Faculty Senate Meeting

March 5, 2003

Wall Building - Room 317


ABSENT: Julia Orri, Peter Hart, Louis Keiner.

A motion was made by Dave Evans to suspend the rules and allow the minutes to come out less then a week before the meeting. Motion passed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: A motion was made by Dave Evans to accept the February 5, 2003, minutes. The motion passed.

PROVOST AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS: Provost Peter Barr extended an apology from the Provost’s office for the minutes not being disseminated on time. Provost Barr made two announcements: First, the Provost’s Office, the Deans, and the Chairs plan to review grades for the past five years at the university. The purpose of this review is to look for grade inflation that might have occurred. Provost Barr mentioned that Representative Stille has asked for delineated information and his latest request was looking at grades. Provost Barr also indicated that he would like to be one step ahead of the legislature, if at all possible. Second, the President has approved a recommended incentive plan that will be discussed at Deans’ Council and then with the Chairs. These discussions will focus on whether the departments would like to voluntarily utilize exit exams. He explained that the exit exam would be used as a means of reacting to curriculum. Such an exam will not be used to evaluate except for internal purposes. He encouraged departments to do so. Provost Barr noted that the proposal is for those departments that utilize standardized exit exams, and he stated that he believes that currently four departments do not have standardized exit exams available to them. However, there is a way departments not having standardized exams can participate. As an example, he used Art Studio of how an internal evaluation system can be developed that is then reviewed by an external body. More details will soon be provided to the Faculty Senate.

GRADUATE COUNCIL: The Graduate Council approved new Spanish courses. Dennis Wiseman reported that the College of Humanities and Fine Arts has courses that will support the MAT program, which began last summer. He mentioned that Jose Sanjines
could answer any specific questions about the courses. Dennis further stated that these
courses would be curriculum specific – for those students coming in and seeking that
degree.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT: Rich Koesterer reported that Carl Dresden
brought to his attention a committee that was formulated about a year or two ago to
address the issues of broad-scale across-campus questions on the Student Evaluations.
Rich said that these questions were developed and administered to a test group; however,
it has been lost and he is looking for it. He mentioned that at this point the impact is
unknown, since it apparently has not been evaluated. He will let the Senate know the
status.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Student Life Committee Report on Their Reconfiguration, Their Membership and
Purpose – Gary Stegall moved to accept the committee report. The motion passed.

Report from the Ad Hoc Core Curriculum Committee - Greg Krippel distributed the
Preface and the Goals. He reported that the criteria used as a basis of these goals were an
examination of four other schools’ cores, three books, two monographs, and over twelve
articles. The committee met numerous times and discussed the goals, reviewing every
goal twice. Greg Krippel and Joan Piroch took the prior nine goals and four proficiencies
and made the proficiency a goal or spread it through the other goals for a total of eleven.
His request to the group was to take the goals back to their departments, go through them,
and discuss them. He would like to present the goals at the next meeting and mentioned
that they do not want to move to the courses until the goals are completed. Joan added
that they kept away from the courses and focused on the goals “in terms of a college
education.” She said they are looking for suggestions on the goals as they relate to
educated persons. Greg Krippel informed the group that 53 percent of the schools of
Coastal’s size are revising their core curriculum. He mentioned that they needed to have
goals that are accessible, which is the reason for the Proficiencies. Discussion took place
about the goals, and Greg told the Senate that the committee wants input and comments
from them and from their departments. He reminded them that for right now, they do not
want to go Course driven; they want to go Goal driven. He asked for comments and
input by email in a word document attachment no later than Wednesday, March 26, to
(krippel@coastal.edu) and (piroch@coastal.edu).

Old Business

Ad Hoc Committee on Disciplinary Suspensions and Transfers – Dr. Michael Ruse
provided background on a proposal that was brought forward last May. He said, “On the
academic transcript, any disciplinary suspension that was current would be listed on that
transcript until the suspension was over, and if it was a permanent suspension that it
would be there forever.” This proposal was voted down. The issue came up again and
the Ad Hoc committee was formed. He related that there is a lot of resistance to the idea
of a permanent academic document containing excessive information. He noted that
there were two possible issues involved: a legal issue where Coastal would have some sort of liability, not now but in the future, and a moral issue and a moral obligation. He related that he had three options to present. One is to do nothing about it. Two, (deals with the legal issue) use a disclaimer statement located in a prominent place that states, “This document is a record of the student’s academic performance at the university. Any other information regarding the student’s performance at Coastal Carolina University can be obtained by contacting the Office of Student Affairs.” Michael Ruse said that in this case the onus of learning if there were any disciplinary issues with this student would fall on the external institution that is considering whether to accept the student or not. Three, “ineligible to re-enroll.” He said, “If a student has been suspended for a period of time, their transcript would read for the duration of the suspension, at which time that statement would be expunged from the record. If the suspension is permanent, it would remain on the transcript unless a successful appeal is filed by the student and it is judged to be removed.” He explained that Option Three is a generic statement that says to the student “for some reason we’re not telling you why you are ineligible to re-enroll in our institution.” He mentioned that this option goes a little further than the disclaimer and that if the other institution wants to query us about why the student is ineligible to re-enroll, the onus is on them to contact Coastal. He said that Dr. Helms prefers that the academic record be without this, but that he could tolerate option two which would be the disclaimer. He invited Dr. Squatriglia to discuss his position.

