

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
FACULTY ASSEMBLY
AGENDA
April 04, 2014**

2:00 p.m.

Kinard Auditorium

- I. Approval of minutes** of January 31, 2014
Arts and Sciences Faculty Assembly Frank Pullano, Chair
 - i. [See appendix 1](#)

- II. Report from CAS Committees**
 - a. Curriculum Committee** Jeff Sinn
 - i. [See appendix 2](#)

- III. Unfinished Business**
 - a. Ad-Hoc Committee for Handheld Technology** Sarah Spring
 - i. [See appendix 3](#)
 - ii. Vote on changes.
 - b. Electronic Elections Committee** Brian Hipp
 - i. [See appendix 4](#)
 - ii. Vote.

- IV. New Business**
 - a. Committee elections** Leslie Bickford
 - i. *Note: Ballots will also be available in 107 Kinard following the meeting. Voting is allowed through noon on Monday, April 7.*
 - b. Activity Insight demo/introduction** Brian Hipp/Beth Costner
 - c. Undergraduate Research grid** Merry Sleigh
 - i. [See appendix 5](#)
 - ii. Vote to place on the agenda for the next meeting. That vote will determine whether the statement will be added to the College's tenure and promotion statements.
 - d. Resolution in response to proposed Gen Ed changes** Peter Judge
 - i. [See appendix 6](#)
 - ii. Vote on whether to endorse this resolution from the Dean's Council.

- V. Announcements**

- VI. Dean's Remarks** Karen M. Kedrowski
 - a. The statement about dean's comments on annual reports is now online, and can be found on the [CAS Faculty Resources page](#).

Appendix 2

Curriculum Committee Report for Faculty Assembly

- 1. The following course change proposals were reviewed and approved:**
 - a. *Modify course:* ENGL 330, Women and Literature. Clarify prerequisites.
 - b. *Modify course:* NUTR 371, Foodservice Systems. Change title to “Food and Nutrition Management I” to better reflect current accreditation standards.
 - c. *Modify course:* NUTR 471, Institutional Foodservice Procurement and Pr. Change title to “Food and Nutrition Management II” to better reflect current accreditation standards.
 - d. *Modify course:* WMST 330, Women and Literature. Clarify prerequisites.

- 2. The following program change proposals were reviewed and approved:**
 - a. *Modify program:* MA in English. Reduce language requirement from 9 hours to 6 hours to be in line with peer and competitor institutions.

- 3. The following blanket petitions were reviewed and approved:**
 - a. **Department of Sociology & Anthropology**
 - i. For the Criminology concentration and Criminal Justice minor, allow students in the current and all previous catalogs to substitute SOCL 332 (Sociology of Conflict and Conflict Management) for any of the following four classes (from which students are required to select 6 hours): SOCL 330, 335, 337, or 525.

- 4. 19 student petitions were approved.**

Appendix 3

Policy for Appropriate Use of Hand-held and Wireless Technology in the College of Arts and Sciences Adopted April 2014

The College of Arts and Sciences at Winthrop University (hereafter “the College”) is committed to educationally sound uses of technology in the classroom, to providing a secure learning environment, and to preventing disruption of students’ and instructors’ educational experiences. The College is also committed to balancing the need for concentration in the course environment with concerns about safety and with students’ outside responsibilities. We recognize that, when used properly, hand-held and wireless technologies can enhance the classroom environment and student learning; used improperly, these same technologies can significantly degrade the quality of learning in the course setting. Each student enrolled in courses in the College has a responsibility to other students and to the instructor to contribute to a courteous, respectful learning environment. This responsibility includes not disrupting instruction or distracting fellow students, maintaining an atmosphere that supports academic integrity, and being committed to learning as required by the Winthrop Dedication for Excellence and the Winthrop Code of Student Conduct.

For the purposes of this document, the term “electronic device” refers to any hand-held or wireless device that can be used to communicate, record, or access stored or networked data. Such devices include but are not limited to laptops, tablets, cell phones, electronic readers, PDAs, and electronic dictionaries. The instructor may prohibit any use of electronic devices that substantially disrupts learning opportunities, degrades the learning environment, or promotes academic dishonesty or illegal activities. Students unsure of whether an activity is appropriate are encouraged to ask their instructors. Students are also encouraged to notify their instructors of disruptive behavior they observe.

