ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR: A motion was made to elect Maria Bachman as Vice Chair for a one-year replacement term. Susan Webb, former Vice Chair, rotated into the Chair position for a one-year replacement term for David Evans. Webb reported she had met with Bachman and she was willing to serve as Vice Chair, replacing Dr. Webb for a period of one year. Dr. Bachman was unanimously elected.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: A motion was made by Lee Bollinger, seconded by John Goodwin to accept the May 7, 2008 minutes with the correction of Karen Aguirre’s name. The motion to accept as corrected passed.

Chair Webb changed the order of the agenda to have the President’s Report next.

President DeCenzo said Dr. Sheehan asked that he convey his apologies for not being at Senate. DeCenzo said we extend our deepest sympathy to Rob and his family during this time of his father’s death. DeCenzo said he had a couple of issues to address. I am very thankful that the Board of Trustees agreed to fund the remaining dollars for the salary compression, DeCenzo said. He thanked Michael Ruse for his work on the compression endeavor. DeCenzo said the state’s budget ended on the 30th of June, and we’re waiting for the final numbers from the BEA (Bureau of Economics Analysis), but the speculation and rumors are that we’re going to be somewhere between 30 and 50 million dollars short at year end of the budget. As you know, we can’t run a deficit, so the state will more than likely have to draw down on some reserve funds, but those reserve funds are going to have to be made up elsewhere. We are anticipating, and I say that with somewhat of a sadness, but we are anticipating a mid-year cut. The question that we don’t know at this point, is how great that mid-year cut may be. We built into the budget that the board approved a contingency to literally deal with roughly our portion of what may come out of a 30 to 50 million dollar shortfall of the state. Assuming that enrollment hits our targets, and if you look at our
enrollment right now, enrollment is strong, if you look at how many have paid their deposits, we are lagging. We’re hearing from students that they are going to wait until the last minute to pay some of these bills, which we hope is truly the case. DeCenzo said he is not trying to use a trite cliché, but we may be facing an unbelievable perfect storm. If the state has a bigger shortfall than anticipated, if we don’t have our enrollment, then we could be looking at not only significant cuts in December, but a potential of having a mid-year tuition increase. It is getting to be that serious, DeCenzo said. We have got to look for ways to find efficiencies, and we’ve got to look for ways to cut some costs. I know that’s something that not all of us want to do, but again, any of us who have been to a gas station recently realize that our money is not going as far as it possibly can. I will keep you posted on what’s happening with the budget, but I can tell you at this point it is not looking pretty. Our hope is that if there is any type of a mid-year cut that our contingency will cover it. We can handle probably about a three percent cut. That will wipe out our contingency, and if we wipe out our contingency on that, then we certainly hope a boiler doesn’t blow up, or a sidewalk has to be replaced, because we will simply take every penny out of contingency to cover those costs. DeCenzo asked Nelljean Rice about the First Year Experience regarding enrollment. Rice said the figures so far are strong, so far about 1200 and we’re looking at two more First Year Orientations and those run between 250 and 300. DeCenzo said we’re optimistic that our enrollment numbers will hold. Obviously we’d like to have all the money in now, but, everything we’re hearing from Admissions is that the numbers are holding. Assuming that we have no problems with enrollment, and assuming the State’s budget is what we anticipate, we hope that our contingencies will cover it.

There are some other things happening at the state level. The Budget and Control Board has put a moratorium for 90 days on approval of all projects. Whether the money is there, or whether the money is state money, needless to say that has hurt a lot of us, there are several individuals, in particular at USC where they had projects that were totally privately funded, that have also been put into the moratorium. The perception is that projects that went through the joint bond review committee for approval, may get released at a special meeting in August, but there is some talk that contingent on what happens to the budget, there may be at least a one year moratorium on all projects irrespective of where the funding is coming from. We’ve got seven projects that are working through the pipeline that we have the money for, we’re not asking for any state money, we’re not asking for anything other than the approval, and it’s our hope that we get them through at the August meeting so we can get started on the Science Building, the Library expansion and a few other things.

