Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 3 April 2012

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 3 April 2012, at 5:06 P.M. in the Beatty Center 115 (Wells Fargo Auditorium). After Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of 13 March, 2012 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Lynn Cherry thanked Heather Alexander (Faculty Secretariat), Sarah Owens (Faculty Secretary), George Pothering (Parliamentarian), and Claire Curtis (Speaker Pro Tempore) for their service this past year. She reminded everyone that we have a very full agenda. If we do not finish tonight, the meeting will continue next Tuesday, April 10. The Speaker briefly reported on the following topics:

• Reminder that the Board of Trustees (BOT) will be meeting on April 19 and 20. Anyone interested in attending is welcome, but should let Clara Hodges in Academic Affairs know so she can reserve extra space.

• New Student Convocation will be on August 20, 2012. The discussion group model from last year worked very well. Let Lynne Ford, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration, know if you want to participate.

• The Speaker introduced a proposal to the Academic Affairs Committee at the January BOT meeting to develop a program for interested Board members to shadow a faculty member for a day and see what goes on in the classroom, the lab, working with students, faculty meetings, etc. Any interested Board member can participate, but new Board members will be targeted and encouraged to participate. Please let the Speaker know if you are interested in taking part in this program.

• Due to conflicts, President Benson is not able to attend the meeting this evening. If we have the continuation of the meeting next Tuesday he will give his report at that time.

There were no questions at this time.
The Provost

Provost Hynd gave a report to the entire faculty this morning. This evening’s report is an abbreviated version (PowerPoint presentation) of the morning report. Links to his reports can be found on the website for Academic Affairs: http://spinner.cofc.edu/academicaffairs/?referrer=webcluster&

Report Outline

- Update on Dean Searches
- Freshman Admissions
- External Funding at the College of Charleston
- Lowcountry Graduate Center (LGC)
- 3rd Year Review & Tenure and Promotion
- Post-Tenure Review
- Changes to T & P Language in FAM
- Q & A

Update on Dean Searches

- School of Humanities and Social Sciences
  1. 89 applications
  2. 9 phone interviews
  3. 4 candidates interviewed

- Honors College
  1. 103 applications
  2. 12 phone/Skype interviews
  3. Candidates identified – Interviews to be scheduled

- North Campus
  1. 97 Applications received
  2. 11 phone interviews
  3. 3 candidates interviewed

- Library

- Language, Cultures and World Affairs
Freshmen Admissions

- 11,850 applications and counting for the fall 2012 entry term
- A 8.2% increase over fall 2011 applications
- A new record high for the College of Charleston

---

External Funding

Total Funded Amount, Fiscal Years 2009-2011

- FY 2011: $15,000,000
- FY 2010: $7,000,000
- FY 2009: $5,000,000
### External Funding
**Total Funded Amount by School**
**Fiscal Years 2009 to 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School or Division</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>$87,714</td>
<td>$40,155</td>
<td>$276,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of the Arts</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$46,755</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>$139,888</td>
<td>$182,355</td>
<td>$21,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education, Health, &amp; Human Performance</td>
<td>$194,614</td>
<td>$193,864</td>
<td>$700,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Humanities &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>$133,111</td>
<td>$139,482</td>
<td>$33,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Languages, Cultures, &amp; World Affairs</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$203,534</td>
<td>$312,400</td>
<td>$156,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Sciences &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>$3,434,424</td>
<td>$4,882,249</td>
<td>$4,515,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>$487,554</td>
<td>$231,083</td>
<td>$637,027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External Funding
**Total Funded Amount by Source**
**Fiscal Years 2009 to 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>federally-funded Amount</td>
<td>$3,950,427</td>
<td>$3,807,107</td>
<td>$33,780,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state-funded Amount</td>
<td>$618,077</td>
<td>$389,416</td>
<td>$474,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>privately-funded Amount</td>
<td>$183,400</td>
<td>$795,296</td>
<td>$537,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local Gov’t-funded Amount</td>
<td>$14,075</td>
<td>$12,411</td>
<td>$22,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internationally-funded Amount</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$210,775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External Funding
Total Activity to Date, FY 2012

AWARDS:

- Total Amount Awarded: $5,555,082
- Total Number of Awards Received: 68

SUBMISSIONS:

- Total Submission Amount: $20,660,261
- Total Number of Proposals Submitted: 108
- Total Pre-Proposals Submitted: 7
- Total Resubmission Amount: $5,241,352
- Total Number of Resubmissions: 15

Lowcountry Graduate Center (LGC)

- Different missions and funding sources, but complementary objectives in a shared physical location
- LGC comprised of "Member Institutions" which include:
  1. College of Charleston (Fiscal Agent)
  2. Medical University of South Carolina
  3. The Citadel
- Need existed to organizationally align the CoC North Campus and LGC
- On March 2, 2012 Presidents Benson, Greenberg and Rosa signed a revised consortium agreement
Post-Tenure Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking superior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking superior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking superior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking superior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes to T & P Language in FAM

- Solicitation of necessary information by higher levels of review
- Communication to candidate of justification for recommendations
- Correction of errors of fact (to be reviewed after two years)
- The nature of external letters addressing scholarly work

Discussion on clarification of standards, nature of departmental guidelines will continue with April Provost’s Workshop
Claire Curtis (at-large) asked about the Lowcountry Graduate Center (LGC). Who is the director at this time? The Provost said that Sue Sommer-Kress is the interim director at this time. He said we want a full time director to drum up new business and to encourage other institutions to use the facility. We are the fiscal agent responsible for the LGC.

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) asked about the director for the Center for Student Learning and why the position had been pulled. Kay Smith, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, said the search was unsuccessful and they are seeking permission to start a new search.

Robert Westerfelhaus (at-large) asked about the permanence of the facility of the North Campus and its relationship to Boeing. The Provost responded that Boeing sees the close proximity of the LGC to their plant as a very important thing. This is permanent for the next 3-5 years (in the future they might need the land for another plant). Bill Manaris (Computer Science) asked about changing the name to Boeing in exchange for a large donation. The Provost said this could be a good opportunity, and they have had conversations, but, the campus is not just for Boeing. Its purpose is to serve the whole area of the Lowcountry.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Academic Standards Committee**

Dan Greenberg, member of the committee introduced the following proposal:

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 30\textsuperscript{31} 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 45\textsuperscript{2153} credit hours, including a minimum of 62\textsuperscript{63} 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 30\textsuperscript{31} 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.

Steve Litvin (Hospitality & Tourism Management) said in the past there was concern that a student could get a BA and then add a couple of classes and then get a BS. He doesn’t think this should be so easy. This should be redefined so that it’s in the same discipline. Mr. Greenberg said that the proposal does address these issues (he cited the proposal above). The 30 hours is only in the case where someone wants two degrees (two degrees on your wall). Ms. Ford said that there is a misunderstanding between two majors and two separate degrees. If you want a BA and a BS (two degrees) then you are required to do additional hours. Mr. Krasnoff said he used to be the chair of the Academic Standards committee when they started this. You need extra hours if you want two degrees.

Mr. Krasnoff asked why we have to round up the number to 31 hours. Mr. Greenberg said he does not know the exact answer, but thinks it comes from SACS. Cathy Boyd (Registrar) said that according to Penny Brunner, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Planning, we were out of compliance with SACS and that’s how it got to the committee (Ms. Boyd took it to the committee).

The Senate voted on the motion to change the requirements for a second Bachelor’s Degree, which was approved.
B. Faculty Curriculum Committee

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

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-SOCY369: change prereqs, add HONS167)

ARCHAEOLOGY

NEW COURSE: ARCH400 Archaeological Internship

DELETE COURSE: ANTH200 Archaeological Lab Methods

DELETE COURSE: ANTH381 Internship

Mr. Westerfelhaus wanted to know why they were deleting the two Anthropology courses (ANTH 200 and ANTH 381). Heath Hoffman (at-large) said that these courses had not been used for some time.

The Senate voted on all of the above course proposals as a single group, which was approved.

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)

The Senate voted on the program changes for English, which were approved without discussion.
Mgmt & Entrepreneurship
CHANGE PROGRAM: Add ENTR451 Health Sciences Entrepreneurship to the ENTR concentration electives.

The Senate voted on the change of program for Mgmt & Entrepreneurship, which was approved without discussion.

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

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

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.

The Senate voted on the change of program and change of minor for French, which were approved without discussion.

Health & Human Performance


The Senate voted on the changes of program for Health & Human Performance, which were approved without discussion.

German & Slavic Studies
CHANGE MINOR: Add LTRS120 to minor

The Senate voted on the change of minor to German & Slavic Studies, which was approved without discussion.
Psychology  CHANGE PROGRAM: Change requirements for new BS from PSYC250 to PSYC250 or PSYC211/220

The Senate voted on the change of program to Psychology, which was approved without discussion.

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

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

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

The Senate voted on the change of program and changes to the minor to Sociology & Anthropology, which were approved without discussion.

III. New Programs:

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

Ms. Ford pointed out that this should be a BS and not a BA. Joe Kelly (at-large) asked about the estimated costs by year (he referred table D). Where did the $56,615 come from? Shawn Morrison, Associate Dean of LCWA, said there are no additional costs to what we are currently doing. This used to be a minor and now will be a major and that is how the calculations are made. This is really showing a net revenue. Bev Diamond, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, said the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) requires us to report the total costs of every program. There are no new costs and there is a new net revenue.

The Senate voted on the new program in Teacher Education, which was approved.

Marketing & Supply Chain Mgmt  NEW PROGRAM: BS in Marketing
The Senate voted on the new program in Marketing, which was approved.

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

Mr. Kelly referred to p. 27 of the proposal and asked about hiring on table D. He doesn’t see the costs for new faculty. Why isn’t that in the table? Ms. Diamond said we don’t have any commitment to hire within the next five years.

The Senate voted on the new program in Archeology, which was approved.

Economics & Finance
NEW MINOR: Real Estate Minor (expanding upon Real Estate Concentration for people outside major)

The Senate voted on the new Real Estate Minor, which was approved without discussion.

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

Silvia Rodríguez-Sabater, Chair of the Committee, introduced the following proposals:

Master of Arts in Communication

New Course Proposals:
**COMM 500 – Introduction to Graduate Studies in Communication:** This course is an introduction to the discipline and essential scholarship to pursue an M.A. in Communication. Discussion will include philosophy of graduate studies in Communication, principles and procedures of scholarly research and ethical issue.

**COMM 514 – Social Media:** This course is an examination of the role and influence of social media on communication processes, effects, and other forms of interpersonal communication. Students will conduct research that explores contemporary theories and communication as applied to social media.

**COMM 680 – Seminar in Rhetoric:** This is a topical seminar that culminates in an original research project in rhetoric.

The Senate voted on the new course proposals for the Master of Arts in Communications (COMM 500, COMM 514, COMM 680), which were approved without discussion.

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

The Senate voted on the title change of COMM 580, which was approved without discussion.

**Change to a Graduate Program – Master of Arts in Communication** (All of the above changes result in the changes to the MA program).

The Senate voted on the change to the Master of Arts in Communication, which was approved without discussion.

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

The Senate voted on the termination of the French Track of the Master of Education, which was approved without discussion.
D. The Nominations and Elections Committee

Bethany Goodier, co-chair of the committee, gave the following report:

By the Numbers:

- 185 Faculty Completed the Committee Survey
- 32 Additional Faculty were contacted by the committee with request to serve based on rank or other qualifications
- Of those who responded, 4 were scheduled for sabbatical
- 46 Volunteered for service on any committee
- 26 Stated a preference for a specific committee with no alternative selections
- 18 Senators volunteered for committee service

Volunteers:

- 62% Tenured Faculty
- 38% Untenured Faculty

Volunteers by School:

- Highest percentage from HSS

Challenges:

- Lack of Volunteers
- Single Committee Preference
- Requirement for senators on committees
- At-Large Senate Seats

Recommendations:

- Reconsider the number of senators required on each committee
- Senate should discuss the apportionment of at-large seats.
Ms. Goodier then informed the Senate that we vote tonight on the following committees: Academic Planning, Budget and By-Laws. There were no additional nominations from the floor at this time.

**Academic Planning**

Erin Beutel, Geology and Environmental
Burton Callicott, Library
Kristin Krantzman, Chemistry and Biochemistry
David Moscowitz, Communication
Bob Perkins, Teacher Education
George Pothering, Computer Science
Jeffrey Yost, Accounting and Legal Studies

**Budget**

Jane Clary, Economics and Finance
Marion Doig, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Julia Eichelberger, English
Tom Heeney, Communication
Linda Jones, Physics and Astronomy
mutindi ndunda, Teacher Education
Marianne Verlinden, Hispanic Studies

**By-Laws and FAM**

Susan Farrell, English
Rick Heldrich, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Glenn Lesses, Philosophy

The Senate voted on the slate for Academic Planning, Budget and By-Laws, which was approved without discussion.
The Speaker asked for nominations from the floor to serve on next year’s Nominations and Elections Committee. Seven people are needed for the committee. Nancy Nenno was nominated. The Senate voted on next year’s committee (see below), which was approved. Online voting will take place within the next couple of weeks.

**Nominations and Elections Committee**

Diane Johnson  
Calvin Blackwell  
Rick Heldrich  
Denis Keyes  
Silvia Rodriguez-Sabater  
Celeste Lacroix  
Nancy Nenno

---

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

Scott Peeples, chair of the committee, introduced the following two motions. He informed the Senate that we are not voting on this tonight. This has to go back to the committee.

**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 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. 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.

There was no discussion at this time.

F. The Faculty Compensation Committee: End of Year Report

Gorka Sancho, member of the committee, gave the following report.

Who are we?

