

Winthrop University Faculty Conference
January 28, 2005 @ 2:00 pm
Barnes Recital Hall
Minutes

I. Approval of Minutes from November 19, 2004 Faculty Conference

At 2:00, Dr. Marilyn Smith, Chair of Faculty Conference, led a vote to do business, which was approved. The minutes from the November 19, 2004 Faculty Conference were approved.

II. Welcome and Remarks

Dr. Smith welcomed the faculty and informed them that the Board of Trustees had not met since the last Faculty Conference; however, the annual weekend planning retreat would be held in two weeks, and she would present her report from this meeting at the next Faculty Conference.

III. Report from the President

The President reported on several items to explain the national, state, and local context of higher education. He reported that the national scene has played a significant role in setting the tone for higher education, particularly in the continuing reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, which is in its unprecedented third year. The Higher Education Act is fundamentally important, Dr. DiGiorgio explained, because it authorizes all federal dollars for higher education, including federal financial aid. Another significant national event is the discussion about changing the family salary income level requirement for the PELL grant. A third national item is that the “for-profit” sector (as represented by schools such as the University of Phoenix) has established a major presence in DC, particularly lobbying that their students should be able to qualify for federal financial aid.

Dr. DiGiorgio continued by noting two other areas that are on the federal as well as state scene. The first is the affordability issue, with many calling for a potential tuition cap structure at the federal/state level. Also, the idea of a federally-mandated differential tuition—that schools would charge tuition depending upon the cost of the program—has become more prominent. (For example, engineers would pay more than a social science major because of the lab costs). Dr. DiGiorgio explained that this discussion illustrates the change in the attitude from the idea of federal and state support as an investment that will yield future returns to the current view that everything should be user-fee oriented. Another federal and state issue deals with governance, with key discussions taking place about whether institutions should have the flexibility to play in the free market or if there should be a centralized authority.

At the state level, Dr. DiGiorgio reported on the Governor’s recent State of the State address, describing it as one of the most narrowly focused addresses that he remembers. In it, the Governor identified agenda issues that have implications for higher education. The Governor proposed a reduction of the state income tax and income tax rates, which could have serious implications for the long term in terms of available funds for state support. Two K-12 education initiatives are a charter school bill that would provide for a separate board for charter schools, creating possibilities of state support, and a voucher system that would allow parents to take the dollar value of the voucher to any private school. Dr. DiGiorgio explained that the Governor’s “open-market” approach is used as a way to argue that K-12 education needs to change in the state. The Governor also talked about the reform of state government (arguing for some positions such as the State Superintendent of Education to be appointed instead of elected) and tort reform.

Dr. DiGiorgio noted that while the Governor was silent on higher education in his address, he was not in his Executive Budget, which reflects a dramatic shift in the views of higher education. The Governor has moved to a program budget, identifying functional areas of state government (including higher education), and developing benchmark formulas to determine if these functions are productive; these productivity rates will be used to determine funding. Higher education, overall, received less funding, with the argument being that there are too many institutions, many are too costly, and the functions that are there need to increase their efficiency. Dr. DiGiorgio reported that Winthrop did well on these formulas individually, but the formulas are still unclear. For example, Winthrop was recommended for the second lowest budget cut (a \$117,000 reduction), while other schools had as high as an 18% reduction recommended. The Governor has also developed an administrative efficiency index; Winthrop had the lowest percentage of cost associated with that.

Dr. DiGiorgio explained that the call for tuition caps at the same time the state is reducing its support goes along with the Governor's perspective that there are too many institutions. He distributed examples to illustrate this point: Winthrop's operating budget in 1994 received 44% of state support; now, that number is 22%. Student fees have increased from 26% to 39%, and Contracts and Grants have increased from 10% to 21% (with this figure including LIFE scholarship funds.) He noted that if this is the situation with the state passing on costs to higher education institutions, then he suggests that reasonable market flexibility needs to exist so that we may price our product in the marketplace instead of capping tuition. Dr. DiGiorgio stated that Winthrop works efficiently, citing the replacement of light bulbs on campus that will result in a \$675,000 savings, and the saving of energy with the installation of new windows. However, he noted that that kind of approach can only be taken to a certain level; beyond that, flexibility is needed. Finally, in terms of state issues, Dr. DiGiorgio reported that the Governor recommended that the salary increases be held to 1% for next year but not for higher education. He does not know if the General Assembly will approve the Governor's plans at this point, but he did note the more highly partisan atmosphere that currently exists.