Policy

Unless otherwise specified by the instructor on the syllabus, the following statements govern the appropriate use of hand-held and wireless technologies in courses in the College of Arts and Sciences.

1. Communication by electronic devices, including but not limited to instant messaging, text messaging, emailing, web surfing, and telephoning during class, is strictly prohibited unless expressly designated as part of the learning activities. Students may not use cell phones, pagers, PDAs, or similar communication devices during scheduled course meetings (including class time, laboratories, review sessions, individual instruction, or similar activities) in the College. Such devices must be silenced or turned off and should not be taken out during course meetings. Electronic audio or video recording of the classroom environment is prohibited unless permission is given by the instructor prior to recording.
2. Laptops, tablets, wireless computers, or similar electronic devices may be used for note-taking or specified course activities (e.g., electronic surveys, electronic course evaluations) with the instructor’s permission. Students using these devices for note-taking must turn off the wireless function and close all applications/windows other than the appropriate document or application unless the instructor specifically permits otherwise. Students must avoid non-course-related activities such as checking email or social networking sites, web surfing, or playing games because these diminish their—and their classmates’—engagement with instructional activities.

3. Because of the increasing prevalence of electronic textbooks, students may, with the instructor's permission, use electronic readers or other electronic devices in place of standard (print) textbooks. These and similar electronic devices should not be used during instructional time for activities not directly related to the course.
4. Unauthorized use of electronic communication or wireless devices during quizzes, examinations, or other graded activities may warrant disciplinary action under the terms of the Code of Student Conduct. In certain circumstances (exams, laboratories, presentations, etc.), students may be temporarily required to deposit cell phones, laptops, or other electronic devices with the instructor or lab supervisor for the duration of the specific class or activity.
5. A course instructor, administrator, or facility manager may prohibit activities that violate laws and/or University policies, such as those related to intellectual property rights or copyright, eavesdropping, or sexual harassment. (Examples of such activities might include using a camera phone to videotape performances or taking inappropriate photos without the subject's knowledge and permission.)
6. Students who require access to hand-held or wireless technology as assistive measures for documented disabilities may use them according to stipulations in the student's Professor Notification Form.
7. Where personal emergency, family care responsibilities or employment situations *require* access to electronic communication devices, arrangements must be made *in advance* with the instructor. The instructor will decide if such access is appropriate; students may appeal these decisions to the Dean or the Dean's designated representative.
8. Because hand-held communication devices are an integral part of the University's emergency notification system, the instructor's or a designated student's hand-held device should be activated during scheduled course times. In an emergency situation or if a security alert sounds or is sent by the Alertus system, the instructor or his/her designee will consult their devices to determine if an emergency exists and may then give students permission to consult their own devices. Once the alert is over, students' devices should be immediately silenced and put away.
9. Other exceptions to this policy may be granted at the discretion of the instructor.

Sanctions

Sanctions for violation of this policy will be determined by the instructor and may include dismissal from the class, attendance penalties or loss of class participation points, zero grades on quizzes or examinations, failure in the class, or other penalties that the instructor determines to be appropriate. These sanctions should be explicitly stated on the instructor's syllabus.

Providing Notice to Students

Instructors should anticipate that issues with wireless communications and electronic devices may arise and publish any policies and restrictions in their course syllabi. Otherwise, a statement such as "The College of Arts and Sciences' Policy for the Appropriate Use of Hand-held and Wireless Technologies is in effect for this class" with a link to the text of the policy should appear on syllabi for all courses in the College. If the instructor plans to use sanctions for disruptions, s/he should publish details about the sanctions in the course syllabus.

Changes

Due to the dynamic nature of technology, any changes or additions to this policy will be published on the College of Arts & Sciences' web site.

Rationale

We are aware that we live in a wired world and that students taking courses in the College are part of a highly technological society. As educators, we also know that focused attention is needed for effective learning and that we have a responsibility to provide an environment where such learning can take place. We know, too, that with easy access to information comes the temptation to use that information inappropriately. Therefore, we have surveyed the existing research on hand-held and wireless technologies in the classroom, reviewed other institutions' policies, and based our recommendations on the best available practices and information. That research is summarized below, followed by a selected bibliography of studies supporting our policies.

