The summer Faculty Senate meeting will be on Wednesday, July 2, 2008 in WALL 309, beginning at 2:30 pm.

COASTAL CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
AY 2007-08
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA
July 2, 2008
Wall Building, Room 309
2:30 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER – Susan Webb

II. ROLL CALL – Susan Slavik

III. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR

IV. APPROVAL OF May 7, 2008 Minutes

V. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Louis Keiner, Chair, Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Evaluations will update the Senate on results of the Spring 2008 Administrator Evaluations. Report begins on page 8

Faculty Senate representatives to the Board of Trustees Committee will give a report for the committee they represented. Academic Affairs – Susan Webb (was Dave Evans), Athletics – Lee Bollinger, Audit – Yoav Wachsman, Facilities – Kenneth Martin, Finance – Mark Martin, Govt Affairs – Holley Tankersley, Institutional Advancement – Susan Webb, Student Affairs – Deborah Walker, Campus Master Plan Ad-hoc – Susan Webb

VI. PRESIDENT REPORT

VII. PROVOST AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

VIII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Annual Report:
Sharon Gilman, Chair, Student Retention and Assessment Committee
Annual Report for 2007-2008 appears on page 12

Michael Ruse, Chair, Faculty Welfare and Development Committee
Annual Report for 2007-2008 appears on page 13

IX. PENDING BUSINESS

Allison Faix and Jennifer Hughes will give an update on the PASCAL (Partnership Among South Carolina Academic Libraries) resolution that was passed at the Senate meeting in May 2008.
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The update will include what happened with the state funding for PASCAL and also what changes to expect in library services that are provided to us through PASCAL.

X. NEW BUSINESS

Deborah Vrooman, Chair, Graduate Council presents the following items of business that were approved on May 7, 2008 by the Graduate Council.

A. Spadoni College of Education

Proposal for New Graduate Program
M. Ed. in Instructional Technology Program

Proposal for New Courses
EDIT 604 – Teaching with Technology (3) A standards-based investigation of instructional technologies and their potential to improve teaching practice, professional productivity, and student performance. The course is designed to meet the National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers (NETS-T), published by ISTE. Rationale: This course is designed to satisfy the ISTE accreditation requirement that all candidates demonstrate proficiency in NETS-T before full admission into a Technology Facilitation (NETS-TF) program, such as the M. Ed. in Instructional Technology Program.

EDIT 610 – Instructional Design and Technology Integration (3) (Prerequisite EDIT 604) Systematic design and evaluation of technology-supported instruction. Emphasis on research-based best practices in curriculum planning and instructional methods.

EDIT 620 – Development of Instructional Materials (3) (Prerequisite EDIT 604) Application of design theories and development techniques to the production of instructional materials using desktop publishing, imaging, and presentation technologies.

EDIT 630 – Development of Instructional Multimedia (3) (Prerequisite EDIT 604, EDIT 620) Application of design theories and development techniques to the production of multimedia learning objects using advanced authoring tools.

EDIT 640 – Technology Planning and Management (3) (Prerequisite EDIT 604) Theories and strategies for planning and managing instructional technology resources for classroom, project, and school implementation. Emphasis on evaluation, acquisition, installation, operation, and administration.

EDIT 652 – Instructional Video Production (3) (Prerequisite EDIT 604) Systematic planning, development and deployment of video programming for school-based applications. Production emphasis on the communication of instructional messages relevant to the needs of student, teacher, parent, or administrator audiences.
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EDIT 654 – Teaching and Learning Online  (3) (Prerequisite EDIT 604) Theory and best practices for the design, development, and implementation of online instruction for blended and distance-based applications.

EDIT 680 – Instructional Technology Leadership  (3) (Prerequisite EDIT 604, EDIT 610, EDIT 620, EDIT 630) Theory and field-based investigation of effective practices for facilitative leadership to guide the instructional technology innovation process. Emphasis on collaboration and service with other professionals in the field.

