

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
FACULTY ASSEMBLY
MINUTES
March 1, 2019**

2:00 p.m.

Kinard 018

I. Approval of minutes from January 11, 2019

- a. See [appendix 1](#) Dave Pretty
Dr. Dave Pretty noted that we have quorum and asked if there were any amendments to the notes. Hearing none, a motion to approve the minutes was made, and they were approved.

Dr. Pretty noted how much Dr. Frank Pullano did on the LEAP Program. Dr. Marsha Bollinger announced the addition of a new faculty member in Interdisciplinary Studies. Dr. Scott Amenson, an Associate Professor who is now the Director of Professional Studies. Since it was our last meeting of the year, Dr. Pretty thanked Dr. Duma Hamed, Parliamentarian, and Dr. Gregory Bell, Secretary, for their service

II. CAS Committees

- a. Curriculum Committee Kathryn Kohl
i. See [appendix 2](#)

Dr. Kathryn Kohl started with Chemistry course actions. Chemistry Department wants to drop CHEM 106, which is currently a General Chem I and II, and they want to make this a one semester Gen Chem. So in CHEM 105 they want to remove the "I" from the title. That way they would only have one course, CHEM 105. Most of the other changes in Chemistry, Geology, and Physics courses are to change the pre-requisites to remove CHEM 106 and only have CHEM 105. CHEM 108, their lab course, is currently one credit hour, and they'd like that to be two credit hours since the students are there for three hours in lab and one hour of lecture anyway. New course CHEM 323 will be a precursor to their 500-level BIOCHEM course. Dr. Eric Birgbauer from Biology was concerned that the department wants to go to a single general Chemistry course, but many professional and graduate Chemistry programs require students two have completed two semesters of general Chemistry. How is that going to align with this curriculum change and how would students at Winthrop satisfy these requirements when they decided to move on? Dr. Pat Owens from Chemistry noted that it is a 1 – 2 – 1 sequence, and students need four. Chemistry is changing the lab from one- to two-credit hours so that the course meets professional school requirements. Down the road, planning in A or B in CHEM 105, we're planning on giving them credit for CHEM 104 (similar to Languages) and so students would have a total of nine credits after 104, 105, and 108. Other schools like UNC Asheville and William and Mary are doing this right now. Dr. Birgbauer noted that anyone who wanted to meet the requirement could then take an upper-division inorganic chemistry to meet their requirements. Dr. Wanda Koszewski noted that most medical schools want organic chemistry I and II with the labs. Dr. Birgbauer said most schools want general chemistry I and II, organic chemistry I and II. That means that any student who wants to go to a medical professional school would need to take these upper division in organic chemistry courses in addition to the general requirements. Dr. Koszewski said that really what medical school wants is biochemistry. So these are the courses that are leading them to biochemistry. Dr. Birgbauer said that some schools won't even consider students if the course requirements aren't properly aligned. Dr. Owens said that having one CHEM 105 course makes biochemistry accessible to other students, as there are some who don't need two semesters of general chemistry to move on. Dr. Birgbauer said he appreciates what is being done with biochemistry, as it allows students to take that

earlier. Dr. Pretty asked if there was any further discussion, and, with none, and the changes were approved.

Dr. Kohl moved onto English. First in ENGL 305 they are changing the pre-requisites. Before students could only have ENGL 203 as a pre-req. So now it will be any 200-level English or CRTW. For ENGL 321, *Recurrent Themes in Literature*, allows students to repeat the course over three times as it's a travel course under different topics. For ENGL 333 there is a request that students can only take the course two times for credit instead of three times. ENGL 494, which is their capstone, they are clarifying and updating their catalogue description. There was no discussion, and the changes were approved unanimously.

In *Interdisciplinary Studies*, a new course, GEOG 515, is the graduate version of a course we recently discussed (GEOG 315). They are now going to have separate undergraduate and graduate courses. They want to drop the *Internship in Gerontology* 440 as previously they put through an internship that offered variable credit hours and this is only a three-credit hour version. So they are dropping it. They created two new undergraduate research courses. One is for zero credit hours (470) and the other is for three-credit hours (473). GRNT 504 is changing the title to *Social and Individual Aspects of Aging* for cross listed course in Gerontology, Sociology, and Psychology. There was no discussion, and the changes were approved unanimously.

Out of *Human Nutrition*, NUTR 321 is a new course, *Nutrition Metabolism*, is a 300-level course to prepare students for a 500-level course, that is *Professional Biochemistry*. They want to drop NUTR 370, to move that cultural piece to course modification in NUTR 428 to add *Cultural Nutrition* and they are also adding a lab component. There was no discussion, and the changes were approved unanimously.

In the Psychology department, PSYC 504 goes with that GRNT 504. They are changing the course names to cross list. There is a course modification for SOCL 213, which is moving from a 300-level *social inequality* and pluralizing it to *social inequalities*, and moving it to a 200-level. SOCL 319 they are adding *sustainability* to their course, which is currently about *population*, to attract additional students to that course. SOCL 519 are changing a pre-req by correcting a typo. Now students need a C, not a C- so their pre-reqs are standard across parallel courses. There is a new course, SPAN 372, about *Latin American Women Writers*. There was no discussion, and the changes were approved unanimously.

Program Changes: out of all the changes in the Biology Department, which we discussed about a month ago. These changes are introducing those two new courses, semester one and two *ecology and evolutionary biology* and *cell molecular biology* for all biology majors. Now *genetics* is required for all biology majors. Within the major, they are moving around courses to fit into the different areas. For instance, students have to take a course from *ecology and evolution*, and they can choose from among several different course options. Shifting courses around to have the same requirements for each of these different tracks. There was no discussion, and the changes were approved unanimously.

In Chemistry, we are changing all the tracks for all their majors. They are including all the new biology courses and the new 1-2-1 sequence that Dr. Owens just mentioned. Depending on which track, there are different requirements depending on the track. There was no discussion, and the changes were approved unanimously.