One purpose for the proposed policy is to maximize student engagement in the classroom. Research demonstrates that the use of hand-held technology is distracting, leads to attention lapses, and slows reaction time. In addition, the user undergoes physiological changes, including increased heart rate and decreased respiration. These consequences are likely to interfere with a student's ability to pay attention to, participate in, and record information presented in the classroom. As a secondary concern, technology users underestimate or deny the impact that technology use has on their bodies and performance. Thus, students may not be aware of the detrimental impact of inappropriate technology use in the classroom.

Students may also resist policies restricting hand-held technology use in the classroom because of psychological attachment to such technology. For many individuals, electronic communication is a primary way to maintain social ties, with text-messaging being the mode of choice. Young adults prefer and greatly rely on electronic communication. Research also indicates that students perceive their cell phones as a means of self-expression. Restricting access to hand-held technology in the classroom may lead students to feel a loss of control and/or anxiety.

Despite these obstacles, both students and faculty acknowledge a need for hand-held technology policies in the classroom and students have expressed a desire for faculty to enforce such policies consistently. Recent research on students and faculty found that both groups are concerned by ringing phones and support restricted use of technology in college classrooms. Research on this technology-savvy generation suggests that the younger the students, the more tolerant they are of cell phone use in the classroom. Thus, our youngest students may benefit from a more detailed explanation of and rationale for classroom policies than their older peers. Visible reminders, such as signs reminding students of the policy, should also be displayed in classrooms in the College to help reinforce awareness of the policy.

Institutional Policy Models

Few institutions have yet instituted a policy such as the one we are proposing; many institutions seem to handle these situations under existing classroom disruption policies, but the Winthrop Code of Student Conduct currently does not contain specific language that applies to these situations. A list of existing policies that we used as starting points for our policy is appended at the end of this report. The proposed policy has also been reviewed by Chief Frank Zebedis of Campus Police to ensure that it is consonant with Winthrop security practices.

Supporting Research

Cell Phones & Attention

- . Reaction time to surrounding events decreased while talking on a hand-held or hands-free phone. People did nothing to counteract their slower reaction times, suggesting that they were unaware that talking on the phone was impairing their performances (Caird, Willness, Steel, & Scialfa, 2008).
- . People were not aware of how distracted they were while talking on the phone. In fact, sometimes, the more distracted people were, the less distracted they believed they were (Horrey, Lesch, & Garabet, 2008).
- . Cell phone conversations were more distracting than in-person conversations, because people talking face-to-face accommodated for and discussed their context. Cell phone conversations did not share the same situational awareness (Drews, Pasupathi, & Strayer, 2008).
- . Cell phone conversations were more distracting than conversations with a passenger or over a loudspeaker. The theory is that information presented in the listener's personal space (i.e., phone on the ear) competed with other external stimuli for attention and was thus highly distracting (Ferlazzo, Fagioli, Di Nocera, & Sdoia, 2008).
- . Talking on the cell phone while driving was associated with attention lapses (Beede & Kass, 2006).

Physiological and Psychological Variables

- . College students experienced physiological changes while text-messaging, including increased heart rate and arousal and decreased breathing. Most students were unaware of these changes (Lin & Peper, 2009).
- . Neurotic students had stronger ties to their mobile phones than other students. Extroverted and neurotic students spent more time text messaging than talking on the phone (Ehrenberg, Juckes, White & Walsh, 2008).
- . College students perceived the style of their cell phones as a form of self-expression (Katz & Sugiyama, 2006).

Social Interaction

- . The most popular form of electronic communication is text messaging; it serves the purpose of maintaining social networks for students (Harley, Winn, Pemberton, & Wilcox, 2007).
- . College students communicate using technology an average of 5.5 hours per day, half of the time spent in written and half spent in verbal communication (Diamanduros, Jenkins & Downs, 2007).
- . Young adults prefer electronic to personal communication because it allows them more control over the interaction (Madell, & Muncer, 2007).