EDIT 690 – Seminar in Instructional Technology  (3) (Enrollment limited to program candidates in their last semester of coursework) Capstone experiences in the design, development, implementation, evaluation and management of instructional technologies and their potential to improve teaching practice, student performance, and professional productivity. Emphasis on the Technology Facilitation Portfolio. Rationale: These courses satisfy specific National Educational Technology Standards for Technology Facilitation (NETS-TF), required by ISTE and NCATE for the Accreditation of the program.

EDSP 670 – Characteristics of Learners with Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities  (3) (Prerequisites: EDUC 692, EDLD 370 or instructor permission.) This course covers theories and specific conditions in the area of emotional and behavior disabilities. Participants will study the impact of learning and behavioral differences on academic and social/emotional performances. Diversity within student populations is addressed throughout the course. Experimental, observational, interactive strategies and technological advances are used to facilitate course outcomes.

EDSP 690 – Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD): Nature and Needs  (3) (Prerequisites: EDUC 692, EDLD 370 or instructor permission.) This course provides a critical analysis of foundational knowledge of Specific Learning Disabilities, including history, theoretical base, legal aspects, terminology, etiology, definitions, medical aspects, and approaches to identification and intervention. Professional literature reviews and experiences in schools required.

EDSP 691 – Instructional Procedures for Students with Learning Disabilities  (3) (Prerequisites: EDUC 692, EDLD 370 or instructor permission.) Provides knowledge of instructional procedures to improve outcomes for individuals with learning disabilities. Applies research on teacher effectiveness, instructional approaches, and current issues and needs in instructional programming for students with LD. Content includes curriculum design, instructional strategies for basic academic skills in reading, language arts, and mathematics; study skills and adaptations for science and social studies; motivation; and peer-mediated instruction. Experiences in schools and applied research projects required. Rationale: These courses each meet the needs of teachers in special education or general education who are pursuing add-on certification in Learning Disabilities or for those interested in understanding instructional procedures appropriate for students with learning disabilities.
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Pattie Edwards, Chair, Academic Affairs presents the following for Senate review/approval.

College of Science

1. **Request for changes in an undergraduate course.** CSCI 370, Data Communication Systems and Networks. Change prerequisite(s) from Grade of C or above in CSCI 310 TO Grade of C or above in both CSCI 150 and 150L. Proposed Catalog description to read: CSCI 370, Data Communication Systems and Networks. (3) (Prereq: Grade of C or above in Computer Science 150 ad 150L) Fundamentals of data communications, including hardware, basic components of communications, configurations, networks and applications, protocols and software are discussed. F. **Justification:** After assessment of the course and of our IS track in preparation for future accreditation, we have decided that the CSCI 310 course is no longer required and should no longer be a prerequisite for CSCI 370. The new prerequisite is sufficient and will accommodate students in both the Information Systems program (as a required course) and the Theoretical program (as an elective). Additionally, the course will now be taught in the Fall instead of the Spring.

2. **Request for a new undergraduate course:** CSCI 400, Senior Assessment. (1) (Prereq: Senior Status & Permission of Instructor). Proposed Catalog description to read: This course provides various resources to graduating seniors including strategies for job searching and/or entry to graduate school. Students will complete all final assessments required to maintain currency and quality of the program. It is intended for computer science majors in their last semester prior to graduation. Grading is S or U. **Justification:** This course will aid graduating seniors in applying for their first job and/or entry into graduate school. It will also guarantee that the students take all assessments including but not limited to senior surveys, exit interviews, senior exit exams, etc.

3. **Request for a new undergraduate course.** CSCI 495, IS Capstone Course and Project. Proposed Catalog description to read: CSCI 495, Information Systems Capstone Course and Project. (3) (Prereq: Grade of C or better in Computer Science 335 and 425 and Senior standing). This senior capstone course integrates and synthesizes the material covered in the field of Information Systems, including Systems Analysis, Project Management, System Development and Deployment, and Security. Students will develop a practical solution to an information systems problem. Presentation will be both oral and written. Lecture topics may vary from semester to semester. S. **Justification:** After assessment of the course and of our IS track in preparation for future accreditation, this new course will be a required course for Information Systems seniors. CSCI 490 has traditionally served as a capstone course for Theoretical majors and for Information Systems majors. CSCI 495 will provide the opportunity for IS students to apply the knowledge and skills gained throughout their college career to a real-world problem in Information Systems.
4. **Request for a change in an undergraduate program**: Computer Science (Both Tracks), BS. Requested change in required courses from ENGL 287 or ENGL 288 TO ENGL 211. **Justification**: We feel there is a need to have more technical writing techniques introduced to our students. English 211 (Technical Writing) is offered by the English Department and we want our students to take this course instead of ENGL 287 or ENGL 288. This change will be for both the theoretical and information systems tracks.