Dr. Squatriglia stated that he respectfully disagrees and votes for “ineligible to re-enroll.” He added that that was his recommendation to the Senate last year, and it remains his recommendation now.

Rich Koesterer asked for a motion.

Discussion of the institution’s legal and moral obligation concerning the student’s transcript took place. Michael Ruse informed the Senate that there is no nationwide standard or obligation of having disciplinary information on transcripts. He was told by Dr. Eddie Dyer that either option would cover us legally. Michael posed the question, “Is there a moral obligation?”

The question of record keeping was brought up and the responsibility should the statement remain on the transcript past the suspension time. Brenda Sawyer said that it would be a process, but there is no guarantee against error. She said that the records would be audited, proofed and everything possible would be done to ensure that it would happen.

Jack Riley asked if Coastal routinely asks for additional information on transfer students from other institutions. Judy Vogt replied that there is a request on the application asking if the student has ever been convicted of a felony or offense. If the application indicates so then the student is contacted first because the other institution would refer Coastal back to the student. The student would have to release the information. Jack Riley said, “Then there is no real reason we have to put it on our transcript reminding the other institution to call us.”
Arlene Adams asked about unjust accusations. Dennis Wiseman said that we wouldn’t be wrong by saying that they are ineligible to return. He said that if we post that on their record it is not a statement of what might be, it is a statement of what is at that particular point in time.

Olcay Akman said that we have a moral responsibility of letting another institution know about this person. He concluded by saying that we are not only producing students that know how to think, we are also producing acceptable human beings to a civil society and he believes that this is part of the college education.

Jack Riley said that he has two moral issues, the one that Olcay Akman mentioned and the one regarding the students’ confidentiality about their lives and records and asked which one is more important. Richard Weldon answered that he would rather represent the university that gets the rapist in an action than a suit that has privacy complaints or complaints about their academic records. He said, “The court traditionally says as long as the institution gives the student ‘due process’ that gives the student a lot of leeway in what they do.” He added that he thought the real danger was in sending away students who have done crimes and not providing some way for the other institution to find that out.

Some discussion took place regarding a student being suspended for an action that could be viewed as a violation of policy at one institution and not another. Bob Squatriglia reminded the Senate that Faculty Senate approved the Code of Student Conduct. He went on to say that the standard is applied by the campus judicial board, by the university, and by the Board of Trustees.

Jack Riley made a point of order; he said that we already voted down any disciplinary statements on the academic transcript and that we are revisiting this whole issue. Michael agreed and said that we are revisiting it with two other possibilities as opposed to leaving it alone. The other one was going to be an explicit statement of disciplinary action against the student. This is not. He said that under Option Two it would be a generic statement that they would be ineligible to re-enroll. He said that the reason for that ineligibility – it is up to the other institution to find out why, either through the student or through us. Under the first option, it is just a disclaimer that we are covered for any legal liability. This is not a recycling of the voted down proposal. The other proposal, an explicit statement, was voted down in that it was a disciplinary action.

Jack Riley moved that we consider option three.

Peter Lecouras asked for a re-reading of Option Three. Michael Ruse read, “If the student has been suspended for a period of time, their transcript would read ineligible to re-enroll for the duration of the suspension at which time the statement would be expunged from the transcript. Now, if the suspension is permanent it would remain on the transcript unless a successful appeal to get it removed is filed by the student.” He further stated, “If it’s permanent, it’s permanent; they have to come back to us and go through due process in order to get that removed.”
Dr. Lynn Franken made a point of order and asked, “If we vote for this motion it means we are voting against the first motion and voting against a potential motion to do nothing.”

Jack Riley amended his motion. He moved that the Senate vote for Number 3 and against Options 2 and 1. Bob Burney seconded.

Dennis Wiseman suggested that these options be put in writing so that the senators could talk to their colleagues about it and if an action is to be taken, it is to be taken up at the next meeting after we are much more informed. He added that not only would we be much more informed in our own thought process, but also in interacting with the people that we represent. Peter Lecouras supported Dennis’ statement.

Koesterer asked for a motion to table the original motion that Jack Riley made. Michael Ruse made the motion to table Jack Riley’s first motion. The favors have it, so moved.

New Business

None

Announcements

Charmaine Tomczyk announced that it was her pleasure to serve as Director of 2004 Celebration of Inquiry conference and she said that it was her honor to serve with co-chairs Joan Piroch and Sara Sanders. Charmaine distributed flyers announcing the “Seeing the World Anew” 2004 theme. She brought the Senate’s attention to the explanation for the definition. She requested that they read it and see how their discipline can fit into this theme and invited them to become involved in the conference. She reminded them of how exciting the conference is and what wonderful success it has had in the past. Charmaine asked for their help and their students help and involvement, saying that it will be successful in the future and the conference needs their involvement.

Tom Secrest invited the senate to the Singleton House gathering next Wednesday and he reminded them that the doors will open at 4:30 p.m.

Michael Ruse reminded and encouraged the Senate to submit their Application for Scholarly re-assignment, which will begin next spring. The application is due to Chairs on August 1.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.