Last item that I have is a two-fold item. It does relate to the gas crisis that we’re in. I’ve had several people ask for the possibility of a four-day work week. Each Vice President is looking at the feasibility of a four-day work week, where in essence we would have some employees working Monday thru Thursday, and others working Tuesday thru Friday, so that we can provide the services that are expected and that we have adequate coverage. I’m waiting for the report back from the Vice Presidents. However, there is a new wrinkle that has been thrown into this, and that wrinkle is there is now some information that’s going up to Columbia from commuter students that says basically, because of the cost of gas, coming to class three days a week is presenting a burden. I just spoke to the Provost before I came in and I told him that I would mention this in here, I’m going to ask the Provost and the responsible committee of the senate to look into a schedule that possibly could be implemented where we would have something to the effect of Tuesday –
Thursday, Tuesday – Friday, whatever two day classes. I’d rather us look at it before it gets mandated from the state. The people I’m talking to in Columbia are certainly understanding that students having to drive that extra day are “upset”. I know that there has been some discussion in the past of going to some kind of schedule where we’re looking at two days a week as opposed to three, and I think it is prudent for us to look at it earnestly this fall because when the legislatures get back in session in January, it would not surprise me, especially as we all keep hearing that gas will probably hit $5.00 a gallon, probably sometime by the end of the summer. If we continue to see this increase in gas, you know there is going to be an increase in requests to go with a different teaching schedule as well as for the faculty being on campus. I will officially ask the Provost to convene the appropriate people, the appropriate committees to take a look at how we may go to a two day a week schedule for our classes. Again, that’s what the idea is, so don’t be surprised if you hear something the first of the year that it is potentially mandated.

Responding to a question, DeCenzo said at this point he does not anticipate that the budget situation will change the number of faculty slots that have been promised. We could end up in the situation where we have to cut positions. I have said and will continue to say that the last positions to be affected are going to be faculty positions. That’s the bread and butter of teaching our students. It is my goal, DeCenzo said, not to eliminate any of the faculty positions that are there, especially as we move forward to try to reduce what we know is a student/faculty ratio that’s relatively high. That’s not to say we are not concerned about staff, we absolutely are, but we have got to make sure in the academic areas, and let me just say in the academic areas, I’m going to do everything possible to ensure we cut no positions, faculty and/or staff. The administration is probably where you’re going to see some cuts. DeCenzo said, I don’t know what that will be until we get a clearer picture. The BEA meets on the 17th of July, and if the number comes in under 40 million dollars, it’s going to hurt, but at least we’re prepared for that. I’ve heard a number as high as 90 to 100 million dollars, and if it is closer to the 90 or 100 million dollars, there is not a state institution that is not going to have problems.

DeCenzo assured the senate that he will keep the campus posted of developments as he knows them.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT: Webb announced the agenda list of the Faculty Senate representatives to the Board of Trustees Committees should be corrected to show that Mark Mitchell attended the Finance Committee meeting.

Secondly, Webb said according to the Faculty Manual, once again ratified in the May Senate meeting, one of the responsibilities of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate is to coordinate and oversee the process of administrator evaluations. Some of the feedback does come to that committee. Overall about 37 percent of faculty took the time to evaluate our President and Provost. With regards to Deans, the highest level of participation was in the Library with 57 percent. The lowest was in Science with 33 percent of faculty participating in that process. With regards to departments, the lowest were Mathematics/Statistics & Chemistry/Physics ties with only 33 percent response rate. The highest was in Art with 77 percent of the Artists taking the time to rate their administrators. Webb said a comment she received is that some faculty members have concerns that with such low response rates it might be particularly easy for an administrator to identify a particular person’s comments. Webb said when she looked at administrator evaluation
results she observed a lot of people must not be providing narrative and that may be because of their concerns regarding confidentiality. My understanding, she said, is that each faculty member has the ability to see the evaluations of the administrators that serve you, and that the process for that generally is announced through emails and it’s often through the Dean’s office. Watch your email for that announcement.

Louis Keiner, Chair of the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Evaluations presented a report to the Senate. That report begins on page 14.

Senators attending the Board of Trustees Committees gave brief oral reports of their observations. Lee Bollinger attended the Athletic Committee, Yoav Wachsman attended the Audit Committee, and Mark Mitchell attended the Finance Committee. Kenneth Martin attended the Facilities Committee, Holley Tankersley attended the Government Affairs and Deb Walker attended the Student Affairs Committee.

PROVOST AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS: None

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Barbara Buckner reported on the Student Retention and Assessment Committee regarding the results of the Sophomore Survey. Committee examined best practices among higher education institutions concerning retention of sophomore students. They initially looked at surveys being used at other institutions. The committee created their own survey based on the information that would be fruitful to our institution. The survey was:

Designed to solicit information from the Coastal sophomore student population in regards to their satisfaction with the university as a whole and student programs and services.

