MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD
May 6, 2014, at 3:15 in Bond 295

BG Hines called the meeting to order in Bond 295 on Tuesday, 6 May 2014.

ITEM 1: Approval of Minutes of the 17 April 2014 meeting
BG Hines

COL Williams requested that the Minutes reflect the number of M.Ed. candidates who presented their Capstone Portfolios: 14 in Counselor Education and 3 in Student Affairs and College Counseling. The Minutes were approved as amended.

ITEM 2: College-Wide Curriculum Committee Recommendations
MAJ Zanin

MAJ Zanin explained that the Curriculum Committee passed a number of course proposals: two new minors, two changes in course of study, the creation of 21 new course offerings, and changes in the program requirements for science and engineering majors in the Honors Program. Also, she presented new courses in the Department of Physics as well as in the Department of Leadership Studies which have been approved by the Committee.

1. Department of Physics: Three (3) new Courses
   A. Fluids Laboratory: PHYS 391, Two (2) credit hours; Pre-requisite: PHYS 241
      Fluid dynamics is the study of fluids in motion. This course concentrates on the role of wind tunnel and computational fluid dynamics (CFD) used to study flow around or through scaled models.
   B. Fluid Dynamics: PHYS 441, Three (3) credit hours; Pre-requisite: PHYS 341
      Fluid dynamics is the study of fluids in motion, both gases and liquids and provides a foundation in the integral, differential, and experimental approaches to understanding the effects which fluids moving over or through an object have on that object.
   C. Flight Simulation Lab: PHYS 393, One (1) credit hour; Pre-requisite: PHYS 241
      Fluid dynamics is the study of fluids in motion. The effect of aerodynamic flow on the control and stability of an aircraft will be studied using the physics engines (aerodynamics calculation model) which power Flight Simulator and/or X-Plane. Simulation is the easiest and safest way to experience the concepts which have been learned in other fluid dynamic courses such as PHYS 241 and PHYS 341. COL Berlinghieri explained that if students were to take PHYS 393 and PHYS 391, these two (2) courses could be combined as a three-credit-hour general elective; however, these combined courses cannot fulfill core requirements. COL Zuraw wondered how many hours of lab students will have
to take to earn three (3) credit hours. LTC Nesmith explained that six (6) contact hours in lab will equal three (3) credit hours.

A Motion was made and seconded to approve these three courses. The courses were approved.

2. Minor in Aerospace Science: Pre-requisites: PHYS 221/271; 222/272 and approval from the department chair

This minor can be taken by students majoring in a STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) discipline or by students who have passed the pre-requisites and is designed to allow students who have successfully completed the introductory calculus-based physics sequence an opportunity to acquire an understanding of aerodynamics in the broad sense. The physics of flight, of propulsion, and of the atmosphere will be addressed through an understanding of fluid dynamics.

COL Berlinghieri explained that the physics of flight and the fundamentals of aerodynamics will be required courses and have been taught previously. Students could take many combinations of courses with the requirement that no more than three (3) hours would be taken at the 200 level. COL Bebensee asked if the main audience would be physics majors, and COL Berlinghieri explained that they would. LTC McNealy added that the required courses are consistent with what other colleges are requiring for this type of minor. COL Trumbull wondered if there were any costs associated with this minor, and COL Berlinghieri explained that there would be no additional cost. COL Welch asked if two (2) engineering courses might be acceptable for this minor, and COL Berlinghieri noted that he would like to discuss this idea further. COL Bebensee pointed out that there is a rule in place explaining that students can use only one course to satisfy a major and a minor, and COL Berlinghieri explained that this rule would be made clear.

A Motion was made and seconded to approve this minor. The Minor in Aerospace Science was approved.

3. Department of Leadership Studies: New Courses
   A. Special Topics in Leadership
   B. Leadership Communications

COL Grenier wanted to know how this communications course differs from other communication courses, and COL Allen explained that this course addresses the connection between the art of communication and events. BG Carter added that this course will also show students how to use multi-media to lead others as well as influence people and pointed out that the School of Business has a similar course in the MBA (Master’s Degree in Business Administration) Program. He added that this 300-level course
focuses on the communication techniques of leaders which will help people become more effective leaders and does not duplicate what is being taught in the Department of English.