The BA in English is adding Writing 300, Rhetorical Theory, to the framework section of their major. Students have to pick from among several courses. For the minor in Gerontology, they are adding flexible internship hours from the one- to three-credit option. The BA in MCOM modification in the major students could take two interests, either broadcast or journalism. They shifted around courses that students can choose between depending on their interests. There is a new minor in Child and Youth Well Being. It will be eighteen credit hours, has required Social Work courses, and students must choose two designators beyond Social Work such as Political Science... The BA in SOCL has a new program or track in inequalities. This will help focus faculty expertise. There was no discussion, and the changes were approved unanimously.

There are two blanket petitions for your information. There were no student petitions.

- b. Nominating & Rules Committee Frank Pullano
 - i. Elections for 2019-20 faculty governance positions (*Voting will be done electronically via a Qualtrics survey. The survey link will be sent to your Winthrop email account by 5pm on Friday, March 1, and the survey will close at 5pm on Monday, March 4.*) See [appendix 3](#)

Dr. Frank Pullano announced that he has great opportunities to serve the college and university in shared faculty governance. We went through each position to see if there were any nominations from the floor.

*For **Academic Council** to replace Adam Glover, there were no nominations from the floor
Educator Prep, there were no nominations from the floor*

***Faculty Committee on University Life**, there were no nominations from the floor*

***FCUP**, there were no nominations from the floor*

***Faculty Personnel**: Dr. Jeannie Haubert nominated Dr. Brent Woodfill, but Dr. Pullano pointed out that the candidate needs tenure. This person also serves on the university faculty personnel, too. Dr. Ginger Williams nominated Dr. Jonathan Marx. Dr. Pullano mentions that we needed two nominations, but wondered what would happen if we only have one. Dr. Greg Oakes said that it's OK if there's only one nominee.*

***Gen Ed**, there were no nominations from the floor*

***Grad Council**, it was clarified that you had to be a member of graduate faculty, but not tenured to hold the position. Dr. Marsha Bollinger nominated Margaret Gillikin*

***Library**, there were no nominations from the floor.*

***Faculty Assembly Chair**, someone who sounded like Dr. Casey Cothran and was sitting with the English Department nominated Dr. Jo Koster. Dr. Pullano wondered what would happen if we did not have a Faculty Assembly Chair, and Dr. Oakes clarified that it would go to the Chair of the Nominating & Rules Committee (Dr. Pullano)*

***Graduate Faculty Committee Chair**, Dr. Koster nominated Devon Ralston, who was not tenured. Dr. Koszewski nominated Dr. Kristen or Zachary Abernathy, but neither was a member of the graduate faculty. Dr. Pretty said that he was ok with being nominated. Dr. Robert Prickett nominated Dr. Pretty.*

***Personnel**, there were no nominations from the floor*

***Curriculum**, there was a lot of confusion about how many nominees were required. Dr. Williams nominated Dr. Duha Hamed (Math). Dr. Wendy Sellers nominated Cory Bloomquist. Dr. Haubert asked if she could remove Dr. Woodfill and put him on the Library Committee. So Dr. Haubert*

nominated Dr. Woodfill for Library Committee. Dr. Jennifer Disney mentioned that Dr. Marx was nominated to a position on a university-level committee without being aware that this was the case. But Dr. Marx said he was OK.

III. New Business

- a. Task Force on Tenure & Promotion Mike Lipscomb, Ginger Williams
Dr. Michael Lipscomb got the new wording up on the screen, and noted the main point was to give people a chance to make comments and ask questions. He described what was on the screen and what we were trying to do. Dr. Lipscomb noted that we can make policy changes and vote on it at faculty conference. But this is important, so we are doing it two step like a change to the bylaws. He described the format of the material on the screen (for example, changes to policy language in the left-hand column allows us to look at each change separately). There were different categories. Some of these would have to be decided in committee. The fourth category is change to post-tenure review process, and this was already approved by faculty conference. We are treating category A as bylaw changes. So it can't be changed between now and the next faculty conference. We agreed that we can make small tweaks, but substantive revision will have to go to faculty conference.

Dr. Oakes asked to look at A5 in the text. He asked if it said to include the third year review in tenure promotion portfolios. In this section, perhaps it's helpful to say that this is a dry run. It's practice. You get a review from peers. Recommendations are made, and it may not be the most beautiful report, but it's still practice. Dr. Oakes thinks it is helpful that pre-tenure review is less formal than the tenure process. He wondered if this had been considered that not so much weight would be put on the pre-tenure review before it would be put in tenure portfolio. Dr. Lipscomb we did consider that very thoroughly, especially after hearing voices from the CAS faculty assembly. For most part, people support formalizing this part of the process across the university. Faculty from the arts and sciences has come up with counter arguments, and Dr. Lipscomb says the task force takes these arguments seriously. The task force, after much deliberation and consideration of these alternative views, still thinks including the pre-tenure review in the tenure portfolio is still in the best interest of the candidates. Dr. Williams said that this recommendation came from the academic freedom, tenure, and promotion committee in part because they felt in the past there was a choice to use it or not use it in your tenure file. That seems unacceptable. So the academic freedom, tenure, and promotion committee had said that this either everybody needs to include it or not include it at all. Dr. Williams said the thought was to include it, as this is a six year process, and everything that happens is a part of that portfolio. Dr. Oakes said that it has been said already that only what is in the portfolio can be considered. Dr. Williams said that the pre-tenure review is often mentioned in the chair's report of the annual review, and so it was thought that the pre-tenure review should officially be part of the record. We feel like it will help candidates. For example, if pre-tenure review doesn't go well for a candidate, and they spend their fourth and fifth years addressing those concerns outlined in the pre-tenure review, that would work in the candidate's favor. But it should still be part of the permanent record. Dr. Lipscomb pointed out that in the summary of notes in the document on the screen, it speaks to this and reinforces what Dr. Williams said. Such a review is relevant... Dr. Dwight Dimaculangan in biology noted that he spoke against this before. He served as chair for eight years and he's served on all of these committees we had mentioned. He says the intention of the the third year review is to give honest feedback to the candidate about where they stand. Dr. Dimaculangan said is his fear is that committees, knowing that all will have to be seen in the portfolio, will now be careful to avoid showing certain details. He thinks it is not a good idea. The person still has the choice, in consultation with their chair, to include it or not. What we are discussing now changes the intention. It will now be absolutely required to