2011-12 Committee
• Calvin Blackwell, Chair (Economics & Finance)
• Deanna Caveny, Provost’s Designee (Mathematics)
• Devon Hanahan (Hispanic Studies)
• Tom Heeney (Communication)
• Jie Xiang Li (Mathematics)
• William Olejniczak (History)
• Kathleen Béres Rogers (English)
• Gorka Sancho (Biology)
Main Items to Report

1. In 2011-2012 no salary raises given at CofC
2. Bonus given to all employees earning <$100,000
3. Institutional expenditure % on salaries still decreasing
4. Faculty receiving awards receive average/low salaries
Peer Institutions (2009-2010 ranking)

1. U. of New Hampshire
2. College of New Jersey
3. Millersville
4. U. of Vermont
5. SUNY - Geneseo
6. UNC - Greensboro
7. Miami (Ohio)
8. UNC - Wilmington
9. St. Mary's (MD)
10. U. of Northern Iowa
11. Appalachian State
12. Citadel
13. UNC – Asheville
14. James Madison
15. Mary Washington
16. College of Charleston
* Rowan
* Ramapo College
* Western Washington
* Murray State

College of Charleston Peer Ranking

<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>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>...likely still near the bottom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proportion Spent on Salaries and Benefits at CofC

- Institutional expenditures on compensation and benefits declined as a percentage of operating expenses from 61.8% (2001) to 56.4% (2010)
- in 2011 they went down to 53.5%

President George Benson to CofC faculty Senate 2011

- “In October, I will submit a proposal to our Board of Trustees for a mid-year, merit-based bonus program for our continuing roster faculty and permanent non-instructional staff. If approved, this one-time bonus would be distributed during the current academic year.”
President George Benson to CofC faculty Senate 2011

• “Additionally, barring a national economic disaster, next spring I will present to the Board of Trustees a budget for 2012-2013 that includes a significant commitment to merit-based salary increases for our continuing roster faculty and permanent non-instructional staff. These salary increases would, of course, be subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees.”

Recommendation to provost by Compensation Committee

1. It is important that whenever raise monies are available, that all meritorious faculty receive a minimal raise.

2. 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.
Merit Awardees Salary Study

• Examined Salaries of Winners of:
  – William R. Moore Distinguished Teacher-Scholar Award
  – Distinguished Teaching Award
  – Distinguished Research Award
  – Distinguished Advising Award
  – Distinguished Service Award

How do their salaries compare to their peers?
Merit Awardees Salary Study

- Merit-based annual evaluations started in 2007
- Examined awardees between 2006-2011 (n=36)
  - 25% had left CofC by 2012
  - Obtained awardees salary figures from South Carolina Budget and Control website
  - Peer salaries from CUPA-HR reports of 2010-2011

Merit Awardees Salary Study

- ~50% of award winners earn less than average salary of CofC peers (same rank & discipline)
- 80% of award winners earn less than average salary of institutional peers (same rank & discipline)

Award winners earn average CofC salaries, and are well below peer institution salaries
CofC Comprehensive
Annual Financial Reports

percent of total expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses by function</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>30.36%</td>
<td>31.21%</td>
<td>36.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>10.89%</td>
<td>10.78%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships &amp; Fellowships</td>
<td>5.52%</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Capitol Debt</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USC to provide bonuses to some employees
[The Post & Courier, 9.7.2011]

COLUMBIA—University of South Carolina president Harris Pastides says some college staff will receive merit-based bonuses.

Pastides said Wednesday he recognizes the 1.5 percent pay incentives are not enough. But he says he hopes employees see it as a statement of the university’s commitment to them.

The president says he’s asked the school chief financial officer and the provost to come up with a proposal for more significant performance-based salary increases next year.

Last month, Clemson president Jim Baker said professors there could get raises of up to 6 percent this fall under the college’s new merit-based compensation system. Clemson’s raises will average 2.5 percent.
### Faculty receiving awards (2006-2011)

#### Salary increase 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CofC faculty awardees salaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average CofC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average CofC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average peer institutions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average peer institutions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deviation from CofC average faculty salary by rank & discipline

55% Below Average

45% Above Average

Deviation from peer Institution average faculty salary by rank & discipline

86% Below Average

14% Above Average
Mr. Kelly asked about the recommendations to the Provost Office. Should raises be the same across the board for meritorious faculty? Mr. Sancho said yes. Moore Quinn (Anthropology) asked how the peer institutions are chosen. Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, said ad hoc committees were created under President Higden in 2003. Mr. Krasnoff said the use of schools can be problematic and it might be better to do it by department. The Provost responded to Mr. Kelly’s initial question. He said these issues are important. He thinks that the notion of merit is very important. He looks forward to having further dialogue.

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)

Heath Hoffman, member the committee, reported on the following three issues.

1) Tenure and Promotion: Academic Affairs has done a lot to address concerns.

2) Merit and Annual Reviews: In the survey, faculty members commented that the whole process is very time consuming, especially when there is no money at the end. Chairs also spend a lot of time doing these annual reviews. There is a lot of concern that chairs, deans and academic administrators are not being evaluated regularly. The subcommittee has 12 recommendations that they will present them to Academic Affairs. Mr. Hoffman mentioned a few of the recommendations for reviews: do away with separate reviews; get rid of the lengthy narrative; simplify the narrative; and implement a 3 year review cycle instead of the yearly method. They want to keep things short, simple, and to the point. There is also a lot of variety depending on departments. The committee would like to see a standard evaluation process across campus.
3) Adjunct Faculty Welfare Committee: The committee is concerned about compensation and how adjuncts are treated. They did a survey of all adjuncts. 130 adjuncts responded. The key issues raised by the survey are: compensation, benefits, reliability of employment, respect, opportunities for professional development, mentoring, and a lack of voice in departments. They will present Academic Chairs with recommendations. They will also present the Faculty Senate a resolution in the fall with a commitment to give adjuncts raises when faculty members also receive raises.

Ms Caveny added that the Faculty Compensation Committee (FCC) is doing a survey of adjunct pay at other state institutions in South Carolina. Devon Hanahan, member of the FCC, is in charge of that survey.

Julia Eichelberger (at-large) thanked the committees for their hard work on these issues.

H. Committee on General Education: End of Year Report
(http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php)

Kay Smith (Provost Representative on the committee) gave a short report. She referred to the goals in the document below and the spreadsheet that can be found on the Senate website. A workshop will occur in the fall to work with faculty and chairs on further defining the goals of General Education (Gen Ed). They are now in the process of more carefully revising the goals that were passed by the Senate.

Several questions were raised by Senators about the First Year Experience and its relationship to the assessment of Gen Ed. Other questions focused on the criteria and assessment of future courses. Ms. Smith said that this is an enormous task, one that they have not yet finished. But, they are already in the process of assessing Gen Ed and they are going to look at the assessment plans that departments have already turned in. Certain courses are already being assessed this year and that is going to allow them to assess Gen Ed. Mr. Krasnoff asked about how the word “measure” is used in this document. Ms. Smith invited him to come to the fall workshop. She said this is still a work in progress.
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

A. Presentation of Degree Candidates

The Provost made the following motion: “Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends to the Board of Trustees that candidates certified by the Registrar’s Office or the Graduate School as having completed all requirements be awarded degrees at commencement.” The resolution was approved by proclamation of the Senate.
Constituents' Concerns

Claire Curtis wondered about the effectiveness of the phishing survey.

Brian McGee (guest) said that President would be giving a written report (which will be available on-line) since he was not able to report to the Senate this evening. He reminded everyone that the President would be holding a town hall meeting next Tuesday. Mr. Kelly thanked the President for defending attacks against professors published in an Op Ed in the Post and Courier.

Mr. Krasnoff thanked the Speaker for her hard work this year.

Speaker Cherry announced the dates of the two commencement ceremonies: Graduate Ceremony will be held on Friday May 11 and the 2 Undergraduate Ceremonies on Saturday May 12.

The Senate was adjourned at 7:04 P.M.

    Respectfully submitted,

    Sarah E. Owens

    Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 13 March 2012

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 13 March 2012, at 5:05 P.M. in the Beatty Center 115 (Wells Fargo Auditorium). After Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of 24 January and 7 February, 2012 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Lynn Cherry reported on the following 4 items:

1. Thanks to all faculty who submitted mid-term grades for spring classes. 80.7% of mid-term grades for spring were submitted. Mid-term grades are important and we need to make sure we, and our colleagues in our departments, turn them in each semester.

2. Reminder – textbook orders are due March 15th (Thursday) is the deadline for Maymester and Summer book orders; April 15th is deadline for Fall 2012 book orders.

3. Heather Alexander has created a Wiki for committee chairs so they can share information with each other about things their committees are working on during the year. The Speaker plans to meet with committee chairs in the fall and spring to have a sense of what various committees are doing and issues that are of importance across the campus.

4. Speaker Cherry met with Cathy Boyd and Lynne Ford yesterday. Effective academic year 2012/13 we will no longer print copies of the Undergraduate Catalog. The catalog will be available electronically as a PDF file with links to all major worksheets.

-Few colleges/universities continue to print undergraduate catalogs – most are strictly electronic now.

-Now that we are including information about all requirements which must be met for majors, many of the major worksheets are quite extensive. To print all of this information would double (at least) the size of the catalog.

-We will continue to print a short handbook of the information in the front of the catalog = academic rules/ regulations, policies, financial aid rules/regulations, etc.
The Provost

Provost Hynd noted that he gave an in-depth report on February 28 during his new format for the Provost report. That report touched on important updates on academics at the College of Charleston. Also, John Newell presented on the Honor’s College. The next report will take place on April 3, in Tate 202. There will be a continental breakfast. Cynthia Lowenthal will be presenting on the School of Humanities & Social Sciences (HSS).

The Provost thanked Lynne Ford, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration, and other faculty and staff who initiated participation in the Wabash study. The College of Charleston was selected by the Center of Inquiry in Liberal Arts at Wabash College to participate in a nationwide examination of student learning and the liberal arts. Dr. Charles Blaich will be giving a presentation on assessment in general and the College’s reported experience with integrative learning. This event will be part of a public forum at 3:30 p.m. on Tuesday March 20 in the Alumni Center in the School of Education, Health, and Human Performance. Dr. Blaich co-directs the Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts at Wabash College. He also is the Director of the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS). The Provost hopes that everyone can attend.

There were no questions at this time.

Old Business

Alex Kasman, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, introduced the updated motions:

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 Bulletin 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
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.

The Senate started their discussion with the second motion. Cathy Boyd (Office of the Registrar) said that the Registrar already is in compliance with Degree Works. There are already hyperlinks with the prerequisites, and they will leave it as-is for now.

Some discussion ensued about counting prerequisites and Advanced Placement courses. It was noted that there are also courses in the sciences and math that have prerequisites.

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) said he supports removing the maximum number of courses.

Garrett Mitchener (at-large) asked about the URL. Mr. Kasman said it is information for Senators only, and will not occur in the catalog.

The Senate voted on the Motion of the Academic Planning Committee to further modify recently approved rules regarding the reporting of major sizes in the catalog, which was approved.

The Senate then discussed the first motion. Mr. Kasman said that it would make sense if a Senator were now to propose an amendment to this motion since the previous discussion approved the motion that no longer has a range (for a major), just a minimum number of hours. Jaap Hillenius (at-large) said he was thinking about proposing this amendment.

Claire Curtis (at-large) asked about the statement in the rationale that says “most of our majors far exceed 36 hours.” She wanted to know if there is evidence for this. She is concerned that the tone makes it appear that the 36 hour majors look like they are inferior. She thinks that approximately half of our current majors are around 36 hours.

Mr. Krasnoff said that the 36 hour number was arbitrary from the beginning. He wondered if we should consider eliminating the number entirely.
Mr. Hillenius proposed that we make the following friendly amendment.

**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.] )

Mr. Kasman accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Bob Mignone (guest) thinks that the wording should say size and not minimum.

Ms. Curtis thinks we have to keep the language of the minimum. Ms. Curtis proposed a motion to change the wording to the already amended amendment. Mr. Hillenius seconded the amendment.

**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.] )
John Huddlestun (Religious Studies) suggested adding two commas to the motion. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

**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.]

The Senate voted on the amended motion regarding the sizes of proposed new programs, which was approved.

**New Business**

Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, presented the following proposal:

**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 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.

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)

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.
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(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 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 independent reviews of the quality of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements. 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.

(In. 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
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. 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 a (immediately above).

5. Nomination of Instructional Faculty to a Higher Rank

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

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

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

c. the individual faculty member to the Provost;

d. the Provost to the Department Chair;
e. the Dean to the Department Chair.

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

(Rev. April 2007)

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

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

....

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—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

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.
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. Information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested 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)

9. Dean’s Role for Tenure and Promotion Candidates

The appropriate Dean will review the evaluation panel recommendations and the candidate’s packet. Information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested 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. The Dean shall provide her/his 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.\(^3\)

\(^3\) 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.
10. Faculty Advisory Committee Action

The Provost shall make packets of all candidates for tenure and promotion available to the members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review. The Faculty Advisory Committee shall provide the candidate, chair of the departmental panel, dean, and Provost a copy of his/her assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the President 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 recommendation or the departmental evaluation panel vote is negative, he/she shall refer the case to 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 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 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.  
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11. Provost’s Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion Candidates

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

(Rev. April 2009) 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.

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.
12. President’s Decision

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

(Rev. April 2009)

Ms. Curtis had a question about the sunset clause in footnote 4 (“These changes will sunset unless ratified partially or totally by Academic Affairs by Fall 2014”). She is concerned that after two years there will be no more dialogue on the issue. Ms. Caveny said that this was not the intention. They want a dialogue. The reason for the sunset clause is that at every stage of the review, candidates will be questioning the judgment of the process. They want something that works well.

Joe Kelly asked about an amendment possibility. In the Diversity Strategic Plan there is a proposal that we put some language about diversity education as evidence of good teaching in the Faculty Administration Manual (FAM). He is thinking of adding a line on this. Ms. Caveny does not think this is necessary now. We still need more dialogue now on this.

Mr. Krasnoff spoke about the language of criteria vs. guidelines (under section 4, “Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion”). Bev Diamond, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, responded that this is not to address the question of department guidelines. Rather, it is only to introduce the process that departments will now have their own guidelines. Mr. Krasnoff said he views “criteria” as a strict standard. Ms. Caveny said that they value a department’s ability to articulate the things that are of value. But at the same time, they are also in tune with Mr. Krasnoff’s comments that there should be overarching guidelines for the College as a whole.

