for librarians, professional competency).**

(40)(7) Candidates seeking a "superior" rating must also furnish clear evidence of exemplary teaching effectiveness **that they continue to perform at the level expected for the promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the standards criteria of the Faculty/Administration Manual, as indicated in**
Sect. 6.a.(1) VI. A. 4. c below for instructional faculty and VI. C. 4. d for Library faculty. In particular, they must demonstrate sustained high-quality and effective teaching (exemplary professional competency in the case of librarians), leadership in service, and continuing quality scholarship, active and sustained service to the College, and leadership in either College service or in the candidate’s professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community. Candidates seeking a "superior" rating must demonstrate either exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in all three areas. This evidence must include two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers, concerning aspects of the candidate’s teaching (or, for librarians, professional competency). Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore, the evidence must also include at least two scholarly articles and/or books scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). Candidates must provide evidence that the scholarly material submitted is peer reviewed, juried or professionally evaluated—Evidence is to be compiled for the intervening period between promotion evaluation and/or post-tenure reviews.

b. 7 11 A late packet will not be considered for a superior rating except in extraordinary circumstances. A letter must accompany the packet to explain these circumstances.
Faculty Curriculum Committee  
December, 2011 Meeting  
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

I. Course Proposals: All proposals involving only courses (new/changed/deleted) 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.

- Urban Studies:
  - New Course Proposal: URST320, Town & Country Planning

- Communications:
  - Delete Course Proposals: COMM436, Crisis Communication; COMM435, Public Relations Campaigns; COMM482, Rhetoric & Identity

- Computer Science:

II. Program Changes:

- International Studies:
  - Change of Major Proposal: International Studies
    - Add French under Foreign Language Requirement
    - Add FREN320/326 as course options for Latin American & Caribbean concentration

- Arts Management:
  - Change of Minor Proposal: Arts Management
    - Reduction of number of hours required for the minor: 18 hours for School of Arts and School of Business majors, 21 hours for other majors.

- Political Science:
  - Change of Major Proposal: BS, Political Science
    - Add New Courses (POLI294, 310, 311, 331, 333, 335, 346, 360, and 365; see attached full description)
    - Shifting from POLS to POLI for remaining courses (Turned in as New Course Proposals; see attached full description)
    - Delete Courses (POLS302, 337, 340, 391, 395, 397; see attached full description)
    - Changed Courses (POLS335, 345, 352, 360, 365, 366, 380, 397; see attached full description)
    - Subfield organization changes to major
      - American Politics and Processes (courses: 210-239, 300-339)
      - Global Politics and Spaces (courses: 240-279, 340-379)
      - Politics of Ideas (courses: 280-299, 380-399)
  - Change of Minor Proposal
    - Change minor to reflect changes from POLS to POLI, Add new courses under POLI

III. New Programs:

- Economics & Finance:
  - New Program: BS, Finance
  - Change of Minor: change existing minor/concentration to reflect new major
  - Change of Course Proposals:
    - FINC313: Management of Financial Institutions
    - FINC382: International Financial Markets
• FINC385: Principles of Risk Management & Insurance
• FINC386: Risk Management
• FINC410: Seminar in Finance

New Course Proposals:
• FINC389: Financial Management Information Systems
• FINC401: Fixed Income Investment Analysis
• FINC402: Derivative Securities
• FINC415: Advanced Business Finance
• FINC418: Advanced Valuation and Corporate Financial Analysis

Political Science Proposal Details

New courses:
• POLI 294 – Sustainability (Politics of Ideas)
• POLI 310 – Urban Applications of Geographic Information Systems (American Politics and Processes)
• POLI 311 – Policy Making in State Legislatures
• POLI 331 – Geography of Native Lands/Indian Law (American Politics and Processes)
• POLI 333 – Suburbia: People, Places, and Politics (American Politics and Processes)
• POLI 335 – Religion in American Politics (American Politics and Processes)
• POLI 346 – Politics of Southeast Asia (Global Politics and Spaces)
• POLI 360 – International Human Rights Law (Global Politics and Spaces)
• POLI 365 – International Relations of the Middle East (Global Politics and Spaces)

Courses moving from 300 to 200 level:
• POLS 380 – POLI 213 – State and Local Politics
• POLS 397 – POLI 214 – LGBT Politics
• POLS 335 – POLI 245 – Cuban Revolution
• POLS 366 – POLI 266 – International Diplomacy Studies
• POLS 360 – POLI 260 – International relations Theory
• POLS 365 – POLI 265 – International Political Economy
• POLS 352 – POLI 292 – Topics in Gender, Theory and Law
• POLS 345 – POLI 293 – Ethics in Politics

Deletions: (Deletion means a course that will not move from POLS to POLI, although we are obviously also deleting all POLS courses:
• POLS 337 – Geography and Politics of US and Canada
• POLS 340 – Democratic and Anti-democratic thought
• POLS 397 – Race, ethnicity and the city
• POLS 391 – Extremist Politics
• POLS 395 – American Federalism
• POLS 302 – Policy evaluation

All other courses going from POLS to POLI (below is a list of all changes and shifts):
• POLS 101 – POLI 101 – Intro to American Government
• POLS 102 – POLI 102 – Contemporary Political issues
• POLS 103 – POLI 103 – World Politics
• POLS 104 – POLI 104 – World Regional Geography
• POLS 119 – POLI 119 – Special Topics in Politics
• POLS 200 – POLI 210 – Introduction to Public Administration
• POLS 201 – POLI 211 – Intro to Public Policy
• POLS 210 – POLI 210 – Introduction to Comparative Political Analysis
• POLS 220 – POLI 203 – Criminal Justice
• POLS 221 – POLI 295 – Law and Society
• POLS 250 – POLI 150 – Introduction to Political Thought
• POLS 251 – POLI 205 – Doing Research in Politics
• POLS 301 – POLI 301 – Bureaucratic Politics and Policy
• POLS 304 – POLI 304 – American Foreign Policy Process
• POLS 305 – POLI 305 – Urbanization and Urban Geography
• POLS 306 – POLI 306 – Urban Policy
• POLS 307 – POLI 307 – Environmental Policy
• POLS 308 – POLI 308 – Education Policy
• POLS 309 – POLI 309 – Health Policy
  o POLI 310 – Urban Applications in GIS
  o POLI 311 – Policymaking in State Legislatures
• POLS 310 – POLI 397 – Environmental Geography
• POLS 319 – POLI 319 – Special topics in public administration and public policy
• POLS 321 – POLI 340 – Politics of Latin America
• POLS 322 – POLI 342 – Politics of Africa
• POLS 323 – POLI 343 – Politics of East Asia
• POLS 324 – POLI 344 – Politics of the Middle East
• POLS 338 – POLI 345 – Politics of China
  o POLI 346 – Politics of Southeast Asia
• POLS 328 – POLI 347 – International Development: Theories and practices (new title)
• POLS 329 – POLI 348 – Protest and Revolution
• POLS 330 – POLI 350 – Comparative Gender Politics
• POLS 333 – POLI 351 – Politics of Contemporary Brazil
• POLS 334 – POLI 352 – Geographies and politics of the European Union
• POLS 335 – POLI 245 – Cuban Revolution
• POLS 336 – POLI 353 – Geographies and Politics of Food
• POLS 339 – POLI 339 – Special Topics in Comparative Politics
• POLS 341 – POLI 320 – Constitutional Law
• POLS 342 – POLI 321 – Civil Liberties
• POLS 344 – POLI 380 – Jurisprudence
• POLS 345 – POLI 293 – Ethics and Politics
• POLS 347 – POLI 387 – American political thought
• POLS 350 – POLI 390 – Contemporary Liberalism
• POLS 351 – POLI 391 – Utopia/Dystopia
• POLS 352 – POLI 292 – Topics in Gender, Theory and Law (new title)
  o POLI 294 – Sustainability
• POLS 355 – POLI 395 – Global Political Theory
• POLS 359 – POLI 399 – Special Topics in Politics of Ideas
• POLS 360 – POLI 260 – International Relations Theory
  o POLI 360 International Human rights Law
• POLS 363 – POLI 363 – International Law and organization
• POLS 364 – POLI 364 – International Environmental Politics
• POLS 365 – POLI 265 – International Political Economy (change number)
• POLS 366 – POLI 266 – International Diplomacy Studies (change number)
  o POLI 365 – International Relations of the Middle east
• POLS 367 – POLI 367 – Geography of International Conflict
• POLS 368 – POLI 368 – Political Geography
• POLS 369 – POLI 369 – The politics of Globalization
• POLS 379 – POLI 379 – Special Topics in International Relations
• POLS 380 – POLI 213 – State and Local Politics (new title, added local)
• POLS 381 – POLI 322 – Urban Government and Politics
• POLS 382 – POLI 323 – The Congress
• POLS 383 – POLI 324 – The Judiciary
• POLS 384 – POLI 325 – The Presidency
• POLS 386 – POLI 326 – American Politics and the Mass media
• POLS 387 – POLI 327 – Political Parties (new title) (from parties and interest grps)
• POLS 388 – POLI 328 – Campaigns and elections (new title from elections, participation and voting)
• POLS 389 – POLI 329 – Public Opinion in American Politics
• POLS 390 – POLI 330 – Southern Politics
  o POLI 331 Geography of Native Lands
• POLS 392 – POLI 332 – Women and Politics
  o POLI 333 Suburbia: People, Places, and Politics
  o POLI 335 Religion in American Politics
• POLS 394 – POLI 334 – Political Campaign Communication
• POLS 397 – POLI 214 -- LGBT Politics
• POLS 399 – POLI 339 – Special Topics in American Politics
• POLS 400 – POLI 400 -- Tutorial
• POLS 401 – POLI 401 – Independent Study
• POLS 402 – POLI 402 -- Internship
• POLS 405 – POLI 405 – Capstone –
• POLS 499 – POLI 499 -- Bachelor’s essay

Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for the Faculty Senate 6 December, 2011 Meeting

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

Proposals for new courses – Master of Business Administration

  MBAD 530: Principles of Revenue Management in Hospitality
  MBAD 531: Forecasting and Business Analytics in Hospitality
  MBAD 532: Channel Management Strategies in Hospitality
  MBAD 560: Special Topics

Change to the Continuing Education Policies: “Policies for Non-Credit Programs” (for information)
FACULTY WELFARE ISSUES AT THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON:

RESULTS OF A FACULTY SURVEY

COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE, 2011-12

Faculty Welfare Committee Members

Martin Perlmutter (Committee Chair) -- Philosophy, Jewish Studies
   Viviane Bekrou -- French & Italian
   Margaret Hagood -- Teacher Education
   Heath Hoffmann -- Sociology and Anthropology
   Stephane Lafortune -- Mathematics
   Simon Lewis -- English
   Amanda Ruth-McSwain -- Communication
   Allison Welch -- Biology
   Kelley White -- Teacher Education
Objective

In August of 2011, the Faculty Welfare Committee conducted an electronic poll of College of Charleston faculty asking them to identify the faculty welfare issues of most concern to them. The Committee’s goal was to use this information to set the agenda for the Committee’s work in 2011-12. Ninety-two faculty members responded to that poll, identifying approximately 240 different faculty welfare issues that generally coalesced under the three categories of 1) faculty compensation and salary compression, 2) relations between faculty and the college’s administration, and 3) the college’s tenure and promotion policies and procedures.

Faculty responses to that poll made it clear that concerns about these and other issues were varied and multi-faceted. To better capture the different dimensions of the above three issues and understand how widespread these concerns might be among college faculty, the Faculty Welfare Committee administered a follow-up survey in October 2011. The follow-up survey was not intended to gauge faculty support for various proposals to address faculty welfare issues. Rather, this committee wanted to determine the weight of faculty sentiment in relation to various welfare issues to direct the Faculty Welfare Committee’s work this year.

Methods

The Faculty Welfare Committee developed a 40-item questionnaire, which consisted of statements reflecting different opinions about faculty compensation, the state of relations between faculty and the college’s administration, and tenure and promotion at the college. Respondents were asked to read each statement and indicate whether they Strongly Agreed, Agreed, Disagreed, Strongly Disagree or had No Opinion about each statement. Respondents were also asked to identify their faculty rank, the School in which their home department was located and whether they served in an administrative role at the college (e.g., department chair or program director).

On October 5, 2011, An e-mail was sent to faculty who subscribe to the college’s Faculty Listserve, inviting them to complete the electronic survey. Two follow-up e-mails were sent to faculty via the Faculty Listserve on October 12 and 19, reminding them of the request to complete the survey. On October 5, we also sent an e-mail to Department Chairs who subscribe to the Chairs Listserve, asking them to forward the original e-mail invitation to faculty through their respective departmental listserves to increase the likelihood that all active faculty would be invited to complete the survey.

Results

While 337 people opened the electronic survey, only 285 faculty completed the entire survey. The 60 faculty members who opened the survey, but did not answer questions, may have been reviewing the survey prior to answering it or were simply curious about the different kinds of questions contained in the survey.

Using the e-mail listserves to solicit faculty participation in this survey prohibits the calculation of a response rate because we do not know how many faculty members subscribe to the listserv. However, we can determine whether the survey sample is representative of the college faculty population by comparing the rank of those who completed the survey with the distribution of faculty at the college. Table 1 presents this comparison data, showing that our sample fairly closely resembles the college population with the major exception being the representation of adjunct faculty in our survey results. Adjunct professors constitute eight percent of our survey sample but are approximately 24% of college faculty. The underrepresentation of adjunct faculty likely reflects the absence of adjunct faculty on the Faculty e-mail Listserv and thus most adjunct faculty did not receive the e-mail solicitation to participate in this survey.
Table 1. Distribution of Survey Respondents by Rank and School Affiliation Compared to College Population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>College Population</th>
<th>Faculty Home School</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>College Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Professor</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>~24%</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Ed., Health &amp; Hum. Perf.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Hum. &amp; Social Sci.</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Lang., Cult., Wrld. Affairs</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Science &amp; Math</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus Professor</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Faculty data obtained from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning show that the college has 555 roster faculty and 381 “other non-roster teaching faculty” (e.g., adjuncts, deans/administrators, contract faculty, consortium faculty, etc.). The percentage of college faculty who are adjunct professors is based on the assumption that 225 adjunct faculty are currently employed by the college. A recent presentation by Academic Affairs indicated that “more than 200” adjuncts currently worked at the college—we rounded that up to 225 which, as an approximate value, is likely close to the actual number of adjunct faculty.

Twenty respondents did not indicate their rank or school affiliation on the survey. There may be several reasons for this. First, we mistakenly omitted Librarian among the list of choices for faculty rank but corrected this shortly after the survey was released. However, we mistakenly omitted Library as an option for School affiliation and never did correct this error in the survey. Second, an Instructor category was mistakenly omitted as a response category. These three omissions might explain why some faculty did not indicate their rank on the survey. It is also possible that some faculty respondents worried that identifying their rank and/or School affiliation would in some way jeopardize their anonymity.

The survey results reported below are presented in a number of different ways. On page 4-5, the raw survey results are reported for each question. Pages 6-17 report the survey results as crosstabulations by faculty members’ rank and separately by faculty members’ school affiliation. To simplify the presentation of the crosstabulated survey results, the survey response categories of Strongly Agree and Agree and Strongly Disagree and Disagree have been collapsed into respective “agree” and “disagree” categories. Because 20 respondents did not indicate their rank and school affiliation, the crosstabulated survey results generally reflect the responses of 265 faculty members who did indicate their rank and/or School affiliation.

Please click on the hyper-linked text below to go directly to the crosstabulated results organized by topical area.

