MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD
March 18, 2014 at 3:15 p.m. in Bond 295

BG Hines called the meeting to order in Bond 295 on Tuesday, 18 March 2014.

ITEM 1: Approval of the Minutes of the 18 February 2014 Meeting
BG Hines

(E-mailed attachment)

COL Mabrouk corrected the wording in the 18 February Minutes to read:
“No comments had been received by Faculty Council.” concerning the
Post-Tenure Document. The Minutes were approved as amended.

ITEM 2: Revisions to the Post-Tenure Review Policy and Policy Ownership
COL Mabrouk

(E-mailed attachment)

COL Mabrouk pointed out that the document is essentially the same but just in a new format
and that Faculty Council had not taken a vote when the Board met last month. However,
Faculty Council has since voted for approval of the document with no further changes. In
addition, she explained that several additions had been made to reflect what COL Bebensee’s
office is already doing as his office: 1) keeps a timetable for when faculty members are ready
for review, 2) notifies the Deans and Department Heads which faculty are eligible the next year,
and 3) provides a list of people who should receive notification of the outcome.

A. Motion to affirm the Policy as it has been modified was made, seconded and approved. The
Policy was approved.

ITEM 3: Proposals from the College-Wide Curriculum Committee
MAJ Zanin

(11 E-mailed attachments)

A. Mechanical Engineering Minor
B. Civil/Environment Engineering Minor
C. Five new Chinese courses
D. MATH 121 and revised four-year sequence for Majors
E. Two new BADM Courses

The School of Engineering proposed two (2) new minors which have been approved by the
Curriculum Committee:
A. Mechanical Engineering Minor
This Mechanical Engineering Minor has four tracks of study: Energy,
Mechatronics, Manufacturing, and Composites.
A Motion to approve this proposal was made and seconded. The proposal was approved.

B. Civil/Environment Engineering Minor
This minor will provide engineering students from other departments the opportunity
to obtain a minor in a single civil engineering technical area.
A Motion to approve this proposal was made and seconded. The proposal was approved.

C. Five (5) new Chinese courses were approved by the Curriculum Committee:

1) Chinese 301, Advanced Speaking, Reading, and Writing I: This course which is taught in Chinese will continually improve students' reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills with extra emphasis placed on oral proficiency. Chinese 301 which is required of all Chinese minors will deepen students' knowledge of Chinese language and culture.

A Motion to approve this proposal was made and seconded. The proposal was approved.

2) Chinese 302, Advanced Speaking, Reading, and Writing II: This course which is taught in Chinese provides a detailed study, analysis, and practice of written Chinese based upon selected texts and will continually improve the students' reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills, with extra emphasis placed on writing proficiency. Chinese 302 which is required of all Chinese minors will deepen students' knowledge of Chinese language and culture.

A Motion to approve this proposal was made and seconded. The proposal was approved.

3) Chinese 303, Chinese Civilization: This course which is taught in Chinese provides a broad survey of Chinese civilization and society with emphasis on values, thought, institutions and art through selected topics that link various periods in China's past with the present. This class will be one of the five courses for a future Chinese minor.

A Motion to approve this proposal was made and seconded. The proposal was approved.

4) Chinese 307, Business Chinese: This course which is taught in Chinese provides an introduction to the language and culture of economics, banking, commerce, sales, import-export, and corporations in the Chinese-speaking world and is designed to simulate real business environments.

A Motion to approve this proposal was made and seconded. The proposal was approved.