Classroom-Relevant Research

- . The students most likely to engage in uncivil behavior in the classroom (e.g., cell phone use, leaving class early) had a consumer orientation, narcissistic tendencies, and a belief that such behaviors are appropriate. Men and students with no plans to attend graduate school were more likely to behave in an uncivil manner (Nordstrom, Bartels, & Bucy, 2009).
- . Multitasking decreases efficiency, learning, and retention (Abate, 2008).
- . Faculty and students perceived a ringing phone to be distracting in a college classroom. Younger participants were most tolerant of mobile phones in the college classroom (Campbell, 2006).
- . Early research on mobile phone use revealed that adults consider the college classroom to be one of the least appropriate places for mobile cell phone use (Campbell & Russo, 2003; Wei & Leung, 1999).

Academic Integrity

- . Research indicated that students use hand-held technology in the classroom to play video games, communicate, and cheat (Gilroy, 2004; Katz, 2005).
- . Research indicated that as many as one third of all teens have used cell phones to cheat in classes. This cheating includes storing information in the phone to be retrieved during the examination or texting others to get answers. (Miners, 2009).
- . Two thirds of teens reported seeing other students use cell phones or other wireless devices to cheat on assignments and tests. (Common Sense Media, 2009).
- . As many as half of teens admitted to using the Internet to cheat on assignments and tests. (Read, 2004).

References

1st annual global mobile learning congress 2012 explores education's exciting future. (2012). Retrieved from <http://news.hct.ac.ae/2012/09/1st-annual-global-mobile-learning-congress-2012-explores-educations-exciting-future/>

Abate, C. J. (2008). You say multitasking like it's a good thing. Downloaded at http://www.nea.org/assets/img/PubThoughtAndAction/TAA_08_02.pdf, 9/20/09.

Beede, K. E. & Kass, S. J. (2006). Engrossed in conversation: The impact of cell phones on simulated driving performance. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 38(2), 415-421.

Brown, M. & Long, P. (2006). Trends in learning space design. In D.G. Oblinger (Ed.), *Learning Spaces* (pp. 9.1-9.11). Boulder, CO: EDUCASE.

Caird, J. K., Willness, C. R., Steel, P., & Scialfa, C. (2008). A meta-analysis on the effects of cell phones on driver performance. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 40(4), 1282-1293.

Campbell, S. W. (2006). Perceptions of mobile phones in college classrooms: Ringing, cheating, and classroom policies. *Communication Education*, 55(3), 280-294.

Campbell, S. W. & Russo, T. C. (2003). The social construction of mobile telephony: An application of the social influence model to perceptions and uses of mobile phones within personal communication networks. *Communication Monographs*, 70, 317-334.

Common Sense Media (2009). Hi-Tech Cheating: Cellphones and Cheating in Schools. Downloaded at <http://www.common Sense Media.org/sites/default/files/Hi-Tech%20Cheating%20-%20Summary%20NO%20EMBARGO%20TAGS.pdf>.

Diamanduros, T., Jenkins, S. J., & Downs, E. (2007). Analysis of technology ownership and selective use among undergraduates. *College Student Journal*, 41(4), 970-976.

Drews, F. A., Pasupathi, M., & Strayer, D. L. (2008). Passenger and cell phone conversations in simulated driving. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 14(4), 392-400.

Ehrenberg, A., Juckes, S., White, K. M. & Walsh, S. P. (2008). Personality and self-esteem as predictors of young people's technology use. *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, 11(6), 739-741.

Ferlazzo, F., Fagioli, S., Di Nocera, F. & Sdoia, S. (2008). Shifting attention across near and far spaces:

Implications for the use of hands-free cell phones while driving. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 40(6), 1859-1864.

Gee, L. (2006). Human-centered design guidelines. In D.G. Oblinger (Ed.), *Learning Spaces* (pp. 10.1-10.13). Boulder, CO: EDUCASE.

Gilroy, M. (2004). Invasion of the classroom cell phones. *Education Digest*, 69(6), 56-60.

Gordon, S. (2013, September 28). The jury is still out when it comes to classrooms and handheld devices. *U.S. News and World Report*. Retrieved from http://www.usnewsuniversitydirectory.com/articles/the-jury-is-still-out-when-it-comes-to-classrooms_13391.aspx#.UtlpQOlo6Uk

Graetz, K.A. The psychology of learning environments. In D.G. Oblinger (Ed.), *Learning Spaces* (pp. 6.1-6.14). Boulder, CO: EDUCASE.