include the pre-tenure review portfolio, and everyone on the tenure committee will always have to address that the the pre-tenure review material is in there. He doesn't think it should be included. It's changing the intention. We are already looking at a six year portfolio. He doesn't see why it has to be put in there. Dr. Lipscomb said that is not an argument that doesn't make sense. Dr. Pretty asked if he could comment. Someone advised Dr. Lipscomb that Dr. Pretty could say something if someone else stood in as chair. So taking off his hat as chair, Dr. Pretty commented as someone on University Personnel for the case that this discussion goes back to, that it makes sense what is said. But if it is not going to go through, or if it is going to be optional, it would have to be made clear that no chairs in annual reports can ever talk about it. Because then you end up with stuff being introduced that has not been introduced because of stuff that has to be introduced. Dr. Dimaculangan said that we talk about things in the overall review already. So, even if we address it in there, it's not completely blind. We will talk about what that recommendation might have come out of. Maybe this is when chairs training about if your going to include it, you need to include whatever information about it so that there is a record that is there. But we are changing the intention to try to help faculty get an honest opinion from their colleagues about where they stand. Dr. Lipscomb said that he sees this as a conversation, so he is not formally responding to comments. Dr. Koszewski said that we have people going up for tenure this year. She agrees with Dr. Dimaculangan, as a department chair, there might be things in the third year report that we need to discuss in the annual evaluation. But they might not be just because of the report. It could be that they are doing something really well, or there are areas that need to be strengthened. Rather than say it's in my third year report and the chair is talking about it, it could be that it had to be addressed because of other things that happened since the report was written. And second, we have to put a date when this would start. Many people have already done their third year reports. Dr. Lipscomb noted that a timeline was in the language. This would only apply to faculty members who apply after this recommendation is accepted. Dr. Koszewski noted that it would not affect anyone going up in the next two to three years. It was clarified that people who went up for pre-tenure review this year are exempt. Dr. Disney's concern about what Dr. Dimaculangan says is that if the candidate has the choice to keep out the third year review, then it is kept out. But the comments that have been shared suggest that it is not actually kept out. Every year after the third year review, the chair is going to write about the candidate in their annual report. The third year review is not being kept out. Instead, it is coming in in ways that are incomplete. The current position does not keep out the third year review, but allows an incomplete version to be included by people who have had the prerogative to see it. Dr. Disney's second point, is that this does not change the intent of the third year review. That is why chair training is important. The political culture at Winthrop University needs to change. The culture needs to be that the third year review should be to tell the candidate what they are doing well and what needs to be worked on to ensure that the candidate is successful by year six. It needs to include the strengths and the weaknesses, and Dr. Disney thinks we are all afraid, a fear of having a weakness put down in writing. There is a fear of having an area that needs improvement. There is a need for perfection in all categories, and that is what needs to change. We need to change the perception of the culture and we have to recognize that the purpose is to know what you have to do so that you can do it. By year six, this means the chair can say wow. This candidate did everything that was asked of them and then some. For Dr. Disney, it doesn't need to be kept out, it doesn't change the intent, and lets have training for chairs and administrators to make sure we know the value and purpose. And lets work on our faculty culture so that we know we all have strengths and weaknesses. Dr. Koster agrees with Dr. Disney that it has been kept out. Dr. Koster has been on university personnel three times. There are cases where candidates change after third year. Their goals or plans change. There may be veiled references by the chair as to why there are these changes, but if you don't have the document that explains why there is this change of course, that can weaken a person's candidacy. From Dr. Koster's experience, the letters out of the College of Arts and

Sciences are very clear and fair. That can't be said of all the colleges. If this language does go in, we need consistent chair training across colleges so that everyone, regardless of their college, are using same rules. Dr. Lipscomb noted that Dr. Koster's point is one of the major points of emphasis in recommendations going forward. In this new language we are discussing, we are stressing more specific and consistent training for chairs, deans, and personnel committees so bringing right kind of attitude to these kinds of deliberations. Dr. Siobhan Brownson says that she appreciates the thought that has gone into this and the motivation. She has been on committees and her experience has not been that the third year review has been used in this way, so she can't speak to that. It is unfortunate that it happened at least one time. Dr. Brownson noted that she is not a chair, but she has been on many department level third year review committees. We have viewed in English as a kind of come to Jesus moment. It is going to take a change of attitude toward third year review across the faculty. During third year review, faculty mentors have to be able to say what is good, and where the candidate needs to step it up a bit. Dr. Brownson thinks Dr. Dimaculangan is right. If she knew the report would be included, she would change her rhetorical approach. That might not be as helpful for the candidate. The lack of honesty... she's not sure if that is helpful for candidate. Dr. Williams noted that this came about because we were thinking about the candidate. Someone will not be denied for tenure because of what they did wrong up until their third year. It will help someone if they can show what they did in year four and five to correct that. It's still diagnostic, and that is in the language we are discussing. But it should be part of the record. It has hurt people when it was not part of the record. Dr. Williams was not going to be as explicit, but, as a member of the academic freedom, promotion, and tenure committee, she experienced someone who was denied tenure and did not include the pre-tenure review in their portfolio. Every committee after that cited that the reason they did not get tenure was in their pre-tenure review. As a committee, we had to go back and look at the pre-tenure review file. And there wasn't really anything there, either, but everyone had hidden behind the pre-tenure review that wasn't in the portfolio. It would have been better for the candidate that it had been in the portfolio. And that happened here recently. Dr. Brownson said that it's very unfortunate and it is clear that something motivated this. Dr. Williams pointed out that the person in question was no longer here. Dr. Lipscomb said that Dr. Williams point underscores that this recommendation made with the best interest of the candidate in mind. However, there are instances where folks withheld their pre-tenure review and some were appealed. Often the appeal was based on the fact that no one was told that there was anything wrong with their record throughout the process. It turns out that if the third-year review had been made available, the record of the candidate being told that there were problems would have been a part of the tenure review process. Dr. Meeler, after claiming naiveté, said that he was concerned about the ideas that Dr. Dimaculangan and Dr. Brownson were expressing. The implication seems to be that people are honest in the third year review makes up for the fact that people were not honest in the other reviews. The annual reports should be honest. They should be similar to third year review, the annual reports, and the sixth year review. Dr. Dimaculangan took issue with the concept of dishonesty. No one is saying that people are being dishonest. Dr. Lipscomb and Brownson agreed that no one is saying people are being dishonest. Dr. Meeler agreed and clarified that the same language was used throughout the conversation. Dr. Lipscomb said that part of what this task force was doing was to move the culture to a consideration of the objectively identifiable material that is part of the portfolio and the appropriate augmenting documents. Dr. Matthew Hayes said that he has heard a few things in this debate that he believes have gotten confounded. One is the issue of training for chairs and others, and that seems to be a concern that is already on the list and is being dealt with. There is also the function of the third year review. Dr. Hayes said that he is not sure that the annual reviews and the third year reviews are serving the same purpose. Are annual reviews supposed to be more summative or formative. Are they supposed to be an evaluation of what was done that year? Or are they supposed to be saying that this is an area for growth—you're fine, but this is

