COASTAL CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
AY 2013/2014
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
December 4, 2013
Wall Building, Room 309
4:30 PM

Note: The remarks of the Senators and others are summarized and not verbatim. The taped recording of this meeting is available in the University Archives and Records Center.

PRESENT: Lola Adebayo, Janice Black, Monica Fine, Richard Martin, Lee Shinaberger, Jay Teets, Todd Cherner, Vin Porter, Nancy Ratcliff, Aneilya Barnes, Deborah Breede, Adam Chamberlain, Mark Flynn, Yun Sil Jeon, David Kellogg, Steve Madden, Stephanie Miller, Denise Paster, Triphiti Pillai, Renee Smith, Chris Todd, Jonathan Trerise, Dan Turner, Jesse Willis, Ogul Arslan, Sara Brallier, Brian Bunton, Erin Burge, Rajendra Dahal, Wanda Dooley, Michael Dunn, Jean French, Vladislav Gulis, Jenna Hill, Fang-Ju Lin, Megan McIlreavy, Kevin McWilliams, Erin Rickard, Sherer Royce, Dustin Thorn, Sandy Wilson, Margaret Fain, Allison Hosier, Ellen Arnold, Keshav Jagannathan, and John Beard.

SUBSTITUTIONS: John Cartaina for Caroline Knight, Alberto Perez for Cynthia Port, and Michelle Barthet for Jennifer Jackson.

ABSENT: Bomi Kang, Tom Secrest, Sam Wathen, Kimberly Carroll, Lindsay Pritchard, Suheir Daoud, Philip Whalen substituting for John Navin, and Gwendolyn Schwinke.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Approval of the November 6, 2013 minutes were moved by Brian Bunton and seconded by Deborah Breede. Motion passed (31 in favor, 0 not in favor).

CONSENT AGENDA: all items on the December 4, 2013 Consent Agenda passed.

PRESIDENT, PROVOST AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:

Provost Byington:

• In response to some concerns here on campus, there will be a series of informational programs available in the Spring. An announcement will be sent once all of the details have been finalized. These will be strictly informational sessions and attendance is not required. The topics will include Title IX Mandatory Reporting, Immediate Response: What If Someone Tells You They Have Been a Victim of a Sex Crime, Title IX Remedies Support and Protocols, and Understanding the Clary Report.

• There will be two riveting meetings with the Provost in the Spring. The Provost would like to have a good turnout, especially for the first meeting, because he would like to have a conversation on academic success. In particular, to do a reflection on some of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats at Coastal in achieving academic success. The other session’s topic(s) will be on anything that the faculty and staff consider important.
• The online evaluations have been started and continued efforts need to be made to notify the students. Chris Mee and her office have done a good job with the online evaluations. We have received suggestions on making sure that the students are aware that the evaluations are online. Currently, we have 40 percent of undergraduates and 50 percent of graduates who have completed the online evaluation.

• The grade reporting e-mails have been sent; therefore, the Provost said that he will not repeat that information. Our football team is going to Montana to play football this Saturday with temperatures at kickoff expected to be between 3-7 degrees. This is an outdoor venue, so it will be interesting from that standpoint. “When” we are successful at this game, the next game will be one week later, which will be the same day as graduation. NCAA requirements are that we certify student athletes as being eligible prior to participation in that Saturday’s game. Therefore, a frantic e-mail will be sent for those students who will be participating in the game trying to determine eligibility. I encourage you to make your colleagues aware of this so that we can do everything that we can to make this process as seamless as possible. I understand that it is a quick turnaround, but it is necessary.

• Fall Commencement is scheduled for Saturday, December 14, 2013 at 8:30 a.m. at the HTC Center.

At this time the Provost opened the floor for questions:

1. Question: The President communicated that there was an investigation concerning an incident at a Tea and Ethics event. Are there any updates you can give us?

   Answer: There are two investigations. One from Title IX and one is dealing with Student Conduct. We can’t really talk about specifics about an ongoing Title IX investigation or with the Student Conduct investigation. As a general observation, quite often when things get reported and you do not continue to hear public statements about them, it is assumed that nothing is going on. This is not the case. I can assure that the administration took everything very seriously that happened at that event. We take the process very seriously. So, please just don’t make the assumption that just because you report something and you don’t hear back immediately that nothing is going on. There will be recommendations that will be coming out of both of those. Thank you for asking.

2. Question: In a very generic way, can you tell us what happened at that event?

   Answer: There was an event that had a paneled discussion where an exchange between the students of the audience and the panel were not probably at the most professional level. Therefore, what happened at the event is a result of that, and more control over the event to ensure that it stayed on a professional level should have been made. It’s difficult to say much more than that at this time.