Harley, D., Winn, S., Pemberton, S. P., & Wilcox, P. (2007). Using texting to support students' transition to university. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 44(3), 229-241. 6

Horrey, W. J., Lesch, M. F., & Garabet, A. (2008). Assessing the awareness of performance decrements in distracted drivers. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 40(2), 675-682.

Katz, J.E. (2005). Mobile phones in educational settings. In K. Nyiri (Ed.), *A Sense of Place: The Global and the Local in Mobile Communication*, 305-317. Vienna: Passagen.

Katz, J. E. & Sugiyama, S. (2006). Mobile phones as fashion statements: Evidence from student surveys in the US and Japan. *New Media and Society*, 8(2), 321-337.

Lin, I. & Peper, E. (2009). Psychophysiological patterns during cell phone text messaging: A preliminary study. *Applied Psychophysiology and Biofeedback*, 34(1), 53-57.

Lomas, C. & Oblinger D.G. (2006). Student practices and their impact on learning spaces. In D.G. Oblinger (Ed.), *Learning Spaces* (pp. 5.1-5.11). Boulder, CO: EDUCASE.

Madell, D. E. & Muncer, S. J. (2007). Control over social interactions: An important reason for young people's use of the internet and mobile phones for communication? *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, 10(1), 137-140.

McCoy, B. (2013). Digital distractions in the classroom: student classroom use of digital devices for non-class related purposes. *Faculty Publications, College of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Paper 71*.

Miners, Z. (2009). One Third of Teens Use Cellphones to Cheat in School. *US News and World Report* 23 June. Downloaded at <http://www.usnews.com/blogs/on-education/2009/06/23/one-third-of-teens-use-cellphones-to-cheat-in-school.html>.

Nihalani, P. & Mayrath, M. (2010). Mobile learning: evidence of increased learning and motivation from using an iPhone app. *GetYa Learn on*. Retrieved from http://gylo.com/WhitePaper_03302010_Stats1.pdf

Nordstrom, C. R., Bartels, L. K., & Bucy, J. (2009). Predicting and curbing classroom incivility in higher education. *College Student Journal*, 43(1), 74-85.

Read, B. (2004). Wired for Cheating. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 16 July. Downloaded at

<http://www.wku.edu/testing/Cheating%20Article.htm>.

Tindell, D.R. & Bohlander, R.W. (2012). The use and abuse of cell phones and text messaging in the classroom: a survey of college students. *College Teaching*, 60, 1-9.

Wei, R. & Leung, L. (1999). Blurring public and private behaviors in public space: Policy challenges in the use and improper use of the cell phone. *Telematics and Informatics*, 16, 11-26.

Wylie, J. (n.d.). Mobile learning technologies for 21st century classrooms. *Scholastic.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.scholastic.com/browse/article.jsp?id=3754742>

Institutional Policy Models

“Cellphone Use in Classrooms.” Office of the Provost, Missouri State University.
<https://www.missouristate.edu/provost/celluse.htm>

“Cellular Telephone/Ready-Link Services.” Policies and Procedures, College of Charleston.
<http://policy.cofc.edu/documents/10.10.pdf>

“Classroom Code of Conduct.” Lander University. www.lander.edu/library/advising/files/Code_of_Conduct.pdf

“Classroom Policies.” College of Health and Human Performance, Brigham Young University.
http://hhp.byu.edu/students/classroom_policies.php.

“Guide for Content of Course Policies” Handout. Learning Technologies Department, Northwest Florida State College. http://ltech.nwfsc.edu/resources-faculty/DL_CourseQuality/Course%20Policies%20Handout%20Statements.pdf.

“Use of Electronic Devices in the Classroom.” The College at Brockport, State University of New York at Brockport. http://www.brockport.edu/policies/docs/use_of_electronic_devices_in_the_classroom.pdf.

Appendix 4

Ad Hoc Committee on Electronic Elections Report

The ad hoc committee looked in to voting methods used in other colleges and found that:

The College of Business and the College of Visual and Performing Arts each use the Kerley method with paper ballots.

The College of Education has electronic elections, set up by James Hammond, and the COE members we contacted did not know the exact method they use. However, Leslie has spoken to James Hammond, and the method they use is not Kerley.

The ad hoc committee on electronic voting has met and agreed on the following recommendations.

Suggested voting methods for CAS:

The ad hoc committee suggests that Faculty Assembly adopt one of the following voting methods.