Distributed electronically to: 1574 students Spring semester 2008

Response rate: 10.7% (n = 169).

- 99% of sophomores have decided on a major or likely program of study with student interest being the largest motivator for that specific decision
- 94% were "very certain" or "somewhat certain" about their decision.

Overall attitudes towards Coastal among sophomore respondents 91.7% would recommend Coastal Carolina University to a student wanting to attend college.

Overall satisfaction with student activities (45.5%) reported their levels as "very high" or "high".
43% expressed an "undecided" opinion to their satisfaction with student activities

Participation in research activities
(14.8%) participated with Coastal faculty members
Of those students 72.0% rated their experience as "good" or "excellent".
Dissatisfaction with various aspects of their Coastal experience sophomores disagreement levels **that exceeded 25% in the following areas:**

- ability to register for courses and enroll in a needed course (44.7%),
- financial aid award (34.9%),
- advising in their major departments (32.0%),
- physical activity facilities (29.0%),
- variety of on-campus activities (26.2%), and
- opportunities to interact with faculty outside of class (25.4%).

Michael Ruse, Chair of Faculty Welfare & Development Committee gave a brief report. Paul Peterson thanked Michael Ruse and his committee for their hard work, and also to the Board of Trustees who came up with the money in these tight times. Ruse responded by saying the Administration fought very hard to make sure this got done.

Michael Lackey reported on the status of PASCAL (Partnership Among South Carolina Academic Libraries) by saying thanks to the Senate for passing at the May meeting the resolution in support of PASCAL that went to the Senate Finance Committee Chair Hugh Leatherman regarding funding of PASCAL. The budget for PASCAL this year was cut from two million dollars to 200,000 dollars. What PASCAL does for the academic libraries in the state is provide the PASCAL Delivers and the Online PASCAL Delivers Catalog. Also PASCAL provides funding for quite a few online databases, and online journal packages that are quite expensive. The PASCAL membership met on June 19, 2008 and voted on the following proposals to try to keep PASCAL going until we can hopefully get the funding restored in next year’s budget.

We will continue the PASCAL Delivers program service, but we’ll have to reduce the service from five days a week delivery to three days a week delivery. The will mean that your normal turn-around time is around three business days now, but starting immediately, the delivery will be cut down to three days a week, so the delivery time may be cut to five or six day turn-around from when you request something from the PASCAL Catalog.

We will continue the electronic resources program, but we will have to cut that back as well. We will be able to renew a minimal number of key databases. Some of the other databases will probably have to go away. We will be able to continue member’s access to Ebsco databases including Academic Search Premier, Business Source Premier, Gale Literature Resource Center, and any of the other databases you see on our website that are Ebsco Databases. We also voted to raise our membership dues by 20% and imposed fees upon ourselves.

Lackey thanked our administration who has given us monetary support to keep some of these databases going. Two that were in jeopardy of going away as of July 1 were the Access Science Database which is the on-line version of the Science and Technology Encyclopedia and the Lexis- Nexis Academic that we currently subscribe to through PASCAL. Our administration has provided the funds for us to renew that for this year. They have also given us funds to renew our online subscriptions to Science Magazine and Nature online. PASCAL knew this was coming because as they did a great job with their financial accounting, carrying the state funding over from year to year, we’ll see that most of our databases are actually renewed until January. We will have to
negotiate six months contracts with our vendors this year in hopes that we can get full funding again next year. We will pay our service fees for this year to continue PASCAL Delivers and the core database packages. We will work diligently to lobby the state legislature to restore our funding for the next budget year. We will provide information to faculty and staff throughout the year about who you can communicate with to voice your concern over the funding for PASCAL.

Tracy Edge is our representative for District 104 on the South Carolina House Ways Committee. Liston Barfield is the representative from District 58, and the Chair of the House Ways Committee is Daniel T. Cooper. On the Senate Finance Committee our representative for Senate District 32 is Yancy McGill, and the Chair of the Finance Committee to whom this body sent a resolution this year is Senator Hugh Leatherman.