*Motion was made and seconded to approve this course. The course was approved.*

**ITEM 3: CACREP Accreditation Update**

BG Hines explained that the site visit by CACREP (Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Educational Programs) was very successful and that the College was in compliance with all standards. In addition, the team cited a number of the Citadel’s best practices and gave helpful suggestions. BG Hines explained that no more details could be revealed until July when the college receives the official report. In addition, BG Hines thanked COL Williams, MAJ Jones, Ms. Hambright, and LTC McNealy and her staff for all of their hard work. Finally, BG Hines explained that the College will go through another year of accreditation, for example, with ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology) and AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business).

**ITEM 4: News from Graduate Council**

COL McNamara explained that the Graduate Council did not have any additional news to report.

**ITEM 5: News from Faculty Council**

MAJ Barth reported that Faculty Council met on 6 May and that the Budget Director spoke about budget issues as well as increased transparency. In addition, COL Welch made a presentation to the Council. Next, MAJ Barth explained that Faculty Council had passed the following resolution: Concerning the Distribution of Funds for Faculty Projects—1) As it seems that the most equitable method for distributing funds to the various schools and the library is to base the percentages on the average amounts funded for the previous several years—Faculty Council endorses this method, so long as the averages are adjusted on a continuing basis; 2) Further, Faculty Council recommends that each school and the library have a review committee made up of at least one member of each department or area of interest and that the committee review and rank all funding requests and make their recommendations to the appropriate dean or department head. The proposal process should be public (i.e., available to the entire faculty), the ranking criteria should be public, the rankings themselves should be available to any faculty member upon request, and the list of funded requests should also be available to any faculty member upon request to the appropriate dean or department head; 3) Faculty Council also recommends that each
school or department should have the freedom to adjust both the process and the
criteria to fit the particular school or department. Acknowledging the need to make
school-appropriate adjustments, Faculty Council recommends that all schools and
departments request an annual proposal in the fall from each faculty member who
anticipates requesting funds at any time during the upcoming year to allow the
committee to commit resources equitably for each semester or each quarter. Faculty
Council further recommends that each committee use the existing criteria from the
Development and Research Committees as templates for their own criteria, whether
they choose to separate Development from Research or to have a single form for all
requests. Faculty Council recommends that, if multiple proposals are deemed worthy
of funding, but cannot all be fully funded, both academic rank and the amount of
funding provided to a faculty member in the previous funding cycle be used as “tie-
breakers,” with priority going to junior faculty whose projects are necessary for tenure
and/or promotion, and to faculty who have not been funded in the previous funding
cycle.

Faculty Council also discussed the issue of putting new faculty members on Faculty
Council and recommended that departments review the experience of the faculty
member before putting that person on Faculty Council. COL Williams was curious
about: 1) the potential for a Faculty Senate as it has been discussed for years and
2) the pursuit of a Citadel Faculty Code of Ethics. MAJ Barth explained that he was not
sure where these issues stood, and COL Davakos pointed out that the Citadel Faculty
Code of Ethics was published several years ago without approval. BG Hines noted that
this issue might need to be revisited.

COL Berlinghieri asked about the funding for faculty research and presentations, and
BG Hines explained that all decisions would be made not later than the end of the
school year. COL Berlinghieri requested that faculty members be informed of these
decisions.

ITEM 6: Department of Biology Promotion and Tenure Standards

COL Weinstein (E-mailed attachment)

COL Weinstein explained that the Department of Biology has developed policies and
standards for evaluating the performance of tenure-track and tenured faculty for the
purposes of decisions on tenure, promotion, probationary reappointment, and annual
performance review and that the department has approved the document.

COL Bebensee asked about the revision at the bottom of page 7 which states, “In the
event that a candidate does not achieve the required ratings outlined above, a
consistent pattern of improvement over the period of review may be used to justify a
positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate
Professor,” as he felt that it seems unusual to receive one before the other.