- Faculty Compensation: Frequency Summary of Faculty Members’ Responses (p. 4)
- Faculty Administration Relations: Frequency Summary of Faculty Members’ Responses (p. 4)
- Tenure and Promotion: Frequency Summary of Faculty Members’ Responses (p. 5)
- Faculty Compensation by Faculty Members’ Rank (pp. 6-7)
- Faculty Compensation by School Affiliation of Faculty Member (pp. 8-9)
- Faculty-Administration Relations by Faculty Members’ Rank (pp. 10-11)
- Faculty-Administration Relations by School Affiliation of Faculty Member (pp. 12-13)
- Tenure and Promotion by Faculty Members’ Rank (pp. 14-15)
- Tenure and Promotion by School Affiliation of Faculty Member (pp. 16-17)
## FACULTY COMPENSATION ISSUES: SUMMARY OF FACULTY MEMBERS’ RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am happy with how the college is handling faculty compensation.</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>11.58%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>32.60%</td>
<td>14.56%</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I intend to apply for faculty positions at other institutions because I am unhappy with my salary.</td>
<td>16.56%</td>
<td>24.35%</td>
<td>23.94%</td>
<td>14.56%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Given the current state of the economy, I feel that faculty at the College of Charleston have fared pretty well in terms of compensation.</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>24.51%</td>
<td>44.55%</td>
<td>22.49%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Decisions made by the Board of Trustees and the State Legislature are preventing the college from improving faculty compensation.</td>
<td>36.71%</td>
<td>37.08%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
<td>19.43%</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The fact that our faculty have not been forthcoming is a compliment to how the administration has been governing the college.</td>
<td>9.12%</td>
<td>50.89%</td>
<td>23.51%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>8.92%</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The college's administration has not done enough to address faculty compensation and salary.</td>
<td>34.36%</td>
<td>44.56%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>7.02%</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Despite the fact that College of Charleston faculty are underpaid compared to faculty at our peer institutions, I would still accept a position here if I had to do it over again.</td>
<td>9.12%</td>
<td>36.22%</td>
<td>24.65%</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
<td>14.63%</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am optimistic that faculty compensation is being addressed since President Benson recently announced plans to ask the Board of Trustees for a merit bonus this year and a commitment to member-based salary increases for 2012-13.</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>35.99%</td>
<td>32.98%</td>
<td>16.04%</td>
<td>12.29%</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I am frustrated that our raises are determined solely on merit when the cost-of-living continues to increase.</td>
<td>42.46%</td>
<td>30.53%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
<td>8.22%</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>It is unfair that some junior faculty are making as much or more than senior faculty.</td>
<td>42.46%</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>7.07%</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Taking on an administrative position at the college is the only way to make more money.</td>
<td>40.49%</td>
<td>30.17%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>7.06%</td>
<td>10.62%</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Adjunct faculty should be eligible to receive pay increases whenever roster faculty receive pay increases.</td>
<td>32.32%</td>
<td>36.59%</td>
<td>12.29%</td>
<td>5.68%</td>
<td>8.77%</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>If I had to choose between addressing the salary of roster faculty versus the pay that adjuncts receive, I would support addressing compensation for our long-time adjuncts first.</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>23.94%</td>
<td>10.01%</td>
<td>15.69%</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The merit review process is too much work in years when little money is available for faculty raises.</td>
<td>52.28%</td>
<td>27.02%</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>7.32%</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONS: SUMMARY OF FACULTY MEMBERS’ RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The size of the college’s administration (e.g., number of Executive Vice-Principals and Associate Vice-Principals) is appropriate given our college’s size and strategic plan.</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>12.37%</td>
<td>30.06%</td>
<td>41.34%</td>
<td>15.15%</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am happy with the college administration’s responsiveness to issues that faculty bring to their attention.</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
<td>40.21%</td>
<td>20.90%</td>
<td>12.48%</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Appropriate faculty committees and/or faculty representatives are consulted before the college’s administration makes decisions relating to academic issues.</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>20.14%</td>
<td>31.45%</td>
<td>23.35%</td>
<td>18.82%</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am happy with the state of faculty governance at the College of Charleston.</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>28.88%</td>
<td>38.40%</td>
<td>12.31%</td>
<td>15.65%</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In the last several years, the College of Charleston has hired more administrators than is necessary.</td>
<td>44.17%</td>
<td>26.09%</td>
<td>7.57%</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>10.61%</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The college prioritizes spending on personnel lines for non-academic administrators over spending on new faculty lines.</td>
<td>36.04%</td>
<td>36.24%</td>
<td>6.01%</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am pleased with the level of communication that comes from the President’s office.</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>22.78%</td>
<td>30.20%</td>
<td>28.47%</td>
<td>11.93%</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The President’s office is attentive to the issues of most importance to my department.</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
<td>35.11%</td>
<td>40.07%</td>
<td>13.48%</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I am pleased with the level of communication that comes from the Office of Academic Affairs.</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>30.25%</td>
<td>23.98%</td>
<td>23.49%</td>
<td>14.51%</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Office of Academic Affairs is attentive to the issues of most importance to my department.</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>20.64%</td>
<td>27.74%</td>
<td>29.18%</td>
<td>15.68%</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I am pleased with the level of communication that comes from my Dean.</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>44.09%</td>
<td>18.31%</td>
<td>12.06%</td>
<td>8.36%</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Dean of my School is attentive to the issues of most importance to my department.</td>
<td>33.75%</td>
<td>41.93%</td>
<td>12.43%</td>
<td>12.12%</td>
<td>8.16%</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TENURE AND PROMOTION: SUMMARY OF FACULTY MEMBERS' RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I have a clear understanding of the criteria one must meet to have a successful tenure and promotion review.</td>
<td>11.15%</td>
<td>24.46%</td>
<td>28.16%</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>5.42%</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The requirements for a successful tenure and promotion review are constantly shifting.</td>
<td>35.36%</td>
<td>35.36%</td>
<td>15.16%</td>
<td>4.33%</td>
<td>9.35%</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I favor replacing the college-wide TSP Advisory Committee with school-based committees.</td>
<td>30.60%</td>
<td>31.52%</td>
<td>12.66%</td>
<td>12.41%</td>
<td>11.59%</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tenure and promotion standards are applied equitably across Schools.</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>8.35%</td>
<td>31.52%</td>
<td>30.01%</td>
<td>23.52%</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Quality teaching is overshadowed by research productivity in tenure and promotion reviews.</td>
<td>36.02%</td>
<td>28.62%</td>
<td>15.52%</td>
<td>7.68%</td>
<td>13.36%</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The low student response rate in on-line course evaluations could have a negative impact on junior faculty during tenure and promotion reviews.</td>
<td>51.71%</td>
<td>31.95%</td>
<td>8.39%</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td>5.42%</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The tenure and promotion process at the College of Charleston is fundamentally sound; meritorious faculty are retained.</td>
<td>4.23%</td>
<td>33.56%</td>
<td>27.37%</td>
<td>30.61%</td>
<td>15.08%</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Faculty Administration Manual should be revised to clarify the requirements for tenure and promotion.</td>
<td>35.36%</td>
<td>37.91%</td>
<td>9.39%</td>
<td>21.17%</td>
<td>15.08%</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Faculty members are treated humanely throughout the entire TSP process.</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
<td>27.44%</td>
<td>22.74%</td>
<td>26.71%</td>
<td>23.22%</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>We have lost some meritorious faculty due to unsuccessful tenure and promotion reviews.</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
<td>30.80%</td>
<td>15.22%</td>
<td>4.74%</td>
<td>27.54%</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The ways in which I am asked to spend my time (teaching, research and service) do not reflect how faculty are evaluated for tenure and promotion.</td>
<td>37.06%</td>
<td>29.35%</td>
<td>17.03%</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>13.41%</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Compensation by Faculty Members' Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your current rank at the College of Charleston?</th>
<th>Visiting Professor</th>
<th>Adjunct Professor</th>
<th>Senior Instructor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Emeritus</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am happy with how the college is handling faculty compensation.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to apply for faculty positions at other institutions because I am unhappy with my salary.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the current state of the economy, I feel that faculty at the College of Charleston have fared pretty well in terms of compensation.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions made by the Board of Trustees and the State Legislature are preventing the college from improving faculty compensation.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fact that our faculty have not been furloughed is a compliment to how the administration has been governing the college.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college's administration has not done enough to address faculty compensation and salary compression.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite the fact that College of Charleston faculty are underpaid compared to faculty at our peer institutions, I would still accept a position here if I had to start over again.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am optimistic that faculty compensation is being addressed since President Riono recently announced plans to ask the Board of Trustees for a merit bonus this year and a commitment to merit-based salary increases for 2012-13.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am frustrated that our raises are determined solely on merit when the cost of living continues to increase.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### FACULTY COMPENSATION BY FACULTY MEMBERS’ RANK, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your current rank at the College of Charleston?</th>
<th>Visiting Professor</th>
<th>Adjunct Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Professor Emeritus</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is unfair that some junior faculty are making as much or more than senior faculty.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Option</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking on an administrative position at the college is the only way to make more money.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>64.11%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Option</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>19.61%</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>16.36%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking on an administrative position at the college is the only way to make more money.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>88.24%</td>
<td>74.55%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Option</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>19.61%</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>16.36%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct faculty should be eligible to receive pay increases whenever roster faculty receive pay increases.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>88.24%</td>
<td>74.55%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Option</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>19.61%</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>16.36%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had to choose between addressing the salary of roster faculty versus the pay that adjuncts receive, I would support addressing compensation for our long-time adjuncts first.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.09%</td>
<td>50.02%</td>
<td>69.09%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>19.61%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Option</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>16.36%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The merit review process is too much work in years when little money is available for faculty raises.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58.10%</td>
<td>160.00%</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>25.57%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>9.92%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Option</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.91%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Compensation by Faculty Members' School Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of the Arts</th>
<th>School of Business</th>
<th>School of Education, Health and Human Performance</th>
<th>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</th>
<th>School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs</th>
<th>School of Sciences and Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.78%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>16.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I intend to apply for faculty positions at other institutions because I am unhappy with my salary.