3. Question: This is related to the online course evaluations, other than that we are being encouraged to remind our students again, are there theories that you might have about why only 40 percent have completed the evaluations?

   Answer: I am hopeful that the primary reason is because it is a new process. Any time that you try to change a culture, it takes time to change that culture. When you do the evaluations in class, you have that captive audience of the students that are there at least during that class period. Please remember that
students can take out their smartphones during class and do the evaluations at that time. I believe it will improve as the students become more familiar with doing them online.

4. **Question:** On that same note, some of my colleagues, several of us who are not tenured, are concerned because teaching evaluations are incredibly important to us. So, we have talked about doing informal course evaluations. Would that be ok?

**Answer:** I know that as an instructor, I used to do an evaluation at the mid-term of the course that was not the official one. Gathering information that you might have that is part of the process, but realize that when you do go up for tenure that there are certain requirements that must be in the promotion and tenure package, and that is still the official evaluations that we are talking about here.

5. **Question:** There were previous discussions about not releasing student’s grades until they have completed all of their course evaluations. Will that policy be put into place?

**Answer:** That will be up to the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee. The reason that we did not go to that immediately is because the policy we have now requires us to do it this way. If we can get the FWD committee to bring the suggestion that we have this requirement to this body that will improve the percentages substantially.

6. **Question:** We are all concerned about incivility in general, but I think on-line the opportunity for increased anonymity, which of course the evaluations are anonymous to begin with, but there is something about the online form that has been well documented as being a particularly vial place from which people can express extremely vial opinions, especially in light of the Tea and Ethics, Twitter and social media which was very public and which many of us saw. I think there have been some concerns expressed that the online forms are an increased opportunity for students to again engage in a venting, as opposed to a thoughtful consideration. I understand a part of that is us training the students in the classroom and talking about that very overtly in our classrooms. But I am wondering if that’s the issue that’s being addressed as part of our new students’ orientations. I know that would mean a lot of work for helping students understand the civility both online and offline. Can we maybe make sure that there is that type of recommendation for that type of training for our students who are new that will maybe help as they’re given socializing to these online evaluations?

**Answer:** It is a fair observation that as you change the culture that it is part of it, that the new students coming in quickly get a dose of what their responsibilities are and it will become part of what they do. To the first point, as far as online evaluations versus in class, they are both anonymous evaluations and realize of course that we are talking about students, a generation that is very used to using this medium and so it should be easier for us to bring them along. I haven’t done the breakdown between freshmen, but I will ask for that. It’s a really interesting question to see if we are having more freshmen participating in this regarding to seniors. A part of it will be making the students understand how serious this process is, how important evaluations are to the faculty and to the administration, and what their role is in the evaluations. I believe that is a conversation we need to make sure that we are having not only with our incoming freshman, but with all of our students.

At this time, the Registrar suggested that it could be a survey for freshman so that they know what it is about. They could do a mock evaluation and actually evaluate some of the programs we do during that time period.
7. **Question:** I understand the desire for students to be anonymous when critiquing professors before grades come out. I don’t necessarily believe that completely anonymous evaluations are the best way to go in showing mutual accountability for acting in civil ways. I would love it if we had some sort of a discussion that allowed for tracking people and an occasional review of the types of evaluations that they gave so that we could address them on a one-on-one basis and their validity to be professional and civil in their feedback.

**Answer:** Tracking an anonymous evaluation from a research standpoint becomes a questionable practice. Online anonymous evaluations, either in class or online, have been a problem for as long as I have been teaching and this is the result of an anonymous process. I believe that all of the deans would agree that the student evaluations are only one part of the evaluation process that actually goes in for teaching. Therefore, I hesitate to go in and track students when it is supposedly anonymous. I don’t know that I would feel comfortable in doing that. I wonder what the response rate might be then.

**Comment:** One of the issues when you move from a paper format to an online format is that the faculty member loses control of exactly when those evaluations are given. So, you have a situation when you’re coming to the end of a semester and they are toggled on before the students have full information in terms of their grades, etc. It would be to some benefit if we could look into the aspect of having the faculty member being able to toggle those on and toggle those off. It would still be anonymous, but the faculty would control that instead of just coming on and off at a certain time.