5. **Request for changes in an undergraduate program**: Computer Science – Information Systems track, BS. Request change in number of credits from 83 TO 78. Required courses from 31 TO 30. Change in other: Adding CBAD 350, CSCI 110, CSCI 415, CSCI 400, CSCI 495. Specifying a particular science and a second programming language instead of providing several options. Changing ENGL 287 or 288 requirement to ENGL 211. Proposed Catalog description to read:

Information Systems Option:

I. **CORE CURRICULUM 34-38 Credits**

II. **FRESHMAN GRADUATION REQUIREMENT** (0-3 Credits), Minimum grade of C is required. University 110, The First-Year Experience 3

UNIV 100 is required for all new entering freshman and for new transfer students with fewer than 12 transfer credits unless the student has satisfactorily completed a college transition course.

III. **FOUNDATION COURSES (53-69 Credits)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSCI 110, 130*/130L*, 140/140L, 150/150L, 170</td>
<td>13-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCI 203</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 160*, 174, 210</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBAD 291</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BINF 110/110L</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBAD 201, 202, 350, 371</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBAD 393</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 101 or 201</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 390</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 211*</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 101*, HIST 102*, or HIST 202*</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 101*, or PHIL 102*</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPRO 121*, PSYC 101*, or SOC 101*</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Credits or courses taken as part of the Core Curriculum are not counted elsewhere in the major.

IV. **MAJOR REQUIREMENTS (25 Credits)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSCI 330, 335, 370, 385, 409, 415, 425, 495</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCI 400</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. **ELECTIVES (0-8 Credits)**

0-8
The summer Faculty Senate meeting will be on Wednesday, July 2, 2008 in WALL 309, beginning at 2:30 pm.

TOTAL CREDITS REQUIRED 120

**Justification:** We are preparing our Information Systems track for ABET accreditation. After reviewing our program requirements and comparing them with other accredited Information Systems programs and with the curriculum recommended by ACM/IEEE/AIS, we have decided that these changes will provide the strongest Information Systems program and will serve the needs of our students. We have removed an upper level programming course, a theoretical operating systems course, a major elective, and two computer architecture courses, and in their place added a Marketing course, a Business Applications course, and a Systems Administration course. We are also replacing the Software Engineering II (490) course (which has served as a capstone course for both tracks) with an IS Capstone course (495). CSCI 400 Senior Assessment is a one-credit hour class being added to both tracks. Our proposed changes free up 5 credit hours that students may use for general electives.

College of Humanities:

6. **Change requested in an Undergraduate Minor:** Interdisciplinary Communication Minor. Proposed Catalog description to read: Communication Minor: COMM 101, COMM 274, COMM 302, COMM 334, COMM 410, and two courses chosen from the following: COMM 341, COMM 304, COMM 411, JOUR 365, JOUR 309, JOUR 316 (New), ENGL 390, ENGL 462, ENGL 465, PHIL 305, PHIL 319 or COMM 495. Total Credits Required: 21

**Justification:** The communication minor is misnamed as being interdisciplinary because it is drawing from only a few interdisciplinary courses. Moreover, the inclusion of COMM 334 Small Group Communication, COMM 302 Law and Ethics and COMM 410 Special topics in the required courses for the minor is important so that students get exposed to all the various legal issues, skilled in working in groups in response to corporate America at large, and having a special topics course that can be taught by different faculty depending on their individual scholarship.