BG Hines explained that a professor can apply for a promotion before applying for
tenure, and COL Weinstein pointed out that some faculty may want to apply for promotion early before applying for tenure. COL Grenier added that this situation has happened several times in the past. COL Feurtado wondered if this issue would need to appear in the hire letter, and BG Hines explained that normally it would need to be negotiated before a professor is hired. COL Williams added that the word “collegiality” stands out in the tenure piece; however, data stands out in the section on promotion. COL Welch wondered about the advantage of being an Associate Professor without tenure, and COL Lew Yan Voon asked if there were anything that might prohibit someone from receiving promotion but not tenure. COL Bebensee pointed out that it doesn’t seem to make sense for someone to receive a “no” for tenure and a “yes” for promotion, and COL Welch added that a promotion results in a pay raise. COL Berlinghieri noted that receiving tenure at the full professor level seems harder to achieve, and BG Hines explained that it might be possible if expectations were set, and the time period were shortened. COL Williams noted that professors have received tenure without receiving a promotion, and COL Grenier added that when that has happened, the standards were different for tenure and promotion. Furthermore, she believes that if a department wants to allow for this possibility, then the standards need to differ. COL Weinstein explained that his department was split on the issue of standards for both promotion and tenure, and COL Allen pointed out that perhaps this issue would make better sense being discussed in Memorandum 3-601 rather than at the department level. BG Hines agreed that the College should review Memorandum 3-601. COL Weinstein explained that he will take these comments back to his department.

ITEM 7: New Department of Leadership Studies

BG Hines explained that the College has been building leadership programs out of the Krause Center for several years and that the Master’s Degree in Leadership Studies is managed by LTC Fekula. As the head of the academic leadership programs, he has been reporting directly to BG Hines, and through many conversations, it has been decided that the College needs an academic leadership program that has more structure and addresses the other issues in maintaining student records and files. Therefore, the College is creating this new Department of Leadership Studies that will monitor all of the programs in that area.

BG Hines pointed out that one of the most attractive draws for The Citadel is the mission of developing principled leaders and that there has been a desire to engage the academic part of the institution so that everyone works in mutual support and engagement on the education part of the development of principled leaders. COL Trumbull asked about the level of preparation for this proposal, and BG Hines explained that the College will identify faculty who have consistently played a role in
LDRS 201, in the undergraduate Minor in Leadership Studies, and/or in the new Master’s Degree in Leadership Studies. Faculty will have a joint appointment with leadership studies, and this new department will provide an opportunity to build linkages with other departments as it will be an interdisciplinary department which reports directly to the Provost. COL Welch wondered if the Krause Center would co-exist with this new department, and BG Hines explained that the Krause Center will remain separate. In addition, he noted that the Krause Center will be hiring a Chair in Leadership Studies. COL Trumbull asked if this new chair would be a tenure-track position, and BG Hines noted that it would. BG Hines added that this type of new department has been done before and, therefore, does not require a vote. However, he felt that a discussion about the new department was important. COL Trumbull asked if the individual schools would have input about this joint appointment, and BG Hines explained that the criteria can be put in writing and that no joint appointments will be made without proper input. In addition, he noted that even though The Citadel does not have many interdisciplinary programs, these types of programs appear to be on the cutting edge. COL Trumbull wondered if there would be tenure-track faculty in leadership studies, and BG Hines explained that this could be such an appointment and that this information could be put in the advertisement for the position. COL Trumbull voiced concern about a department outside of the schools as well as about the tenure and promotion process. BG Hines pointed out that the College would have a faculty committee comprised of faculty with joint appointments. In addition, he explained that the College did not want to identify the academic study of leadership with only one school, as this could hinder its progress. He continued to explain that when a College is trying to create synergy and buy-in across the campus, it helps if the department is not connected with just one school. COL Trumbull pointed out that this new department’s lack of connection to any school appears to be complicated, and that he wanted to bring out these complications. Moreover, he explained that the transition from department to schools is still not complete. BG Hines acknowledged the numerous concerns and explained that the College will try to make these appointments very clear.

