

## Minutes for 19 September 2006 Academic Board Meeting

### 19 September 2006 Attendance List

In Attendance	
YES	BG Harry Carter
YES	COL Spike Metts
NO	Dr. Ray Jones
YES	COL Angie LeClercq
YES	MAJ Tom Thompson
YES	MAJ Sylvia Nesmith
	<b>School of Business Administration</b>
	COL Earl Walker
YES	COL Mark Bebensee
YES	MAJ Wes Jones
	<b>School of Education</b>
YES	COL Tony Johnson
YES	MAJ Jennifer Altieri
YES	COL George Williams
	<b>School of Engineering</b>
YES	COL Dennis Fallon
YES	COL Ken Brannan
YES	COL John Peoples
	<b>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</b>
YES	COL Al Finch
YES	COL Mark Del Mastro
YES	COL Gardel Feurtado
YES	COL Jim Leonard
YES	COL Bo Moore, Jr.
YES	LTC Steve Nida
	<b>School of Science and Mathematics</b>
YES	COL Chuck Groetsch
YES	COL Joel Berlinghieri
YES	COL John Carter
YES	LTC John Moore
YES	LTC Paul Rosenblum
YES	COL Lisa Zuraw
	<b>ROTC Departments</b>
Victor Brown for	COL Cardon Crawford
YES	COL Alan Ekrem
YES	COL Kevin Frederick
	<b>Guests</b>

BG Carter called the meeting to order at 3:15pm.

### **Item 1. Military Promotions**

BG Carter provided the following listing of military promotions that have been approved by the President:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Old Rank</b>	<b>New Rank</b>
Calloway, Licia	English	Captain	Major
Carter, Betsey	Library	Major	Lt. Colonel
Frame, Frances	English	Captain	Major
Francel, Margaret	Math & Computer Science	Lt Colonel	Colonel
Grenier, Katherine	History	Major	Lt. Colonel
Hurd, Spencer	Math & Computer Science	Lt Colonel	Colonel
Hutchisson, James	English	Lt Colonel	Colonel
Knapp, Keith	History	Major	Lt. Colonel
Lipovsky, Julie	Psychology	Lt Colonel	Colonel
McNamara, Robert	Political Science	Captain	Major
Peeples, John	Electrical Engineering	Lt Colonel	Colonel
Skow-Obenaus, Katherine	Modern Languages	Major	Lt. Colonel
Sparks, Donald	BADM	Lt Colonel	Colonel
Thompson, Tom	English	Major	Lt. Colonel
Toubiana, Guy	Modern Languages	Major	Lt. Colonel
Trautman, David	Math & Computer Science	Lt Colonel	Colonel
Williams, George	Education	Lt Colonel	Colonel

### **Item 2. Parent's Weekend**

BG Carter reminded the Board of the discussions of a new format for Parents' Day weekend and provided a handout describing the Friday afternoon events: Ring Ceremony at 1300 in Summerall Chapel, Academic Open House in designated areas from 1300 to 1430, Parents' Reception in Holiday Alumni Center from 1430 to 1530 with an update from the President at about 1500. Saturday morning will be reserved for cadet events. BG Carter provided a copy of a draft letter to parents providing locations of the Academic Open Houses and asked that any errors be brought to his attention.

### **Item 3. Corps Strength**

BG Carter presented an updated strength report for the Corps of Cadets. The Howard Johnson placement went well, and all cadets were moved out of Howard Johnson and back on campus by Friday, 15 September. Some are still in the trailers and in the tower rooms of Padgett-Thomas, but all are back on campus. Current Corps strength is 2028. Attrition to date is 10.8% and is the highest to this point in the year since 2001. BG Carter indicated that for some reason we stopped our efforts to contact fourth class cadets who leave in the fall semester. He will reinstate that process and is attempting to contact the consultant who had been doing telephone interviews with these students. We had found this information to be very helpful in the past, and he is not sure why this effort was stopped.

#### **Item 4. Freshman Surveys**

BG Carter shared with the Board that already in the semester; the freshman class had been surveyed eight times: CORE Alcohol Survey, Nelson Denny Reading Test, CIRP Survey out of UCLA, MBTI, Values and Respect Pre-Test, Library Pre-test, Writing Sample, Modern Language Placement Test. He shared the results of the CORE Survey and the Nelson Denny Reading Test. BG Carter indicated that he was searching for comparable data from other institutions.

#### **Item 5. Student Evaluation of Instruction**

BG Carter provided the following summary of the current state of the College relative to Student Evaluation of Instruction:

“I am writing to provide you with an update regarding our progress on the issue of Student Evaluation of Instruction. I have organized this update around the three motions approved by the Faculty Council and the Academic Board.

**I. Faculty should be consulted and participate actively, through appropriate committee(s), in any future process of establishing or editing procedures and guidelines related to Evaluation of Instruction.**

This will happen during the 2006-07 year and I will ensure that the new Provost is aware of this issue.

**II. Immediate suspension of campus-wide online evaluations, until procedures, set forth in the Faculty Manual, has been implemented.**

The online evaluations have been suspended. Our recent efforts have been to return as closely as we can to the old paper process, while the on-line process is being considered through the decision-making process presented in the Faculty Manual. Unfortunately, the scanner with which the old "Cafeteria" software package operated "died" over one year ago and was beyond repair. We had, therefore, already purchased a new scanner, and since at the time of that purchase we felt that we would be moving to the on-line format, we did not attempt to find a new scanner on which the "Cafeteria" software would work. These are the steps we have taken to reinstate as closely as we can the old paper process. Whatever we do will not duplicate that process because the "Cafeteria" software can no longer be used.