**Answer:** It is worth investigating.

**Comment:** I think that is a great idea. My biggest concern coming into this is what I’ve been thinking about is the “rate my professor.com syndrome” where students kind of associate online evaluations with this movement to rant, but what has really been concerning is when I talk to my students about how they are filling out online evaluations they are like “oh, it only took me 5 minutes.” And I was like, “you did a class in like 5 minutes?” “No, I did them ALL in 5 minutes!” So, if we can maintain some control over this, I love the idea of having them bring their tablets, devices and phones and do it in class. But that becomes complicated when half of them have already completed them. So, if we can have control over when they do them, we can facilitate and take 20 minutes to really think about the class.

**Answer:** The important thing is that they complete the online evaluation. The venue is in their residence hall, their apartment, in class, as long as it gets done is all the focus should really be. From my many years of doing this, I know some of them do take this seriously and some of them do not. Some of them take 5 minutes and I know quite often the class will make sure the instructor thinks it takes 30 minutes to do it when quite often it only takes 5 minutes to do it. So, these are problems we have dealt with in evaluations for a number of years and it is just a question of us coming up with the mechanism that is going to give us the most successful results that we can use effectively, recognizing the limitations of the instruments.

**Comment:** First, I am going to disagree that I don’t think that the focus of this should be that they do them. The focus should be that they do them well. Second, in terms of the distribution, I love the idea that we have some control especially when students are saying that they can do all of them at one time. How much of my class is influencing another or another class influencing mine? There is the potential for the data to be skewed because they can just do it all at once.

**Answer:** Yes, excuse me. These are valid points.
8. Question: The idea of cell phones and having tablets in the classroom is a great idea, but with income disparities too, I think a lot of students might feel alienated in that situation. If we are going to recommend that, is there any discussion about providing devices that could be handed out in class to help facilitate this process?

Answer: I have seen the numbers, but don’t have those in front of me right now. The numbers indicate that a vast majority has a device and would have the ability.

The Provost excused himself at this time due to another appointment. At this time, Steve Madden asked Dean Dan Ennis, Chair of the Provost Search Team, to give an update on the provost search.

- It began in September with the team putting together a job description and placing the ad online and through the Chronicle for 30 days. 80 applicants were attracted by the preferred deadline. The ad was written in order to continuing receiving applications until the position is filled. So, there is actually a set of second applicants but the search committee is not actively looking at them right now and does not expect to. This applicant pool was up to 87 the last time he checked.
- The team is preparing to do one-on-one interviews with a group of semi-finalists in Charlotte, NC for three days in January. The finalists will then be brought to campus. We are hoping to make an offer before spring break.
- A provost search website will be put up once the team returns from Charlotte. There will be a prominent link on the CCU web page that will be available to community stakeholders, students, faculty, and staff. At that point, the team will be asking for everyone’s participation and cooperation. Open forums will be scheduled for each candidate’s interview and they are hoping there will be a lot of participation from faculty in particular. Since this is a position that also has student affairs, they are hoping that the staff on that side of the house will also be involved in the process.
- During the interview process, it is important to remember that we are selling ourselves to these candidates as much as they are selling themselves to us. So, we hope to present them with an engaged and curious faculty that will ask good questions and makes the decision fully informed by all your points of view.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT:

Steve Madden, Chair, presented the Executive Committee Report.

A. Executive Committee

1. Motion for the Faculty Senate Chair to address the University Faculty regarding procedure changes for promotion to the titles of Senior Teaching Lecturer and Senior Lecturer at the January 10, 2014 General Faculty Meeting, and at the close of the meeting an electronic vote will commence. The motion passed (42 in favor, 0 not in favor).

B. Administrative Actions four and five were generated and approved without stipulations. For complete details, refer to the December 4, 2013 Order of Business.

COMMITTEE REPORTS: none.
OLD BUSINESS: none.

NEW BUSINESS:

Refer to the December 4, 2013 Order of Business for complete details on the following:

A. Faculty Athletics Representative

1. Sharon Thompson presented the yearly update on Academic Performance and Graduation Information for CCU Student-Athletes. Her PowerPoint presentation was sent as an attachment with the December 4, 2013 Order of Business.

B. International Programs Committee

1. Motion to make changes to the International Programs Committee’s charge. The motion passed (38 in favor, 1 not in favor).

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

There were no announcements; however, there were continued discussions among the senators with concerns about the online course evaluation system. A request was made by a senator to have these concerns typed up and given to whomever was in charge of the online evaluations. Because the minutes are not verbatim, a recorded copy of the December Faculty Senate meeting was given to the Office of Institutional Research so that they would be able to get the full context of the conversations and questions that took place at this meeting.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Monica Streicher, Faculty Senate Recorder

Approved by Deborah Cunningham Breede, Faculty Senate Secretary