an area where you need to grow? Part of what's getting confounded here, too, is that it seems like we are trying to make annual reports and third year review serve more than one master, and we are not clear about it. Part of that is that the assumptions that go into the third year review are formative. These are the strengths, and here are areas to grow. We are going to set the bar high because we want the candidate to excel. We don't want the candidate to just get to the bar. We want them to be safe and exceed the requirements for tenure. The annual report is more summative. The candidate has met the goals for whatever their rank and position is for the year. Dr. Hayes strongly objects to the idea that someone can do both in one document. Dr. Lipscomb clarified that there is a distinction being made between both reports. Dr. Hayes said it is dangerous to confound the summative and formative in reporting. We need to distinguish between one and the other. Using himself as an example, Dr. Hayes said that he is going up for promotion, and he doesn't know what the requirements are. A part of this is normal as there is a lot of variability across departments. In this example, Dr. Hayes says he would appreciate formative feedback that will not be later used against him as summative. Dr. Lipscomb asked that if you summarize what people have done up to a given point, isn't that related to what they need to do going forward? Dr. Hayes clarified that he is using summative and formative as technical terms. Summative is an evaluation of how well you have met the standards, whereas formative captures areas where you can grow more. The training for these two concepts is very different. You don't want to use the same methods and processes to do both things. Doing this makes the evaluation process different. It makes the interpretation different. People think that they are providing formative feedback, but it is later used as summative. That is an issue. Dr. Lipscomb commented that the task force was trying to bring some clarity to this, and he is unsure that it keeps to the analytically clear distinctions just described. Deans are being charged by Provost to add prompts to annual reports that they have to comment specifically on junior or probationary faculty exactly what progress they are making in regards to tenure and promotion. That is a very explicit prompt. It says, based on what you've done, this is what your weakness is, and this is what you have to do. Dr. Lipscomb believes the logic behind this recommendation, which is recommendation #5 in the document we were looking at on the screen, is to add another layer to this. It allows protection against chairs and other evaluators, who might not be doing their job as well as they should. But also, it brings in another set of eyes looking at someone's record that might counter what a dean or other evaluators are saying. Or it could reinforce their comments. Dr. Hayes pointed out that this highlights where we are confounding training with the product and the process. If it is an issue of training chairs, then that is separate from the purpose of the third year review. Dr. Lipscomb acknowledged that they are separate, but noted that they also augment one another. Dr. Hayes said that we can deal with the training issue. If chairs aren't leaving appropriate feedback at the end of the year, that is a separate issue from changing the purpose and procedures for the third year review. Dr. Hayes clarified that when we are changing this to a summative assessment, that is going to accomplish what Dr. Brownson and Dr. Dimaculangan were talking about. We are changing the way in which the reports are done, and therefore the feedback. The question is will these changes make it better for the person going up and for the university as a whole. Now we just have annual summative feedback and third year summative feedback. There is really no vehicle for getting that formative feedback. Dr. Lipscomb pointed out a line in the language of the document on the screen. The purpose of the pre-tenure review is primarily diagnostic, not summative. It is geared toward candidates making improvements towards a successful tenure position. It's not purely formative. In part, a negative third year review could be part of the evidence used to terminate employment during their probationary period. Already, it is not just formative. It already has a summative value. Dr. Dimaculangan said that in his experience most people already include the third year review. These are a few exceptions where we are changing the entire system, and only for a small number of cases. Since the process has worked, and we are already making other changes, maybe we should table this part now and see how the rest this falls out. Maybe explore it more in the

