

March 24, 2003

Minutes of March Faculty Senate Meeting

The Faculty Senate met for an hour and a half on Tuesday, March 11. Fifty Senators attended.

Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order. The February minutes were approved with one correction.

Reports

The Provost

The Speaker welcomed Provost Andy Abrams, who had come to answer Senators' questions about impending budget cuts from the S. C. Legislature. In response to a question by Tom Kunkle (Mathematics), Mr. Abrams told Senators that the Administration did not consider faculty furloughs to be an option. Although the legislature plans to cut funding by 9.98 %, the College will absorb this reduction without affecting new faculty lines or their salary levels. Mr. Abrams said that the College did plan to review all requests for replacements in classified (non-faculty) positions. In some cases the College will save some money by replacing these positions with temporary rather than full-time appointments. This would mean that the line would be protected, but the cost to the College would be lowered.

Glenn Lesses (Philosophy) asked whether the President planned to recommend a tuition increase to the Board. Yes, Mr. Abrams replied. The President is currently "working the scenarios" for various rates of increase, to see what income the College could gain, how it could offset the increase for needy students, etc., depending on the amount. Mr. Abrams said he expects a double-digit increase. When asked if there were plans to increase out-of-state tuition at a higher rate, Mr. Abrams conceded that "it is a bargain" for out-of-state students to attend the College at our present rates. Yet we need high-quality students from out of state in order to improve the overall quality of our student body; we don't have enough high-achieving in-state students to draw from to accomplish this with only South Carolina residents. If we increase our out-of-state tuition too much, we may discourage some of these out-of-state students from coming here. Frank Kinard (Chemistry) asked if the school had considered increasing lab fees, since they had remained at \$25 for 10-15 years. Mr. Abrams said that this and other fee increases would be considered. He also reminded Senators of the need to document their travel requests carefully so that they not be deemed "non-essential" for lack of information to justify them. "I'll do all I can to interpret travel as being essential," he said, but he needs full information about the purpose of a trip in order to do this.

Peter McCandless (History) asked Mr. Abrams to explain the difference between these budget cuts and the new building projects that are underway, such as the expanded gym.

The Provost said that the budget cuts would affect only our operating costs. This income is separate from monies given by the state (or anyone else) for a specific purpose. The state has already allocated \$12 million for a new athletic facility. Additionally, the College has been authorized to retain the profits it realized from the sale of property at Remley's Point, but only if we use it to build athletic facilities. Some members of the Board wanted a much larger athletic facility than what they finally approved—one that would have cost some \$45 million. President Higdon convinced them to scale back their plans to a project costing \$36 million, because he was opposed to weakening our debt capacity that could be used to finance academic facilities. The President is especially eager to secure about \$45 million for the building of new science facilities. He has not yet obtained the full amount, and plans to finance the balance through a bond bill, the Provost told the Senate. The Speaker thanked the Provost, who replied, "See you next month."

The Speaker

Mr. Wilder began by reminding faculty that Senior Week would take place in late March and early April. This tradition was begun last year by President Higdon in an attempt to encourage students to identify with their graduating class. He encouraged faculty to attend a reception at the President's home, and to RSVP to the invitations we had received by email.

Next the Speaker reminded faculty of the formation of Ad Hoc Committees which would make recommendations concerning four areas: class size, communication across the curriculum, workload, and IT competency. All these recommendations would then flow through the normal Faculty and Senate committee channels. Mr. Wilder encouraged Senators to submit nominations, including self-nominations, to David Gentry. He also noted that a new Bookstore Advisory Committee would soon be formed. This would not be a standing faculty committee, but would be an advisory committee like the Parking Advisory Committee, composed of students and staff as well as faculty, who would offer input to Kristen Wing, the new Bookstore manager.

The Speaker then updated the Senate on other matters in the S. C. Legislature. A bill to eliminate the TERI retirement plan is now under consideration, and Mr. Wilder says he believes the TERI plan will probably be eliminated eventually. He also reported that an "at-will employment" bill was passed by the House with almost no debate. One effect of the bill, which was probably unintentional, could be to make tenure illegal. Senator Kay Patterson has been filibustering the Senate debate on this bill, and ceded the floor long enough to hear an amendment to the bill that would exempt faculty from this "at-will employment" condition. This amendment has passed, and as of this time the filibustering continues. Even if the bill is passed as amended in the S. C. Senate, it will return to the House for reconsideration in its amended form. Mr. Wilder noted that Senator Glenn McConnell sponsored the amendment, and said that if any faculty had contacted him asking for support, it would now be appropriate for them to thank him. Susan Kattwinkel (Theater) asked if we should be ready to contact House representatives if the bill returned to them, and Mr. Wilder said he would let faculty know if that became appropriate.