- Given the current state of the economy, I feel that faculty at the College of Charleston have fared pretty well in terms of compensation.

- Decisions made by the Board of Trustees and the State Legislature are preventing the college from improving faculty compensation.

- The fact that our faculty have not been furloughed is a compliment to how the administration has been governing the college.

- The college's administration has not done enough to address faculty compensation and salary compression.

- Despite the fact that College of Charleston faculty are underpaid compared to faculty at our peer institutions, I would still accept a position here if I had to do it over again.

- I am optimistic that faculty compensation is being addressed since President Benson recently announced plans to ask the Board of Trustees for a merit-based salary increase for 2012-13.

- I am frustrated that our raises are determined solely on merit when the cost-of-living continues to increase.

- It is unfair that some junior faculty are making as much or more than senior faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of the Arts</th>
<th>School of Business</th>
<th>School of Education, Health and Human Performance</th>
<th>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</th>
<th>School of Languages, Culture and World Affairs</th>
<th>School of Science and Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taking on an administrative position at the college is the only way to make more money.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.69%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjunct faculty should be eligible to receive pay increases whenever roster faculty receive pay increases.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.11%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If I had to choose between addressing the salary of roster faculty versus the pay that adjuncts receive, I would support addressing compensation for our long-time adjuncts first.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The merit review process is too much work in years when little money is available for faculty raises.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.22%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONS BY FACULTY MEMBERS’ RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your current rank at the College of Charleston?</th>
<th>Visiting Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Emeritus</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The size of the college's administration (e.g., number of Executive Vice-Presidents and Associate Vice-Presidents) is appropriate given our college's size and strategic plan.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Agree</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52.38%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy with the college administration's responsiveness to issues that faculty bring to their attention.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Agree</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate faculty committees and/or faculty representatives are consulted before the college administration makes decisions relating to academic issues.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Agree</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy with the state of faculty governance at the College of Charleston.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last several years, the College of Charleston has hired more administrators than it is necessary.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>89.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college prioritizes spending on personnel lines for non-academic administrators over spending on new faculty hires.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am pleased with the level of communication that comes from the President’s office.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The President’s office is attuned to the issues of most importance to my department.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONS BY RESPONDENT’S RANK, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your current rank at the College of Charleston?</th>
<th>Visiting Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Professor Emeritus</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am pleased with the level of communication that comes from the Office of Academic Affairs.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1 (20.00%)</td>
<td>5 (29.11%)</td>
<td>6 (52.87%)</td>
<td>16 (69.94%)</td>
<td>26 (16.13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1 (20.00%)</td>
<td>5 (29.11%)</td>
<td>9 (52.87%)</td>
<td>26 (62.94%)</td>
<td>66 (66.04%)</td>
<td>10 (50.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>3 (60.00%)</td>
<td>11 (52.87%)</td>
<td>2 (11.76%)</td>
<td>11 (20.00%)</td>
<td>6 (6.52%)</td>
<td>6 (8.70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Office of Academic Affairs is attuned to the issues of most importance to my department.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2 (20.00%)</td>
<td>7 (42.00%)</td>
<td>9 (50.22%)</td>
<td>32 (56.16%)</td>
<td>70 (70.09%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2 (20.00%)</td>
<td>9 (42.00%)</td>
<td>13 (70.22%)</td>
<td>32 (56.16%)</td>
<td>38 (65.00%)</td>
<td>60 (70.09%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2 (40.00%)</td>
<td>8 (38.10%)</td>
<td>3 (15.75%)</td>
<td>12 (21.82%)</td>
<td>4 (6.83%)</td>
<td>11 (15.94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am pleased with the level of communication that comes from my Dean.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1 (20.00%)</td>
<td>13 (61.90%)</td>
<td>13 (71.47%)</td>
<td>38 (69.90%)</td>
<td>60 (65.22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3 (20.00%)</td>
<td>14 (69.90%)</td>
<td>23 (61.47%)</td>
<td>18 (69.90%)</td>
<td>20 (31.52%)</td>
<td>10 (16.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>6 (60.00%)</td>
<td>23 (69.90%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00%)</td>
<td>1 (3.23%)</td>
<td>1 (1.62%)</td>
<td>5 (8.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dean of my School is attuned to the issues of most importance to my department.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1 (20.00%)</td>
<td>9 (42.06%)</td>
<td>13 (71.47%)</td>
<td>38 (69.90%)</td>
<td>64 (65.22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2 (20.00%)</td>
<td>6 (26.57%)</td>
<td>2 (11.76%)</td>
<td>14 (54.55%)</td>
<td>24 (24.55%)</td>
<td>17 (24.55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>4 (40.00%)</td>
<td>28 (65.77%)</td>
<td>2 (11.76%)</td>
<td>3 (8.45%)</td>
<td>4 (3.85%)</td>
<td>4 (5.80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL AFFILIATION</td>
<td>School of the Arts</td>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>School of Education, Health and Human Performance</td>
<td>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>School of Languages, Culture, and World Affairs</td>
<td>School of Science and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree, Agree</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Opinion</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree, Agree</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Opinion</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree, Agree</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Opinion</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree, Agree</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Opinion</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree, Agree</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Opinion</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree, Agree</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Opinion</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree, Agree</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Opinion</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The size of the college's administration (e.g., number of Executive Vice-Presidents and Associate Vice-Presidents) is appropriate given our college's size and strategic plan.**

**I am happy with the college administration's responsiveness to issues that faculty bring to their attention.**

**Appropriate faculty committees and/or faculty representatives are consulted before the college administration makes decisions relating to academic issues.**

**I am happy with the state of faculty governance at the College of Charleston.**

**In the last several years, the College of Charleston has hired more administrators than is necessary.**

**The college prioritizes spending on personnel lines for non-academic administration over spending on new faculty lines.**