Locally, Dr. DiGiorgio noted that GNED work is in full swing with 45 sections of GNED 102. He thanked those involved with that process. Also, a Master of Social Work degree has been approved and will go on to the Commission of Higher Education. Dr. DiGiorgio also discussed the success of the Winthrop Invests in Lifelong Learning (WILL) program, an effort to promote literacy in our area by having over 40 trained tutors work with staff members.

Dr. DiGiorgio noted the city development before commenting on a newspaper item that had discussed the cost increase in the Lois Rhame West project and the approval of Bancroft Tower. He cites this article as reflecting a view of this Governor's administration in regard to capital construction that "debt is debt," no matter where it comes from. Usually the state will take on state indebtedness from state sources of funding, and that is used to look at bond ratings. Other entities within the state who have the separate capacity to bond projects like we do and like school districts do generate and authenticate a revenue stream that bond companies approve. However, this administration sees such work still as debt, and Dr. DiGiorgio noted the Governor has voted against every project increase that has gone before the Budget and Control Board this year. Fortunately, Winthrop did not have any problems with the increase of debt service of 3.5 million dollars for Lois Rhame West, and construction will start on Bancroft Tower next year as planned.

The President concluded with two local matters. He noted that Winthrop's successful fundraising efforts have led us to be third in the state (behind USC and Clemson) in funds received from the

Academic Incentive Endowment Act; this state program allows public money to be matched (not on a one-to-one basis, however) for private dollars raised. The success of this program is one of the reasons why the amount of Research Council grants has increased so dramatically. He also noted that in regard to Admissions and Enrollment Management, recruitment is now starting at the sophomore level, and that we are seeking to stabilize the size of an entering class to about 1100.

IV. Report from the Vice President for Academic Affairs

Vice President Tom Moore began by noting that 45 sections of GNED 102 are currently being taught, and he thanked those who had been involved in contributing to that process, including Brien Lewis, Dr. Smith, the department chairs, and the faculty. Next, he reminded faculty that the NCAA Recertification Process is underway, and he thanked people for getting the Graduate Program Reviews done. He then noted that Karen Jones is helping him to develop a regular review of programs for which there is no national accreditation body. Also, Dr. Moore announced that Dr. Debra Boyd will continue as the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and Dr. Joseph Prus will be the new Psychology department chair.

Dr. Moore next moved on to discussing the review of Faculty Roles and Rewards, noting that the conversation has lagged a bit. To stimulate discussion, Dr. Moore shared information from “Aligning Faculty Activities and Student Behaviors,” a piece written by George Kuh, Project Director of NSSE and FSSE. In this work, faculty and students were both asked if their classes included academically-challenging activities, active and collaborative learning, higher-order cognitive tasks, and diverse perspectives. This information led Dr. Moore to consider how the Winthrop academic community—faculty and students—would answer these same questions. He argues that the presence of engaging and academically-challenging tasks is an integral part of our institutional mission. Then, Dr. Moore shared that the most frequently assigned grade to undergraduates in the spring of 2004 was an “A” (36%), and 34% of students receiving a “B.” Dr. Moore clarified that he was not trying to foster an accusatory environment where faculty would feel like they had to explain their grades, but rather he hopes that these comments will help start the conversation about this topic so that we may come to clearer understandings among our students and ourselves of what we mean by academic challenge and higher-order skills. Dr. Moore concluded by expressing his pride of Winthrop and its faculty.

V. Committee Reports

Dr. Frank Pullano, Chair of Academic Council, noted that Academic Council had met on January 14, and he brought forth several curriculum items (that had been circulated with today’s agenda) for Faculty Conference approval. (See Appendix I). All of these items were approved. Dr. Pullano announced that Academic Council would next meet on February 18 at 2:00.

Dr. Alice Burmeister, Chair of the Task Force on Academic and Institutional Integrity, announced that the group was getting ready to launch several campus events, including a February campus-wide forum during which survey results would be revealed. Also, the Director of the Center for Ethics at Clemson will meet with the Task Force. They are hoping to invite him to present a campus-wide address and work with him in creating a future vision of Academic Integrity here at Winthrop.

Dr. John Bird, Chair of Faculty Concerns, reported that the Committee had been working with Walter Hardin to resolve a problem with the hot water in Bancroft and Thurmond. He noted that

the Committee would meet near the end of February to establish its agenda, and members are currently collecting concerns.