---

5 Deadlines for earlier stages of the review process are prior to March 1 and are announced by Academic Affairs each year.
Mr. Mitchener asked about individual tenure cases. Ms. Caveny said that this is a formal way to look at guidelines. Bill Manaris (Computer Science) proposed adding the wording “additional guidelines and criteria.” It was noted, however, that this was a report and not a formal proposal to be amended.

Mr. Huddleston said that he is under the impression that departments are strongly encouraged to do this, but he thinks that the language is weak by saying “may develop additional criteria.” Ms. Caveny said they are not telling departments that they have to have them.

In response to some questions about the approval process of departmental criteria, Ms. Caveny said that the overall decision of the Senior Faculty group (that met at the retreat to discuss these issues) was that they wanted the Provost Office to take on this responsibility. Vince Benigni (Communication) wondered if the five year review would be too long. Ms. Caveny said that they think five years is reasonable but they will monitor this.

Scott Peeples, Chair of the Committee on By-Laws and the FAM, said that his committee had a question regarding the number of external reviewers and not having an upper limit of letters. They are concerned with burdening colleagues at other institutions by making them do a lot of outside reviews.

Ms. Caveny said they will welcome continuing feedback. This language will likely go into the FAM.
Jen Wright, Chair of the Committee, introduced the following proposals:

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Proposal Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>NEW COURSE: ARTH287 New Media in Contemporary Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>CHANGE COURSE: Change prerequisites for ENGL378 Fiction Writing II and ENGL377: Poetry Writing II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American &amp; Caribbean Studies</td>
<td>NEW COURSE: LACS332 Latin American Politics and Society in Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>CHANGE COURSE: Change prerequisites for all PSYC46x labs (to be consistent with old prereqs while old BS remains in place)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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 |

The Senate voted on the course proposals for Art History, English, Latin American & Caribbean Studies, Psychology, and Theatre, which were approved without discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Proposal Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>NEW COURSE: PHIL210 Philosophy, Law and the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEW COURSE: PPLW400 Seminar in Politics, Philosophy, and the Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Wright said that it would be more appropriate to consider the Philosophy courses below under program changes.
III. Program Changes:

- **Discovery Informatics** CHANGE OF MINOR: Deleting MATH355 Bayesian Statistical Inference (no longer offered) and adding MATH350 Statistical Methods II

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

- **Latin American & Caribbean Studies** CHANGE MINOR: Add LACS 332 to minor

Ms. Wright clarified that in addition to the minor, this was also a proposed change to the major.

Paul Young (Mathematics) asked whether this would change the size (number of hours) to the minor and major. Mr. Wright said no, that this was just an additional elective.

The Senate voted on the change of minor and major of Latin American & Caribbean Studies, which was approved.

- **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)

Ms. Wright clarified that LACS 332 should also be added here. The Senate voted on the change of program of International Studies, which was approved.

- **Philosophy/Pol Science** CHANGE PROGRAM: Add concentration to both majors. Concentration titled: Politics, Philosophy, and the Law (PPLW). Also, change major req's for PHIL and POLI majors from PHIL 450 to PHIL 450 or PPLW 400 and from POLI405 to POLI405 or PPLW 400

The Senate voted on the change of program for Philosophy and Political Science, and the new courses for Philosophy from section II, which were approved without discussion.

IV. New Programs:

- **Academic Affairs/College of North**
The Provost spoke in favor of this program. There is a national concern about the number of people in the United States who do not have a university degree. This program is designed to help individuals learn to think critically and to become more engaged with society. Those who have a degree in higher education will encourage their own children to pursue higher education. The state of South Carolina is below the national average in higher education and this program will help the state. A lot of faculty members have been involved in this proposal. He feels strongly that this is the right thing to do. It represents what a liberal arts education is all about.

Ms. Ford said that this is a new degree program for the College. It is targeted at transfer students. They will already have a two-year college degree or they will have a certain amount of college credits. They have tried to create something that will work for this area of the state. They have studied programs all around the country, but they have created something unique for the College of Charleston. There will be common seminars required for all students. There are two concentrations (they hope to develop more over time). There are several new courses too. For example, the Department of Communication re-created some of the courses that they had removed for their new major. Computer Science has created some new courses. There is a capstone, a common element for all students. But this program will also be highly individualized, for instance, the capstone seminar will be a supervised seminar within a workplace. Or there might be an internship. The overall program requires 122 hours, but students will bring in 60 or more hours.

Joe Kelly (at-large) said he likes the proposal a lot. He wanted to know what will happen if they have to hire new faculty and how will they be governed. Ms. Ford said that they imagine hiring faculty from current departments at the College. They do not want to have a “shadow faculty” at the North Campus.

Julia Eichelberger (at-large) supports this program. She still has a few concerns. She wanted to know how adjunct faculty would be selected. Ms. Ford said that the Dean of the North Campus will actively recruit adjunct faculty but they will all have to be checked through departments on campus. This will assure that the faculty members are of the same quality as those teaching on campus. Ms. Eichelberger asked about ongoing supervision of adjuncts. Ms. Ford said that at the beginning, the initial oversight will be at the level of the Dean. But if the program grows, then they will have to review this.

Ms. Eichelberger was also concerned about the lack of emphasis on writing and research. She thinks it needs to be more robust. She believes that using library research materials is also important. Ms. Ford said that this is a really good point and they need to look at this issue. Students will come in with a variety of skill levels. Jannette Finch (the librarian for the North Campus) said that there are several subcommittees in charge of support services of what students will need. She thinks that they might need more library support in the future.
Mr. Mitchener is disappointed by the lack of science content of the program. Ms. Ford said that students have to complete lab sciences before they are admitted. They do not have lab facilities at the North Campus at this moment.

Mr. Mignone asked about the minimum age limit for this program (24 years of age). Is that legal? Ms. Ford said yes. This program is meant to serve an adult population. They want someone who has already completed half their studies.

Heath Hoffman (at-large) asked if adjuncts would be paid the same rate as they are receiving at the downtown campus. Ms. Ford said yes. How will faculty members be compensated beyond their assigned load? Ms. Ford said they are still working on this. This program will be requiring Saturday courses and under those circumstances, they will provide additional compensation. But they hope that some faculty will teach as part of their regular load. Summer will provide a good opportunity for additional compensation and opportunities. Ms. Diamond said that the numbers for compensation are in the proposal ($4,500 per course).

Ms. Curtis said she supports this proposal. We need to recognize the reality that there are a lot of for-profit universities out there, and we will be able to serve students better than those programs.

A comment was made about diversity and that it would be great for our students to interact with these “adult” students. Will there be a bus? Ms. Ford said the program will generate a new revenue source and this will be a good thing to keep in mind. She also said that the North Campus students can take electives at the downtown campus. Several questions were then asked about revenue and the cost of the program. Ms. Ford said that the students will be charged in-state tuition. She pointed out that this program would cost significantly less than the aforementioned “for-profits.”

The Senate voted on the new Bachelors of Professional Studies Program, which was approved.
Silvia Rodríguez-Sabater, Chair of the Committee, introduced the following proposals:

**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 Senate voted on all of the proposals for the Master of Science in Accountancy, which were approved without discussion.
Constituents' Concerns

There were no concerns at this time.

The Senate was adjourned at 7:04 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 7 February 2012

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 7 February 2012, at 5:07 P.M. in the Beatty Center 115 (Wells Fargo Auditorium). After Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of 17 January, 2012 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Lynn Cherry thanked everyone for coming this evening. She reported on four items.

1. The Speaker encouraged colleagues to run for at-large and department Senate seats. She also urged faculty members to nominate themselves and others for various committees next year. The Nominations and Elections Committee is currently seeking names for various positions. She said it’s important that we as a faculty participate in shared governance.

2. She announced that the Bachelor of Professional Studies is currently be reviewed by the Curriculum Committee and will come to the Senate in March. It’s a new degree (not a new major).

3. The Faculty Newsletter will be coming out soon. Some items of note that will be included in the newsletter are that the January Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting approved the Facilities Master Plan. This includes the guiding principles and strong recommendations on how the College should grow within the next 10-15 years. There is a copy in the Faculty Senate office in Randolph Hall. These are recommendations and we are not locked in to them. The BOT postponed a vote on the Diversity Plan. It was submitted at the meeting, but they chose to wait until the April meeting and will vote then. President Benson will present the 2012/13 Annual Plan at the April meeting.

4. This room is no longer called the Wachovia Auditorium. It is now the Wells Fargo Auditorium.

The Provost

Provost Hynd made the following brief announcements.
1. He said that the Bachelor of Professional Studies is a wonderful way to reach out to the larger community, and representative of a liberal arts education. He thanked those who have worked on it.

2. The Provost announced that we are now listed in the Princeton Review of “Best Value Colleges.” We are in the top 150. He thanked Don Burkard, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Planning, who has worked hard on this.

3. The three Deans’ searches are all underway. All three have generated approximately 90 applications. Some telephone interviews are taking place. Stay tuned. The Dean of Library Search will move forward a little slower than the other two (Humanities and Social Sciences and the Honor’s College).

4. ETS Proficiency Profile we will be administering its test this spring at the College of Charleston. This is a voluntary system of accountability. We need 200 freshmen and 200 seniors to participate. This will require a 75 minute period for testing. He encouraged faculty members interested in volunteering one of their classes to contact Karin Roof, Director of Academic Assessment and Planning.

5. The first Provost Report will be held on Feb 23 from 12:00-1:30 p.m. The location has not yet been announced.

There were no questions at this time.

New Business

Faculty Curriculum Committee

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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Change Course (change pre-requisites for all upper-division courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>New Course PSYC335: Positive Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Course PSYC469: Advanced Developmental with Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete Course PSYC360-level labs (been replaced with 460-level labs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>New Course POLI319: Special Topics in Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Course ECON324: Game Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>New Course BIOL412: Capstone in Molecular Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women &amp; Gender Studies</td>
<td>New Course WGST120: Studies in Women's and Gender Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Course WGST420: Seminar in Women's and Gender Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Course WGST499: Bachelor's Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Course WGST320: Special Topics in Women's and Gender Studies (change the course number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Performance</td>
<td>Change Course PEHD100 to PEAC100: Introduction to Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Course PEHD115 to PEAC115: Physical Conditioning and Weight Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Course PEHD116 to PEAC116: Beginning Golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete Course PEHD112: Beginning Gymnastics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) suggested a friendly amendment to the description of the General Education requirements in History by adding the word “other.” The description would now read: “Either Hist 115-116 OR any other combination of courses that satisfies the general education history requirement.” Richard Bodek, Chair of the Department of History, accepted this as a friendly amendment.

The Senate voted on the course proposals from all of the departments above, **which were approved.**

II. **Program Changes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Change Program (incorporate changes above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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)

The Senate voted on the change of programs for History, Psychology, Biology, and Women & Gender Studies which were approved without discussion.

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

Michelle Futrell (at-large) noted that the change of program for Health & Human Performance is wrong and should be listed as 52 to 54 credit hours.

The Senate voted on the change of program for Health & Human Performance, which was approved.

III. New Programs:  NONE

Graduate Council

Amy McCandless, Dean of the Graduate School introduced the proposal to modify an existing degree program: Master of Public Administration (see http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/faculty-senate-meetings/index.php)

Ms. McCandless said this will finally be a stand-alone program. This is something they have wanted since the beginning. The program will separate from the University of South Carolina.
The Senate voted on the proposal to modify the existing degree program, Master of Public Administration (so that it will be a stand-alone program), which was approved without discussion.

Committee on General Education

Bob Mignone, chair of the Committee on General Education introduced the following motion.

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).

Mr. Mignone said that he was presenting this as one motion. Mr Krasnoff asked about dividing up the motion into individual sections. George Pothering (Parliamentarian) said that we can do it by paragraph or by section. Mr. Krasnoff moved that we take each set of criteria as an independent motion. It was seconded.

The Senate voted on taking each set of criteria as an independent motion, which was not approved.

The Senate then returned to the discussion of the original motion. Julia Eichelberger (at-large) said she had one small suggestion for the Approval Criteria for Humanities, number 1 – add the words “Analyze how ideas and/or experiences are represented...” Mr. Mignone asked for input and wanted to know if this should be accepted as a friendly amendment. Ms. Eichelberger said that many kinds of art do not simply explore ideas but they also represent experiences. Vince Benigni (Communication) suggested adding more wording: “Analyze how ideas and/or experiences are represented, interpreted and/or valued.”

Garrett Mitchener (at-large) had a question about the wording for the Math Criteria, and why it was not consistent with the rest of the document. For example, all the other sections begin with the wording “The primary purpose of the course is...” and the Mathematical Reasoning and Analysis begins “The course must have as its primary purpose...”
Martha Stackel (Library) had a question about the Approval Criteria for Foreign Languages. She said that there is no mention of being able to speak the foreign language. Noelle Zeiner-Carmichael (Classics) said some of the languages, Latin and Greek, do not involve speaking. Bill Manaris (Computer Science) asked if Latin counted as a foreign language. Speaker Cherry said yes.

Mr. Krasnoff asked about the Approval Criteria for Social Science. Does Religious Studies count as a Social Science? He said sometimes yes and sometimes no. There should be a list, or things should be described in more methodological terms. Claire Curtis (at-large) said she was on the group that discussed Social Science. They addressed this issue in number one, trying to distinguish between a survey course and a course from someplace else. This came directly from thinking about First Year Seminars.

Several Senators continued the discussion regarding the exact wording of the Approval Criteria for Social Science.

Joe Kelly (at-large) wanted to know how we make substantive changes to the approval criteria. It is his understanding that someone would have to go to this committee, they would consider it and then it would come back to the Senate.

Heath Hoffman (at-large) referred to the earlier conversation on the Approval Criteria for Humanities. Regarding the friendly amendments to add “and/or” he thinks this wording makes it complicated for the people on the committee. Mr. Benigni said it was fine to eliminate the second “and/or.” The wording now reads:

1) “Analyze how ideas and/or experiences are represented, interpreted or valued.”

Mr. Pothering suggested a small word change to the Approval Criteria for Foreign Languages. In reference to number one, he suggested: “understand languages” be changed to “a language.” Moore Quinn (Sociology/Anthropology) wanted to know about students who take language equivalents. Will these approval criteria be used for other courses that are not languages? The Speaker said that the criteria that count go through a process of review by departments. She assumes that language alternatives will have been reviewed periodically by the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards. Mr. Pothering’s suggestion did not get voted on by the Senate.