following year. Dr. Lipscomb said that he thought that this is a substantive suggestion and it would have to be brought up on the floor of faculty conference. Notice that it is the very last of the five recommendations, so we would be at a point when we could have that conversation. Maybe we can have some preliminary conversations where some of the concerns of people in the College of Arts and Sciences faculty assembly might be expressed. Maybe we could convince people to table it at that point. That is something that goes with the democratic process that all of this has to be subject to. Dr. Dimaculangan said that his last point is when speaking of a third year review, it's not just a committee letter. There is also a chairs letter and a deans letter. All three of those things are included in the third year review. There are times when some deans have done this differently. As dean, Dr. Kedrowski wrote a very formative letter. We can't just look at the committee letter all by itself in this process, as it isn't the only thing included in that third year review. Dr. Dimaculangan expressed that he felt we really need to explore this. What is the value of the third year review, and are we changing the intention of it when it absolutely has to be a part of that documentation? Dr. Lipscomb said that he appreciated the feedback, but pointed out that this is not the first iteration of this discussion. We did try to fold some ideas based on previous feedback into the language as a part of this recommendation. Reading from the language on the screen, Dr. Lipscomb said that all candidates for tenure must include their pre-tenure review committee letter and the associated letters from the candidates chair and dean in their portfolio. Remember that candidates have the ability to respond to the pre-tenure review, and that too would be included in the portfolio. Dr. Disney said gave an example, noting that sometimes these examples are the exception and not the rule. What if you were on a committee in a different college? Those departmental colleagues voted unanimously that the person deserved to be promoted, but wanted to deny tenure. It seems impossible, but it happened. The sad reality is that deans can hold back promotion letters, but they can't hold back tenure letters. Dr. Disney has seen it happen in another college where unanimous support for promotion was held back, while a minority vote for tenure went forward. Perhaps the third year review could shed some light on the tension. This is the type of example that highlights why this task force was created. The idea is to make policies that protect the most vulnerable. Dr. Lipscomb said he wanted to reinforce what Dr. Dimaculangan and Dr. Disney said. The system we have had has worked for most people most of the time. At Winthrop, we work hard to make sure the people we have succeed. These recommendation came about because over the last four or five years we had a string of difficult cases that were appealed, but revealed that there were tensions in the actual policy language that are part of the tenure and promotion protocols. This is about the exceptions. The task force, when given this charge, felt compelled to address those exceptions. Responding to the scenario that Dr. Disney described, this did occur. The committee recommended promotion but not tenure, and the dean held back the promotion letter. It seemed outrageous and that it shouldn't stand. If he was one of the evaluators, he would have wanted to know that the committee recommended promotion and not tenure because it would have made him take a hard look at what was going on at the level of the evaluation. Dr. Lipscomb pointed to language on the screen (A1). The deans recommendation and all materials are submitted to the chief academic officer. At this point the dean notifies the candidate... and the candidate has the option to withdraw their application. It should be clear that we are talking about promotion. And it is clear when looking at the actual policy. Dr. Disney clarified that the letters cannot be held back. Dr. Lipscomb said that the language is explicitly meant to prevent that type of problem. Dr. Prickett noted that it seems that this process takes whole school year. It seems that the task force has added in structures that will extend the process even further. While he appreciates the concern about getting a little more information fed into the process, we've added in meeting and an email communication. Now the dean is going to meet with each candidate and provides feedback on strengths and weaknesses, which is a new step, yes? Currently they only notify and move on. Also response time is added. This process already takes a year, and it is now going to take longer. Are committees and chairs going to have less time? There is no move

to truncate the time, although there are limits on the 1,000 word response and a time frame. There are no other limits to the actual portfolio or the process that would speed the process up. Dr. Lipscomb said that in part that is handled by the administration. There is a way that Dr. Prickett is right. It could add time. The question is how much time, and will it make it difficult to fulfill the integrity of the process within what is already a tight schedule. The tenure task force talked about that extensively, and we believe the limits that were put in connected to the ability of candidates to respond to personnel committee changes and the necessity of a meeting would not be prohibitive to completing the review process even with a tight schedule. Dr. Brownson said that she has been many of the meetings, and she appreciates the context. From the start, she felt blindsided by this whole thing. Where did this come from? Now there is context, and she realized that there are sometimes unjust exceptions that pushed this process forward. Hundreds of hours have been spent on this, and now she realizes why. People were hurt by the lack of process. This is not out of the blue, and the context is much appreciated. Dr. Lipscomb noted that it's strange to publicly deliberate on matters that, by their very definition, entails information that can't be discussed in public. Context is important. Dr. Lipscomb also said that he has sent out a timeline that explains how this whole thing came into being. We are dancing around specific events that led up to this. Concerns that were brought forward by different iterations of two committees (academic freedom, tenure, and promotion committee and the personnel committee) got this process started. Dr. John Byrd had said we need to review this process. Dr. Lipscomb brought this up with President Dan Mahoney and Provost Boyd during the summer as he was preparing to take on his current leadership role, and they said it probably did need to be looked at. That led to the discussion that we probably did need to put together a task force. Dean McCormick commented that she's worked at this process at another place and it took almost seven years. She wanted to point out that we are making an institutional change, and so we are giving our perspective as a college. It's important to give CAS perspective and have the umbrella guidance of the processes and documents that inform us in CAS. If any of our faculty feel they don't understand what they need to do to move forward, then it needs to be fixed. Also might need to look at the departmental level within the college to make sure no one feels unsure. We need to dig further into this and look at our processes in departments. How do you balance equitable practices when there are individual contexts as well. Starts at the department level and the guidance and mentoring at that level. She is happy to partner with chairs and work more with faculty to determine what steps we might take at the college level and also touch upon those exceptions that have driven this institutional change. Dr. Hope Lima said that she was just hired in August, so this is all new. But to speak to new faculty confusion, it has been unclear. She has been mentored and told what she is doing right or incorrectly in a given circumstance. But she has not seen an overarching idea of a process that she is supposed to complete. She is more dependent on feedback given as she does particular activities. As a new faculty member, she would appreciate a checklist or an appropriation of time, as other universities do. Even if this was done at the departmental level, it would be helpful. Dean McCormick said this is true. The issue with giving specifics like that is that you then have to enforce them, which can be difficult. Dr. Koszewski said that a check sheet might help. Right now, Human Nutrition has no tenured faculty and she is the first going up. When she was hired, they only had one tenured faculty member. She went up for tenure in another institution, and it was clearly laid out what was expected there. It's not clear here at Winthrop. It is very confusing. Dean McCormick said that this is where department level policies would be good. Provide departmental expectations and say how they align with the college and the college with the university. Dr. Lipscomb underscored that it was our charge (the task force's charge) to deal with university level issues. We are careful not to impinge on the autonomy of the different colleges. When talking about different colleges, it's harder to make things uniform than one might think. Different colleges have different accreditation requirements. But what Dr. Lipscomb hears in our concerns at this point, he believes that is mostly under the purview of the college. If you want to push for change