For Spring 2006:

- 1 We purchased sufficient forms from the old scanner company to handle spring and summer evaluations. Approximate Cost: \$634.00
- 2 We had the information printed on the forms by the Print Shop as we did in the past. Approximate Cost: \$329.00
- 3 We have contracted with Pearsons NCS Assessment Processing Center in Columbia, PA, to scan the forms, type the comments, and provide statistical analyses using both means and medians. Approximate Total Cost: \$25,000 (\$16,900 for scanning and analyses plus approximately \$7500 for transcribing comments).

- 4 After all the evaluations forms were returned (we did not get the forms from one department until 8 June), they were packaged in boxes for shipment to the Pearsons NCS Assessment Center by UPS. These boxes left The Citadel on Monday, June 12, but we have been given no time for the return of the completed analyses. Approximate Shipping Cost: \$275.00
- 5 Supplies for the paper forms (red sheets, envelopes) \$175.19 for Spring, and postage for PDEV (to send out to their location as well as return to The Citadel) \$165.00. Approximate Cost: \$350 Approximate TOTAL for Spring 2006: \$27,000

#### Summer 2006

We will repeat the steps outlined for the Spring 2006 evaluation. Evaluations for Maymester, Summer I, and Summer II will be sent off for processing after the Summer II forms have been returned to Institutional Research. Approximate Total Cost: \$13,500 (\$10,000.00 plus an estimated \$3,500 for transcribing comments). The new scanner we had purchased has a software package that will enable us to produce paper versions of an evaluation form, and we have replaced the software we purchased initially and have purchased the more sophisticated software. Approximate Cost: \$25,000.

Pam King received training on this new software in late July, and Fall 2006 evaluations should be administered using the new software. Scanning of forms and analyses will be provided without depending on external support. Just how student comments will be provided to the faculty is still an issue.

In summary, by fall 2006, we will be able to locally administer the existing agreed upon survey and to provide the statistical analysis of that information using the new software. We will continue to have the comments typed and distributed to the departments and faculty as soon as those are completed. We will have returned (as closely as possible) to the process that was in place prior to the implementation of the on-line electronic collection of this information. We will also have returned to a process which is economically reasonable. We will await additional recommendations from the Evaluation of Instruction Committee. Now that we have returned to the established process, it would seem reasonable to examine faculty interest in online student evaluations of instruction. If our faculty are interested in this approach, perhaps we could explore ways to improve student participation given our recent experience.

- III. **Data from the online administration of the evaluations for Summer Sessions I & II, and Fall Semester 2005 should not be included in faculty performance evaluations due to low response rate.**

This matter was settled by BG Steven in his email to the faculty dated March 9, 2006.

#### **Current action needed by Faculty Council:**

**The Faculty Council needs to consider the feasibility of conducting student evaluations of instruction using an on-line procedure and provide recommendations to the Academic Board regarding this possibility. This will enable us to follow the correct decision-making process regarding this issue. It is my hope that this can be done in a timely manner.**

## **Current action by Academic Board:**

**The Academic Board needs to consider ways in which we can type the written comments and include them in the evaluation process. We currently have Summer 2006 comments to type and will soon have Fall 2006 to type.”**

After the Board reviewed the Provost’s written summary statement and requested actions, discussions began. It was pointed out that as long as a paper process is used, comments will need to be typed, and several alternatives were presented for typing comments:

- External contract
- Internal Arrangement
  - Department/School Secretaries could assume that responsibility;
  - A person could be trained and brought in several times each year to type comments.

The question of why we cannot give the handwritten comments back to the faculty was raised. It was pointed out that issues of confidentiality and anonymity have been raised by CHE and SACS as well as concerns for fairness to our students. It was pointed out that Faculty Council wanted to have the entire evaluation form returned to the faculty member. That way the faculty member could consider each student’s comments in the context of his/her numerical submissions. It was pointed out that this could lead to issues of whether or not the evaluation process is legitimate and fair to the students. The issue of doing away with comments was also raised. Several members of the Board spoke to the value and importance of the comments. BG Carter again asked the members of the Board to give this matter some thought and expressed that he hoped the entire matter could be brought to closure by the end of this semester.

## **Item 6. Honorary Degrees and Palmetto Medals**

BG Carter shared with the Board pages 46 and 47 of College Regulations that describe the process by which nominations for Honorary Degrees and Palmetto Medals are presented. The Provost indicated that nominations would be solicited through an e-mail from his office and would need to be received by 1 January.

## **Item 7. Proposed New Faculty Positions**

BG Carter questioned the status of the proposals by the former provost to establish a variety of new positions and titles. MAJ Thompson indicated that the proposal was still before Faculty Council and that there had been difficulty getting agreement on those positions carrying stipends. BG Carter suggested that the Faculty Council consider separately those positions carrying honorary or ceremonial titles with no funding. There are a number of excellent candidates in the area who would qualify for such a position and would be of significant benefit to the College and our students. Those positions carrying stipends and requiring carefully detailed selection and evaluation processes could then be considered at a later date.

## **Item 8. Other Business/Announcements**

LTC John Moore indicated that a number of members of his department had expressed concern at the cancelling of classes on Friday afternoon of Parents’ Day Weekend.

It was noted that the minutes of the 14 August meeting had not yet been approved. COL Metts indicated that all the submitted corrections had been made, and the minutes were approved without opposition.

BG Carter shared statistics from an article regarding cheating among graduate students. According to the article, 56% of Business graduate students and 47% of graduate students in other disciplines admitted to having cheated while in graduate school.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1612.

Respectfully submitted,

Isaac S. Metts, Jr., Ph.D.  
Associate Provost