7. **Request for new undergraduate course:** POLI 334, East Asian Politics. (3) (Prereq: POLI 101), Proposed Catalog description to read: POLI 334 East Asian Politics (3). An introduction to how changes in the post-WWII international political system have influenced the strategic, political, and economic situations in East Asia. **Justification:** In recent decades, East Asia (including China, Japan, and the Koreas) has become increasingly significant in world politics. On the one hand, decades of sustained economic development has made East Asia the most volatile and fastest-growing region in the world. On the other hand, however, the uncertain situation in the Korean Peninsula and the Taiwan Strait still makes this region one of the potential flashpoints that could involve the U.S. in conflict. Despite the significance of East Asia in world politics, the department does not offer any course to cover this region. This course will fill the void by providing a comprehensive introduction of East Asian states’ domestic economic and political situation.
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Renee Smith, Chair, Core Curriculum makes the following motion. Amend the current description of the membership of the Core Curriculum committee to specify that at least one representative from each college should be tenured.

Current Description:

5. Core Curriculum (p. 22 of the Faculty Manual)

Membership: Nine faculty (two elected from each College and one elected from the Library). Ex Officio: Provost. Ex Officio, non-voting: University Academic Center representative, and Director of General Education. (Approved May Senate)

Purpose: This committee oversees and makes recommendations regarding all aspects of the core curriculum, including implementation, modification and assessment. The committee’s recommendations regarding modifications to core curriculum requirements are forwarded to the Academic Affairs Committee for approval prior to requesting Senate action. Each individual College is responsible for Core Curriculum student petitions. The college from which a student is requesting a course waiver hears the petition. Appeals to Core Curriculum petition decisions are heard by the Core Curriculum Committee. (Approved April Senate)

Proposed Addition to the Membership Description: Membership: Nine faculty (two elected from each College, one of whom should be tenured, and one elected from the Library). Ex Officio: Provost. Ex Officio, non-voting: University Academic Center representative, and Director of General Education.

Justification: Given the nature of the duties of the committee members, the university would be best served if the members of the committee included both tenured and non-tenured faculty.

XI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

XII. GOOD OF THE ORDER

XIII. ADJOURNMENT
Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Evaluations
June 9, 2008

Charge to the Committee:
“Look at the instruments used by students to evaluate faculty, faculty for administrators, and administrators for faculty and make recommendations on how they can be improved to maximize their value.”

Report Summary:
The committee met twice as a full group to review the current set of evaluation instruments used at Coastal. We evaluated these instruments based on current research in the field of faculty evaluation. We conducted interviews with administrators who use these evaluations for performance evaluation. We came to the conclusion that Coastal’s evaluation instruments are flawed and should be immediately revised. Highlights of our recommendations include:

- Administrator Evaluations should be based on job description, and should be designed to be useful both for improving job performance and for evaluation by a supervisor.

- Student (Course) Evaluations should contain a common core of questions for faculty in all colleges and utilize a common scale with well-defined response anchors. Evaluations should provide useful information both for the improvement of teaching and for the evaluation of teaching by a supervisor.

- This ad hoc committee should continue work on creating the common structure of the evaluation instruments, utilizing faculty input, administrator input, the work of previous committees and the body of current research in the field. After the Faculty Senate approves a common structure, colleges should make individual additions and submit the instruments for approval.

- There should be a Faculty Senate Committee who has in its charge the task of periodically reviewing the effectiveness of Coastal’s evaluation instruments and making recommendations to Faculty Senate about needed revisions.

Findings about the current Administrator Evaluations:
1. Current evaluations forms do not match the current job responsibilities for most administrators.
2. The current Yes/No/”Not able to judge” is too crude a scale to be valuable.
3. Administrators would like better information for making formative assessments of their own performance and summative assessments of those they evaluate.
4. There are more administrative posts that now may need evaluations (i.e. Associate Provosts)
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5. The **low response rate** for administrator evaluations limits their usefulness. The current electronic version has a lower response rate than did the former paper version. The possible reasons for this are complex, including
   a. fear of identification in small departments,
   b. less of a sense of anonymity in the online forms
   c. email reminders are easier to overlook/ignore
6. Many faculty members are **not aware of the uses and importance** of administrator evaluations, or where the results can be found.