5) Chinese 450, Undergraduate Seminar Studies in Special Topics: This course which is taught in Chinese provides a comprehensive study and interpretation of a major author, work, period, movement or some other literary, linguistic, or cultural topic and may be repeated provided the subtitle is not duplicated. BG Hines asked if there should be a stipulation for the number of times students can take this course, and COL Tubiana explained that there is no such stipulation. COL Chen wondered if these courses will be taught on campus, and COL Tubiana explained that they would. COL Chen asked if the syllabi had been created for these courses, and COL Davakos noted that normally the syllabi are presented with the proposal. COL Tubiana pointed out that they are hiring a new professor to teach these courses and that the new professor would create the syllabi. MAJ Zanin added that the syllabi for these courses will need to be checked for the proper requirements, and COL Tubiana pointed out that these courses are necessary for the program. COL Bebensee explained that this course is more for transfer credit purposes and that only Chinese 301 will be offered in the fall. BG Hines noted that in theory the Board could approve this course for transfer purposes only and stipulate that the Curriculum Committee would need to see the syllabus in August. COL Tubiana explained that he could request the
new syllabi from the new professor. COL Moore added that the Board would want to include Chinese 302 in the framework as well. COL Davakos pointed out that the professor will need to follow the proper guidelines for the syllabi. COL Chen asked if there would be two new professors to teach these courses, and COL Toubiana explained that they are just hiring one new professor who is currently an adjunct professor in their department. 

*A Motion to approve this proposal was made and seconded. The proposal was approved to include the above stipulations.*

D. **MATH 121 and revised four-year sequence for Majors**

1) **Math 121, Introduction to the Practice of Mathematics:** This three-credit-hour course is required of all mathematics majors during the freshman year and will develop skills in effective written and oral mathematical communication and basic facility with modern mathematical software. Instruction in written communication will include the craft of mathematical writing, the use of technology (e.g., LATEX) for creation of mathematical text, and readings of level-appropriate mathematics articles in undergraduate journals. Attendance at some departmental seminars will be required and models for effective presentations in professional venues will be discussed. An introduction to computational (e.g., MATLAB) and indexing (e.g., MathSciNet) software that will be of use throughout the four-year curriculum will be provided. LTC Nesmith asked if this course will be available for other majors as an elective, and COL Chen believes that it will. MAJ Jones suggested that this might be a good course for students who plan on teaching, particularly in the Department of Chemistry and Physics. LTC Nesmith explained that this course will fit in as an elective if it is not required for other majors; however, that decision will come from each department. BG Hines pointed out that the Curriculum Committee and then the Board will need to give approval if the department is increasing the total number of hours for math majors. COL Bebensee recommended that since this new requirement will add three hours to Mathematics majors’ curriculum, then another course should be taken out of their curriculum, for example, a general elective. COL Chen explained that she will go back to the department to see what might be removed. 

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

2) **Revised Four-Year Schedule for Mathematics Major:** Several new courses will be added:

- **Freshman Year**
  - Scientific Writing and Computing
  - Introduction to Computer Science
- **Sophomore Year**
  - Two semesters of Biology, Chemistry, or Physics
- **Junior Year**
  - Social Science Core Course
- **Senior Year**
  - Two new Electives

*A Motion to approve this proposal was made and seconded. The proposal was approved.*
E. Two new BADM courses

1) Professional Selling, BADM XXX: Professional Selling is an upper-level business elective course and is a study of the stages of the professional selling process and the role of sales in today's marketing environment. This course is the first of two sales courses required for the Professional Selling Pathway. LTC Nesmith requested that the School of Business send her the level of the course, so she can determine the proper course number. COL Moody explained that both courses will be at the 400 level. LTC Nesmith asked if these courses had been taught previously as seminar courses, and COL Moody confirmed that they had been.

A Motion to approve this proposal was made and seconded. The proposal was approved.

2) Advanced Professional Selling, BADM XXX: Advanced Professional Selling is an upper-level business elective course and is a continuation of the study of the professional selling process as well as the role of sales in today's marketing environment. Emphasis will be placed on further learning adaptive selling techniques and developing effective interpersonal communications skills. National and regional sales competitions will be discussed and possibly attended depending on the semester.

A Motion to approve this proposal was made and seconded. The proposal was approved.