New Business

Graduate Committee

Maureen Hayes recommended the following new courses, course changes, and program changes. All were approved:

ENGL 560 - Film Studies

FREN 683 - Realism and Naturalism in French Literature & Art

LALE 601 - Applied Linguistics

Course Change Proposals (3):

EDFS 738, EDFS 748, EDFS 758

Program Change Proposals (4): Change admission criteria for:

MAT in elementary and early childhood programs

MED in elementary and early childhood programs

MAT in special education program

MED in special education program

Curriculum Committee

Norris Preyer brought the following proposals before the Senate, and all were approved:

B.S. in Biology with Concentration in Molecular Biology – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements

Math 121 Introductory Calculus Lab – New Course

B.A. in Biology, Dual Degree with Allied Health - Proposal to Change Degree Requirements

ENGL 496 Undergraduate Research – New Course Proposal

ENGL 326 Irish Literature – New Course Proposal

CHEM 343 Introduction to Modeling in Chemistry – New Course Proposal

PHYS 206 Planetary Astronomy – Proposal to Change a Course

PHYS 311 Stellar Astronomy and Astrophysics – Proposal to Change a Course

Academic Standards Committee

Brian Scholtens presented the Senate with the following proposal.

Final Exam Policy

It is the general policy of the College of Charleston to require final exams in accordance with the final exam schedule in *all* courses for *all* students registered for credit.

Exceptions to this policy may be made only under the following conditions:

1. The final exam in a course may be eliminated by an instructor who considers such an exam to be unnecessary if approval has been received from the department head and the dean of the school.

Although the instructor may give a final exam, individual approval for eliminating the exam does not have to be obtained for certain categories of courses:

- a. Seminars, Internships, Practicums
 - b. Independent studies, Bachelor's essays, Tutorials
 - c. Music performance courses; Studio Art courses
 - d. Student Teaching
2. If no final exam is given, instruction shall be continued through the *last* week of the semester in all courses. In such cases, the classes will meet at the times shown on the final exam schedule with the exception, at the discretion of the instructor, of (a) Seminars, Internships, Practicums; (b) Independent studies, Bachelor's essays, Tutorials; (c) Music performance courses; Studio Art courses; (d) Student Teaching
 3. The presence of each student registered for credit in a course shall be mandatory at the final exam or at the last class meeting during exam week unless the student is excused by action of the Undergraduate Dean in consultation with the professor.
 4. Adherence to this exam schedule is required. Only in extreme circumstances can a final exam be scheduled by a faculty member at a time not in conformity with the College schedule. If this action is necessary, it must be approved by the head of the department, Dean of the School, and Undergraduate Dean.

Exception: Final exams for laboratories which are part of a 4-credit course and receive either zero credits or one credit may be scheduled prior to the final exam period.

5. Ordinarily, tests should not be given during the final week of classes. Exceptions are permitted if:
 - a. a test is the last of three or more during the semester and there will be minimal new material on the final exam, and
 - b. no major papers are due in the class during this time, or
 - c. the test is in a laboratory class as described in Item 4-Exception, above.

Mr. Scholtens explained that the policy was designed to prevent conflicts for students whose professors gave exams at non-scheduled times. Senators asked whether this policy would require them to give an exam, and Mr. Scholtens said that for most courses, faculty would have to get permission from their chairs if they chose not to give an exam. In response to a question by David Mann (Political Science), Mr. Scholtens said the committee had not decided where this policy should go (in the Faculty-Administration manual or the Undergraduate Catalog, for example). In response to other questions, Mr.

Scholtens said that the present policies are not being followed, and faculty were giving what was actually an exam during the last week of class, instead of during the normal exam period when students had more time to study. Other faculty were moving their exams to a time other than their scheduled slot.