**Recommendations for Administrator Evaluations:**

1. The evaluation forms should be **rewritten to match the performance expectations** of each position, with a common core of questions for all administrators in a certain position.
2. The evaluation forms should **utilize a balanced point rating scale**, with clearly marked anchor points, and a separate category for “Not able to judge.”
3. The evaluation forms should be **written to provide useful information** to the administrator to use for his/her own improvement, as well as useful information for his/her supervisor to use in evaluation.
4. Ways should be sought to **increase the response rate** for the current electronic version, and, failing that, a return to the paper version should be considered.
5. The **entire faculty should be made aware** of the uses of administrator evaluations.
6. There should be a written, defined process for the regular assessment of these evaluations, and a specific group that is tasked with this.

**Outline of Recommended Course of Action:**

1. Job analysis of each position – Colleges should review current descriptions and revise as necessary.
2. Determine what ‘universal’ performance expectations there are for certain positions. Determine common questions for these.
3. Determine appropriate scales for items.
4. Send back to colleges for additional position-specific questions.
6. Make clear methods of collection and uses. (general faculty meetings?)
7. Faculty senate needs to write document for SACS, detailing the uses of the evaluations.

**Findings about current Student (Course) Evaluations:**

1. **Not much is widely known about the origins** of the currently used student evaluations. They predate most current faculty and administrators.
2. The current forms use a variety of scales. Anecdotal evidence suggests that
   a. Different scales in different colleges may confuse students.
   b. Different scales in different colleges may confound University P&T Committee
      members.
   c. The lack of explicit anchors in the scales leads to a variety of interpretations of
      what a certain numerical score means.
3. The current forms use a variety of items. While there are examples of important questions
   being asked, there are also examples of irrelevant questions being asked.
4. The current forms are useful to administrators in only the most general sense, in that very
   bad scores are used as a flag for further investigation.
5. The forms vary in the types of freeform response questions that are asked. The general
   consensus is that the current questions are of limited value in helping faculty members
   improve their courses.
6. There is currently a variety of ways in which the evaluations are administered, including
   when and by whom. Faculty members working at night and at satellite campuses report
   difficulties in securely returning the evaluation packets.

Recommendations for Student Evaluations:
1. The student evaluation forms should be rewritten with a core of common questions for
   all instructors.
   a. The questions (items) should address the aspects of a course and/or instructor’s
      performance that can be fairly judged by students. There may be the need for
      distinct evaluation forms for ‘lecture’ and ‘lab’ sections, since the expected role of
      the instructor may be very different.
   b. Colleges should be encouraged to add additional questions.
   c. All questions should conform to the standards of best practices in the field.
   d. The evaluations should include questions that address structural aspects of the
      course, as well as behavioral aspects of the instructor.
2. The evaluation forms should utilize a balanced rating scale, with clearly marked anchor
   points.
3. The free-form portions evaluation forms should be written to provide useful information
   to the instructor to use for his/her own improvement. There is some disagreement on
   whether the written comments should be reported to others.
4. The administration of student evaluations should be more standardized:
   a. They should be administered before the last few classes of the semester.
   b. It would be best (if possible) to have them administered by someone other than
      the instructor.
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c. Secure drop-boxes should be installed near each dean’s office and at satellite campuses to collect evaluation packets from night and remote classes.
5. There should be a written, defined process for the regular assessment of these evaluations, and a specific group that is tasked with this.

Outline of Recommended Course of Action:
1. Committee determines areas of common performance expectations, and associated items and scale.
2. Approval by senate/colleges/provost
3. Colleges add own additional questions
4. Committee reviews additions for consistency.
5. Field test in Fall Semester.