COL Moore suggested that it might be helpful to commit the information about the new department to paper to help with discussions as that would help to explain issues such as representation, funding, and office space. BG Hines noted that the College has sufficient funds to provide temporary support for the first year and that there will be no new faculty, as LTC Fekula’s obligations will stay the same. In addition, no person will be assigned to that department for 100%, as this will be an interdisciplinary unit. COL Grenier asked if this department will offer a BA in Leadership Studies or if the department would simply be a supporting department. BG Hines explained that this department might eventually offer a BA in Leadership Studies but that, first, the College will need to study the leadership minor.
In addition, he explained that contract cadets are engaged in different courses because of their military commitment, and the College will need to review how these courses might connect to the Minor in Leadership Studies, as currently few students have participated in this minor. Also, BG Hines explained that there will be some type of connection to the execution of the QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan). COL Welch pointed out that the Krause Center has remained committed to their mission and that it seems like they may be moving toward becoming a separate department. Therefore, he would like to see how these departments will co-exist without too much overlap, as it might be confusing to have two leadership organizations. BG Hines explained that there should not be any duplication, as one ties in through the Leadership Council, and the other department is completely academic. COL Welch expressed concern that the new department may grow outside the bounds of teaching and that joint appointments could be a slippery slope. BG Hines concluded by explaining that LDRS 411 will stay with the Krause Center and that the College is trying to draw a distinction between courses taught for academic credit and courses offered for academic enrichment.

ITEM 8: Academic Grant Update

BG Hines thanked Faculty Council for their work in this area and explained that the College is reviewing the number of FTEs (Full-time Equivalents) for each school. He pointed out that he will send out the latest draft to the Board and that in some schools, there is a direct correlation between FTEs and grant funds. He added that many faculty members have spent much of their time away from campus by consulting and serving as expert witnesses. Also, he explained that there has been a focus on local school districts. He explained that the funds will be allocated according to the pattern of how these funds have been awarded going back to 2007-2008 and that the deans will review all of the funds available to them. That way, the deans will have the perspective of seeing all resources and matching them with the demand. BG Hines noted that each dean will decide the review method and that there will be some consensus about the total amount a faculty member might expect. He encouraged the faculty to present a plan for this year (the first round has been submitted) and to look ahead for the year in an effort to project the needs and priorities with respect to funding. LTC Goble asked if the library might be considered separately, and BG Hines confirmed that it could. COL Chen explained that some 2014-2015 proposals have been reviewed and recommended to BG Hines; however, many faculty members are preparing for their new projects as research in the summer is critical. BG Hines pointed out that the deans will make the awards and that funds will not be available until 1 July. He added that the deans should know about the awards in the next several weeks, and for the first round, they will need to support the
committee recommendations. COL Grenier asked if all monies will come from Mrs. Clegg in the Office of the Provost or from the deans, and BG Hines explained that the deans will notify their faculty of the awards and will allocate the funds.

ITEM 9: Final Exams – Discussion Continues

BG Hines reported that he had heard from most of the deans and was in the process of reviewing the input. He voiced his concern that many cadets did not have comprehensive exams in all of their classes; for example, the Top 9 cadets reported having an average of three (3) exams each. He encouraged all deans to enforce the Final Examination Policy as it stands and to note that the Exam Policy does allow for alternate means of assessment other than the traditional exam during the exam period without authorization from the appropriate department head or dean. COL Welch suggested that some faculty are unsure about whether or not a multiple choice or an online exam given during the exam period fulfills the requirement for a comprehensive exam. BG Hines pointed out that he does not want to police faculty and trusts the deans to enforce the Exam Policy. COL Trumbull voiced concern that reporting faculty members who were not following the Exam Policy might have an adverse effect and could result in a type of paranoia. BG Hines encouraged department chairs to regularly meet with their faculty to discuss the types of final exams that are being given in the hopes that these conversations will reduce the number of inconsistencies concerning final exams. In addition, he explained that GEN Rosa wondered about the effect of final exams not being considered as a major factor in calculating final grades and whether or not this may be one of the reasons for higher GPAs (Grade Point Averages).

BG Hines explained that the deans have been reviewing faculty workload and that the College is trying to develop a formula which recognizes the variance in workload between lower- and higher-level courses. He pointed out that some courses have multiple assignments over the semester which require more grading while other courses may have an increased class size which also requires additional work for the faculty member. He concluded by assuring the Board that he is trying to make the workload as fair as possible.