on these issues, the appropriate place to do that is through the college governance system. Dr. Oakes said with some hesitation that he had another question. In proposals for tenure and promotion portfolio preparation, the current vita is struck from the materials to be included. Why? The table of contents is removed because it is handled on Interfolio. But why is the vita taken out? Dr. Lipscomb said that he personally thinks the Vita should stay. Dr. Oakes said maybe we can generate one anyway through Faculty 180, but then that takes away the candidate's ability to include the document the way they want to. Dr. Lipscomb said that the task force will take that under advisement and talk with the chair of the Rules Committee, Dr. Zach Abernathy. Does anybody object to Dr. Oakes suggestion? Other faculty have also made suggestions about that part of the document, and those suggestions will be taken that under advisement. We may make suggestions about how the language may be changed. Feel free to talk to anyone on the task force. We appreciate the feedback. We will talk about it at Faculty Assembly in April.

Announcements: Dr. Williams said thank you to everyone who participated in the Food Conference. Perhaps it was Dr. Ralston who announced that the Writing Center is having a book sale in lobby, and would be there until 5 pm. Dr. Lipscomb announced that the next faculty appreciation lunch would be on March 9th

IV. Dean's Remarks Adrienne McCormick

Dean Adrienne McCormick began by thanking everyone for submitting midterm grades on time. Only five grades were not filed in CAS before the deadline (not 5% but five grades total). Dean McCormick thanked Dr. Lipscomb, Dr. Williams, and Dr. Takita Sumter for their work on the task force. Dean McCormick also congratulated Dr. Adolphus Belk as the rising Chair of Faculty Conference as well as Dr. Lipscomb for his service. She noted that the Food Conference was wonderful and a success. The dean mentioned the SC Humanities Festival, as there are a number of people in the college participating in this. There were flyers for the SC Humanities festival—there are flyers—take one. The college is working with York County on this. Congrats were offered to the department chairs in the college. We cut 12.5% from interim faculty and dual employment budget, and this was a big accomplishment. It prevented additional cuts having to come from somewhere else.

Dean McCormick then reviewed the current goals for the College:

CAS Goal 1: Being student ready. We have additional movement (added stuff) in two new ways. We added to the faculty website until we add a share drive. We are working on advising, working with data sharing among deans and chairs, and the facilities planning group. The idea is to improve in advising and make sure our buildings are ready for students. A professional advising model is being explored (draft). We are looking at the role of a professional advisor as an added part of an advising mix. There would be a newly titled role in the office of student services. There would be three professional advisors in college, a faculty advisor, and the student would also have a role, too. Chairs have heard about the professional advising model and will go to their departments to get info and feedback. The dean also plans to use a Qualtrics survey. Feedback from these two sources (the Chairs and the Qualtrics survey) will be used to move forward. A report will go to the Provost by March 25th. Dean McCormick mentioned a professional advising center as part of student services. The model is available, and chairs will bring it to their departments in the near future. The prevalent model has a primary advisor for first and second year students, and then goes to faculty advisor in later years. There is lots of data about supporting students, making sure that they know institutional requirements. These professionals are well-educated. A lot of this is already done now. We would be adding someone to support what we currently do. This is what they want feedback on. Chairs have also been

talking about faculty advising role in departments. Roles could be different depending on departmental needs. In the departments, chairs have autonomy. We are talking about adding support and right configuration to move forward. Students ranked us lower than our peers than other institutions on advising, and Dean McCormick noted that she had heard faculty when we said we needed relief. So this is the proposal. One of changes would be that a faculty advisor would oversee the student in the major, focusing on their career path and the courses that they need in the discipline. The professional advisor would be the path to success for particular students, using LEAP info to help. A professional advisor would have to be expert at Degree Works and have clear responsibilities. They would need to have an advising syllabus and an advising expectation list for students. Dr. Kristen Abernathy in math mentioned that one of ways that we know we meet with students is we lift the flag. She noted that she would still want students to come talk, and they won't unless you lift flag. Dean McCormick said that we would have to determine the benefits of allowing the advisor to pull flag and benefits of a professional advisor pulling the flag. We will have social science and humanities advisors, and extra responsibilities would be taken on by the person with less work. Dr. David Meeler noted that students already have a team of advisors, who they ignore. Double majors have two advisors. Maybe students should be talking to all their advisors, but one of the advisors usually gets ignored. Dean McCormick thought that working as a team is a great idea, and expectations would have to be established within departments. Career Center partners could help, too. We can use programs to see what works.

CAS Goal 2: Telling our story. We will have new tabletop displays, and many people saw this. Thanks to Dr. Prickett for bringing this to fruition. STEM tours are going on. There is an increase in the use of social media. We can use the images we have and re-use color and branding. The dean wanted a last bit of input. How many have read our mission statement recently? She put it on the screen and highlighted a few phrases. Some of the mission statement seemed uninspired, and there were certainly areas for improvement. Dean McCormick noted that Winthrop had a team of students from IMC do a branding study (before she got here) and one thing was maybe fix the mission statement. Chairs thought we might share sample mission statements that are more condensed and make it shorter. The dean highlighted that she wanted the faculty to provide feedback on what to do about the mission statement. She asked what was acceptable and wondered if leveraging a Qualtrics survey was ok. Everyone seemed on board.

CAS Goal 3: Dean McCormick discussed travel funding. She noted that three people will be travelling this summer. The dean wants to get more money into travel, and so needs to find where it will come from. Ideally, the college will provide at least \$1000 per faculty member. There is also the Great Teachers Institute. They will be in New Jersey in June. Dean McCormick mentioned that the History and Social Work chairs implemented house calls 1-on-1 with their departmental faculty. She also said that she is waiting to hear about whether we got the NEH grant, as there were delays due to the government shutdown. Two consultants would probably come to Winthrop, regardless of whether we get the grant or not. The dean asked if there was any interest in a professional development session in May after graduation. The dean thought maybe May 6-10? There was not much interest, as everyone had their annual report deadline. Dr. Meeler asked about putting money in travel funds. Dr. Disney said the week in May may be a good time, but the first or second week in January might work, too. Dean McCormick said the session would only be few hours on one day. Dr. Kristen Abernathy noted that people with kids might have a hard time.