Dr. Michael Lipscomb reminded faculty who are applying for Research Council grants to remember to include an Institutional Review Board (IRB) form if relevant. He also stated that a rigorous schedule has been established to review these requests on a monthly basis, and that information could be found at the SPAR website.

VI. Old Business

Dr. Jo Koster brought forth “Recommended Practices for Winthrop Faculty Regarding the Disposal of Examination Copies of Textbooks.” This information had been circulated with the agenda. (See Appendix II). Dr. Koster reviewed the material, and after some discussion, Faculty Conference voted to accept these guidelines. This information will be posted on the Academic Affairs website under Faculty Conference for future reference.

VII. New Business

There was no new business.

VIII. Announcements

Announcements were made about the following items:

- *Kiss Me Kate* will open in two weeks.
- Dr. Moore asked for information about Saturday classes because of the threat of inclement weather tomorrow.
- The Dorothy Perry Thompson Colloquium will be held March 3 in Tillman featuring Elaine Brown.
- On February 15th, “The Murder of Emmett Till” will be shown in Plowden, followed by a discussion led by Janet Hudson.
- Graduate Faculty Assembly will meet immediately after Faculty Conference today.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Kelly L. Richardson
Faculty Conference Secretary

Appendix One

Winthrop University Academic Council Report to Faculty Conference 1/28/05

Academic Council met on Friday, January 14, 2005, at 2:00 pm in Tillman 308. The following actions require the approval of Faculty Conference:

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

African American Studies Committee

Modify Minor in African American Studies add requirement to minor in AAMS to state “student minoring in AAMS must complete 3 hours from ARTH 281, ARTH 381, ANTH 323, GEOG 303, HIST 337 or PLSC 338 (modify minor).

Modify Minor in African American Studies replacing PLSC 318 (3) Political of the American South with PLSC 518 (3) Politics of the American South in list of electives for minor in AAMS (due to course renumbering).

Modify minor in AAMS to replace ENGL 518 (3) African American Literature with ENGL 318 (3) African American Literature in the list of required courses for the minor (modify minor due to renumbering).

Department of Biology

Modify BS Biology to add BIOL 560 (3) Bioinformatics in elective courses in Area D: Cell and Molecular Biology (modify major).

Department of English

Modify minor in Writing **from** “Students completing the writing minor may emphasize either creative writing or professional writing. Students choosing the creative emphasis must complete 18 hours from WRIT 307, 316, 350, 351, 507 516, 530 = 12-15 hours and WRIT 300, 500, ENGL 510 = 3-6 hours. Students choosing the professional emphasis must complete 18 hours from WRIT 300, 350, 351, 465, 566, MCOM 341, 370 = 12 to 15 hours and WRIT 3-7, 316, 500, ENGL 303” **to** “Students completing the writing minor may emphasize either creative writing or professional writing. They must complete 18 hours from: Writing Core for either emphasis: WRIT 300, 350, 351, 500, 501, ENGL 303, 507 = 6 to 9 hours; Creative Emphasis: WRIT 307, 316, 507, 516, 530 = 6 to 9 hours and ENGL 317, 325, 501 or 502; or ENGL 310, 320, or 510 if done on an appropriate topic (department chair permission required) = 0 to 6 hours; Professional Emphasis: WRIT 465, MCOM 241, 302, 340, 341, 370, 471, BADM 180, MGMT 355, 511, IMCO 105 = 9 to 12 hours” (modify minor).

Modify BA in English, certification as secondary school teacher **from** “ENGL 300*, 302*, 303*” **to** “ENGL 300*, 303*, 507*” in the Requirements in major (modify program).

Modify BA in English, Literature and Language Track **from** “ENGL 302 or ENGL 303” **to** ENGL 507 or ENGL 303 in the Requirements in major (modify program).

Modify BA in English, Writing Track from ENGL 302 to ENGL 507 in the Elements of Writing: Rhetoric, Language and Audience electives (modify program).

RICHARD W. RILEY COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Modify Bachelor of Science in Middle Level Education. Incorporate new general education requirements and reconfigure content pairings

Department of Health and Physical Education

Modify Bachelor of Science in Physical Education – concentration in Fitness/Wellness. Add courses as possible selection in the 8 – 9 hour credit requirement.

Center for Pedagogy

Modify Teacher Education Program Completion requirements: Delete “Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) from requirement 3 and reference to “EDUC490 faculty member” in requirement 5.