Mr. Krasnoff asked about Natural Sciences. Does number three make sense for the majors? Linda Jones (at-large) said that the upper level courses do satisfy this.
The Senate voted on the 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, which was approved.

**Constituents' Concerns**

Mr. Mitchener wanted to know if the Facilities Master Plan (mentioned by the Speaker in her report) could be posted on-line as a PDF instead of having to look at the hard copy in the Senate office in Randolph Hall. The Provost said no because they are still editing it.

There were no further comments.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:04 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 17 January 2012

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 17 January 2012, at 5:07 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of 6 December, 2011 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Lynn Cherry welcomed everyone back to the Faculty Senate. She reported on the following four items.

1. Reminder – special meeting next Tuesday, Jan. 24 – 5:00-7:00 in RSS 235 (not here in Wachovia). Topic: School based model for Tenure and Promotion (T&P).
   a. The Speaker will send motion/agenda to senators by the end of the week.
   b. Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS) had a meeting this afternoon to discuss this issue. She hopes other schools or departments have opportunity to discuss issue prior to meeting next week.
   c. Her hope is that this will provide a framework for future discussions – either special session of the Senate or open forum. This will occur approximately once a semester to discuss major philosophical questions/issues.

2. Institutional Technology (IT) Issues
   a. Server problems continue to be an issue. The Sunday before classes began there were problems.
   b. IT is aware of the problem. The Speaker’s understanding is that they are looking into an “auto alert” system that will notify on-call tech support. She does not know when this might happen, but she will follow up and keep the Senate informed.
   c. Classroom notification pilot program will begin in another week or so once all the classroom changes have been finalized. There will be a set of distribution lists for each classroom and the faculty will be notified when there are problems. Hopefully this will be launched next week.
3. Revisions to the Strategic Plan

   a. Thanks to all who participated in the open forum and/or submitted comments and suggestions.
   b. 80 suggestions and comments were submitted which resulted in 39 changes being made to the revisions. Some of these were minor changes regarding wording or punctuation while other changes resulted in the addition or deletion of tactics or the reordering of tactics.
      i. Sustainability is now included
      ii. Diversity Strategic Plan is now included
      iii. Facilities Master Plan is now included
   c. Some changes which were submitted will be considered in the fall revision cycle.

4. Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting this Thursday and Friday
   a. Clara Hodges needs to know by 2:00 tomorrow if you plan to attend any of the meetings/sessions (these are public meetings)
   b. Friday morning’s general session with the full Board will include:
      i. Revisions to the Strategic Plan (this will be FYI – no vote)
      ii. Diversity Plan (this will be discussed and voted on)
      iii. Facilities Master Plan (this will be discussed and voted on)

The Speaker opened the floor to questions.

Bob Mignone (guest) had a question about the motion for the special meeting of the Senate regarding School-wide T&P committees. Will the motion specify if the school wide committees will replace the campus wide committee? The Speaker replied that she does not know yet. She has not finished framing the motion.

The Provost

Provost Hynd welcomed everyone back to the Senate. He reiterated some things that the Speaker covered in her report about the Strategic Plan and the BOT meetings. He encouraged everyone to attend the BOT and Academic Affairs meetings. The Campus Master Plan and other important issues will be discussed at the Finance Committee meeting on Thursday morning (same day as Academic Affairs). Friday is the BOT meeting, but he reminded everyone to inform Clara Hodges if you will be attending these meetings so she can make sure there are enough chairs.

He spoke about his plan to make a more formal report, (not at the Senate) perhaps the first week in February. He wants to “paint a larger picture” of what’s going on at the College; providing information about other units on campus. He will invite Dean John Newell to make a presentation about the Honor’s College. This will be informative, especially in regards to the search for a new Dean of that College. At a future meeting he would like to invite Dean Cynthia
Lowenthal to give a presentation on the School of Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS). He will then continue that cycle of sharing information and looking to the future for opportunities.

There were no questions at this time.

New Business

Faculty Curriculum Committee

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

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
Claire Curtis (at-large) wanted clarification on credits for this major because she counted 54 hours (it was listed as 48). Ms. Wright said some departments count in different ways. Justin Benefield (guest) said it was 54 hours.

Joe Kelly (at-large) wanted to know if there would be a new line. Mr. Benefield said yes, that was his understanding. Bev Diamond, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, responded that that a line in Economics was requested from the Dean.

The Senate voted on the new program: BS in Finance, which was approved.

**Academic Planning Committee**

Before introducing the main motion (see below) Alex Kasman, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, gave the following brief report regarding the need to change the rules regarding sizes of majors and to standardize the reporting of major sizes in the catalog.

Motivation for this Proposal:

- There is a lack of consistency/clarity in presentation of major size to students in catalog.
- The rules in the catalog about major size (no more than 54 required hours in major, at least one option not more than 36) are not written clearly and so are either misunderstood or not observed.
- For the sake of transparency to students, clarity to faculty committees, and for SACS accreditation, we sought to correct both problems with a proposal.

Content Summary:

- Major size defined as a range, including all prerequisites, cognates, etc. where min excludes hours avoidable by placement or options within major and max does not.
- This range should be presented in the catalog along with optional paragraph outlining potential General Education double counting.
- The rules about major size should be removed from catalog. Instead, add “existence of a small option encouraged” and “justification required for proposals of major larger than 54” to committee approval process.

Rationale:

- “Honest reporting” to students.
- Compromise between rules to keep majors small (to preserve Liberal Arts tradition) and those who want freedom to offer large majors (strong, modern, meeting disciplinary expectations).

- Note: Existing majors which require more than 54 credits do not have to provide justification for the size of the major. Only new majors, or changes to existing majors, which require more than 54 credits will be required to provide a justification for the size of the major.
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.

Comments from the Senate:

Provost Hynd made a few remarks regarding this motion. Academic Affairs is strongly in favor of this. Transparency and costs (to students) are very important. The four year graduation rates are part of the governor’s plan to create benchmarks at how institutions are performing. The range of courses that might be required for a major speaks to transparency.

The Speaker asked Mr. Kasman if he was presenting this as one motion or as three separate sections. Mr. Kasman said as one motion.

Ms. Curtis wanted more clarification about number three and the last point in regards to “range” (“every department will be encouraged to offer a degree with a range minimum of no more than 36 hours”).

Scott Peeples (at-large) wanted to know who changes the catalog. Mr. Kasman said that this should be the charge of the Senate. Ms. Diamond thinks that the faculty determines the rule. She said we do not have a good repository for these rules. Ms. Cherry said they could not find evidence that the Senate voted on this in the recent past, but it could have come through a committee. Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) said that in regards to the current language in number two, it’s not a rule, just a stated fact.

Mr. Krasnoff suggested a friendly amendment to number two so that the language would be amended to the present tense (for example, get rid of “will include”):
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 includes a clear articulation of the courses required to complete the major. Each program will publish publishes a credit requirement range that includes the minimum and maximum credits required for the major. The minimum will be 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 will include includes all required courses, including course prerequisites and cognate courses completed in another discipline or department. The maximum value will be 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.

Mr. Kasman accepted this as a friendly amendment. The Senate voted on the amendment which was approved.

Another Senator made a motion to divide the proposal into sections. Specifically the Senate would vote on one and two together and then three as a separate section. It was seconded and the Senate voted on dividing the original motion into separate sections, which was approved.

The Speaker reminded everyone that the Senate would now be considering sections one and two, and then move on to the third item.

Julia Eichelberger (at-large) asked about the catalog language. Where is number one going to go? In the FAM? The Curriculum Committee website? Mr. Kasman did not know the answer. Ms. Wright thinks the Curriculum committee website would be a good place. Ms. Diamond suggested that we need something that distinguishes between rules and guidelines – this has to be developed. Mr. Mignone said that the Registrar’s office should be involved in the process. Lynne Ford, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration, said that this is a policy, but the first provision allows us to put this into effect for the next catalog. The 2013 catalog is going to be the one that the South Carolina Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) will look at.

Mr. Kelly said we’ve been working for years to update the catalog. We need a place to clearly put these proposals. We need a mechanism. He would like to amend items one and two so that they clearly stipulate a place to put these things. He proposed the following language be added at the end of item one:
• **Academic Affairs** will work with appropriate faculty committees to develop a repository for all rules passed by the Senate governing the development of curriculum. The Curriculum Committee will report back to the Senate by the March 2012 meeting.

Cathy Boyd (Registrar’s Office) said that in interest of full disclosure, a few years ago the Registrar’s office changed the maximum number of hours for a major from 43 to 54 hours. She said that at the time, 54 seemed like a more correct number.

Ms. Wright wanted to know about the charge to create a repository. Who will police this to make sure that there are a minimum and maximum number of semester hours?

Garrett Mitchener (at-large) suggested that we put this in the FAM.

Several senators spoke in favor of Mr. Kelly’s amendment, others against it.

The Senate voted on Mr. Kelly’s amendment to develop a repository for rules passed by the Senate, which was approved.

The Senate then returned to the discussion of items one and two. Several Senators asked questions about how to count credit hours. Some said that the language was unclear in regards to how to count General Education courses and their relationship to majors. Other questions were asked about Math classes (as an example) and students who placed out of basic courses.

Jaap Hillenius (at-large) wanted to know where the 27 hours came from? Paul Young (Mathematics) said that we need to specify 27 as the minimum of the range. Mr. Kasman said no one knows where the 27 came from. Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, thinks that the 27 came from thinking of majors as a collection of courses in a discipline.

Mr. Mitchener proposed an amendment to strike the first sentence in item two: “A major program requires at least 27 semester hours.”

**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.

Mr. Kasman said he agreed with the amendment. This was the intention of the committee.

The Senate voted on the amendment to delete the first sentence in item two, which was approved.

Mr. Young asked about the numbers 27, 36 and 54. Were they passed at some point by the Faculty Senate?
Mr. Carew said he thinks they did this before there was a Senate, when the faculty met as a whole.

Brian McGee (guest) said this dates to the 1970s. These are rules that predate the Senate.

Ms. Jones is concerned that we are changing the rules without knowing where they come from.

Vince Benigni (Communication) said that he doesn’t think the students read the catalog, instead they look at DegreeWorks. In addition to the catalog this also needs to be changed. Ms. Boyd said the Office of the Registrar is charged with making DegreeWorks match the catalog. This is their goal.

The Senate voted on items one and two (as amended), which were approved. The following reflects the new wording of one and two:

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).

• Academic Affairs will work with appropriate faculty committees to develop a repository for all rules passed by the Senate governing the development of curriculum. The Curriculum Committee will report back to the Senate by the March 2012 meeting.

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.

The Senate then moved on to the discussion of item number three. A guest from the Department of Psychology said he’s worried because the maximum number of hours for Psychology is going to be over 54 hours. He also thinks many majors are already over 54. Mr. Kasman said transparency is important. Ms. Jones thinks that the number 54 should be looked at more carefully and should be looked at by departments first before voting at the Senate. Mr. Hillenius said that these numbers are arbitrary. With the new accounting system our smallest majors will be much more than 36. He thinks the real number will be somewhere between 80 and 90.

Mr. Mignone agrees with Mr. Hillenius that 54 is an arbitrary number. He thinks the first bullet is very important, but that the second bullet is irrelevant. The second bullet should not indicate numbers.

Mr. Young proposed an amendment to remove the second bullet point from item three and replace it with: “All proposals for new majors and changes of major must include the minimum and maximum hours (as described in point one above) and should justify their size.” The Senate voted on this amendment, which was approved.
Mr. Krasnoff proposed to amend the amendment as follows: All proposals for new majors and changes of major that affect the minimum or maximum number of hours must include the minimum and maximum hours (as described in point one above) and should justify their size.

The Senate voted on Mr. Krasnoff’s amendment, which was approved.

Ms. Cherry suggested (since it was already after 7:00 p.m.) that a Senator propose a motion to send this proposal – specifically item three - back to the committee. Mr. Hillenius made a motion for the committee to look at a range of majors across campus and their number of hours. The committee should come up with a rationale for counting hours. Ms. Boyd said that this will be a very time consuming process for the Academic Planning Committee. She thinks that they will need some help. Ms. Cherry said that the committee could request departments to provide them that information. The Senate voted on the motion to send item three back to the committee for further research in regards to credit hours, which was approved.

Constituents' Concerns

Jeri Cabot, Dean of Students, reminded everyone about the ExCEL award nominations. The winners will be announced at the April 4th ceremony. Mr. Kelly said that there will be a presentation about SPECTRA (a mentoring program) next Thursday at noon in the Stern Center Ballroom. Lunch will be provided. Robert Westerfelhaus (at-large) expressed concern about the process by which the office of the Vice-President for Economic Development was filled. Ms. Cherry reminded everyone that when a department has a proposal coming before the Curriculum Committee and later the Senate, that they should have a representative at those meetings to answer questions.

There were no further comments.

The Senate was adjourned at 7:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens

Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 24 January 2012

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 24 January 2012 in RSS 235. Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order at 5:07 P.M.

Speaker Lynn Cherry thanked everyone for coming to this special meeting of the Senate. She thanked Bev Diamond, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, for sending out the document summarizing the Provost’s Workshop on Tenure and Promotion (T&P) in December (*note - faculty leadership team who participated in the workshops were the ones who received the document, not all members of the faculty Senate). She reminded everyone that this evening’s discussion would be focused on school-based committees. She said all faculty have speaking privileges, even participants who are not Senators. However, only Senators can vote. She noted that in the spirit of an open discussion the minutes from this evening would only reflect actions, motions and main points.

She referred to Ms. Diamond’s summary of the discussion that took place at the Provost’s Workshop on T&P in December. The Speaker read aloud the first two paragraphs on p. 6:

“(8) Role of and workload of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review; School-wide Committees
Deans have requested that school-wide committees be developed to provide a mechanism beyond the department to inform their recommendations. The Advisory Committee provides that function for the Provost, and he is committed to its continuation, with its current responsibility for providing a recommendation on each case. At other institutions, negative recommendations arising from departments and schools sometimes stand as decisions at that level, rather than merely recommendations, while positive recommendations go forward for further review at all institutions reviewed. At the College, in past years, positive departmental decisions have been overturned at higher levels of review. The Provost feels the role of the Advisory Committee remains crucial on all cases.