ITEM 4: Proposals from the Graduate Council

A. New Course Proposal (PMGT 662)

B. Change of Course Title Proposal (CSCI 631)

(2 Emailed attachments)

A. New Course Proposal, PMGT 662: This three-credit-hour course provides a detailed exposure to Technical Program Development, understanding of market needs, a sound business model, a well-defined financial strategy, and well-thought-out strategic goals. This course is designed to help the professional engineer, technical program manager, and all others who must come together as a working team, to better understand their respective roles and responsibilities in that process. Through case examples, analysis, and project planning tools, this course looks at the longer organizational view of program development and will present proven ways to improve program development cycle times and to take advantage of new market opportunities. Students will learn how to develop and analyze Technical Requests for Proposals (RFPs) that are essential in today’s global economy. Key topics include program development, analysis tools, preparation/evaluation of RFPs, building on existing product lines, and product platform management. COL Davakos wondered how this course will impact the faculty load, and COL Skipper explained that the course will initially be taught in the summer.

A Motion to approve this proposal was made and seconded. The proposal was approved.

B. Change of Course Title Proposal (CSCI 631):
The current title of course CSCI 631 is Privacy and Security Issues which does not reflect the technical aspect of the course. Rather the title creates confusion among non-technical community who think that the course is designed for teaching privacy and security issues related to anything. The Curriculum Committee of Computer Science has proposed to change the course title to Principles of Computer Security. A Motion to approve this proposal was made and seconded. The proposal was approved.

ITEM 5: Continuation of Discussion on the Final Exam Policy

BG Hines reviewed the current policy for final examinations and explained that comprehensive examinations are required at the end of each semester and that the comprehensive nature of the final examination, which is normally three hours in length, ensures that the student is provided with an opportunity to organize the content of the course and to understand the progressive nature of learning. If an instructor should feel that another procedure is more appropriate for a particular course, that faculty member must obtain written approval from the department head, and the department head will inform the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs of the courses in which comprehensive final examinations will not be required.

It is recommended that when determining the final grade for a course, the final examination should not be given a relative weight in excess of one-third and that any deviations from general practices must be explained to the student at the outset of the course when the general nature of the course and the work upon which the grade will be based are discussed and presented in writing through the course syllabus. Final exam periods (three hours in length) are scheduled for each section of course work and are given at the assigned time.

Next, BG Hines asked for suggestions or proposals to modify the Final Exam Policy.

COL Bebensee explained that RPED activity-level courses are excluded from the exam policy. COL Berlinghieri suggested that whereas there is a cap on the weight of the exam, he believes that there should be a minimum percentage, as well, as the exam must hold some weight.

COL Welch suggested that a comprehensive exam should account for at least 20% of the grade and should be cumulative. However, COL Allen explained that the current policy does not work for the freshman writing class as their best work often occurs earlier in the semester. In addition, he noted that the four or five essays the freshmen write are cumulative and that the main reason for failing English 101 is that students cannot keep up with the pace of assignments and, therefore, begin to skip assignments. Also, there is a problem requiring students to write an essay by hand in the classroom and that English 101 doesn’t fit with other lecture classes. COL Berlinghieri wondered if faculty could deviate from the policy at the discretion of the department head. BG Hines agreed that there may be some classes when a final examination may not be appropriate; however, he believes that the College should have a process which would allow a professor to petition the Dean. COL Grenier agreed that the final exam format may not work for all classes and that possibly there might be a culminating assignment instead. She believes that faculty should have the opportunity to give an assignment rather than an
exam. COL Trumbull agreed with this idea and believes that projects and other culminating activities should work. In addition, he asked if faculty would need approval every semester, and BG Hines explained that approval would only have to be given once.