Faculty asked about the particulars of the policy. Would it prevent faculty from giving a take-home exam, asked Tim Carens (English). Mr. Scholtens said that as long as the take-home exam was due during the exam period, it would not prevent this option. George Pothering asked if students could email a take-home exam. Mr. Scholtens said the committee had imagined that students must present their exams in person, and that they had not considered the email option. More objections to this requirement were raised. Susan Morrison (Associate Provost) said she thought this document was intended for students, so they would take the exam period more seriously and not try to leave for a vacation as soon as possible by changing their exam dates. After more discussion, David Mann moved to remand the proposal to the committee, in order that they address the issue of electronic delivery of take-home exams. Some faculty thought if this document were for the benefit of students, it needed to be written more clearly. Mr. Scholtens noted that the committee had used another university's policy as the model for the policy they proposed. Other faculty acknowledged that there was a need for some clarification of exam policy, because some professors were changing their exam dates or giving exams during the last week of the semester just so they could leave early. The question was called, and the vote to remand passed.

By-Laws Committee

Bob Mignone presented two changes to the Faculty-Administration Manual. As Mr. Mignone explained, a change appeared in the Faculty/Administration Manual when that document was revised in 1999, and his search of Senate records indicated to him that no one intended for this item to be deleted. The first motion follows:

MOTION 1 TO CORRECT THE BY-LAWS

Change: Article V, Section 2, A. (page 41):

FROM: "A. Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations at least 15 days prior to the April Senate meeting, and are elected by the Senate during the April Senate meeting."

TO: "A. Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations at least 15 days prior to the April Senate meeting, and are elected by the Senate during the April Senate meeting. The majority of members of standing Senate committees must be Senators."

RATIONALE

At the December 1, 1998 Senate meeting the By-Laws Committee forwarded, with "no adjustments", several motions that were approved by the Senate at the November 1998 Senate meeting (original motions made by the Committee on Nominations). The relevant motion is as follows:

Motion 1 Part A. Change: Article V, Section 2, A. (page 42):

From: "A. Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations and Elections by March 15 and are elected by the Senate by April 1."

To: "A. Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations at least 15 days prior to the April Senate meeting, and are elected by the Senate during the April Senate meeting."

The "From" part OMITTS and the rationale does not mention the last sentence in the then existing By-Laws which stated: "The majority of members of standing Senate committees must be Senators." It does not appear the intention of the 1998 motion was to delete this sentence, yet it was deleted upon revision of the Faculty/Administration Manual as of August 1999. Every indication is that the deletion was inadvertent. This motion would correct that omission by replacing this sentence."

This motion was approved by the Senate with no discussion. Mr. Mignone's second proposal was to change the Faculty/Administration manual by repeating a criterion for tenure. His written rationale stated, "Since the exemplary performance requirements already exist as requirements for tenure and promotion and since they are used in the evaluation process, it is highly important that these requirements are not missed. The intention of this motion is to repeat this requirement in a more prominent location to increase the likelihood that this vital information is not missed." This proposal provoked a brief discussion. Some faculty suggested it was unnecessary, since it involved only repeating information in more than one place in the manual. Bev Diamond (Mathematics) suggested a change in wording that would indicate that this was a reminder rather than a new requirement. Mr. Mignone accepted this suggestion as a friendly amendment, and moved that the faculty endorse their recommendation, as follows:

MOTION 2 TO IMPROVE THE FACULTY/ADMINISTRATION MANUAL

CHANGE: CHAPTER IV; J; 4. (Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion), first paragraph (page 79)

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

TO: "What follow are minimum criteria for tenure and promotion. Each department may develop additional appropriate criteria, which must be written, available and on file

in the Office of the Provost. Candidates are reminded that evidence of exemplary performance is required in at least one of the specified professional competency areas.”

RATIONALE

In Chapter IV, Institutional Policies, Regulations and Procedures; J. Third Year Review, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional Faculty (page 73); second sentence of the second paragraph, it states: "In addition, evidence of exemplary performance is required in at least one of the specified professional competency areas."

Since the exemplary performance requirements already exist as requirements for tenure and promotion and since they are used in the evaluation process, it is highly important that these requirements are not missed. The intention of this motion is to repeat this requirement in a more prominent location to increase the likelihood that this vital information is not missed.

The Senate then approved this motion.

With no constituent concerns offered, the meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary

**Last Spring 2002 Senate Meeting (5:00 PM, 116 ECTR):
Tuesday, April 1 (continued Tuesday, April 15, if necessary)
Faculty Meeting (5:00 PM, Physicians Auditorium): Monday, April 21; agenda
deadline Wednesday, April 9, 3:00 PM**