Feedback on a proposal to establish school committees to evaluate applications for tenure and promotion has consistently indicated that if the Advisory Committee continues in its current role, school committees only serve to add another layer to the evaluation process. For this reason, we indicate no next steps on the issue of the establishment of school committees.”

According to the paragraph above, Academic Affairs has come to the conclusion that no steps regarding school-wide committees will be taken at this time. Speaker Cherry asked the Senate if school-wide committees are something that the College wants or not.

Ms. Cherry then referred to the motion for today’s meeting. The motion regarding the establishment of School Based T&P Committees was introduced and seconded (both by Senators).
School Based Tenure and Promotion Committees

Introduction:

In August 2011 Academic Affairs convened faculty leaders from across the campus to discuss issues and ideas related to ways in which the process and procedures for Tenure and Promotion can be strengthened. A number of recommendations were offered and Academic Affairs has worked to frame recommendations for actions to present to appropriate faculty committees, most notably Faculty Welfare and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third Year Review. One issue that has been raised, but not fully discussed nor any recommendation for action been crafted, is the issue of whether the College should adopt a model of School based Tenure and Promotion committees. The provost has affirmed that if a decision is made to develop School based T&P committees, they would not replace the campus Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third Year Review. Among the many questions/issues that need to be considered regarding the question of whether the College should move to a model of School based T&P committees are the following:

1. What would be the purpose of School based T&P committees? Are there particular benefits to adopting this model? Are there drawbacks to this model that would outweigh the potential benefits of School based committees?

2. What would be the role of School based committees in relation to the current departmental evaluation committees and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third Year Review?

3. How would School based committees be composed?
   - Some Schools have very few departments – what challenges or opportunities would a School based model for T&P provide those Schools?
   - What would/should be the term of service for members of School based T&P committees?
   - Could/should members from other schools be included as external members of a School T&P committee?
   - How should the committee be selected? Elections? Appointments? If so, by whom?

4. How would the addition of School T&P committees affect the timeline for the submission and review of materials and the decisions at all levels of the T&P process be changed?

5. Would guidelines be developed to ensure a degree of consistency of expectations across all Schools? Is so, who would be responsible for developing these guidelines?

This motion to recommend the adoption of School based T&P committees will allow Academic Affairs, in conjunction with faculty committees, to develop a model for the adoption of School based T&P committees.

Motion:

The Faculty Senate requests that the Provost and the Academic Affairs Office present a proposal to the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third Year Review for the development of School based Advisory Committees on Tenure, Promotion and Third Year Review. The proposal should be presented to Faculty Welfare and the Advisory Committee on T&P no later than September 2012 for consideration by the committees.
Much discussion ensued regarding the pros and cons of adopting school-wide committees.

Several Senators said that their departments discussed the option, but came to the conclusion that they did not want to add an extra layer of bureaucracy to the overall T&P process and were against the adoption of school-wide committees. Some Senators made the point that a school-wide committee could help the larger committee with split decisions. They could also play an advisory role to Deans.

Others responded that the issue at hand is that currently the big T&P committee needs help, but this does not mean creating school-wide committees. It was suggested that more people should serve on the big committee. This would help alleviate the workload and also serve the interests of smaller departments that can be more difficult to evaluate (Studio Art was mentioned as an example).

The comment was made that Departmental guidelines are essential for all these committees. Another Senator remarked that these guidelines are very problematic. It was suggested that the evaluation of Senior Instructors should be delegated to another committee.

The question was called by a Senator at 6:00 p.m. The Senate voted on whether to call the question, which did not pass.

The conversation continued regarding the pros and cons of school-wide committees.

Some Senators noted that there should be a disinterested level beyond the department decision on a candidate. The school level could do that because there is a level of expertise that the campus-wide committee might not have. It was noted that the interpretation of the FAM is also an issue. School-wide committees could help interpret the FAM. Others said that the interpretation of the FAM is another issue and that the establishment of school-wide committees is not going to fix this.

When asked, the Provost said that if this motion were to get voted down, then Academic Affairs would not be coming back with a proposal for school-wide committees. They would however, be looking for solutions to the issues addressed in the document sent out by Ms. Diamond.

It was noted again by several Senators that the big committee needs some help. For example, interviews should be conducted at the big committee. Having a school-wide committee does not help this issue. The importance of the faculty colleague letters was noted. These letters could help the Dean interpret the FAM. They also help the big committee.

The question was called by a Senator at 6:45 p.m. The Senate voted on whether to call the question, which passed.
The Senate voted on the motion to recommend the adoption of School based T&P committees to Academic Affairs, which did not pass.

There were no further comments.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:47 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah E. Owens
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 6 December 2011

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 6 December 2011, at 5:06 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of 1 November, 2011 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Lynn Cherry thanked everyone for coming on Reading Day. She reported on the following five items.

1. She updated the Senate on the three Dean’s positions that have to be filled. The job descriptions for the Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences and the Dean of the North Campus are on the Academic Affairs’ webpage. Provost Hynd recently met with the search committee for the Honor’s College Dean. They hope to have the position posted within the next couple of weeks. All of these positions are being posted on the Chronicle of Higher Education.

2. The Speaker referred to the last senate meeting and the discussion that was generated by Larry Krasnoff’s (Philosophy) queries regarding the work of the Curriculum Committee. She said the charge of this committee has changed and evolved over the years. They are looking for things to be done so the committee can work more efficiently and also look closely at pedagogical merits of proposals. The Curriculum Committee is going to work with the Registrar’s Office to work with the flow of documents. The committee asks that starting in January a representative from the department (who is submitting a proposal) attend their meeting so that they can explain the proposal and respond to questions. Additionally when the committee presents the proposals to the Senate there should be a representative to answer questions.

3. Back in October the Speaker asked all the committee chairs to discuss the by-laws and the charge of the committee with their members. This is to make sure that the by-laws and duties correspond to the committee. If changes need to be made then they should be given to the By-laws Committee who will then bring them before the Senate for approval.

4. On Monday December 12, the Provost and Academic Affairs will reconvene faculty leaders who participated at the tenure and promotion workshop this past August. The Speaker encouraged attendance at this event.
5. The President and the Executive Vice-Presidents have been working on revising the Strategic Plan and the revised plan will be going out to various committees within the next few days. Although this is a busy time, the Speaker asked for feedback from committees that have been tapped for this purpose. President Benson plans to present a revised Strategic Plan to the Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting in January. The annual plan will be presented to the BOT in April and will include projected costs associated with each action. The BOT will vote on the budget in June.

The Provost

Provost Hynd congratulated everyone for working very hard this semester.

He and others were just at the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) conference in Orlando. There is a move nationally to document learning outcomes. This is a serious endeavor here on campus. Penny Brunner, Associate Vice President for Institutional Assessment and Planning, and others, are helping us move forward with documenting these outcomes.

He reported that there are three Dean’s searches under way: Humanities and Social Sciences, Honors, and the Dean of the North Campus. All three committees have been charged. He thanked the chairs of those committees. He hopes the search for the Dean of the North Campus will move forward quickly because they are currently in discussion with the governing board of the Lowcountry Graduate Center (LGC). The Director of the LGC will report directly to the Dean.

The Provost noted that the BOT Meeting in January is important because the campus master plan will be presented along with the revision of the strategic plan.

In reference to the new format of the Provost Report (mentioned at the last Senate meeting) the Provost will begin this in January.

Don Burkard, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Planning, informed the Provost that applications are up over a thousand from last year. We had 7900 applications at this time last year. The word is out that we offer outstanding programs by outstanding faculty. The in-state applications are also up.

There were no questions.
Heath Hoffmann (Faculty Welfare Committee)

Mr. Hoffmann showed a brief PowerPoint summarizing some main points from the results of the Faculty Survey on Faculty Welfare Issues here at the College of Charleston (see report posted on Senate website). He then opened up the floor for questions.

Vince Benigni (Communication) said that there is a lot of administrative work piled on faculty and he wanted to know how we can simplify the process of merit raises. Mr. Hoffmann said each department is different in how they go about soliciting information from faculty members in regards to merit raises. He said maybe we could streamline this process. Mr. Benigni also remarked that there are many surveys and it is hard to prioritize.

Joe Kelly (at-large) asked the Provost about the merit raise process. The Provost said he wants to work with some committees on how to improve the merit raise procedures. He said the Deans are empowered to develop their own procedures. Nonetheless the Provost remarked that we do need a merit system and the President has said this is important. This is a terrific opportunity to see what departments are doing and to share information. We can learn from some departments. Regarding Promotion and Tenure (T&P), we have a process moving forward. There was an August workshop that worked on this process and now the faculty will generate proposals. He would like to see everything move online, but that is still up in the air.

Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Hoffmann about the alarming number of faculty members that are thinking about looking for another job. Is this normal at other colleges? Is this a high number? Mr. Hoffmann does not have the answer – he has not seen the data from other institutions. The Provost said this is a concern. Every year across institutions there is a 4-8 percent turnover in faculty. This occurs for lots of different reasons: retirement, moves for families, etc. Here at the College of Charleston we lose about 30 roster faculty every year. He said that people start thinking about leaving at certain points in their career: on the way to tenure, and then after promotion to Associate Professor. He noted that we need to differentiate between how many faculty think about leaving and how many faculty actually take jobs elsewhere. He said that the question in the survey was worded about salary and might have prompted people to say that they would like to find a job elsewhere. Mr. Hoffmann said that this is the problem with this type of survey. The questions on the survey were short and without a lot of depth because they did not want it to be too long. Provost Hynd said that Academic Affairs would welcome any comments.
Bob Mignone (General Education Committee)

Mr. Mignone said General Education (Gen. Ed.) needs to be assessed. The process has been started, but we have to come up with learning outcomes and approval criteria for courses. The timeline is tight and the General Education Committee is going to start immediately. Groups will be formed to work on learning outcomes for the competencies. Mr. Mignone said we need not start from scratch because these learning outcomes for the competencies (overarching goals) already exist and were worked on over a long period by the Senate. He would like to invite participation in these core groups. A workshop will be held early in the spring semester to give some guidelines. Mr. Mignone referred to the last attempt to revise Gen. Ed. During that process some of the overarching goals were approved, but the whole package failed in the spring of 2008. The defining characteristics were essentially the learning outcomes. He says that a lot of the work has already been done. So, it’s natural to begin with the things that we worked very hard on: these defining characteristics that serve as learning outcomes and often as approval criteria. However, if this does not work and the groups do not produce learning outcomes and approval criteria, his committee will develop them.

Mr. Krasnoff asked about the requirements on the right hand side of page 17 of the undergraduate catalog (http://catalogs.cofc.edu/pdf/Undergraduate_Catalog_2011-2012.pdf). He asked Mr. Mignone which ones they want to assess. Julia Eichelberger (at-large) said that they were submitted to SACS initially. Mr. Mignone said that SACS is expecting us to assess these. Mr. Krasnoff said they do not all go together. Mr. Mignone said that if some things don’t work, then the Senate has the authority to change this. He thinks it’s doable. Number 6 (on p. 17) of the overarching goals has to do with the major and we do not have to worry about it because we are already assessing the major.

Kay Smith, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, said we have a very tight timeline. We can do it, especially by merging the requirements and the goals together, but we need for people to work purposefully and rapidly.

Mr. Kelly said he wanted to follow-up on Mr. Krasnoff’s question. He thinks that once the work is finished, we will see goals that are “orphans” and do not fit together. Lynne Ford, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration, said that after returning from the SACS meeting she has learned that we are several years behind relative to our assessment of Gen. Ed. She said we are not in the position to revisit our goals. This is very serious because we could lose our accreditation if we do not act quickly. Now we have to provide the evidence. Mr. Mignone has provided a good matrix and (in reference to “orphans”) we do not need to have a one-to-one match. We have to show SACS that we have a process in place. We have to have mature data. Bev Diamond, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, said that she has heard that there will be some bad new coming from SACS, but she does not know the specifics.
Mr. Kelly said that any honest assessment will show that we are not meeting those goals because we failed on the Gen. Ed. Proposal. He is worried that we are going to try to sell SACS something we are not doing. Ms. Ford said she does not believe this is the case. In some instances we are already doing assessment, but it is important that we articulate the outcomes that we expect of our students.

Claire Curtis (at-large) said there are a lot of things that we still do not know. She cited oral communication as an example (#1 on p. 17). Are students getting oral communication without taking public speaking? How many students are actually getting this in a variety of classes?

Ms. Ford said that the process will involve mapping the courses onto the competencies. Mr. Mignone said that SACS wants to see that we have a process to assess our own programs. This is what is important. Ms. Ford said we cannot plan any longer. We have to assess. We have to do this as quickly as possible. We have to collect evidence now. Mr. Mignone said that they are going to task the core groups with identifying the learning outcomes and criteria. This will be done by Spring Break and then they will be working on the assessment.

Garrett Mitchener (at-large) said there is data management problem. How are we going to do this?

Ms. Ford said they will work with samples, that they will not be assessing every course. There will be a series of assessment cycles. They purchased a system called Compliance Assist, to help with the data. They can customize it and work with the data.

Mr. Krasnoff said he thinks this list on the aforementioned website needs to be paired down. He said the Senate never directly discussed assessment. He thinks that the list of outcomes is vague. We need to edit and amend the list. Mr. Kelly disagrees with Mr. Krasnoff. He said that the Senate did talk about SACS and assessment. We have to wait to modify the goals, until after we’ve done the assessment.

Ms. Smith said that we do not need to think of one course matching one requirement. There may be multiple places for achieving the learning outcome.
Old Business

Scott Peeples, Chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, spoke briefly about the following motions:

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.

The Senate voted on the motion of the By-Laws Committee to change/clarify eligibility to serve as a Senator which was approved without discussion.
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) (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.

(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).
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) 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.

There was a motion from the floor which was seconded to consider approval of this proposal from the By-Laws Committee.
Hollis France (Political Science) asked about the narrative and why it lacked specific instructions. Mr. Peeples said Academic Affairs puts those types of stipulations in their memo at the beginning of the year.