- 1) **Borda** – simple ranked preference. Voters rank the candidates in order of preference (as they do now with Kerley). The candidate with the most points wins (e.g. in a five candidate race, a candidate receives 5 points for being ranked #1, 4 points for being ranked #2, etc. All point assignment is done electronically behind the scenes). *Note: this method could just as easily state that the candidate with the fewest number of points wins and eliminate the need to reassign points to positions.*
The key difference between Borda and Kerley is that Borda is simple ranked preference whereas Kerley has a feature similar to Instant Run-off voting that requires a second stage and the elimination of the worst performing candidate. The Borda method is JUST ranked preference.
- 2) **Cumulative voting** – each voter has a fixed number of points to distribute among the candidates as they please, with the one requirement that all of the points cannot be assigned to a single candidate.

Electronic implementation:

We suggest using Qualtrics to implement either of the above methods.

Here is a link to a [generic example of Borda](#). Question 1 is structured like our current ballots. Question 2 has drag-and-drop functionality for ordering the candidates.

Here is a link to a [generic example of cumulative voting](#).

Qualtrics will allow us to send an email with links to the ballot that will be open for any period of time we specify. Those links allow us to specify exactly who is able to vote. Qualtrics will also allow us to prevent voters from completing the survey more than once. (Note: the two links above are to anonymous surveys that anyone can take any number of times)

Bylaws:

Two places in the [CAS Faculty Assembly Bylaws](#) refer to voting. We don't believe that any change to our bylaws will be required.

- The last sentence of Section 1 under Article VIII (on page 5) states that recommendations for a change to the voting procedure will have to come to Faculty Assembly from the Nominating and Rules Committee. Since Leslie is a member of the Rules Committee, she can relate the suggestions to the committee.
- Section 4 under Article VIII (at the top of page 6) states that "Custody and counting of ballots shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of Faculty Assembly, who will tally the votes with the assistance of a faculty monitor designated by the Nominating and Rules Committee." So, as long as the Secretary or designated faculty monitor are the owners/keepers of the online survey and results, we feel that the new method can be made to abide by this statement.

The [Faculty Conference Bylaws](#) state in Article VI, Section 6, bullet 4 (starting at the bottom of page 4) that voting will be done using the Kerley method. The Kerley method is described again on page 18 for Graduate Faculty Assembly elections. A section of the Faculty Conference Bylaws that one may argue applies (as it was unsuccessfully argued when we added of adjunct faculty to the CAS Faculty Assembly membership ranks) is in Article VI, Section 2 (on page 3): "Each assembly shall adopt bylaws for its own governance which shall be subordinate to and consistent with these Bylaws." However, since COE does not use Kerley, there is precedent for a Faculty Assembly to use a different voting method.

Length of time that voting should be open:

The length of time voting should be open is not specified in the bylaws. No one on the ad hoc committee had a strong opinion on a specific amount of time that voting should be open. The voting could be opened as soon as nominations have been made on the floor, and could extend through the customarily allowed time period or longer. 5pm on the following Monday and 5pm on the following Friday were the earliest and latest voting deadlines discussed.

Dealing with Ties:

Neither of the methods above is likely to result in a tie if three or more candidates are running. We recommend that the nominations committee be tasked with always coming up with a minimum of three nominees to make ties less likely. In the event of a tie we suggest a coin flip* (see note below) to determine the winner.

* Dr. Huffmon strongly prefers, in the case of a tie, instead of designating one candidate as "heads" and the other as "tails" and flipping a coin, that one candidate be designated "even" and the other be designated "odd." Then a twenty sided die shall be rolled and the winner be determined by the outcome. The official die shall be stored in the Dean's office in a wooden box with a dragon on the front and labeled "The College of Arts and Sciences d20 of Fate."