**I am pleased with the level of communication that comes from the President's office.**

**The President's office is attuned to the issues of most importance to my department.**
FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONS BY FACULTY MEMBERS’ SCHOOL AFFILIATION, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In which of the following School is your home department located?</th>
<th>School of the Arts</th>
<th>School of Business</th>
<th>School of Education, Health and Human Performance</th>
<th>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</th>
<th>School of Languages, Culture and World Affairs</th>
<th>School of Science and Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am pleased with the level of communication that comes from the Office of Academic Affairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>5 27.72%</td>
<td>3 16.07%</td>
<td>11 39.29%</td>
<td>32 22.05%</td>
<td>15 26.40%</td>
<td>17 20.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>10 55.56%</td>
<td>11 61.11%</td>
<td>14 50.00%</td>
<td>57 58.16%</td>
<td>16 41.03%</td>
<td>35 54.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>3 16.67%</td>
<td>4 22.22%</td>
<td>3 10.71%</td>
<td>9 9.18%</td>
<td>8 16.67%</td>
<td>12 18.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Office of Academic Affairs is attuned to the issues of most importance to my department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>3 16.67%</td>
<td>2 11.11%</td>
<td>8 28.07%</td>
<td>22 22.45%</td>
<td>11 28.95%</td>
<td>10 15.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12 66.67%</td>
<td>13 72.22%</td>
<td>18 64.29%</td>
<td>63 64.29%</td>
<td>21 55.26%</td>
<td>40 62.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>3 16.67%</td>
<td>3 16.67%</td>
<td>2 7.14%</td>
<td>13 13.27%</td>
<td>6 15.79%</td>
<td>14 21.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am pleased with the level of communication that comes from my Dean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>8 44.44%</td>
<td>4 22.22%</td>
<td>23 82.14%</td>
<td>65 67.35%</td>
<td>24 41.54%</td>
<td>51 79.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7 38.89%</td>
<td>12 72.22%</td>
<td>5 17.28%</td>
<td>29 28.28%</td>
<td>12 36.77%</td>
<td>6 9.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>3 16.67%</td>
<td>1 5.56%</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td>3 3.00%</td>
<td>3 7.06%</td>
<td>7 10.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dean of my School is attuned to the issues of most importance to my department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>8 44.44%</td>
<td>2 11.11%</td>
<td>22 73.57%</td>
<td>70 71.43%</td>
<td>22 56.41%</td>
<td>53 82.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7 38.89%</td>
<td>14 77.28%</td>
<td>6 21.43%</td>
<td>22 22.45%</td>
<td>14 35.50%</td>
<td>4 6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>3 16.67%</td>
<td>2 11.11%</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td>6 6.12%</td>
<td>3 7.09%</td>
<td>7 10.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TENURE AND PROMOTION BY FACULTY MEMBERS’ RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your current rank at the College of Charleston?</th>
<th>Visiting Professor</th>
<th>Adjunct Professor</th>
<th>Senior Instructor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Professor Emeritus</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Option</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The requirements for a successful tenure and promotion review are constantly shifting.

| Strongly Agree, Agree                                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| Agree, Strongly Disagree                               | 2                 | 4                 | 4                | 2                  | 1                  | 1        | 1                 | 1        |
| Disagree, Strongly Disagree                            | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| No Option                                              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |

I favor replacing the college-wide T&AMP Advisory Committee with school-based committees.

| Strongly Agree, Agree                                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| Agree, Strongly Disagree                               | 2                 | 4                 | 4                | 2                  | 1                  | 1        | 1                 | 1        |
| Disagree, Strongly Disagree                            | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| No Option                                              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |

Tenure and promotion standards are applied equitably across Schools.

| Strongly Agree, Agree                                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| Agree, Strongly Disagree                               | 2                 | 4                 | 4                | 2                  | 1                  | 1        | 1                 | 1        |
| Disagree, Strongly Disagree                            | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| No Option                                              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |

Quality teaching is overshadowed by research productivity in tenure and promotion reviews.

| Strongly Agree, Agree                                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| Agree, Strongly Disagree                               | 2                 | 4                 | 4                | 2                  | 1                  | 1        | 1                 | 1        |
| Disagree, Strongly Disagree                            | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| No Opinion                                              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |

The low student response rate in on-line course evaluations could have a negative impact on junior faculty during tenure and promotion reviews.

| Strongly Agree, Agree                                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| Agree, Strongly Disagree                               | 2                 | 4                 | 4                | 2                  | 1                  | 1        | 1                 | 1        |
| Disagree, Strongly Disagree                            | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| No Opinion                                              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |

The tenure and promotion process at the College of Charleston is fundamentally sound; meritorious faculty are retained.

| Strongly Agree, Agree                                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| Agree, Strongly Disagree                               | 2                 | 4                 | 4                | 2                  | 1                  | 1        | 1                 | 1        |
| Disagree, Strongly Disagree                            | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| No Opinion                                              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |

The Faculty Administration Manual should be revised to clarify the requirements for tenure and promotion.

| Strongly Agree, Agree                                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| Agree, Strongly Disagree                               | 2                 | 4                 | 4                | 2                  | 1                  | 1        | 1                 | 1        |
| Disagree, Strongly Disagree                            | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| No Opinion                                              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |

Faculty members are treated humanly throughout the entire TAP process.

| Strongly Agree, Agree                                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| Agree, Strongly Disagree                               | 2                 | 4                 | 4                | 2                  | 1                  | 1        | 1                 | 1        |
| Disagree, Strongly Disagree                            | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| No Opinion                                              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                  | 0                  | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
### TENURE AND PROMOTION BY FACULTY MEMBERS’ RANK, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your current rank at the College of Charleston?</th>
<th>Visiting Professor</th>
<th>Adjunct Professor</th>
<th>Senior Instructor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Professor Emeritus</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>We have lost some meritorious faculty due to unsuccessful tenure and promotion reviews.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The ways in which I am asked to spend my time (teaching, research and service) do not reflect how faculty are evaluated for tenure and promotion.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>80.96%</td>
<td>25.53%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TENURE AND PROMOTION BY FACULTY MEMBERS’ SCHOOL AFFILIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In which of the following Schools is your home department located?</th>
<th>School of the Arts</th>
<th>School of Business</th>
<th>School of Education, Health and Human Performance</th>
<th>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</th>
<th>School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs</th>
<th>School of Sciences and Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I have a clear understanding of the criteria one must meet to have a successful tenure and promotion review.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.00%</td>
<td>28.00%</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63.57%</td>
<td>59.13%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The requirements for a successful tenure and promotion review are constantly shifting.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89.29%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>94.44%</td>
<td>89.29%</td>
<td>74.49%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.28%</td>
<td>35.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.47%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.64%</td>
<td>15.80%</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I favor replacing the college-wide Tenure/P-Advisory Committee with school-based committees.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55.11%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.13%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>17.56%</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.13%</td>
<td>17.56%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure and promotion standards are applied equitably across Schools.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>61.11%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>8.18%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.28%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>25.51%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality teaching is overshadowed by research productivity in tenure and promotion reviews.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>61.11%</td>
<td>61.11%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74.49%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>20.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>20.71%</td>
<td>35.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The low student response rate in on-line course evaluations could have a negative impact on junior faculty during tenure and promotion reviews.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88.71%</td>
<td>88.78%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>54.44%</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88.78%</td>
<td>73.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>9.19%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>17.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The tenure and promotion process at the College of Charleston is fundamentally sound; meritorious faculty are retained.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>72.22%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of the Arts</td>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>School of Education, Health and Human Performance</td>
<td>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>School of Languages, Culture and World Affairs</td>
<td>School of Science and Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty members are treated humanely throughout the entire TBampP process.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>27.18%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>30.61%</td>
<td>17.35%</td>
<td>46.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>56.12%</td>
<td>51.28%</td>
<td>51.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.67%</td>
<td>18.67%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>13.27%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We have had some meritorious faculty due to unsuccessful tenure and promotion reviews.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>58.10%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>18.67%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>20.41%</td>
<td>12.82%</td>
<td>34.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>41.03%</td>
<td>41.03%</td>
<td>24.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The ways in which I am asked to spend my time (teaching, research and service) do not reflect how faculty are evaluated for tenure and promotion.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>61.11%</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>82.14%</td>
<td>74.45%</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>46.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>26.41%</td>
<td>12.82%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.78%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>17.95%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary  
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 1 November 2011 at **6 P.M.** in Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115). Please note the modified time - this meeting will start at 6:00 p.m. in order to minimize the overlap with The College Reads. This meeting will adjourn no later than 7:00 p.m.

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the 4 October 2011 Minutes (see [http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php](http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php))

3. Reports
   
   The Speaker

4. New Business
   
   Curriculum Committee

5. Constituents’ Concerns

6. Adjournment

*All minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site: [http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/index.php](http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/index.php)*
Faculty Curriculum Committee
November 1, 2011 Meeting
List of Proposals Approved by the Committee
(All curricular proposals along with supporting
documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

I. Course Proposals: All proposals involving only courses (new/changed/deleted) 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.

