

**Minutes  
Coastal Carolina University  
Board of Trustees**

**Academic Affairs Committee  
E. M. Singleton Building, Dawsey Conference Room  
October 11, 2007**

**Committee Members Present:** Mr. Joseph L. Carter, Mr. J. Wayne George, and Dr. Oran P. Smith

**Other Board Members Present:** Mr. William H. Alford and Mr. Clark B. Parker

**Others Present:** Dr. Janis W. Chesson, Dr. David A. DeCenzo, Mr. Wilbur L. Garland, Dr. Rob Sheehan, Dr. Judy W. Vogt, and Ms. Nila Hutchinson

Dr. Smith called the meeting to order at 10:45 a.m.

**Mr. George moved to approve the minutes of June 21, 2007 and Mr. Carter seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Dr. Sheehan noted that Dr. Emma Savage-Davis had been tenured at a previous institution. In accordance with our policy, the request for her hire with tenure should have been made when she assumed the duties of the Center Director in 2006. He asked that the committee correct this administration oversight.

**To correct the oversight awarding tenure at the hiring of Dr. Emma Savage-Davis, Mr. George moved to confer tenure to her. Mr. Carter seconded and the motion carried.**

Dr. Smith noted the list of 2007-2008 New Hire Faculty Bios. Each year the list is more prestigious and the qualifications are stronger. We are attracting outstanding faculty from prestigious universities throughout the United States.

Dr. Smith asked if Dr. DeCenzo felt that improvements made for faculty salaries while he was Provost had made a difference in attracting the new faculty. Dr. DeCenzo said that word is getting out that the Board has set a minimum salary and believes that it is going to be a tremendous asset in future hiring in some of the areas in humanities.

Dr. Smith asked what are the top two ways of recruiting faculty and had Coastal Carolina received a good pool of faculty applicants this year. Dr. DeCenzo stated that it depends on the major because the pool is smaller for sciences, accounting, finance, etc. Dr. Sheehan stated that ads in the Chronicle of Higher Education and participation in conferences within the discipline were the top recruiting tools. Also, networking with colleagues throughout the country is valuable.

**Academic Affairs Committee**  
**October 11, 2007**

At the request of the Board, the promotion and tenure and the post-tenure review process is being evaluated. Dr. Sheehan stated that the University is taking this very seriously and have approached it by communicating to the Board and with the faculty to discuss the standards. An ad-hoc committee of Faculty Senate has been charged to completely rewrite the Promotion and Tenure process on the Faculty Manual. It is hoped to have significant progress within the year. The expectations of promotion and tenure differ from one discipline to the next, i.e., what constitutes scholarship and teaching loads may vary.

The colleges have been simultaneously charged to develop patterns of elaboration—written down expectations in teaching effectiveness, scholarship and service. It is hoped to have these recommendations by the end of December 2007. In addition the colleges have been asked to then turn to the departmental level and develop similar patterns of elaborations by April 2008. We will then have detailed expectations of what is necessary to join the community of scholars as promoted and tenured faculty or to be renewed or assessed in the post tenure review. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will have the information available when reviewing faculty. Dr. DeCenzo would like for the Board to review the expectations and approve them.

Dr. DeCenzo feels that there should be no secret as to whether or not a person is tenurable or promotable. If expectations have been met, there shouldn't be an issue.

In past promotion and tenure reviews, Dr. Smith recalled that faculty members up for review did not have representation of his/her discipline on the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. This seemed to have caused questions regarding fairness in evaluation. Dr. Sheehan stated that with this new approach this would not be a likely factor.

Dr. Smith stated that the Academic Affairs Committee currently has a role in the promotion and tenure process and asked if he foresaw a change in that role in the new process. Dr. Sheehan said that ultimately the awarding of promotion and tenure belongs to the trustees based upon recommendations from the president. Trustees will have the benefit of knowing what the expectations are within the various colleges and departments and the new revisions should help the trustees in their role.

Dr. Sheehan believes that as important as collegiate and departmental expectations are, faculty are part of a broader society of colleagues and that external letters reflecting on the quality of scholarship are an important part of the promotion and tenure process. Some departments do not feel that this should be part of the promotion and tenure elaborations. Dr. Sheehan will not approve the promotion and tenure guidelines if they do not include mandatory letters of support from the academic community.

Dr. Smith commended Dr. Sheehan because he feels that being a part of the national academic community is important, too.

Mr. Parker asked what input the student would have in this process. Dr. Sheehan stated that part of the process would be codifying and demonstrating teaching excellence. The University's expectations should be codified and written down that excellence in teaching is a minimum requirement and excellence in the ability to respond to students is a minimum requirement in order to be successful at any stage of the process. If you have not demonstrated teaching ability by this time, you should be cut loose irrespective of what you are bringing to the table in other

## **Academic Affairs Committee**

**October 11, 2007**

areas. Mostly likely the faculty member will not get significantly better and, in the meantime, we will have lost cohorts of students.

Dr. DeCenzo added that teaching effectiveness is more than what you do in a classroom—it is advising and mentoring.

Dr. Smith wanted to know what changes have been made to the Technology in Education to Advance Learning (TEAL) Center to make it more effective. Dr. Sheehan believes the University has had success in helping teachers teach, in particular, with technology. The TEAL Center is joined with the Center for Effective Teaching Learning (CETL).

We are moving to redefine the Director of the Library position to be Executive Director of the Library and Instructional Technology. We want to bring in someone who has already demonstrated excellence in helping students learn and teaching through technology. As we join how we teach with how we assess, our outcomes will be better.

Dr. Sheehan noted that each of the deans is working with their department to identify new degree programs in their respective colleges. As many as ten additional degree programs may be brought forward in the next 18 months.

Four new degree programs will be proposed at the SCCHE meeting in January. A 2+2 ½ program will be partnered with Horry-Georgetown Technical College for a bachelor of science in nursing to respond to the crisis for nursing faculty. Frances Marion University is excited about providing support for this program. Three masters in education degrees will have tremendous regional impact: administration and leadership; literacy, with particular emphasis on English as second language; and, instructional technology. There is strong support through the school district for regional needs with these backgrounds. The University will need help from trustees to contact members of the SCCHE and legislators to gather support for future programs. As we grow, we will be challenged by other universities when adding new degrees.

Mr. Alford remarked that we need to find additional ways to provide more resources to the University in academics and athletics. He encouraged the Academic Affairs Committee to have a retreat with deans and appropriate administration to evaluate where we are, where we need to be, and how do we get there. We do a lot of great things, public engagement, and NESA and we need to improve our image. Waccamaw Neck is an area of tremendous wealth and willing to support the university. We need to provide programs in the Litchfield campus that will benefit this university.

As there was no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Chyrel Stalvey for  
Tommy M. Stringer  
Secretary/Treasurer