BG Hines further explained that he did not want to mandate a blue-book exam, but that he does have a problem with out-of-class assignments because it puts pressure on those faculty who do give in-class final exams as cadets want to leave early. COL Grenier suggested that faculty could have assignments that are due at the exam time; however, the downside can be that these projects can take longer to grade and waiting until the scheduled exam period to collect these projects may not allow enough time for faculty to evaluate them and still be able to submit final grades on time. COL Trumbull noted that deviating from the exam policy may put an unneeded pressure on faculty to make a different decision about this culminating experience and that possibly there could be a date before which cadets cannot leave. COL Moore asked if the exam period has changed, and COL Bebensee explained that it has remained the same. COL Moore suggested that the College might consider adding days to the exam period because if students have five (5) or six (6) exams in the current time frame that can be difficult. He believes that one week seems a bit short if faculty members want to give a meaningful exam. COL Feurtado agreed that a set leave time for all cadets might help. BG Hines explained that the College can stipulate that cadets must stay until a particular date.

BG Hines emphasized that the College needs to develop the language that supports faculty’s credible practices and possibly have a variety of options for finals. He requested that each school look at the defining characteristics of their discipline and makes suggestions as an amendment for clarification as to what should be done to offer a culminating experience in their school.

COL Moody pointed out that clarification needs to be made for graduate as well as online courses. There also needs to be wording for students who are away from campus to reschedule exams, as they should not miss competitions because of final exams. COL Berlinghieri asked if students sometimes miss final exams because of games or other school activities, and COL Bebensee explained that this sometimes happens. BG Hines explained that this item will be on the Dean’s Agenda to illustrate the important variables for this policy. In addition, he noted that the policy will need to be rewritten to accurately reflect the best practices of faculty. However, the college needs to be careful not to establish an expectation among students that traditional exams are disappearing. COL Welch suggested that for courses that have a final project, then students could present their projects during the exam period or possibly results could be discussed during that time. COL Welch explained that his department must have a final exam; however, students constantly complain about having to take these exams. He pointed out that this issue is not so critical in the spring but is extremely important at the conclusion of fall semester.
ITEM 6: Updated Promotion and Tenure Standards for HESS

(E-mailed attachment)

COL Davakos presented the updated 2014 Department of HESS Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Annual Evaluation Guidelines and explained that it was time to update the document to better conform to the policy standards for all faculty. COL Grenier pointed out that the standards for tenure seemed vague; however, the standards for promotion are specific and asked if the document could clarify the tenure standards. COL Davakos explained that the standards will be the same for tenure as well as for promotion. BG Hines suggested that it is also helpful to define concrete progress and then provide evidence of this progress. COL Davakos explained that his department does not want faculty to publish in their first year and then become complacent as they need to show ongoing progress. COL Grenier pointed out that many faculty members, her included, would not understand that expectation from this document. COL Trumbull added that most research schools state that faculty must have a continuous or sustained progress in their discipline. COL Mabrouk suggested that COL Davakos may want to look at other schools and that some items need to refer to Memorandum 3-601. BG Hines asked if COL Davakos would like to make amendments to this document and then bring it back before the Board, and he agreed.

ITEM 7: Initiating a Discussion on the Core Science Requirement

COL Welch

At The Citadel, each student must complete four semesters of science, and this requirement must be met by at least one sequence of two semesters each in biology, chemistry, or physics unless a major can demonstrate why two non-sequential courses within a single science are beneficial to that major. In addition, the other two science courses must be in a science area different than the first two-semester sequence.