Health & Human Performance
Change of course ATEP437L: Therapeutic Modalities Lab (change cr hrs from 0 to 1)
Change of course ATEP430L: Therapeutic Exercise Lab (change cr hrs from 0 to 1)
Delete courses: PEHD185, PEHD186, PEHD138, PEHD137, PEHD135
Change course: PEHD102 to PEAC102, PEHD103 to PEAC103, PEHD104 to PEAC104, PEHD105 to PEAC105, PEHD107 to PEAC107, PEHD108 to PEAC108, PEHD109 to PEAC109, PEHD110 to PEAC110, PEHD113 to PEAC113, PEHD117 to PEAC117, PEHD118 to PEAC118, PEHD119 to PEAC119, PEHD120-1 to PEAC120-1, PEHD190 to PEAC130, PEHD133 to PEAC133, PEHD139 to PEAC139, PEHD120-2 to PEAC120-2, PEHD120-2 to PEAC120-2
**see attached list of courses with titles**

Arts Management
New course ARTM499: Bachelor’s Essay

French, Francophone, & Italian Studies
New course FREN491: Topics in Contemporary French & Francophone Cultures

Linguistics
New course LING490: Special Topics

Psychology
New course PSYC404: Teaching Mentorship
Change of course PSYC400: Independent Study to PSYC498 (change number & description)
Change of course PSYC499: Bachelor’s Essay (change of description)
New course PSYC497: Tutorial
Delete course PSYC399: Tutorial

II. Program Changes:

Health & Human Performance
Change of Major (Athletic Training) to incorporate course changes above (reqs changes to credit hours of major)
Change of Major (Physical Education/Teacher Education) to replace PEHD105 & 117 with PEAC105 & 117 **see attached list of courses with titles**

Linguistics
Change of Minor (Linguistics) to include new course above and ENGL309

Psychology
Change of Major to include course changes above
**Accidentally left off October’s Agenda**
Change of Major: Change economics requirement for minor from ECON201 to ECON200.

**III. New Programs:** None

---

**Course Change Proposals for Faculty Curriculum Committee**
Submitted by the Department of Health and Human Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>COURSE NUMBER/NAME or DEGREE</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proposal to change degree requirements for the major | BS: Athletic Training | 1. Increase credit hours for ATEP 430 lab and ATEP 437 lab  
2. Increase major BS in Athletic Training by 2 hours. |
<p>| Proposal to Change a Course | ATEP 430L | Change from zero to 1 credit hour |
| Proposal to Change a Course | ATEP 437L | Change from zero to 1 credit hour |
| Proposal to change degree requirements for the major | BS: Physical Education/Teacher Education | Replace required courses PEHD 105 and PEHD 117 with PEAC 105 and PEAC 117 |
| Proposal to Change a Course | PEHD 102, Beginning Yoga | Change to PEAC 102, Beginning Yoga |
| Proposal to Change a Course | PEHD 103, Martial Arts | Change to PEAC 103, Martial Arts |
| Proposal to Change a Course | PEHD 104 Beginning Figure (Ice) Skating | Change to PEAC 104 Beginning Figure (Ice) Skating |
| Proposal to Change a Course | PEHD 105 Basketball &amp; Volleyball | Change to PEAC 105 Basketball &amp; Volleyball |
| Proposal to Change a Course | PEHD 107 Beginning Swimming | Change to PEAC 107 Beginning Swimming |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal to Change a Course</th>
<th>PEHD Course Name</th>
<th>Change to PEAC Course Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 108 Advanced Swimming</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 108 Advanced Swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 109 Aerobics</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 109 Aerobics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 110 Step Aerobics</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 110 Step Aerobics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 113 Beginning Horseback Riding</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 113 Beginning Horseback Riding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 115 Physical Conditioning and Weight Training</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 115 Physical Conditioning and Weight Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 117 Badminton &amp; Racquetball</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 117 Badminton &amp; Racquetball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 118 Beginning Sailing</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 118 Beginning Sailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 119 Beginning Tennis</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 119 Beginning Tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 120-1 Social Dance</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 120-1 Social Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 120-2 Advanced Horseback Riding</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 120-2 Advanced Horseback Riding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 120-2 Intermediate Ice Skating</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 120-2 Intermediate Ice Skating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 130 Intermediate Sailing</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 130 Intermediate Sailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 133 Intermediate Horseback Riding</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 133 Intermediate Horseback Riding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 139 African Dance</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 139 African Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Delete a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 135, Elementary Jazz Dance</td>
<td>List only as THTR 135, Elementary Jazz Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Delete a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 137, Elementary Modern Dance</td>
<td>List only as THTR 137, Elementary Modern Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Delete a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 138, Intermediate Modern Dance</td>
<td>List only as THTR 138, Intermediate Modern Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Delete a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 185, Elementary Ballet</td>
<td>List only as THTR 185, Elementary Ballet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Delete a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 186, Intermediate Ballet</td>
<td>List only as THTR 186, Intermediate Ballet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary
To: Faculty and Staff

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 4 October 2011 at 5 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the 13 September 2011 Minutes (see http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php)

3. Reports
   
   The Speaker
   The Provost

4. Old Business
   
   Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
   -- Motion to change the term of the Speaker of the Faculty and Faculty Secretary

5. New Business
   
   A. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
      -- Motion to change, clarify eligibility to serve as a Senator

   B. Post-Tenure Review Committee
      -- Motion to change the FAM, VI.H.2, Post-tenure Review, Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member’s Packet

   C. Faculty Curriculum Committee

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

6. Constituents’ Concerns

7. Adjournment

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

The 2011-2012 By-Laws Committee unanimously approved the following motion. This motion to change the Bylaws was brought to the Senate by the 2010-2011 By-Laws Committee at the final Senate meeting of 2010-2011. The proposal was referred back to the 2011-2012 By-Laws Committee for consideration before being brought back to the 2011-2012 Senate for debate and a vote on the motion. This procedure, as required by our by-laws, ensures that a By-Laws Committee with different members will consider this motion and report their views to the Senate.

Motion of the By-Laws 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 by-laws 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.

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 and the current Speaker all support the change.
New Business

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

Motion of the By-Laws Committee to change, clarify eligibility to serve as a Senator.

Change to Article IV, Section 2, B (Eligibility to serve as a Senator).

Introduction and purpose of change:

This change in the by-laws would clarify that in order to be eligible to serve as a Senator, someone must be able to fulfill regularly the duties of the role.

Proposed change with new wording indicated in italics underline:

Article IV, Section 2, B:
A Faculty Senator must be a full-time tenured, tenure-track, Instructor, or Senior Instructor employee of the College who has completed at least three years of service at the College, and who normally teaches at least three contact hours per semester or the equivalent in assigned research or who is a full-time professional librarian. Without regard to teaching load, Department Chairs, Assistant Department Chairs, and Associate Department Chairs who otherwise would be members of the regular faculty are eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. (App. April 2005) Administrative officers, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Academic Deans, the Dean of the Honors College, Associate Deans, and Assistant Deans are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. Faculty members on Leave, teaching away from the Charleston campuses, or for other reasons are unable to attend Senate meetings regularly, are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. (Rev. May 2009)

Rationale:

The immediate past Speaker had to consider cases about Senate eligibility for faculty who were teaching in College of Charleston overseas programs. Since the by-laws were silent about this issue, he asked the By-Laws Committee to consider it. Because there might be other cases besides teaching abroad in which a faculty member was unable to fulfill Senate duties, the motion includes more general language. Note that Article IV, Section 2, G as written already explains the process for replacing Senators who lose their eligibility during a term.
B. PROPOSED CHANGES IN POST-TENURE REVIEW GUIDELINES
September 16, 2011

Post-Tenure Review Committee Members: Thomas Baginski, William Barfield, Katherine Bielsky, Peter Calcagno, Scott Poole.

MOTION of the Post-Tenure Review Committee to change the Faculty/Administration Manual, VI.H.2, Post-tenure Review. Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member’s Packet.

STATUS: To be placed on the agenda of the Faculty Senate for the October 2011 Faculty Senate meeting. The Post-Tenure Review Committee requests that the Faculty Senate consider this motion in the October 2011 meeting.

INTRODUCTION: Explanation of changes and rationale

- To earn a superior post-tenure review, a faculty member must continue to perform at the level expected for the promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the standards of the Faculty/Administration Manual. When the standards for promotion to Professor were modified about three years ago, the post-tenure review section was not modified accordingly. In particular, the PTR policy still requires exemplary teaching effectiveness, while the Promotion to Professor Policy does no longer. This proposal is intended to remedy the inconsistencies in the Post-Tenure Review policy of the FAM compared with the criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor.
- The specific arrangement of items in a candidate's PTR packet—see the sequence below: H. 2,a (1) to H. 2,a (11)—will further greatly facilitate organization of the material by the PTR candidate as well as review by the PTR Committee. The PTR packets that a faculty member shall submit to his/her Department Chair will be prepared more consistently
MOTION:

H. Post-Tenure Review

1. Introduction

A post-tenure review will be conducted for each tenured faculty member during the sixth year since her/his previous extra-departmental review.