Ms. Curtis asked about page length of the narrative. Is this language in the FAM or in the memos? Mr. Peeoples said it’s not in the FAM. Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, said it’s in the joint memo and not in the FAM

Tom Baginski, Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee, wanted to change the ordering of point 6 to come after point 4 – because now these letters are buried at the back of the packet. Mr. Peeples said that would be fine.

Robert Westerfelhaus (at-large) made a motion to change the order, which was seconded.

Mr. Hoffmann hoped that a memo would give specific directions on how to structure the packet. Mr. Peeoples said that this ordering really should come from the memo. He does not see a problem with this, however, since people will take a hint from this ordering.

The Senate voted on the amendment to the main motion to move item number 6 so that it follows number 4, which was approved.

In regards to the main motion, Mr. Kelly had a question for Mr. Peeples and for Mr. Baginski. With all the recent changes to the FAM did the Senate or the Post-Tenure Review Committee discuss the wording of Exemplary Teaching? Mr. Baginski said his committee was guided by the wording for promotion to Professor in the FAM. The FAM does not require Exemplary Teaching for that promotion. He said it makes sense not to require it for Post-Tenure Review.

Ms. Diamond said that the standards for superior rating would be the same as promotion to Professor. This could be taken up by a new committee if you wanted to change this.

Mr. Baginski wanted to know why “exemplary” was taken out of the promotion to Professor. Who discussed this? Ms. Diamond said the discussion did take place. The concern at the time was the ambiguity of the wording. This was discussed at the Senate.

The Senate voted on the motion to change the FAM, VI.H.2, Post-tenure Review, Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member’s Packet which was approved.
New Business

Faculty Curriculum Committee

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

Faculty Curriculum Committee
December, 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.

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

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

Computer Science

The Senate voted on the course proposals for Urban Studies, Communication, and Computer Science which were approved without discussion.

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

The Senate voted on the change of major proposal for International Studies which was approved without discussion.

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.

The Senate voted on the change of minor proposal for Arts Management which was approved without discussion.
Ms. Curtis clarified that this is a BA in Political and not a BS. The Senate voted on the change of major and the change of minor in Political Science, which were approved.

Ms. Wright said Academic Planning still has to review the BS in Finance so all of these proposals will be tabled for the next meeting.
New courses:
- POLI 294 – Sustainability (Politics of Ideas)
- POLI 311 Policymaking in State Legislatures
- POLI 331 – Geography of Native Lands/Indian Law (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 307 – POLI 307 – Environmental Policy –
- POLS 308 – POLI 308 – Education Policy –
- POLS 309 – POLI 309 – Health Policy –
- POLI 310 – Urban Applications in GIS
- 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
Silvia Rodríguez-Sabater, committee chair, briefly explained the following proposals.

**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

The Senate voted on the new course proposals for the Master of Business Administration which were approved without discussion.

**Change to the Continuing Education Policies: “Policies for Non-Credit Programs”** (for information)
Ms. Rodriguez-Sabater said the committee will no longer review non-credit courses. Instead, the Director of Continuing Education—in consultation with expert faculty and the Dean of the North Campus—will review the proposals. The Director of Continuing Education will be an ex-officio member on the Graduate Committee and will report on the proposals.

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

The Provost proposed the following resolution: “Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends to the Board of Trustees that candidates certified by the Registrar’s Office as having completed all requirements be awarded degrees at graduation.”

The Senate voted on the approval of degree candidates for December graduation which was approved without discussion.

The Speaker encouraged everyone to attend commencement.

**Constituents' Concerns**

Ms. Curtis said that the email system has broken down again. She emphasized that this is an important tool for communicating with our students. The Speaker said that she spoke to Bob Cape, Senior Vice-President of Institutional Technology, about this previously. When the server goes down, and no one notifies IT then they do not know that there has been a problem.

There were no further comments.
The Senate was adjourned at 6:52 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

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

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 1 November 2011, at 6:10 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of 4 October, 2011 were approved as circulated with one minor change. On the bottom of page 2 (point 4 of Speaker’s report), the wording should be “to err on the side” rather than “to error on the side.”

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Lynn Cherry said she would give a brief report. She thanked all those who attended Edward Jones’s talk sponsored by The College Reads. She responded to questions that she has received about the updated version of the Bylaws and the Faculty Administration Manual (FAM) from last year. She has been told that changes to the FAM also must be approved by the Board of Trustees. The next meeting will be in January and it will be voted on at that time. The updated versions will be posted after that.

The Speaker reported that faculty should be involved in the revision of the Strategic Plan. She has been looking back through previous Speaker’s reports and the American Association of University Professors’ (AAUP) website about faculty governance, and they stress the need for faculty to be involved in the decision making process. She has talked to President Benson and Provost Hynd about this issue. Her recommendation is that specific faculty communities (already in existence) work on revising the Strategic Plan. The time frame will be fairly short so that a revised version can be ready for the Board of Trustees’ meeting in January. If your committee is tapped, she encourages you to participate.

Lastly she reported that she will be bringing a couple of topics to the Senate in upcoming meetings for discussion.

There were no questions at this time.
New Business

Faculty Curriculum Committee

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

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, PEHD130 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**

Ms. Wright mentioned that the Health and Human Performance courses PEHD 115 (will come later at a future meeting).

Claire Curtis (at-large) asked about the acronym PEAC. Ms. Wright said that it refers to physical education and health activity courses. Martha Stackel (Library) asked why African Dance is changing to PEAC, while all the other dance course are changing to Theater. Sue Balinski, (Health & Human Performance) answered that they have an adjunct in their department who has taught the African Dance course for a long time, but that on the whole, Theater has people who are better prepared to teach these courses. The Speaker said all the other Dance courses fulfill requirements for the Dance major or minor, but African Dance course does not count for the minor or major.

The Senate voted on the course proposals for Health and Human Performance, which were approved.
Arts Management New course ARTM499: Bachelor’s Essay

Frank Cossa (Art History) asked if this is like an Honor’s – 6 credit hours. He asked if it is required of all other majors. Ms. Wright said it is for students in the Honors program and not required for all majors.

The Senate voted on the new course in Arts Management which was approved.

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

The Senate voted on the new course in French, Francophone & Italian Studies which was approved without discussion.

Linguistics New course LING490: Special Topics

Ms. Wright said a more general statement which includes goals and objectives for LING 490 has been submitted.

The Senate voted on the new course in Linguistics which was approved.

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

Julia Eichelberger (at-large) said she had trouble finding all the forms. Ms. Wright said they had all been posted on the web.

The Senate voted on the course proposals in Psychology which were approved.

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**

The Senate voted on the change of major in Health & Human Performance, which was approved without discussion.

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

The Senate voted on the change of minor in Linguistics, which was approved without discussion.

Psychology  Change of Major to include course changes above

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

Hosp & Tourism  Mgmt **Accidentally left off October’s Agenda**  Change of Major: Change economics requirement for minor from ECON201 to ECON200.

The Senate voted on the change of major in Hosp. & Tourism Mgmt., which was approved without discussion.

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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to change degree requirements for the major</td>
<td>BS: Athletic Training</td>
<td>1. Increase credit hours for ATEP 430 lab and ATEP 437 lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>ATEP 430L</td>
<td>2. Increase major BS in Athletic Training by 2 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>ATEP 437L</td>
<td>Change from zero to 1 credit hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to change degree requirements for the major</td>
<td>BS: Physical Education/Teacher Education</td>
<td>Replace required courses PEHD 105 and PEHD 117 with PEAC 105 and PEAC 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 102, Beginning Yoga</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 102, Beginning Yoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 103, Martial Arts</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 103, Martial Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 104 Beginning Figure (Ice) Skating</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 104 Beginning Figure (Ice) Skating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 105 Basketball &amp; Volleyball</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 105 Basketball &amp; Volleyball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Change a Course</td>
<td>PEHD 107 Beginning Swimming</td>
<td>Change to PEAC 107 Beginning Swimming</td>
</tr>
<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 Course Old</td>
<td>Change to PEAC Course Old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</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>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>
Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) asked Ms. Wright if her committee sees that the learning outcomes conform to the overarching standards for the whole College. She responded that when there are standards, they use them. But, there is still not a lot of guidance at the College-level, like for the mentorship class. They try to make sure that the outcomes in the course are in accordance with the department outcomes. She said now departments are developing outcomes and assessments and that will help the committee in the future. Mr. Krasnoff said maybe the committee has too much to do, but someone should be exercising oversight, especially for mentorship. There should be some sort of general standards. He thinks the committee should come up with these standards. We need to perhaps to think about how to fix this. Speaker Cherry said that this is on her “project” list.

Lynne Ford, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration, said that this is a process of evolution. Even if you are just looking at the forms, those kinds of conversations should be at different levels. Not just at the curriculum level.

Constituents’ Concerns

The Speaker responded to Joe Kelly’s (at-large) question from last Senate meeting about computer passwords. To that end she asked Brenton LeMesurier, Chair of the Educational Technology Committee, to briefly speak about the committee’s findings. Mr. LeMesurier said that he received the following information from Institutional Technology (IT). In the future we will be receiving advanced warning for password changes (11-12 days). Nonetheless, IT still thinks changing every 3 months is a good idea for security reasons. IT also informed them that the Banner System contains confidential information and that is why we are getting timed-out so quickly. The new version of Windows 7 is coming in spring, 2012.

Ms. Wright wanted to know about the difference between log-in time for OAKS and Banner since OAKS also contains sensitive information. Mr. LeMesurier said he did not know the answer.

Mr. Kelly asked Mr. LeMesurier if his committee is satisfied. Mr. LeMesurier said they are not satisfied with all the answers or the process. He recommends that when you have a problem that you first email Helpdesk and then Bob Cape, Senior Vice-President of Institutional Technology, and then him. His committee is dealing with these issues because of lack of trust, but it is not really his committee’s charge. Garrett Mitchener (at-large) asked about the discussions regarding phishing. He said the only thing he’s seen happen are the glossy posters. Mr. LeMesurier said there has been some discussion about user training. Mr. Mitchener said there is
software available to alleviate this problem. He sent it to Helpdesk and to Mr. Cape, but has received no response. Mr. LeMesurier said to send it to him.

Bill Manaris (Computer Science) asked if there is lack of communication between IT and users on campus. Mr. LeMesurier said it would be nice to have a forum for these types of discussion and concerns.

The Speaker asked Mr. Kelly to respond to Mr. Kranoff’s question from last Senate meeting about the International Scholars Program. He wanted to know if this program had ever come through a committee or the Senate. There was some confusion as to the nature of this program and whether it was part of the School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs (LCWA), or Honors, or both. Mr. Kelly said that the language online describing this program led one to believe that it is an academic program, but he has since discovered that it is a scholarship program to help recruit students. He learned this from John Newell, Dean of the Honor’s College and David Cohen, Dean of LCWA.

Ms. Curtis said more than a handful of people had problems with their email this past Sunday, but we did not receive any notice about this from IT. She said email is a key form of communication with our students.

Marianne Verlinden (at-large) asked about the hiring process for a new Dean of LCWA, since David Cohen has announced his upcoming retirement. Provost George Hynd said that tomorrow they were going to formally announce this at the Academic Council. He will be meeting with program directors from LCWA to discuss the search process for a new dean.

There were no further comments.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:48 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 4 October 2011

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 4 October 2011, at 5:05 P.M. in the Beatty Center (Wachovia Auditorium). After Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of 13 September, 2011 were approved as circulated with one minor change. On page 3 of the minutes, item 1, the word “fund” was inserted for clarification. The phrase now reads: “the President announced the creation of a competitive professional development fund for non-instructional staff.”

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Lynn Cherry began her report by reminding everyone to introduce themselves and to identify his/her department, school or office. She also asked participants to please speak loudly enough so that everyone can hear. Only senators can vote, but everyone can speak. She then briefly reported on the following four topics:

1. On November 1, 2011 the Faculty Senate meeting will begin at 6:00 pm and will end at 7:00 pm. As part of “The College Reads Program” Edward P. Jones, author of The Known World, will be speaking to the College and the public at 5:00 pm in the TD Arena (previously known as Carolina First Arena). The Senate will meet at 6:00 pm to avoid conflict with the event. The Senate was not postponed until the following week because November 8 is Election Day (and senators have asked that Senate not be scheduled on Election Day).

2. The Board of Trustees will be meeting on Oct. 13 and 14. The committee meetings are on Thursday, Oct. 13. She reminded everyone that these are open to public. If you are interested in attending a particular committee meeting, please let Speaker Cherry or Elizabeth Kassebaum know. The Speaker will send out a schedule of the meetings.

3. Information from the Facilities Master Planners is available online. There is a link on your My Charleston page. She thanked everyone who has looked at the materials and provided comments/feedback. There is still time to look at the information and provide feedback online, to the Speaker or to Beverly Diamond, Senior Vice Provost. The planners will return to campus later this month and we want to provide as much feedback as possible.

4. In light of all the recent emails regarding Institutional Technology (IT), the Speaker invited Bob Cape, Senior Vice-President of Institutional Technology, to briefly address the issue of email and problems that arose over the past weekend.
Mr. Cape said that if you give up your username and password to a phishing scheme then you are compromising the whole College of Charleston system. Phishing incidents can lead to a data disclosure threat, which can lead to an identity threat, all of which can cause an enormous expense to the College. In response to the emails this morning, we experienced the effects of phishing schemes. We were blocked by other internet providers. He said we should not respond to phishing. Since April of 2010 we have had 35 incidents of phishing. Those were caused by 14 students, 14 staff and 7 faculty members. The expense to the individual and to the institution is very high. His office is developing training materials, a poster campaign to fight this.