Senate creates a standing committee to periodically evaluate evaluations.
May 20, 2008

To: Dr. Susan Webb, Chair, Coastal Carolina University Faculty Senate
From: Dr. Sharon Gilman, Chair, Student Retention and Assessment Committee
Re: Annual Report for 2007-2008

The University Student Retention and Assessment Committee met monthly through the 2007-2008 academic year and accomplished the following:

- Course Repeat Privilege Policy and amendments passed Faculty Senate. This policy was passed as long as the student in question did not receive a “FX” (academic dishonesty) for the course that they are trying to repeat.
- After consulting with the Provost, changes were made to the Medical/Psychological Leave Policy and this was sent onto Academic Affairs for approval.
- Dr. Barbara Buckner, Associate Provost of Assessment and Accreditation, was added to the committee.
- The committee looked at sophomore retention at Coastal. This included a thorough examination of the issue in the higher education literature, and investigation of best practices among institutions of higher education in addressing sophomore retention. After discussion, the sophomore survey was redesigned and administered to all Coastal sophomore level students, via electronic distribution, in spring 2008. Results from this survey were discussed among SRAC members and it was decided to summarize the finding for delivery to university leadership.
- During the year, it was also proposed that the SRAC committee be disbanded in favor of a university-wide committee that focused on student retention. After some discussion, the idea was approved by Faculty senate at a meeting held on May 7, 2008.

With the dissolving of the Student Retention and Assessment Committee in favor of a university-wide student retention committee, this report will be the final annual update from the SRAC group. We are pleased that the legacy of the Faculty Senate Student Retention and Assessment Committee was to serve Coastal Carolina so diligently over the years and contribute to the growth and strategic development of our university. Additionally, we are very pleased that this legacy will continue on in the future through the efforts of the university-wide retention committee.

We respectfully submit this report to Faculty Senate for review and want to sincerely thank the following individuals for their enthusiastic service to our committee. Without this team of ex-officio committee members, we would not have accomplished nearly as much:

Barbara Buckner, Office of the Provost
Chris Mee and Robert Belovics, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.
Nelljean Rice, First Year Experience
Judy Vogt, Enrollment Services
Lynn Willet, Office of Student Affairs
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Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Annual Report

June 19, 2008

The membership of the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee (FWDC) is as follows: Alan Case, Allison Faix (Secretary), Steve Hamelman, Thomas Hoffman, Kathy Jones (spring semester), Varavut Limpasuvan, John Marcis, Carol Osborne (fall semester), Barbara Ritter (Vice-Chair), and Michael Ruse (Chair). The full committee met five times during academic year 2007-2008 (9/7, 10/19, 2/29, 4/4 and 5/02). The committee elected Barbara Ritter as Vice-Chair, John Marcis as its representative to the Grievance Committee, and Allison Faix as Secretary. The committee suspended the rules and elected Michael Ruse as Chair.

The charge of the committee, as stated in section IV of the Faculty Manual, is to consider policy matters pertaining to salaries and other aspects of the personal welfare of the faculty and to act as the initial agent of the faculty in matters concerning discipline of its own membership. In addition, this committee assists in all aspects of faculty development, including the organization of seminars or workshops to support continued education, scholarly research, and publication, or travel to professional meetings. Recommendations concerning scholarly reassignment leave applications and the awarding of faculty development grants are forwarded to the Provost.

Salary Compression:
The Administration accepted and funded the decompression proposal submitted by the FWDC which included a $48,000 minimum salary for all teaching faculty. The minimum salary was not applied to librarians holding faculty rank due to what appeared to be a statistical anomaly resulting from the data available to calculate librarian salary compression (the CUPA cohort data did not include data for librarians). An alternative scheme based on the librarian faculty receiving the same percentage increase as the teaching faculty as a whole was applied instead.

The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment was charged with compiling data that would definitely be a valid measure of librarian salary compression. Chris Mee and the Chair of FWDC met and analyzed that data in early June. They will meet with the Provost to discuss their findings in early July. Further adjustments to librarian salaries may be forthcoming based on that data.

The application of the decompression adjustments was performed in such a way so as to preserve merit increases in the form of exceptional ratings in post tenure review ($4,000 added to the base salary target) and the history of merit evaluations as evidenced by the annual reports of faculty members. The highest merit ratings on the annual reports were translated into the equivalent of one-half year at rank per rating earned since the inception of merit pay at Coastal Carolina University (one year at rank was awarded to library faculty based on their four-point scale). These adjustments were calculated in consultation with the Deans and Chairs of each College and the Library.