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

a. A faculty member shall submit to his/her Department Chair by the announced deadline a packet of material that must include:

(Rev. April 2009)

(1) A letter from the candidate indicating the rating for which he/she wishes to be considered.

(2) Letter from the dean with recommendations.

(3) Letter from the department chair with recommendations. For department chairs undergoing post-tenure review, a departmental post-tenure review panel with most senior tenured faculty writes this letter.
(4) Candidates seeking a "superior" rating must furnish two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers concerning aspects of the candidate's teaching (or, for librarians, professional competency).

(2) (5) Curriculum vitae.

(3) (6) Statement from the candidate on teaching, research and service addressing accomplishments since the last review and future plans and goals. This should be one narrative, no more than ten pages.

(5) (7) Annual performance evaluations by the department chair during the period under review. In the event that a department chair is being evaluated, the dean's annual evaluations of the chair will be included instead.

(4) (8) Computer-generated student teaching evaluations (summary pages with numbers) for all evaluated courses taught by the candidate during the period under review.

(6) (9) Other evidence of accomplishments in the competency areas: Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore, the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). Candidates must provide evidence that the scholarly material submitted is peer reviewed, juried or professionally evaluated. On co-authored articles, the candidate must indicate the degree of contribution. Sample of course syllabi (no more than three).

(6) (10) Candidates seeking a "superior" rating must also furnish
clear evidence of exemplary teaching effectiveness that they continue to perform at the level expected for the promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the standards of the Faculty/Administration Manual, as indicated in Sect. 6.a.(1) below. In particular, they must demonstrate sustained high quality and effective teaching (exemplary professional competency in the case of librarians), leadership in service, and continuing quality scholarship, active and sustained service to the College, and leadership in either College service or in the candidate’s professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community. Candidates seeking a "superior" rating must demonstrate either exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in all three areas. This evidence must include two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers, concerning aspects of the candidate’s teaching (or, for librarians, professional competency). Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore, the evidence must also include at least two scholarly articles and/or books scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). Candidates must provide evidence that the scholarly material submitted is peer reviewed, juried or professionally evaluated. Evidence is to be compiled for the intervening period between promotion evaluation and/or post-tenure reviews.

(7) (11) A late packet will not be considered for a superior rating except in extraordinary circumstances. A letter must accompany the packet to explain these circumstances.
C. Faculty Curriculum Committee
October, 2011 Meeting
List of Proposals Approved by the Committee
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

I. Course Proposals: All proposals involving only courses (new/changed/deleted) 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.

Hosp & Tourism Mgmt  New Course: HTMT380 Managing Global Tourism

Arts Mgmt  Change of Course: ARTM420 Policy in the Arts, change prerequisites

II. Program Changes:

History  Change of Minor: Delete HIST299 and a 400-level course as a part of the required 18 hours. Replace with req. that minors must take at least 3 hours at the 300-level.

Hosp & Tourism Mgmt  Change of Minor: Change economics requirement for minor from ECON201 to ECON200.

III. New Programs:

Hisp. Studies  New Minor: BLSP Business Language Minor in Spanish – includes following changes/additions:
  • Change of Course: SPAN317 Introduction to Spanish for Business, change prerequisites
  • Change of Course: SPAN318 Spanish for International Business, change prerequisites
  • Change of Course: SPAN323 Civilization and Culture of Spain II, change prerequisites
  • Change of Course: SPAN327 Latin American Civilization Culture II, change prerequisites
  • Change of Course: SPAN329 Current Issues in Spain or the Spanish Speaking World, change prerequisites
  • New Course: SPAN418: Advanced Spanish for Business Communication

French  New Minor: BLFR Business Language Minor in French (no course changes/additions)
D. Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for the Faculty Senate 4 October, 2011 Meeting

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

Proposal for a graduate certificate program:

- Graduate Certificate in Operations Research

Proposals to Change a Graduate Course, Master of Arts in Teaching in Early Childhood Education:

- EDEE 510 Name and description change
- EDEE 636 Name and description change

Proposal to Change a Graduate Course, Master of Education in Teaching, Learning and Advocacy:

- MTLA 702 Course prefix change from EDFS 702

Proposals for non-credit courses/programs (for information):

- Law School Admission Test (LSAT) Preparation
- Medical College Admission Test (MCAT) Preparation
From: Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary  
To: Faculty and Staff  

The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday, 13 September, 2011 at 5 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order


3. Reports
   - The Speaker
   - The President
   - The Provost
   - P. Brian Fisher, Office of Sustainability

4. New Business
   - Election of Speaker *Pro Tempore*
   - Faculty Compensation Committee
     --Salary Study Report
   - Curriculum Committee
   - Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

5. Constituents’ Concerns

6. Adjournment
   - Reception sponsored by Academic Affairs (Tate Gallery, second floor)

*All minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate Web site: [http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/index.php](http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/index.php)*
Committee Members:

- Calvin Blackwell, Chair (Economics & Finance)
- Timothy Carens (English)
- Deanna Caveny, Provost’s Designee (Mathematics)
- David Gentry (Psychology)
- Elizabeth Jurisich (Mathematics)
- Denis Keyes (Teacher Education)
- Gorka Sancho (Biology)
- Felix Vazquez (Hispanic Studies)

The Faculty Compensation Committee met 8 times during the 2009-10 academic year. This report represents a summary of our activities and discussions. Detailed minutes of each meeting are also available.

Addition of the Provost’s Designee to the Faculty Compensation Committee

The committee discussed and ultimately recommended to the Faculty Senate a motion to change the composition of the committee to include an eighth member. This new member serves *ex officio*, is non-voting, and is chosen by the Provost. The committee felt that formally adding the Provost’s designee to the committee would improve the flow of information between the Provost’s office and the committee. This motion was approved by the Senate and Faculty.

2010 Salary Exercise

The committee discussed the 2010 Salary Exercise at a number of meetings. Numerous faculty commented upon the decision by the Provost to allocate the salary raise pool across schools on the basis of each school’s proportion of total faculty salary. In particular, many faculty members suggested that the raise pool ought to have been allocated according to the size of the gap between average salaries at the College and our peer institutions. The Provost requested that the Compensation Committee provide his office with a recommendation regarding future salary exercises. After a number of meetings, the committee made the following recommendation to the Provost:

The committee recommends the following for handling all future raises. First, the committee believes that it is important that whenever raise monies are available, that all meritorious faculty receive a minimal raise. In years in which the raise pool is substantial, money beyond that needed for the minimal raise should be allocated to schools and departments on the basis of the size of the gap between average salaries at the College and at our peer institutions.
Summer School Salary Issues

The committee expressed its concerns regarding summer school salary to the Provost’s office. In particular, the committee expressed dissatisfaction with the uncertainty regarding faculty member’s compensation when the number of students enrolled in a class is below the minimum required for full compensation. The Provost’s office indicated it was working with the Summer School office to address the problem. New rules were issued this year guaranteeing that a faculty member’s compensation for summer school will now be a guaranteed minimum based on a course’s enrollment five business days before the session begins.

Survey of Peer Institutions Regarding Tenure and Promotion Salary Increments

In conjunction with the Provost’s office, the committee designed a short survey to be sent to our peer institutions to ascertain how they handle salary increases associated with tenure and promotion. As of this writing, the committee has not seen the survey results.

Salary Compression and Inversion

Throughout the academic year, the committee discussed issues of compression and inversion. The committee collected data and began analyzing it in an attempt to measure compression and inversion. Although the committee has made significant progress on producing a report, at this time the report is not ready to be released.

Removing the Limitation on the Number of Times Full Professors May Earn a ‘Superior’ Rating Salary Increase

Last year’s committee recommended increasing the number of incentives given to faculty to continue to perform meritoriously. In consultation with the committee, Associate Provost Bev Diamond recommended to the Provost that full professors be allowed to earn the salary increase associated with a ‘Superior’ rating on post-tenure review more than once.