The Speaker said it is a problem when we do not know that these events have occurred and our students do not know that emails have been delayed. She asked if there is a way faculty can be informed when this occurs. Mr. Cape responded that when email is delayed due to a phishing incident, he will post an email to everyone with this information. He said internal emails are not affected. It varies between internet providers. Claire Curtis (at-large) wanted to know if that was the reason that we could not read our email on Sunday for 5-6 hours. He said that was an indirect consequence. Ms. Diamond asked him to clarify student to faculty emails. He said he is confident that internal emails will work, however, he is not sure about student gmail accounts. He will come back with a clarification. Vince Benigni (Communication) said he had problems with a student with gmail who did not get his email. Rob Dillon (Biology) said we learned about the delay in emails from other faculty members (and not IT); we need to hear about it immediately. He said that Mr. Cape’s report was “some sort of blame game.” He said the security system is so bad that it is letting these phishing schemes through to our email. Mr. Cape said he is right – that in regards to the most recent phishing incident they did not respond to faculty right away, but they will do it in the future. He said our security is not as effective as they would want it to be. They have spam filters, but he thinks faculty would want them to error on the side of caution and not filter out important emails, but the consequence is that some spam bate does arrive. It’s not perfect.

In reference to his report, Mr. Cape wanted to clarify that internal gmail accounts should not be affected when outside email accounts are experiencing delays.

The Provost

Provost Hynd said that he would give a brief report. He updated the Senate on program proposals. Exercise Science will be heard at The Commission on Higher Education (CHE) this week. The Public Health program is coming up in December. Dance, will be next to go to CHE. Marketing and Finance were submitted a while ago and are being revised. Marketing will go to the Curriculum Committee and then Finance will follow. The proposed degree program in
Professional Studies at the North Campus has garnered very good response. Lynne Ford, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration, and others are working on it.

The Provost noted he has been thinking hard about a different way of reporting to the faculty. There will be a new format this year. Although he will continue to attend Senate meetings, and to answer questions, he will not make a formal report at every meeting. One idea he is considering is that every other month he’ll make a more formal report to the faculty at-large (not at the Senate) and pair it with another presentation from another unit on campus. Unit heads will make formal presentations so we can learn about them. In a couple of weeks he will be putting out a communication, inviting ideas. Julia Eichelberger (at-large) asked for more information about the format. He said there will formal presentations, for instance with PowerPoint, but he wants feedback. Joe Kelly (at-large) asked for clarification on unit heads. He said there would be Deans and others. Ms. Curtis wondered if every two months would be too often and that people might not attend. He said food would help.

**Old Business**

Scott Peeples, Chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, spoke briefly about the following motion:

The 2011-2012 By-Laws Committee unanimously approved the following motion. This motion to change the By-Laws 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.

**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.

The Senate voted on the motion to change to change the term of the Speaker of the Faculty and Faculty Secretary (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), which was approved without discussion.
New Business

Scott Peeples, Chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, introduced the following motion:

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.
There was a short discussion about clarification (in reference to sabbaticals) and wording of the motion. The motion was referred back to the By-Laws Committee for further review.
Tom Baginski, Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee, introduced the following motion:

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 across the board, as detailed below in the section "Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member's Packet."

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.
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.

Martha Stackel (Library) said the wording “Letter from the Dean with recommendations” in item two (under preparation and submission of packet) is confusing. Mr. Baginski noted that this is a problem and asked if she could propose some language to clarify it.

Mr. Baginski said he would like to see the motion put in place by January or February.

Mr. Benigni asked about people who are coming up for Post-Tenure Review now. Speaker Cherry said this would not come into effect until next year (Fall 2012 and Spring 2013). Mr. Baginski said it’s not fair to professors that the bar is higher for Post-Tenure Review than for promotion to Full Professor; that is why they are pushing this now.

John Olson (guest) asked if there is a way we could address the language concerning teaching so we can help people coming up now for Post-Tenure Review. The Speaker asked if By-Laws could look at it now, but she does not think the changes will affect those coming up for review in the spring. Mr. Peeples said his committee can move fast, but he doubts this is going to be done in time for January.

Robert Westerfelhaus (at-large) noted that in number 9 it says “Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality” and he wanted to know what are the others. Mr. Baginski said that they copied that language from the FAM and he does not know the answer. Jim Carew (Geology) said that the new wording from the FAM for Full Professor should carry over to Post-Tenure Review. Mr. Baginski said that those changes need to be reflected in this document and that is why his committee is proposing this motion. Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) said that the reference to other criteria means that there could be other ways of demonstrating scholarly quality, for example, if an article is invited by a very prestigious press and not peer reviewed, that might be a possibility. Mr. Westerfelhaus said he still thinks this is vague.

Ms. Stackel said there are two issues here: one regarding teaching & the wording of exemplary and the other regarding the preparation/submission of the packet. The committee needs some advice on the ordering of the packet.

Ms. Diamond said a superior rating for Post-Tenure Review should meet the spirit of the standards of promotion to Full Professor. She said the language from the FAM should be used to address this. The ordering of the packet is a different issue.

Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, said that the proposal here is about the structure of the packet and not the language of the FAM.
Mr. Baginski said he wants to know how far we are bound by the actual document. Ms. Diamond said she will work with the committee. The new standards are the ones that they should use.

The Speaker asked Ms. Diamond if she could relate this information regarding FAM language to Department chairs. Ms. Diamond said she needs to sit with the committee first.

With no further discussion, the motion was referred to the By-Laws Committee.
C. Faculty Curriculum Committee

Jen Wright, Chair of the Committee, introduced the following proposals. She noted that the change of course for Span 329 was misplaced on the agenda and that it belongs under Part I Course Proposals (the change is reflected below and is underlined).

Speaker Cherry reported that the Academic Planning Committee had no concerns with either of the proposed new minors.

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

Hisp. Studies Change of Course: SPAN329 Current Issues in Spain or the Spanish Speaking World, change prerequisites

The Senate voted on the new course for Hosp & Tourism Mgmt and the change of course for Arts Mgmt and Hisp. Studies, which were approved without discussion.

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.

The Senate voted on the change of minors for History and Hosp & Tourism Mgmt, which were approved without discussion.

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
• New Course: SPAN418: Advanced Spanish for Business Communication

Mr. Kelly asked if the documentation for the new minor had been posted. Ms. Wright said all the documentation has been posted on the website.

The Senate voted on the new minor for Hispanic Studies, which was approved.

French New Minor: BLFR Business Language Minor in French (no course changes/additions)

The Senate voted on the new minor for French, which was approved without discussion.
D. Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

Silvia Rodríguez-Sabater, committee chair, briefly explained the following proposals.

Proposal for a graduate certificate program:

- Graduate Certificate in Operations Research

Ms. Rodríguez-Sabater explained that this is a certificate program that allows non-degree students to learn about operational research combining theoretical and applied approaches. This certificate fills a need in the community, especially for the Coast Guard. It has a minimum of 15 credit hours.

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 only):

- Law School Admission Test (LSAT) Preparation
- Medical College Admission Test (MCAT) Preparation

Ms. Rodríguez-Sabater noted that this LSAT prep course is more intensive than the one currently taught at the Center for Student Learning. It is also more economical than commercial services.
Mike Duvall (English) wanted to know if we had a similar type of course for the Graduate Record Exam (GRE). Ms. Rodríguez-Sabater said she is not aware of one. Mr. Krasnoff commented that someone could do it because the structure is already there.

The Senate voted on these proposals, which were approved. Please note that the last two items were for information only and did not require a vote.

**Constituents' Concerns**

Mr. Krasnoff asked about the International Scholars Program. He wanted to know if this program had ever come through a committee or the Senate. There was some confusion as to the nature of this program and whether it was part of the School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs (LCWA), or Honors, or both. Ms. Eichelberger said she thought it was in recognition of students who qualify, but does not think it’s a program. Elizabeth Martinez-Gibson (at-large) wanted to know if they were referring to Global Scholars. Ms. Curtis said no, it was on the webpage of LCWA webpage today. The Speaker said she would find out more about the program.

Mr. Kelly asked if the faculty committee on technology could make a report to the Senate about the changing of passwords. He’s heard that frequent changing of passwords does not add extra security.

There were no further comments.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 13 September 2011

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 13 September 2011 in Wachovia Auditorium (Beatty Center 115). Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order at 5:03 P.M.

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Lynn Cherry welcomed everyone to the Senate. She then introduced the members of the team at the front table, George Pothering (Parliamentarian), Sarah Owens (Faculty Secretary) and Heather Alexander (Faculty Secretariat).

The Speaker reminded everyone that the Senate webpage is a good source for information: general information, template for drafting motions, committee listing and members, etc.

She announced that the team from the Facilities Master Plan began work last spring. They worked over the summer to look at the physical and technology needs of the College. They will be on campus next Tuesday, September 20 and will hold an open forum for faculty and staff from 3:30-5:00 in Wachovia Auditorium. There will be an opportunity for questions, comments, and feedback to group at the forum. They will have a website with an electronic link to submit ideas and provide feedback. An email to the campus will be forthcoming later this week from the President’s office. Among the findings so far:

a. The College needs approximately 550,000 more assignable square feet of instructional space – about a third more of what we already have as far as instructional space.

b. Technology infrastructure needs to be dramatically improved in classrooms and across campus.

c. The College is exploring various options for additional housing and campus wellness/fitness center.

The Speaker announced that “Extreme Make-Over – Home Edition” – will again feature the College of Charleston in an upcoming edition of the show, to air in October. (Unfortunately, the first time around problems arose with the family because they had not been forthcoming about their financial situation). This time the College will be providing scholarship money which has been donated for this specific purpose. The “Make-Over” will occur in Fayetteville, North Carolina at “Jubilee House” which is a facility for women veterans and their immediate families. The scholarships will be made available to any woman or their children who were residents of Jubilee House and who meet all CofC Admissions requirements. The money for these scholarships has been privately donated and is not funded through the CofC.
Speaker Cherry reminded everyone that the Board of Trustees meetings are here on campus and are open, public meetings. Faculty presence at meetings may underscore faculty interest and concerns, as well as provide an opportunity for faculty to talk informally with Board of Trustees members and/or respond to questions they might have. Let her know if you are interested in attending so she can make sure there will be enough space at the meeting.

She invited everyone to the reception in the Tate Gallery (second floor) immediately after this evening’s Senate meeting.

The minutes of 5, 12 April and 3 May, 2011 were approved as circulated.

**The President**

President Benson said that he was going to focus his speech on three topics: tenure and promotion (T&P), college budget (salaries), and three new initiatives.

**Tenure and Promotion:** He began by saying that our future is determined by promoting and granting tenure to our faculty. He is confident that the faculty, the Deans, and the Provost make the upmost quality decisions. He discussed three tenure appeals directed to last year’s Faculty Hearing Committee. He reversed one of the decisions after careful review, but before the Hearing Committee had concluded their procedures. He thought that he was saving the Hearing Committee and everyone else time and money by acting expeditiously, but since then he has been advised by faculty leaders and the Senate, that he needs to let the Hearing Committee conclude first. He will follow that advice. He said that he is 100% confident about the final decision, but not the timing.

In late April the Hearing Committee recommended that the other two faculty members be allowed to come up again for tenure this year. This is against the recommendations of the Faculty Administration Manual (FAM). The committee raised complex issues. He concluded that an additional review process had to be an extension of the initial process, not a whole new process this year. He composed a committee, they followed the timeline and the results are in, but they are confidential.

**The College Budget:** The President said that since 2008 the College of Charleston has lost a significant amount of funding. The Strategic Plan depends on money. Due to lack of funding we have been prevented from implementing a new financial model. This year a proposed modest 3% tuition increase was turned down by the Board of Trustees. The College has been forced to eliminate some lines, but no one has been laid off. The budget crisis and reduction of services threatens the quality of the education experience. Now, we have no choice but to re-evaluate the Strategic Plan. He said we must prioritize initiatives in the current plan, for example, increase salaries. The President was shocked 5 years ago when he saw the low salaries at the College and he is still shocked. We are in danger of losing our best faculty and staff. This is already
happening. There have been no across the board salary increases at the College since 2008. Yet, other South Carolina institutions have received raises and bonuses. He is frustrated.

The President announced that he would be taking a proposal to the Board of Trustees for a mid-year, merit-based bonus program for roster faculty and permanent non-instructional staff. If approved, this one-time bonus would be distributed during the current academic year.

The President indicated that in spring 2012, barring some national economic disaster, he plans to present to the Board of Trustees a budget for 2012-2013 that will include a multimillion-dollar commitment to merit-based salary increases for our roster faculty and non-instructional staff. Again, these salary increases would be subject to approval by the Board of Trustees. This is his highest priority. This would come from increased tuition. He said that the College is still a good deal for in-state tuition. He is certain that most parents will support a tuition increase.

**New initiatives:** The President announced 3 initiatives, small steps in support of the Strategic Plan.

1) This past spring he visited 7-8 offices such as SNAP (Students Needing Access Parity), Undergraduate Academic Services, the Center for Student Learning, etc. all of which directly support students. Because of budget cuts over the past three years, these offices operate with very small budgets. As a result, there is a shortage of professional development money for staff. To alleviate this problem the President announced the creation of a competitive professional development fund for non-instructional staff. Initial funding will be $20,000.

2) The President announced a pilot, small grants program to support innovative teaching in the liberal arts and sciences. This program will provide grants of up to $1,500 and is intended to support faculty in any discipline, as long as the grant supports improvement in teaching and learning in the liberal arts and sciences. The initial funding for this pilot program will be $20,000. The quantity and quality of the applications will determine whether and how this program will be continued in future years.

3) The President discussed previous recommendations of the Faculty Compensation Committee. In response to some of those recommendations, he announced that the total salary increase for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will be moved from $3,300 to $3,800. The total salary increase for promotion to Full Professor will be adjusted from $4,500 to $5,000. These changes will take effect beginning with those who are tenured and promoted in August 2012.

The President thanked everyone for their hard work. He then opened the floor for questions.
Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) asked about the percentage of out-of-state students this year. Steve Osborne (Senior VP for Business Affairs) said the freshman class runs close to 50/50. However, there is a percentage of transfer students from in-state and that makes the out-of-state more like 38%. The Provost said that of the 11,000 applications 64% were from out-of-state. Claire Curtis (at-large) asked about the tenure and promotion decisions. She asked about his response to a case being heard only once. He said both committees were allowed to weigh in. Another question was raised regarding our short term building commitments. Mr. Osborn said they are working on building out the 1st and 2nd floors of the New Science Center, renovating the Old Science Center and the Simons Center for the Arts, adding to Jewish Studies and building an additional science building at Grice Marine facility. The President said money will come from tuition.