ITEM 10: News from the School of Education

BG Hines welcomed Dr. Larry G. Daniel from the University of North Florida as the new Dean of the School of Education who will report in the latter part of May, and he thanked MAJ Jones for her service as Interim Associate Dean for Operations as he truly appreciates all of her hard work. Also, he explained that the new dean would like for her to remain become Associate Dean for at least one year.
ITEM 11: Certification of Graduation Candidates

COL Bebensee asked the Board to approve the awarding of degrees and noted that he will have a complete list by Wednesday if all grades are turned in on time. 

A Motion to approve the awarding of degrees for all those who meet the requirements was made, seconded, and approved.

ITEM 12: Early Departures for Military Training

COL Bebensee explained that this semester numerous cadets have had to leave early for National Guard or Reserve training either before or during final exams. This early departure puts added pressure on the professors to create, administer, and grade exams earlier than normal, and it places the students at a disadvantage by reducing the time they can study for exams. Therefore, the College is speaking to recruiters about the schedule for mandatory training during an academic semester.

ITEM 13: Reminder about Submission of Catalog Revisions

COL Bebensee explained that many of the Catalog revisions have been sent to Mrs. Pike and emphasized that the deadline for sending changes to Mrs. Pike is 16 May. However if for some reason any Board member will not be able to meet this deadline, please let Mrs. Pike know as soon as possible.

ITEM 14: Calendar Reminders

A. Grades for graduating students due 10:00 WEDNESDAY; all other grades due 10:00 a.m. THURSDAY. Please pay attention to this deadline. Deans and department heads please remind your faculty as we cannot hold up the entire process. If one section missing, we cannot move forward.

B. Thursday: Awards Convocation at 10:00; Baccalaureate Service at 2:00

C. Friday: Long Gray Line Parade at 3:45

D. Saturday: Undergraduate Commencement will be at 9:00 a.m.  
   CGC Commencement will be at 3:30 p.m.

ITEM 15: Other Matters from the Group

MAJ Barth explained that he was able to see the grade distribution sorted by faculty member and course on Clemson’s Web site and wondered if The Citadel might be able to provide this type of information. BG Hines noted that this information is given to department heads and deans; however, providing this type of information to the public might be a good idea. COL Berlinghieri pointed out that raw data can be misleading because there are no comments associated with this data. MAJ Barth added that often this type of information can make a difference to a parent as well as to a student. COL Zuraw explained that some schools publish comments along with
grades, for example, North Carolina State. MAJ Jones pointed out that the size of the class may skew the results, for example, a small number of students in an upper-level physics class. MAJ Barth explained that information is only reported for sections with 10 or more students. BG Hines suggested that this idea should be addressed by Faculty Council, first.

COL Williams pointed out that 6 May is Lowcountry Giving Day sponsored by the Coastal Community Foundation which will match all donations given on this day.

*There being no further business, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn.*

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark A. Bebensee, Ph.D.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>BG Sam Hines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>COL Mark Bebensee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>COL Robert McNamara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>LTC Tara McNealy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>LTC David Goble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>MAJ Mike Barth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>LTC Sylvia Nesmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>LTC Chris Fudge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School of Business Administration**

| YES | COL Bill Trumbull |
| YES | LTC Janette Moody |
| YES | COL Wes Jones |

**School of Education**

| YES | MAJ Kathy Richardson-Jones |
| TBA | COL George Williams |

**School of Engineering**

| YES | COL Ron Welch |
| YES | COL Kevin Bower |
| NO  | COL John Peeples |
| YES | COL Chuck Skipper |

**School of Humanities and Social Sciences**

| YES | COL Bo Moore |
| YES | COL Guy Toubiana |
| YES | COL Gardel Feurtado |
| YES | COL David Allen |
| YES | COL Kathy Grenier |
| YES | COL Steve Nida |
| YES | COL Martha Hurley |

**School of Science and Mathematics**

| YES | COL Lok Lew Yan Voon |
| YES | COL Joel Berlinghieri |
| YES | COL Harry Davakos |
| YES | COL Mei Chen |
| YES | COL John Weinstein |
| YES | COL Lisa Zuraw |

**ROTC Departments**

| NO  | COL Laurence Hutto |
| YES | COL John Columbo |
| YES | COL Thomas Clark III (CDR Bryant for COL Clark) |

**Guests:** MAJ Zanin, BG Carter