CAS goal 4 dynamic programs: Dean McCormick noted that we've seen a lot with curriculum changes coming through, and lots of exciting work is being done.

CAS Goal 5, Efficiency and Sustainability: Dean McCormick noted that, as mentioned before, we reduced budget 12.5%. Currently, each department has an opportunity to right size their budget. This is the time to correct where there are budget gaps. The dean thinks we will come out well in end. She is hoping to see budgets at 100%. We have been working to determine budgets versus actual spending. The dean mentioned that Provost Deborah Boyd hopes to get instructional budgets to 99 – 100%. We saved so much in 12.5%, so Provost Boyd did not have to dip into departmental budgets (only \$300,000). This was a good thing. Want to meet instructional and costs. Dean McCormick also said that she wants to streamline our annual reports. She asked how we can reduce, reuse, and be more efficient in the processes that we have to do. Autonomy model—ask chairs. There was a point about increased MWF 50-minute course scheduling. Dean McCormick said that the Clare Boothe Luce Scholarship pre-proposal was submitted. We might be asked to do a proposal later. There were no questions.

V. Adjournment

Appendix 2

CAS Curriculum Committee Report

Meeting held on February 19, 2019

1. Course change proposals

a. Department of Chemistry, Physics, & Geology

- i. Modify course: CHEM 105, General Chemistry
 1. Title is being changed to General Chemistry since there will no longer be a General Chemistry II course. EXSC majors can now take the course.
- ii. Drop course: CHEM 106, General Chemistry II
 1. With the expansion of Introductory Biology to two courses, Introductory Chemistry is transitioning to a 1-2-1 approach that has been implemented so successfully at many other schools.
- iii. Drop course: CHEM 106H, General Chemistry II
 1. Dropping the Honors sections of the above course.
- iv. Modify course: CHEM 108, General Chemistry Laboratory
 1. Adding a lecture – Increasing lab fee – Adding a credit hour to cover the time students are currently spending in the course.
- v. Modify course: CHEM 305, Chemical Hygiene and Safety
 1. Changed pre-requisite course from CHEM 106 to CHEM 105 since CHEM 106 is being dropped.
- vi. Modify course: CHEM 314, Quantitative Analysis Lab
 1. Added goals and changed pre-requisite (see CHEM 305)
- vii. Modify course: CHEM 315, Environmental Chemistry
 1. Added goals and changed pre-requisite (see CHEM 305)
- viii. New course: CHEM 323, Introduction to Biochemistry
 1. Provides opportunity for sequential learning
- ix. Modify course: CHEM 330, Introductory Inorganic chemistry
 1. Added goals and changed pre-requisite (see CHEM 305)
- x. Modify course: GEOL 335, Fundamentals of Geochemistry
 1. Added goals and changed pre-requisite (see CHEM 305)
- xi. Modify course: GEOL 340, Hydrogeology
 1. Added goals and changed pre-requisite (see CHEM 305)
- xii. Modify course: PHYS 321, Materials Science
 1. Added goals and changed pre-requisite (see CHEM 305)
- xiii. Modify course: PHYS 350, Thermodynamics
 1. Added goals and changed pre-requisite (see CHEM 305)

All course changes were approved.

b. Department of English

- i. Modify course: ENGL 305, Shakespeare
 1. Change of pre-requisite course as students now take a bridge course
- ii. Modify course: ENGL 321, Recurrent Themes in Literature
 1. Allows students to repeat the course when course content has changed
- iii. Modify course: ENGL 333, Global Narratives

1. Decreases the number of times students may take the course in hopes to increase the rigor of the degree
- iv. Modify course: ENGL 494, Capstone Seminar in English
 1. Adjustments to course description for clarification purposes. Updated pre-requisites

Requested that ENGL 321 and 333 states that course must have a different title in order to take course again. Changes were approved.

c. Department of Interdisciplinary Studies

- i. New course: GEOG 515, Global Sustainable Development
 1. Provides an undergraduate and graduate level course for same topic to better distinguish the varying work between the two groups of students
- ii. Drop course: GRNT 440, Internship in Gerontology
 1. Replaced by GRNT 340, which allows for credit flexibility
- iii. New course: GRNT 470, Undergraduate Research in Gerontology
 1. Provides undergraduate research opportunities
- iv. New course: GRNT 473, Undergraduate Research in Gerontology
 1. Provides undergraduate research opportunities for more credits than 470
- v. Modify course: GRNT 504, Social and Individual Aspects of Aging
 1. The new title and description better describe the present course. Added pre-requisites and information for graduate student requirements.

Changes were approved with minimal discussion about possible issues with same name for different courses.

d. Department of Human Nutrition

- i. New course: NUTR 321, Nutrition Metabolism
 1. Provides sequential learning in hopes that students will be more successful in NUTR 521
- ii. Drop course: NUTR 370, Food and Nutrition in Cultural Perspective
 1. Information being covered in other courses
- iii. Modify course: NUTR 428, Community and Cultural Nutrition
 1. Combining of two courses to provide space in the major for NUTR 321

Changes were approved.

e. Department of Psychology

- i. Modify course: PSYC 504, Social and Individual Aspects of Aging

Changes were approved with no discussion.

f. Department of Sociology, Criminology, & Anthropology

- i. Modify course: SOCL 213, Introduction to Social Inequalities
 1. Changed to an introductory course through the broadening of information covered in anticipation of a new concentration
- ii. Modify course: SOCL 319, Population and Sustainability
 1. Added more information in hopes of attracting more students
- iii. Modify course: SOCL 504, Social and Individual Aspects of Aging

1. New title and information better describe the course as currently being taught
- iv. Modify course: SOCL 519, Social Research Methods II: Qualitative Methods
 1. Fixing a typo: Students need a C not C- in pre-requisites

Changes were approved with no discussion.

g. Department of World Languages & Cultures

- i. New course: SPAN 372, Latin America Women Writers
 1. Introduces students to Latin American women writers since they are not covered in other courses

Discussion as to whether the issue might be better solved by adding women writers to preexisting courses. English also has courses that focus on women writers. Course was approved.