AAUP Salary Study

Following the format of previous committees, this year’s committee produced a study comparing salaries of faculty at the College of Charleston to salaries at our peer institutions. The study’s three main findings are: 1) salaries at the College remain low relative to our peers; 2) unlike the historical trend, there has been no growth in the average salary over the last two years; 3) of all the ranks, assistant professors are paid most competitively, while full and associate professor salaries are losing ground to our peers. The study is presented in full in the appendix to this report.

Sincerely,

Calvin Blackwell, Chair
on behalf of the Faculty Compensation Committee

cc: George W. Hynd, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
Darryl Phillips, Speaker of the Faculty Senate
Appendix
2010-11 AAUP Salary Study

This study is based on the “Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2010-2011,” conducted by the American Association of University Professors and published in Academe. The AAUP reports average faculty salaries by rank and for all ranks combined. It does not report salaries by discipline. This year’s report follows the template established by last year’s committee, and therefore should make year to year comparisons more effective. Because the Faculty Compensation Committee’s study is based on the AAUP report, average College-wide salaries are reported. This study is therefore less detailed than the comprehensive salary studies completed at the College in 2003, 2005 and 2008 (all posted on MyCharleston for Faculty).

The methodology of the AAUP salary report is described at the www.aaup.org web site. Note that AAUP data excludes salaries of medical school faculty; salaries of faculty in other professional schools (law, engineering, business, etc.) are included. The Compensation Committee study compares College of Charleston faculty salaries with faculty salaries at “current peer institutions” (Exhibits 1, 2, 3 and 5); these institutions are the same as those used in the comprehensive 2003, 2005 and 2008 College of Charleston salary studies. Using the same peer group in this study has the advantage of providing data for historical comparisons (see Exhibit 2).

Although this report is less detailed than earlier reports, the Compensation Committee believes this report provides a useful snapshot of faculty salaries at the College and how they compare with salaries at peer and regional institutions. The data suggest “where we are now” and will help in planning a salary enhancement program to bring College faculty salaries closer to parity with peers.

Observations

1. Relative Ranking Remains Low.

Of the 17 peer institutions that reported salary information to AAUP this year, the College ranked 16th on average salary over all academic ranks (see Exhibits 1 and 2). The College has not ranked higher than 14th of 19 in the last ten years. Despite a number of attempts to raise faculty salaries, the College has not gained ground relative to our peer institutions. Within the state of South Carolina, the College has the fifth highest average salary of any public institution, trailing the University of South Carolina, Clemson, Winthrop and the Citadel (Exhibit 6). Fellow Southern Conference schools Furman University and Wofford College both have higher average salaries than the College, as does Appalachian State University. Comparing the College to other, similar schools in the South Atlantic region is also unfavorable; the College’s average salary is 96.9% of the average salary of all Category IIA (Master’s Institutions).

2. No Overall Salary Growth.

The average annual salary for faculty at all ranks at the College of Charleston has shown zero growth for two years in a row. Exhibit 4 indicates that the last two years have been exceptionally lean compared to earlier years. The low growth appears whether salary increases are measured in absolute terms or relative terms. Two years ago, the only South Carolina public
college or university to do worse was Frances Marion University, while this year the College’s zero growth was matched by the Citadel and only Coastal Carolina’s average salary growth was below that of the College (Exhibit 7). Nine of 17 reporting peer institutions also managed positive salary changes this year, with six showing a decrease in average salary (Exhibit 3). Note that these figures are the overall changes in faculty salaries from 2009-10 to 2010-11. They are not the average annual increase that continuing faculty (i.e., those faculty on staff in both academic years, 2009-10 and 2010-11) received. Those figures - average increases by rank for continuing faculty – are reported in Exhibit 5. The figures show that the College rated near bottom compared to our peers in salary increases made to continuing faculty.


The College’s recent emphasis on paying new assistant professors competitively has been somewhat effective; as shown in Exhibit 1, assistant professors are paid nearer the average of their peers (the College’s rank on average assistant professor salary is 11th of 17) than other ranks. Exhibit 5 indicates that of all ranks at the College, continuing assistant professors received the largest percentage increase in salary. Exhibit 8 shows that the average salary for an assistant professor is slightly higher than the average salary for an assistant professor at all South Atlantic Master’s level universities. Exhibits 9 and 10 show that assistant professor salaries have consistently shown the highest percentage gains over the last five years.

Full and associate professor salaries are far behind our peers. The College ranked 16th of 17 institutions on average full professor salary, and 15th of 17 on average associate professor salary. Average salaries this year for continuing faculty at the full and associate professor levels actually fell. Compared to other Master’s level universities, full and associate professor’s earn about 93% of their peers.

Conclusion

The following ten exhibits provide more details concerning faculty salaries at the College in relation to several peer groups. The overall picture is not good. The Committee is concerned that the College of Charleston is unable to keep pace with the majority of its peer institutions. While College of Charleston’s salaries remained flat, most of our peers found ways to make at least modest gains (Exhibits 1, 2, 7). Not surprisingly, the College was not able to make up any ground relative to its peers and lost ground in some respects.
Exhibit 1
2010-11 Average Salary (in $1000s) at Current Peer Institutions
Listed from highest to lowest average salary for all ranks combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>All Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. of New Hampshire</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of New Jersey</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millersville</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Vermont</td>
<td>114.4</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY - Geneseo</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC - Greensboro</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami (Ohio)</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC - Wilmington</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s (MD)</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Northern Iowa</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citadel</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC - Asheville</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Washington</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Charleston</strong></td>
<td><strong>81.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman State</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramapo College</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 2
College of Charleston’s Ranking Among Peers, 2001-02 – 2010-11*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>19th of 19 schools reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>17th of 18 schools reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>18th of 19 schools reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>17th of 19 schools reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>14th of 19 schools reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>15th (tie) of 19 schools reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>15th of 18 schools reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>18th of 20 schools reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>16th of 18 schools reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>16th of 17 schools reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are 20 peer institutions (21 institutions including the College of Charleston). In any given year, the number of schools participating in the AAUP study varies. Therefore, rankings can change either because of actual salary changes or because of changes in which schools participate. For instance, between 2007-08 and 2008-09, the College’s ranking fell from 15th to 18th, but only one school (Western Washington) actually moved ahead of the College that year. The other two places were lost because two higher salary schools (U. of New Hampshire and St. Mary’s) reported data in 2009 when they did not in 2008. Similarly, although the College moved up in 2009-2010 in numerical ranking, two higher salary schools (U. of New Hampshire and Ramapo) did not report data.
Exhibit 3
Average Salary Percent Change for All Ranks at Peer Institutions
2009-10 to 2010-11
Exhibit 4
Average Salary Percent Annual Change for All Ranks at the College of Charleston
2002-03 to 2010-11
### Exhibit 5
Average Salary Percent Change for Continuing Faculty at Peer Institutions
2009-10 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. of New Hampshire</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of New Jersey</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millersville</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Vermont</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY - Geneseo</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC - Greensboro</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami (Ohio)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC - Wilmington</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's (MD)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Northern Iowa</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citadel</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC - Asheville</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Washington</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Charleston</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman State</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramapo College</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 6
Average Salary (in $1000s) for All Ranks at Select SC Public Colleges & Universities
2009-10 and 2010-11*

* Incomplete data for Lander University and Winthrop University.
Exhibit 7
Average Salary Percent Change for All Ranks at Select SC Public Colleges & Universities
2009-10 and 2010-11*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>All Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Institutions</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CofC as % of All</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>100.7%</td>
<td>104.1%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Incomplete data for Lander University and Winthrop University.*
Exhibit 9
The College of Charleston’s Average Salary (in $1000s) by Rank for 2002-03 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ranks</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 10
The College of Charleston’s Average Salary Growth by Rank for 2002-03 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ranks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for the Faculty Senate 13 September, 2011 Meeting

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

Proposals for new non-credit courses/programs (Information only):

CEIT 201: Security Professional

CEIT 210: Linux Administrator I

CEIT 211: Linux Administrator II

CEIT 320: Java Application Development Foundation

CEIT 321: Java Web Component Developer

CEIT 322: Java Business Component Developer

CEIT 323: Java Web Service Developer