The Provost

Provost Hynd began by saying that he appreciates the opportunity to address the Senate. He said that he would focus his speech on academic updates and objectives for the 2011/12 academic year.

Academic Updates:

In 2011/12 all first year students will be required to complete the First Year Experience (FYE). This experience will help with retention rates. Currently our first year retention rate is at 82.2%, the 4 year graduations rate is 58.9% and the 6 year graduation at 67%.

The Provost said that the Center for Excellence in Peer Education opened this fall under the direction of Page Keller. We know this has a positive impact. The College of Charleston is poised to become a national leader in best practices and research in peer education.

The Provost briefly mentioned the College’s participation in the national Wabash Study of Liberal Arts Education. We will be exploring and assessing integrative learning as it occurs in the first year. In the next six months, the study will expand to include the ways in which integrative learning is facilitated by study abroad.

The Office of Accountability, Accreditation, Planning & Assessment (AAPA) has been restructured as the Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Planning. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Fifth-Year Interim Report is due March 2013 and must include comprehensive, systematic assessments for all academic programs. Penny Brunner, Associate Vice President for Institutional Assessment and Planning, is working with Deans, Associate Deans and faculty so that strategic initiatives and school assessments will show alignment with the College’s mission and goals.
New majors in Computing in the Arts and Jewish Studies began this fall. The Computing in the Arts major grew out of faculty collaboration with a FYE Learning Community. The Commission on Higher Education (CHE) is set to approve new majors in Exercise Science and Public Health.

Provost Hynd remarked that external funding continues to be a high priority as the College tries to move towards more self-sufficiency. Susan Anderson, Director of the Office of Research and Grants Administration, has worked closely with faculty in pursuing grants. 375 proposals have been submitted in the last 3 years, with an outcome of $130 million. Also, as a point of pride, some of that money has come in conjunction with research with our students.

The Provost said that despite the loss of some lines, we are still reinvesting in our faculty. This year 34 new tenure track faculty joined the College. He mentioned that 10 of the 34 faculty have a degree from an overseas university.

**Objectives for the 2011/12 Academic Year**

The Provost said there were a number of objectives for 2011/12 year. Academic Affairs has launched a study to analyze the cost of academic programs. They are not looking to use data to cut programs but to better understand how instructional resources support our programs. They will use this data to support new program proposals. This information will be presented to the chairs of Budget and Academic Planning, Deans and program directors on September 19. They want input and then they will present it to the President and the Board of Trustees. The data underscores the fact that our programs cut across schools and our faculty is working hard. CHE has started challenging programs regarding instructional costs so now we have to estimate program costs.

Last March campus leaders including the previous Speaker of the Faculty, Darryl Phillips, expressed concerns about the T&P process. There was a retreat in August to identify the major concerns. The retreat was very productive. As a result of discussion during the retreat faculty asked the Office of Academic Affairs to develop proposals on issues they considered most important. He listed four major concerns: 1) Provision of feedback to candidates, chairs and Deans on reasons for decisions. 2) Guidelines for the solicitation of information at each level of review in the case of ambiguity or incomplete packet information 3) Approval process for departmental guidelines 4) Correction on factual errors.

The Provost provided the following timeline. In November Academic Affairs will discuss proposals with the Faculty Welfare Advisory Committee, in December they will have a discussion with senior faculty leadership and by spring, Academic Affairs will work with faculty committees.

Those who are coming up for T&P this year will not be impacted at all. There have been no changes in standards or process this year. They will follow the guidelines in the FAM.
The Provost said the North Campus, adjacent to Boeing, represents an outstanding opportunity to offer high quality instruction, especially to adult students. We already have a good relationship with Trident and would like to develop one with Boeing. This summer the Provost charged a task force to develop a degree completion program to be offered only at the North Campus. This program is intended to increase the number of college graduates in South Carolina and the Lowcountry. Only 34.4% of South Carolinians between the ages of 25 and 64 hold a 2 or 4-year college degree, yet by 2018, over 60% of jobs in the US will require a postsecondary degree. By developing a new degree at the North Campus we will meet a need in our community. As proposed, the degree would be a B.A. in Professional Studies with a couple of tracts. This is a degree completion program, therefore admission requires that a student have completed a 2-year A.A. (Associate in Arts) or A.S.(Associate in Science); or present 60 transferable credits, and be at least 24 years old. He looks forward to our input. In preparation for this program the College will be searching for a Dean of the North Campus. He thanked Sue Sommer-Kress for her exceptional service as interim director.

The Provost announced a new initiative called Carolina Identity. The purpose is to create synergy and engagement across campus, drawing on our unique history, but also on our incredible expertise. This will be a collaborative effort with the Carolina Lowcountry and Atlantic World program (CLAW), Avery Research Center, African American Studies, Women and Gender Studies, the School of Humanities and Social Sciences and the School of Languages, Culture and World Affairs. More information will follow in an email.

As a final initiative, the Provost announced that summer school offerings will be increased. This will further impact our retention rate. Using 2011 summer school revenue data as a baseline, 40% of any increase in revenue over that baseline will be shared with the schools and departments proportionate to their contribution to the increase.

The Provost thanked all those who participated in initiatives over the summer. He then opened the floor to questions.

Vince Benigni (Communication) commented that the format of the new convocation was wonderful. It was a great improvement over the previous format. Provost Hynd said he appreciates the positive feedback, but others like Lynne Ford, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration, deserve a lot of credit. Ms. Ford said the committee will get together next week to go over the feedback.

Ms. Curtis asked about summer teaching. Faculty members are concerned about courses making. She wanted to know how many courses made this past summer. The Provost said he did not know the number. He is encouraging more on-line courses - they can be more generous with the number of students in those courses. Beverly Diamond, Senior Vice Provost, said that they are
trying to commit with faculty for salary earlier, so that last minute cancellations do not affect their pay.

Joe Kelly (at-large) wanted to know if the Faculty Senate will have the same role for the North Campus as it does downtown. The Provost said that he assumes yes, but they still need to develop a financial model. Hopefully with a Dean for the North Campus this will be a good way to promote access to the community, but there are still a lot of things to figure out.

Mr. Kelly asked about departments and their own statements for T&P and what will happen to the statements. The Provost answered that they will be looking at these statements and expectations, but they will also be sent to the Faculty Advisory Committee. Brian Lanahan (at-large) asked about publications. Where does one look for a guide to acceptance rates and quality? The Provost said scholarly efforts should reach a wide distribution but also be respected. Departments need to decide how they define quality and impact. The author of the department panel letter needs to be as explicit as possible. The Faculty Advisory Committee needs explicit statements. Otherwise there is ambiguity. Deanna Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, added that this was discussed at the retreat this past summer. At present we still do not have a process to approve departmental standards. They need to work on this.

Jen Wright (guest) said her department is reluctant to offer too many classes during summer because they do not fill. She wanted to know if they were actively recruiting to get more summer students. The Provost said not yet. But, they want to increase advertising.

Some more discussion ensued regarding T&P and department standards. Mr. Krasnoff said he does not think that a committee can be bound by a department statement and exercise independent judgment. The actual candidate will be under different committees – he is worried that this will make a worse outcome. He said we have to be careful and find another model for guidelines because this is a “recipe for a disaster.” The Provost said that is why panel letters need to be very explicit. He also said that most faculty members go through the process relatively easily.

P. Brian Fisher, Office of Sustainability

Brian Fisher, Director of the Office of Sustainability, thanked Burton Callicott for all the wonderful work he’s done in the past. Mr. Fisher began his report with several updates. He said that today was the official end of our first greenhouse gas audit. Now we have a baseline from which to go forward. A Climate Action Plan will be incorporated into a larger sustainability plan. He wants to put together a large committee with faculty and staff to develop a long range plan for carbon neutrality. This will be an important step forward for the college. He will put out the open call for the committee.
Mr. Fisher reported that there is currently an Ad-hoc Faculty Sustainability Committee, but this will be formalized into a permanent committee in the near future. He envisions the committee defining and implementing sustainability into our teaching and research. Five paid interns have been hired and he also has a graduate assistant from the Master of Science in Environmental Studies (MES) program. This is a unique opportunity for students to build bridges that will make the campus more sustainable. He said the commuter survey will come out next week. Another survey will also be conducted and will go out on 10 October. He encouraged everyone to take it. He will be applying for a large National Science Foundation (NSF) grant on sustainability networks. The deadline is 1 December. Contact him if you would like to help work on the proposal.

Mr. Fisher defined sustainability as a complex social learning process. He went on to say that we do not have all the answers. It is a learning process through your community. Every member has an opportunity to participate, not just students. The office will be a hub for teaching, research and applied management of the issues.

Mr. Benigni said it would be nice to incorporate this into the FYE and reach every freshman. Mr. Fisher said he loves the idea and would like to take it one step further. He would like to see an outreach program for elementary and high schools. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Fisher about the problem with students receiving $150 tickets for biking infractions. He asked about dedicated bike lanes. Mr. Fisher said we need to identify bike safe-ways, back streets and mark them for this purpose.

**New Business**

**Election of Speaker Pro Tempore**

Claire Curtis (at-large) was nominated by Robert Westerfelhaus (at-large) for the position of Speaker Pro Tempore. Ms. Curtis accepted the nomination and was elected by unanimous vote.
Faculty Compensation Committee

Calvin Blackwell, committee chair, presented the following report on faculty salaries.

Annual Report 2010-11
Faculty Compensation Committee
College of Charleston

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>97.2</td>
<td></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>82.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY - Geneseo</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td></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>71.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s (MD)</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td></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>68.6</td>
<td></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
<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*

* Incomplete data for Lander University and Winthrop University.*
### Exhibit 8

**2010-11 Average Salaries (in $1000s) at All Category IIA Institutions in the South Atlantic Region**

(DE, DC, FL, GA, MD, NC, PR, SC, USVI, VA, WV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
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>
Tom Heeney, member of the committee and also chapter President of American Association of University Professors (AAUP), gave the following additional report:

**AAUP Shared Governance Principles**

- “The Faculty should participate both in the preparation of the total institutional budget and… in decisions relevant to the further apportioning of its specific fiscal divisions (salaries, academic programs, tuition, physical plant and grounds, and so on).”
- Faculty representatives should receive complete information before major decisions are made.
- “Faculty information is most useful when we can look at trends over time.”

**CofC Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses by function</th>
<th>2010 (percent of total expenses)</th>
<th>2001 (percent of total expenses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>31.21%</td>
<td>36.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>10.78%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships &amp; Fellowships</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Capitol Debt</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USC to provide bonuses to some employees**
[The Post & Courier, 9.7.2011]

COLUMBIA—University of South Carolina president Harris Pastides says some college staff will receive merit-based bonuses.

Pastides said Wednesday he recognizes the 1.5 percent pay incentives are not enough. But he says he hopes employees see it as a statement of the university’s commitment to them.

The president says he’s asked the school chief financial officer and the provost to come up with a proposal for more significant performance-based salary increases next year.
Last month, Clemson president Jim Baker said professors there could get raises of up to 6 percent this fall under the college’s new merit-based compensation system. Clemson’s raises will average 2.5 percent.

AAUP 2010-2011 Salary Data for Select SC Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CofC</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citadel</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Carolina</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wofford</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of time constraints the Speaker asked that questions to the Provost or the committee be asked via email.
Faculty Curriculum Committee

Jen Wright, committee chair, briefly informed the Senate about the new procedures and curriculum proposal forms that can be found on the Faculty Curriculum Committee webpage: http://currcomm.cofc.edu/index.php

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

Silvia Rodriguez-Sabater, committee chair, briefly explained the following proposals. These were for information only and not voted on by the Senate.

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

Ms. Rodriguez-Sabater explained that these non-credit courses/programs are targeted for working professionals in computing/technology and those working in IT related fields—these are certification courses. Each course will have 40 hours of instruction. They are pass/fail. Aspen Olmsted is the main instructor from Computer Science. They are self-supporting and will be mostly held at the North Charleston campus.

There were no questions at this time.
Constituents' Concerns

There were no concerns at this time.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:55 PM.

A reception sponsored by Academic Affairs was held in the Tate Center Gallery.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens
Faculty Secretary
Motion Regarding the Establishment of School Based Tenure and Promotion Committees

Introduction:

In August 2011 Academic Affairs convened faculty leaders from across the campus to discuss issues and ideas related to ways in which the process and procedures for Tenure and Promotion can be strengthened. A number of recommendations were offered and Academic Affairs has worked to frame recommendations for actions to present to appropriate faculty committees, most notably Faculty Welfare and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third Year Review. One issue that has been raised, but not fully discussed nor any recommendation for action been crafted, is the issue of whether the College should adopt a model of School based Tenure and Promotion committees. The provost has affirmed that if a decision is made to develop School based T&P committees, they would not replace the campus Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third Year Review. Among the many questions/issues that need to be considered regarding the question of whether the College should move to a model of School based T&P committees are the following:

1. What would be the purpose of School based T&P committees? Are there particular benefits to adopting this model? Are there drawbacks to this model that would outweigh the potential benefits of School based committees?

2. What would be the role of School based committees in relation to the current departmental evaluation committees and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third Year Review?

3. How would School based committees be composed?
   - Some Schools have very few departments – what challenges or opportunities would a School based model for T&P provide those Schools?
   - What would/should be the term of service for members of School based T&P committees?
   - Could/should members from other schools be included as external members of a School T&P committee?
   - How should the committee be selected? Elections? Appointments? If so, by whom?

4. How would the addition of School T&P committees affect the timeline for the submission and review of materials and the decisions at all levels of the T&P process be changed?

5. Would guidelines be developed to ensure a degree of consistency of expectations across all Schools? Is so, who would be responsible for developing these guidelines?

This motion to recommend the adoption of School based T&P committees will allow Academic Affairs, in conjunction with faculty committees, to develop a model for the adoption of School based T&P committees.

Motion:

The Faculty Senate requests that the Provost and the Academic Affairs Office present a proposal to the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third Year Review for the development of School based Advisory Committees on Tenure, Promotion and Third Year Review. The proposal should be presented to Faculty Welfare and the Advisory Committee on T&P no later than September 2012 for consideration by the committees.