Appendix 5

Types of undergraduate research with respect to faculty credit

	Faculty Research	Faculty Research Student Assistant	Faculty Research Student Collaborator	Student Research Faculty Collaborator	Student Research		
Categories	Faculty Credit	Public Product*	Author-ship	Additional Faculty Credit**	Student Benefits	Brief Description of Mentored Research Experience	Linked to Course?
Faculty research with student research assistant	Student intellectual development	Yes	Faculty only	Scholarship	Mentored research experience	Faculty member's program of research. Student assists with tasks that do not substantially contribute to the research process or warrant authorship, such as entering data, caring for animals or equipment, or locating resources.	A project may start in a course and extend beyond the course, or it may start and then link with a course.
		No					
Faculty research with student collaborator	Student intellectual development	Yes	Faculty and student	Scholarship	Mentored research experience & product	Faculty member's program of research. Student makes a substantive intellectual contribution, such as designing methodology, synthesizing information, interpreting data, or developing the external product in a manner that warrants authorship. Authorship is determined by the faculty member in line with discipline-specific standards.	Linked courses may include Independent Research, Research Methods, McNair Scholars Program, or the Honors thesis.
		No			Mentored research experience		
Student research with faculty collaborator	Student intellectual development	Yes	Student and Faculty	Scholarship	Mentored research experience & product	Student initiates the general idea of the project, which evolves through the collaborative efforts of the faculty member and student. The faculty member makes a substantive intellectual contribution, jointly creating the product with the student, in a manner that warrants authorship for both parties. Authorship order is determined by the faculty member and student in line with discipline-specific standards.	
		No			Mentored research experience		
Student research	Student intellectual development	Yes	Student		Mentored research experience & product	The student's project usually fulfills a course requirement. The contribution of the faculty member is limited to feedback on written work and conferences on work in progress. The faculty member guides the student's development of intellectual content without substantially contributing in a manner that warrants authorship.	
		No			Mentored research experience		

* A public product is an intellectual creation presented in a venue outside of the classroom. Common examples of such products include, but are not limited to, professional presentations and journal publications.

** Scholarly products are prioritized according to the guidelines in "CAS Roles and Rewards."

Appendix 6

Resolution in response to the proposed General Education changes

Whereas, the Dean's Council of the College of Arts & Sciences embraces the goals behind the revision of the general education program and the seven guiding principles that preserve the integrity of the program, especially with respect to:

- Becoming transfer friendly;
- Increasing flexibility to enable students to change majors;
- Reducing Bachelor's degree programs to 120 hours;
- Supporting retention and degree attainment efforts; and
- Encouraging students to think critically when choosing courses.

Whereas, the Dean's Council of the College of Arts & Sciences has the following reservations about the process and the outcome:

- The committee did not include representatives from physical activity or the natural sciences;
- The committee did not include a broad range of representatives from the humanities, visual and performing arts, and social sciences;
- The committee did not consider possible changes to the Core (ACAD 101, WRIT 101, HMXP 102, and CRTW 201), consistent with the principles above;
- The committee examined categories of courses and number of hours without examining the definitions of such categories or designators they may include (For example, can social science methods courses count in the quantitative category?); and
- The committee presented the proposal to Faculty Conference on March 7, 2014 with the expectation that the Faculty Conference would vote on April 25, 2014, offering departments and colleges little time to fully identify the proposal's possible impact on their degree programs and general education delivery.

Therefore be it resolved,

The Dean's Council of the College of Arts and Sciences, **with the support of the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Assembly**, moves to postpone the Faculty Conference vote on the proposed general education changes until the 2014-2015 academic year.

Be it further resolved that the following activities will take place in the interim:

- Winthrop University's administration will appoint faculty representatives to the ad-hoc general education task force (i.e. the committee) from the disciplines of physical activity (i.e. PESH) and the natural sciences, and additional representatives from the humanities, visual and performing arts, and social sciences. The latter will be drawn from disciplines not already represented on the committee;
- Winthrop University's administration will appoint student representatives to include a transfer student, a current undergraduate student who started at Winthrop as a first-semester freshman, and a graduate student with a Bachelor's degree from Winthrop;
- This committee will consider possible changes to the Core as part of its general education proposal as well as policies and practices associated with accepting transfer credit for these courses, consistent with the principles above;
- The committee will provide clear guidance regarding whether the proposed changes to the general education program also include changes to the definition of the courses that are included in each category;
- Departments and colleges will examine the implications of this proposal and provide feedback to the committee; and
- The committee will report to Faculty Conference its recommendations with respect to the Core, transferability of courses into the Core, the definitional questions, and any possible revisions to the proposal, before asking Faculty Conference to vote on its recommendations. This report will occur no earlier than the second Faculty Conference meeting of the 2014-2015 academic year.