2. Program change proposals

a. Department of Biology

- i. Modify program: BS-BIOL-BMRS
- ii. Modify program: BS-BIOL
- iii. Modify program: BS-BIOL-MTEC
 1. The three preceding programs have been modified to include the new core sequence of courses, information on genetics and new elections.
- iv. Modify program: BS-BIOL-CSST
 1. The preceding program has been modified to include the new core sequence of courses, information on genetics and new education designators.
- v. Modify program: BS-BIOL-CNSV
 1. Information not provided

Changes were approved with no discussion.

b. Department of Chemistry, Physics, & Geology

- i. Modify program: BS-CHEM-CHBU
 1. Updates introductory biology and chemistry courses and reduces CHEM upper division hours
- ii. Modify program: BS-CHEM-BCHM
 1. Updates introductory biology and chemistry courses, reduces CHEM upper division hours and provides options for physics courses
- iii. Modify program: BS-CHEM-FORC
 1. Updates introductory biology and chemistry courses
- iv. Modify program: BS-CHEM-ACSP
 1. Updates introductory biology and chemistry courses and removes course no longer needed for ACS certification
- v. Modify program: BS-CHEM-BIOC
 1. Updates introductory biology and chemistry courses and reduces CHEM upper division hours
- vi. Modify program: BS-CHEM-MULP
 1. Updates introductory biology and chemistry courses

vii. Modify program: BS-CHEM-PHYS

1. Updates introductory biology and chemistry courses and reduces CHEM upper division hours

No questions about Chemistry program changes. Changes approved.

c. Department of English

i. Modify program: BA-ENGL

1. Includes WRIT 300 as a framework course now that there is faculty to consistently offer WRIT 300

Changes were approved with no discussion.

d. Department of Interdisciplinary Studies

i. Modify program: Minor-GRNT

1. Adjusts internship requirements, consolidates resources with other departments, adds biological component

No questions about Interdisciplinary program changes. Changes approved.

e. Department of Mass Communication

i. Modify program: BA-MCOM

1. Changes core courses to better reflect skills students need and added additional electives

Changes were approved with no discussion.

f. Department of Social Work

i. New program: Minor-CYWB

1. Offers students exposure to and application of knowledge and skills that support child and youth well-being

Changes were approved with no discussion.

g. Department of Sociology, Criminology, & Anthropology

i. New program: BA-SOCL-INEQ

1. Provides a unifying focus for the sociology major and encourages more enrollment in upper division courses.

Changes were approved with no discussion.

3. Blanket Petitions

a. Department of Biology

- i. For the BS-BIOL, in all catalogs, allow BIOL 302X (*Ecology and Evolution of Mammals*) to satisfy area A of the major requirements (in addition to area C, where it currently counts).

b. Department of English

- i. For the BA-ENGL, in the 2017-18 catalog, allow WRIT 300 to count as a Frameworks course.

All blanket petitions were approved without discussion.

4. Student Petitions

- a. There were zero student petitions for review.

Appendix 3

Current and needed nominations for 2019-20 faculty governance positions

UNIVERSITY-LEVEL COMMITTEES:

Academic Council/Financial Exigency (replacing Adam Glover) – 3 year term, nominees must have served two years as a faculty member immediately preceding service.

Kori Bloomquist (SCWK)

Dave Pretty (HIST)

Wendy Sellers (SCWK)

Educator Prep (Mary Pat Sjostrom) – 3 year term, cannot come from BIOL or CHEM

Catherine Chang (HIST)

Margaret Gillikin (INDS)

Valerie Jespon (WLAC)

Allan Nail (ENGL)

FCUL (Rick Chacon) – 3 year term, must be tenured.

Maria Aysa-Lastra (SOCL)

Kristin Kiblinger (RELG)

Wendy Sellers (SCWK)

FCUP (Scott Werts) – 3 year term, must be tenured.

Gwen Daley (CHEM)

Matt Fike (ENGL)

Jo Koster (ENGL)

Jeff Sinn (PSYC)

Ginger Williams (INDS)

Faculty Personnel/CAS Nominating & Rules (Jason Hurlbert) – 3 year term, cannot be adjunct faculty, this person is elected to serve on both committees.

Gen Ed Curriculum (Zach Abernathy) – 3 year term

Monique Constance-Huggins (SCWK)

Gwen Daley (CHEM)

Ty Miller (SOCL)

Graduate Council (Kelly Richardson) – 3 year term, must have served 2 years as a grad faculty member

Library (Fatima Amir) – 3 year term

Catherine Chang (HIST)

Anthony Hill (SCWK)

Sarah Reiland (PSYC)

COLLEGE-LEVEL COMMITTEES:

Faculty Assembly chair (Dave Pretty) – *1 year term, must be tenured, full-time CAS faculty member*



Graduate Faculty Committee chair (Wendy Sellers) - *1 year term, tenured, full-time, member of CAS Graduate Faculty*



Personnel (Will Kiblinger, Nick Grossoehme, Padmini Patwardhan) – *2 year term, tenured, may not be considered for promotion while serving or serve on any other tenure/promotion committees. New members should not be from PSYC. Nominations come from the dean, but nominations from the floor are also acceptable. 6 nominees are needed.*

TBD

Curriculum (Matt Fike, Dave Pretty, Kathryn Kohl, Duane Neff) – *2 year term. New members should not be from CHEM, WLAC, or PHRL. 8 nominees are needed.*

Gwen Daley (CHEM)

Anthony Hill (SCWK)

Dustin Hoffman (ENGL)

Dave Pretty (HIST)

Mike Sickels (SOCL)

Brent Woodfill (SOCL)