We will see PASCAL continue this year though in a slightly pared down capacity. Another thing PASCAL is going to do for us is that any of the databases that we’re in danger of losing, they will act as our agent in terms of opt-in or a buyers club arrangement where individual colleges and universities can opt in to subscribe to these databases that may have been lost and again we will see cost savings on those just by the fact that we come to them as a group rather than individual libraries.

Richard Johnson, Associate Provost for Graduate Studies and Academic Outreach, first thanked Deborah Vrooman for serving as interim director of Graduate Studies this year. She has really done a tremendous job working with the Council and getting some of many grants proposals and programs through the program. Dr. Johnson said if there are any questions regarding programs approved, please contact him. He stated that there are several changes he is looking at for the upcoming year: how curriculum proposals work their way through the council, academic affairs and senate throughout the year. Johnson is anticipating the development of a procedural handbook for submission of materials to include program planning proposal procedures. He will also look at the structure of the Graduate Council itself. There are some protocol issues about how students enter and exit the Graduate program that need to be addressed. We are seeking uniformity among programs without detracting from the uniqueness of each program and their individual needs, hence the necessity of regular meetings among program directors and the associate provost. The graduate office will also be looking at both national and SACS standards that may need to be in place that will be helpful to the program.

Annual Reports

Jeff Linder, Chair, Intercollegiate Athletics Committee Annual Report for 2007/2008 begins on page 18.

PENDING BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

Items approved by the Graduate Council on May 7, 2008 were presented to Senate for information only. No action was needed.
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.

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.

Pattie Edwards, Chair, Academic Affairs presented the following for Faculty Senate review/approval.

A motion was made by Renee Smith, seconded by Terry Fries to accept items 1 – 3 as recommended. The motion passed.

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.

A motion was made by Terry Fries, seconded by Renee Smith to accept items 4-5 as recommended. After some discussion, a motion was made by Terry Fries, seconded by Renee Smith to withdraw the motion and reconsider it at the Senate’s October 1st meeting. The motion to withdraw passed.
4. **Request for a change in and 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)**

- CSCI 110, 130*/130L*, 140/140L, 150/150L, 170  
- CSCI 203  
- MATH 160*, 174, 210  
- CBAD 291  
- BINF 110/110L  
- CBAD 201, 202, 350, 371  
- CBAD 393  
- ECON 101 or 201  
- ENGL 390  
- ENGL 211*  
- HIST 101*, HIST 102*, or HIST 202*  
- PHIL 101*, or PHIL 102*  
- HPRO 121*, PSYC 101*, or SOC 101*  

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

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

- CSCI 330, 335, 370, 385, 409, 415, 425, 495  
- CSCI 400

V. **ELECTIVES (0-8 Credits)**
**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/AAEE, 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:

A motion was made by Yoav Wachsman, seconded by Lee Bollinger to accept item 6 as recommended. The motion passed.

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.

A motion was made by Paul Peterson, seconded by Jennifer Hughes to accept item 7 as recommended. The motion passed.

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.

Patti Edwards announced the new co-chairs for Academic Affairs for next year are Dr. Pat Pivor and Dr. John Goodwin.

A motion was made by Renee Smith, Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee for this year saying the Core Curriculum Committee met with Academic Affairs and changed the description of the committee as follows, Jim Solazzo seconded the motion.

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.

An amendment was made by Michael Ruse, and was seconded to change the wording of proposed membership to one of whom should be tenured TO one of whom must be tenured. The motion to amend passed. The motion as amended passed.

GOOD OF THE ORDER: Chair Webb said that for 13 years or more, our order has been served extremely well by Janet Straub who has been doing this job faithfully and taking care of a lot of things for the senate. Janet is retiring and will be able to get our agenda to us, but she’ll be gone before our next senate meeting. Webb asked the senate to join her in thanking Janet for her work. After a standing ovation, Straub said it has been a pleasure to be associated with the senate for the past 15 years. I have always had your support, and I hope you give the next recorder the same
support. I’ve called many of you and asked for your “talking notes”, or other assistance and you’ve always responded. Your assistance has certainly been appreciated.

Webb asked whether there were other items for the Good of the Order, and Senator Yoav Wachsman called for an executive session to discuss questions of shared governance between faculty and administration, and mentioned recent announcements by specific administrators. Before any formal motion was put on the floor general discussion began, with Janis Chesson saying we could not legally go into Executive Session under South Carolina law, and Henry Lowenstein pointing out that Executive Sessions are limited to personnel and other very limited matters. Webb reported and Michael Ruse, Parliamentarian, indicated they had researched the matter in Roberts Rules of Order, which governs Senate proceedings; Senate can vote to go into executive session following a motion, second, and majority vote in support. Mike Roberts suggested administrators and others not on the Senate could voluntarily leave so Senate could informally discuss the issues off-record, and other administrators present agreed.