The School of Engineering’s proposal does not prevent students from taking a second two-course sequence, but instead modifies the current requirement to give students more flexibility without decreasing the total number of hours they will take in the sciences. COL Welch pointed out that except for modern language nowhere else does The Citadel require more than one two-course sequence in a discipline within the core curriculum of English, history, and math. The School of Engineering would like their students to be able to take one two-course sequence plus one course in each of two additional science areas because they need courses in three different sciences. COL Welch continued to explain that right now, The Citadel requires one two-course sequence in English, math, and history; however, students must have four sciences. Unfortunately, engineering does not have room in their curriculum to take a second two-course sequence in science, and that most programs around the country only require two sciences. He is asking that engineering students not be required to take two sciences in a sequence and explained that engineering students could take two courses in one sequence and then take two other science courses that are not in a sequence, as he believes that this change would help
broaden students’ exposure to sciences. COL Welch emphasized that his school is not asking to change the total number of required science courses, but instead, asking that there be only one required two-course sequence. COL Trumbull noted that his department would like to have that flexibility, as well. COL Grenier asked if the other sciences would be lab sciences, and COL Welch confirmed that they would. COL Mabrouk voiced concern that this change may give students very little science because first-semester courses can be more of a survey or a place where students only learn the skills of that science; therefore, students will not have a complete science course. She asked what students could do with only one semester of a science, and COL Bower explained that engineering courses build on those sciences because their students need a diversified foundation which they currently do not have. COL Bower pointed out that engineering students need two semesters of chemistry and one physics course. He continued by explaining that Physics II does not have a prerequisite. COL Davakos suggested that engineering may want to tailor their courses a bit more if they want to build on the science foundation; however, COL Welch emphasized that engineering does not want to be any different than any other school and that as their accreditation changes they will have to make adjustments to their curriculum. COL McNamara asked if these changes were only going to be in Engineering and not in all schools, and COL Welch confirmed that this change would only apply to engineering students. COL Lew Yan Voon added that some type of flexibility needs to be reviewed and that a number of courses may need to be redone. COL Weinstein explained that the biology curriculum is a two-course sequence and that having a student take one semester may not work well. LTC Nesmith pointed out that other institutions do not have the two-semester, same-science sequence, and COL Allen asked if biology could create a class to satisfy engineering. COL Weinstein noted that he could work with engineering to create a course. BG Hines explained that as a Liberal Arts College, having a strong core curriculum used to be a distinguishing element; however, as each discipline continues to evolve and their reliance on other disciplines grows greater, the College needs to look for ways to be more flexible to better meet department needs. COL Welch emphasized that physics does not need to change, as these courses resemble the curriculum that is across the country; therefore, engineering will just move students from one course to another course. However, having a two-semester course in biology and chemistry keeps his students away from these courses. COL Feurtado asked if the only way to make this situation work would be to create another course and wondered if this change would require more personnel. COL Welch explained that engineering can use the current courses and build on them as Biology I and Chemistry I, in other words, these courses do not need to change. COL Grenier cautioned that piecemeal exceptions have an impact on the curriculum and wondered what happens when a student transfers out of engineering and only has the first level of two (2) sciences. COL Allen suggested that all engineering students should take physics, first. COL Welch pointed out that if students change to another major, they will have to honor the requirements of that major course of study. COL Bebensee suggested that a vote be deferred to the April Board Meeting now that a discussion has taken place.
ITEM 8: Discussion of Plagiarism and Proposed New Policy

COL Allen explained that he has been working with LTC Fudge as well as with BGEN Carter who has had numerous discussions with the Honor Court. Moreover, COL Allen has been surprised with the faculty reaction for turning in students for plagiarism, as some of them are reluctant to have the Honor Court handle these situations. However, the English department is one department that continues to turn in students to the Honor Court for plagiarism; however, there seems to be an uneven approach throughout the College. Currently, the College subscribes to Turnitin.com to ensure that students are submitting their own work; however, COL Allen is proposing that a better use of the software is to have students screen themselves. Then if there is a problem, the student has the opportunity to correct an honest mistake. In addition, COL Allen explained that the report from Turnitin.com will be shared with the faculty and the student and that way, any plagiarism will be flagged before a student turns in a paper.

With the punishment often being expulsion, it is hard to understand why Citadel cadets do commit plagiarism; however, COL Allen points out that some students may knowingly take a chance on violating the Honor Code in order to complete a written assignment, but it seems likely that others are not completely clear about what they are doing wrong. He added that there seems to be a general consensus that students commit plagiarism because they are ignorant, not deceptive.

This proposal will require student use of the software Turnitin.com before any out-of-class written assignments in the core curriculum are submitted to the instructor for a grade. In fall 2014, the Department of English will pilot this program in ENGL 101 & 102 to work out any difficulties that may arise. Then in spring 2015, all departments that require out-of-class writing assignments in the core curriculum will require that their students use this software before submitting any out-of-class writing assignment for a grade.