The Provost, Vice President for Finance, President and Board of Trustees funded $575,000 (48% of all decompression) in academic year 2007/2008. The remaining 52% has been funded effective June 16, 2008 for 12 month faculty and will apply to teaching faculty beginning with the first pay
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Another compression analysis is scheduled to be performed by the FWDC based on salary data for academic year 2008-2009 during 2009/2010.

Scholarly Reassignment:
The Committee received four applications for Scholarly Reassignment in the fall application period and four applications in the spring application period. Each proposal was ranked and a report was submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs. As per the recommendations of the Deans Committee and the FWDC, two Scholarly Reassignments were awarded by the Provost and President in the fall period (one was withdrawn). Four Scholarly Reassignments were awarded in the spring application period. Applications for Scholarly Reassignments beginning spring 2009 are due in the appropriate Chair/Supervisor’s office by July 1, 2008.

Professional Enhancement Grants:
For these proceedings Darlene Slusher served as substitute for Var Limpasuvan who was applying for a grant under the program. The committee received 38 applications for grants with a total budgetary request of $141,391.92 (the current program budget is $65,000). Ten applications were for Academic Enhancement Grants (AEG), and twenty-eight were for Research Enhancement Grants (REG). No Proposal Writing Grant (PWG) applications were received.

In total, four Academic Enhancement Grants (one with partial funding) and seventeen Research Enhancement Grants (nine of which received partial funding) were awarded by the Office of Academic Affairs as per the recommendations of the FWDC with additional grants funded by the Provost. The total recommended expenditure for the 2007/2008 Professional Enhancement Grant program was $64,395.73 or $64895.25 depending on the choice made to receive a course release or stipend of one applicant (roughly 45.5% of requested PEG funds and between $604.75 and $104.75 under budget). After meeting with the Provost, additional grants were funded and one grant application was withdrawn by the candidate. As a result, the PEG awards were funded at $65,707.25 (46.5% of requested PEG funds and $707.25 over budget).

Two faculty members requested slight modifications to their grants and those requests were forwarded to the Provost and Associate Provost.

Due to the increasing demand for these funds, the committee has requested that the PEG program funding be increased to $80,000 per academic year and that any unused funds be rolled over into the following year’s budget for the grants.

University Ombudsman:
The University Ombuds Office was created for a probationary period of two academic years. Charmaine Tomczyk was elected to the position of Faculty Ombuds. The Office will officially open fall semester 2008. In the late fall of 2009 a committee of faculty and administrators will evaluate the activities of the Office and determine if it is to be made permanent.

Family Leave and Child Care:
The summer Faculty Senate meeting will be on Wednesday, July 2, 2008 in WALL 309, beginning at 2:30 pm.

A subcommittee was formed to investigate issues concerning family leave and child care. Tom Hoffman, Barbara Ritter and John Marcis served on that committee. A report/proposal has been drafted and a survey was held via the faculty senate website. 117 faculty responded to the survey. The results are being compiled and a proposal will be made available by the September meeting of the Faculty Senate. There are questions as to whether or not we can offer benefits over and above those contained in the Sick Leave Act and the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA). The committee is seeking answers to these questions. The policies and procedures manual contains more detail on issues pertaining to sick and family leave.

Civic Engagement:
The Provost asked the committee to formalize the application process for civic engagement reassignments. The committee has begun work on the criteria, application form, and procedures. Work is ongoing over the summer and it is hoped that a proposal can be finalized by early September.

Chair’s Manual:
A manual for the Chair of the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee is being compiled this summer so as to facilitate smooth transitions when changes of committee leadership occur. Included in the manual are the procedures for Professional Enhancement Grants, Scholarly Reassignments, decompression studies, and for conducting committee business in general.

Other Issues:
The agenda for the committee in 2008/2009 is as follows:
- Finalization of library decompression system
- Continuation of the tuition benefit and childcare/family leave initiatives
- Formalization of the civic engagement program
- Investigate ways of increasing summer semester enrollments through a possible tuition break for a limited number of course hours.

I would like to thank membership of the committee for an outstanding effort in conducting the business of this committee. The Senate and the Faculty as a whole owes them a great debt of gratitude for their selfless efforts on behalf of us all.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Ruse, Chair, Faculty Welfare and Development Committee