Appendix II

Recommended Practices for Winthrop Faculty Regarding the Disposal of Examination Copies of Textbooks

As a function of their employment, Winthrop faculty often receive both solicited and unsolicited examination copies of textbooks from publishers. Many of these copies will not become part of their teaching libraries and must be disposed of according to South Carolina law and also with respect to the best ethical practices of the teaching profession.

State of South Carolina Official Policies

South Carolina Code Title 8, Public Officers and Employees, Chapter 13, Ethics, Government Accountability, and Campaign Reform, § 8-13-700, Use of official position or office for financial gain; disclosure of potential conflict of interest, reads as follows:

No public official, public member, or public employee may knowingly use his official office, membership, or employment to obtain an economic interest for himself, a member of his immediate family, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business with which he is associated.

A 1992 ruling by the South Carolina State Ethics Commission used this section of South Carolina law to determine how members of K-12 textbook selection committees should handle their examination copies. While this ruling does not refer specifically to college faculty, the guidance it gives provides a strong sense of how college faculty should proceed. The relevant portion of the Ethics Commission ruling reads:

Section 8-13-700(A) prohibits the use of a public position for personal financial benefit. In accordance with Department of Education Regulation No.: R 43-70, and the Policy for Disposition of Textbook Samples, it appears that the samples not reclaimed by the publishers would be used by schools or other institutions and not for personal use of the committee members. The Commission advises that this policy should be followed to avoid even the appearance of impropriety.

Recommended Practices

Based on this ruling, we recommend that faculty who wish to dispose of unwanted or unused examination copies of textbooks should

- If possible, return unwanted copies to the appropriate publishers' representatives so that they may be returned to "new" stock and not count against the author's royalties. Encourage representatives of textbook companies to send only those books specifically requested by faculty members to cut down the number of books that must be disposed of.
- If such returns are not possible, donate the textbooks for the use of schools, other institutions, or students. Some (but not the only) ways to do this appropriately are to place copies in a departmental resource room or tutoring center; to donate the copies to libraries at schools (for instance Clinton Junior College) or other state institutions or to public libraries; to pass them on to other faculty or to needy students or student teachers in the field; or to donate them to public literacy programs.

We do **not recommend** the practice of leaving **current** editions of textbooks out on a “free books” shelf since this encourages unapproved resale; however, leaving **outdated** copies on a “free books” shelf may be acceptable. Particular care should be taken when disposing of instructor’s editions containing answers to problems or exercises if those materials are re-used in later editions of the text to avoid compromising academic integrity.

- Selling texts to a book buyer or other vendor is **not recommended** since it may give the appearance that the faculty member is doing so for personal gain, which violates state law. If texts are sold, faculty members should
 - Document the sale, including the date, the title of the text, the buyer’s identity, and the amount received
 - Document that the proceeds have gone to benefit the institution, its departments, its official organizations, or its students (for instance a receipt from the Winthrop University Foundation or from a scholarship fund)
 - Notify the department chair of the transaction in compliance with the Ethics Commission’s directive to “avoid even the appearance of impropriety.”
- Faculty members who have any concerns about the proper disposal of unwanted examination copies are encouraged to speak to their chairs, deans, or the Vice-President for Academic Affairs for guidance on appropriate practices.

Dealing with Book Buyers on Campus

Winthrop University’s Solicitation and Distribution Policy, based on provisions of the *Family Privacy Protection Act of 2002, Section 30-2-10 – 30-2-50* of the *South Carolina Code of Laws* relating to controlling “commercial solicitation,” states:

Solicitation or distribution by persons other than employees of Winthrop University who are on official State business in those areas of the University which are not open to the public is prohibited. Solicitation and distribution by persons other than employees of Winthrop University in those areas of the University which are open to the public is prohibited to the extent that such solicitation or distribution results in disruption of or interference with administrative or University activities.... It is management’s responsibility to ensure that these rules are consistently applied to all types of solicitation and distribution. (*Winthrop University Employee Manual*, p. 5)

Book buyers and representatives of book buying companies are permitted on campus to solicit examination copies; such vendors must obey all University rules and register with the Purchasing Department. Solicitations may be approved for a specific area on campus. If the solicitor is unregistered or interferes with administrative or University activities, he or she should be politely requested to leave the premises. If the solicitor does not do so, please contact Campus Police.