COL Allen explained that sometimes Turnitin.com may convert a paper to another program; however, the Department of English is working on fixing this issue. COL Berlinghieri asked for more information about how the program works as his problem with plagiarism is students copying other student’s work. COL Allen explained that this program can catch one of the two students and would even flag a lab report submitted three years ago. The program will not flag the first paper; however, it will flag a paper if it is submitted a second time, as this is actually cheating. LTC McNealy noted that she uses this program in her CIT 101 class to show students how to cite properly. BG Hines pointed out that using this program would help students tremendously, and COL Allen emphasized that there does not seem to be a down side to using this program, as students should not be thrown out for making a stupid mistake. COL Grenier asked how using this program reduces plagiarism, and COL Allen explained that students must submit the work themselves and receive a report before submitting the assignment for a grade. LTC McNealy pointed out that this program integrates with Citelrn. MAJ Barth wondered if the program would cost more if 2300 students per year submitted their assignments, and COL Allen
explained that there are unlimited submissions. COL Davakos asked why only core courses would participate in this program, and COL Allen noted that he wanted to start small in the Department of English, move forward to the core curriculum, and then use this program for all majors. COL Moody added that this program is actually a teaching tool as it warns students if they commit plagiarism. COL Trumbull added if a student copies a final exam from another student, it is almost impossible to tell who is guilty; however, once the word gets out that all written assignments for a grade will be submitted to this program, it should help to eliminate this type of cheating. LTC McNealy explained that when she taught in Florida, she had students staple the Turnitin receipt to the final paper as there is an electronic mode that will print the receipt. COL Bebensee suggested that the Board could support the initiative for the English Department and that a report could be submitted at the November Board Meeting.

A Motion was made and seconded to use Turnitin.com, first, in English and then for the rest of the school. The Proposal was approved.

Before moving to the next item, LTC McNealy wanted to remind the Board that the College is twelve days away from the SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) visit, and she will know in three or four days which departments will be audited. COL Bebensee asked that if any Board members do not plan to be in their offices during Spring Break to please let the College know who in their department can fix any audit issues. In addition, he asked that the Board emphasize to their faculty that the team may walk by classes (mainly in Bond Hall), so please caution professors to keep students engaged.

ITEM 9: Reminder of Faculty Role in Drills/Emergencies
COL Bebensee

COL Bebensee explained that the drill went well as Sean Heuston in the English Department recognized the intruder; however, there are opportunities for improvement, as some faculty continued to teach. The procedures are to have all lights off and to keep students away from windows. He asked the Board to remind their faculty that they have a responsibility to help students stay safe and acknowledged that Deas Hall seems to have a problem with phone signals. LTC Goble pointed out that there were a few problems with the notification process.

ITEM 10: Catalog Changes Due March 31 – everything but new courses to be approved in April. Please update faculty lists, including emeriti
COL Bebensee

ITEM 11: Calendar Reminders
COL Bebensee

April 7-11 – Pre-Registration Advising plus Priority Pre-Registration
April 14-17 – Regular Pre-Registration
Tuesday, April 29th – First Day of CGC Exams
Wednesday, April 30th – First Day of SCCC Exams plus Tech Fair in MCH
Tuesday, May 6th – Last Day of SCCC Exams plus General Faculty Meeting
Wednesday, May 7th – Graduating Students’ Grades Due by 10:00 am

Thursday, May 8th – All Remaining Students’ Grades Due by 10:00 am

ITEM 12: Other Matters from the Group

COL Hurley pointed out that the Department of Criminal Justice will be co-sponsoring an Active Shooter Workshop and encouraged the Board to register online. COL Williams reminded the Board that CACREP (Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Educational Programs) will be coming to the campus at the end of April.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark A. Bebensee, Ph.D.
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