Wachsman moved to call the Senate into executive session. Renee Smith seconded. There was a vote by show of hands. The motion was defeated, 18-16. Paul Peterson suggested Senators could stay after the Senate adjourned for a ‘friendly conversation.’ All still present did so.

Webb asked for a motion to adjourn, Slavik so moved, Ruse seconded, and the meeting was adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT: 3:55 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Approved by Susan Webb,
Faculty Senate Chair

Janet Straub
Faculty Senate Recorder
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)
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.

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.
7. Senate creates a standing committee to periodically evaluate evaluations.
Elected Faculty (1 elected by each College, 1 from Library)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chan-Tsin, Matthieu</td>
<td>1H</td>
<td>6471</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Matthieu@coastal.edu">Matthieu@coastal.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hollandsworth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costner, Richard</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>3461</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rcostner@coastal.edu">Rcostner@coastal.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham-Ligas, Jamie</td>
<td>2L</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jligas@coastal.edu">Jligas@coastal.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guentzel, Jane</td>
<td>2N</td>
<td>2374</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jguentze@coastal.edu">Jguentze@coastal.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrash, Charles</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ethrash@coastal.edu">Ethrash@coastal.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appointed by Faculty Senate Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linder, Jeff</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>2829</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jeff@coastal.edu">Jeff@coastal.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty representative to the NCAA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Sharon</td>
<td>NCAA</td>
<td>2635</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Thompson@coastal.edu">Thompson@coastal.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brad Bowen</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Babowen@coastal.edu">Babowen@coastal.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Harris</td>
<td>843-283-3723</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Leharris@coastal.edu">Leharris@coastal.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other members Ex-officio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Director – Warren Koegel</td>
<td>2813</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Wkoegel@coastal.edu">Wkoegel@coastal.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Office representative – Jennifer Runyon</td>
<td>4199</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jarunyon@coastal.edu">Jarunyon@coastal.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Office representative - Tim McCormick</td>
<td>2062</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tim@coastal.edu">Tim@coastal.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The charge of the committee, as stated in section IV of the Faculty Manual, is:

This committee considers all phases of the intercollegiate athletic program at the university and makes reports and recommendations to the faculty and the administration. The Athletic Director and all coaches are excluded from any elected or appointed position on this committee.

This committee did not meet in the Fall semester due to a lack of a chair.
1\textsuperscript{st} meeting  February 4\textsuperscript{th}
Sharon Thompson contacted the committee by email for an organizational meeting. Jeff Linder was elected chair. Athletic Director Warren Koegel gave the committee an overview of the athletic department. The committee agreed to meet again in three weeks.

2\textsuperscript{nd} meeting  Feb 27\textsuperscript{th}
This meeting was called to order by the chair. The meeting was held in the conference room of the athletic office building. Again, Warren Koegel spoke to the committee about the importance of this committee to fully understand what exactly the Athletic Department responsibilities are. We discussed the daily routine of all athletes and how the department tracks the student/athletes. Each athlete is required to have a certain number of hours each week to be spent in the study hall. There is at least two times a semester when the department sends out reports to be filled out by each faculty member that has a student/athlete enrolled in his/her courses. After a good discussion that shed light on many of the committee members, Warren then took us on a tour of the softball, baseball and football facilities. At the end of the tour, the meeting was over.

3\textsuperscript{rd} meeting  April 23\textsuperscript{rd}
The meeting was called to order by the chair. This meeting was almost entirely dedicated to the NCAA compliance regulations. Warren Koegel handed out copies of the list of all intercollegiate athletics that our university supports. These were broken done by the individual sports and by the women’s and men’s sports.

The data included the retention of the athletes, the average grade point for the sport, and also the NCAA’s standards. The committee resolved that our athletes in almost every sport are above the NCAA standard. There were only a couple of sports in which the department felt there was a need to improve, while keeping all of the other sports above the standards.

This was a very informative meeting. The committee feels that with the information we learned this semester, that the committee will be prepared to accomplish much more in next years meetings.