

Minutes
College of Arts and Sciences
Faculty Assembly
August 15, 2013

9:00 AM

Kinard Auditorium

I. **Approval of minutes** of March 22, 2013

Meeting was called to order by Dr. Frank Pullano at 9:01 AM. A quorum was present. The minutes of March 22, 2013 were approved.

II. **Introduction of Secretary and Parliamentarian**

Dr. Frank Pullano introduced himself as new Chair of the Faculty Assembly, the new Parliamentarian, Dr. Zachary Abernathy, and the new Secretary, Dr. Clara Paulino. He gave the floor to the new Dean, Dr. Karen Kedrowski, who began by pointing out this was the first Assembly meeting which had the participation of adjunct faculty. She asked the departmental Chairs to acknowledge new adjunct faculty as well as full-time faculty, and to include in their announcements the faculty who had been promoted or tenured. She then introduced the new departmental Chairs: Dr. Tom Polaski, Department of Mathematics; Dr. Jennifer Disney, Department of Political Science, who will continue to be the Head of the Women's Studies program; Dr. Scott Shinabargar, Department of World Languages and Cultures.

III. **Introduction of New Faculty and New Roles**

Dr. Dwight Dimaculangan, from the Department of Biology, introduced Dr. Matthew Stern, and Dr. Meir Barack; Dr. Pat Owens, from the Department of Chemistry, Physics and Geology, announced Dr. Werts was awarded tenure and promoted to Associate Professor; on behalf of Dr. Gregg Hecimovich, Dr. Siobhan Brownson introduced six new faculty of the Department of English; the Department of History had no new faculty; Dr. Sarah Stallings, from the Department of Human Nutrition, introduced Simone Camel and Stephanie Nielsen; Dr. Marsha Bollinger, from the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies, mentioned faculty in new roles: Dr. Meeler, Dr. Kiblinger, Bryan McFadden, and Dr. Paulino; Dr. Polaski, from the Department of Mathematics, introduced faculty in new roles, Dr. Zack Abernathy and Dr. Rusinko, and three new adjunct faculty; Dr. Click, from the Department of Mass Communications, introduced Aimee Meader; Dr. Jon Marx, from the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, had no new faculty to announce; Dr. Jennifer Disney, from the Department of Political Science, introduced a faculty member in a new role, Katarina Moyon; Dr. Prus, from the Department of Psychology, announced that Dr. Leigh Armistead was promoted to Professor and Dr. Matt Hayes was awarded tenure and promoted to Associate Professor; Dr. Jon Marx, from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, had no new faculty to announce; Dr. Deana Morrow, from the Department of Social Work, introduced two new faculty, Dr. Monique Constance-Huggins and Dr. Duane Neff; Dr. Scott Shinabarger, from the Department

of World Languages and Cultures, introduced two new faculty, Dr. Adam Glover and Dr. Anna Igou.

Dr. Pullano invited the new Provost, Dr. Debra Boyd, to take the floor. Dr. Boyd spoke of her role as Provost as an indication of the primacy of the academic program at Winthrop, and reminded the Assembly of the President's words about recruitment and retention goals. She invited us to think of these goals at the micro-level, with each department doing its best to increase recruitment and retention rates. She stressed also that higher retention and attainment rates will not mean a downgrading of our programs.

IV. Presentation of College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Awards

Dr. Kedrowski presented the Outstanding Advisor Award to Dr. Frank Pullano due to his contribution to retention through the LEAP program. The Arts and Sciences Undergraduate Research Faculty Mentor Award 2013 was presented to Dr. Jason Hurlbert.

V. Report from the Curriculum Committee

Dr. Kristin Kiblinger presented a report from the Curriculum Committee.

1. The following course change proposal was approved by the body:
Department of English: modify ENGL 305 Shakespeare
2. The following program change proposal was approved by the body:
Department of Interdisciplinary Studies: modify minor in African American Studies
3. Blanket petitions from the following departments:
 - English: that students in B.A. in ENGL-LLAN track, all catalogs, be allowed to count the new course ENGL 307 (The Arthurian Tradition) in the "British Literature" string of requirements.
 - Human Nutrition: that students in the B.S. in Nutrition Science program, all catalogs, be permitted to sub CHEM 523 for CHEM 521.
 - Interdisciplinary Studies: that African American Studies minors receive elective credit for THRT 442 (which has replaced THRT 212).
 - Political Science: that PLSC 390 meet the major requirement as an advanced course in American Government/Politics when offered as South Carolina Government and Politics, for all catalogs and all options.
 - Political Science: that PLSC 390 meet the major requirement for Comparative Politics/International Relations when offered as Middle East Politics, for all catalogs and options.
 - Social Work: that the requirement of SCWK 201 be waived for the social work major and for the minor in social welfare, all catalogs. (This course no longer exists; its content was absorbed into SCWK 200.)
 - 16 student petitions were reviewed; 15 were approved and 1 was denied.

VI. Report from the Nominating Committee

Chair Jeannie Haubert said there was no official report, but there will be an election on August 30th meeting. There are vacancies in the Curriculum Committee, Academic Council, and Academic Freedom and Tenure. There are nominees, but if there are other people the Assembly would like to nominate, they should send proposals by email; they can still be added to the ballots.

VII. Other Committee Reports

There were no other committee reports.

VIII. Unfinished Business

The Dean opened a discussion on the proposed added language for college statement on student intellectual development.

Proposed Added Language for College Statement on Student Intellectual Development

1. Tenure:

“When considered for tenure, a faculty member should have demonstrated a consistently effective record in the area of Student Intellectual Development. Evidence should be provided that illustrates that the faculty member addresses appropriate student learning objectives; handles routine course issues; maintains accessibility to students through a variety of modes of communication; designs and administers assessments in a fair and consistent manner; and reflects appropriately on teaching effectiveness in ways that show s/he is responsive to feedback from students, peers, chair, and Dean. Individuals are expected to maintain these expectations throughout a tenured appointment with appropriate growth.”

Dr. Greg Oakes declared that he was not prepared to vote on all the proposed changes today as they contained much information and he had only had access to them the day before. The Dean answered that the Assembly could discuss them during this meeting and vote on them later; these changes will not be operative this year anyway because they will have to be reviewed by the Faculty Conference Rules Committee. One faculty member proposed adding the adjective “reasonable” to the phrase “maintains accessibility to students.” Dr. Jeff Sinn commented he did not see markers of excellence in the statement, for example, in reference to tests requiring higher order thinking or deep learning. In this respect, he felt there was better language in previous iterations of the document. The Dean suggested we look at the language of the other levels to see whether this question was addressed at those levels.

2. Associate Professor:

“For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate all the characteristics described for tenure. In addition, the faculty member should provide evidence of ways in which s/he engages with students in meaningful ways outside of the traditional classroom/lab environment through activities that include but are not limited to mentoring, supervision of undergraduate research, or supplemental academic support. An Associate Professor is involved in curriculum development at the course and department levels. Finally an Associate

Professor maintains a connection to the discipline through professional development and reflective practice.”

Dr. Beth Costner commented that there was no specific language of the kind Dr. Sinn had mentioned, and if the members of the Assembly felt this should be reviewed, it could be done. Dr. Janice Chism further brought up the question of the high numbers of students in some classes, which made it even more important that there should be more of a focus on teaching in the statement. Dr. Bird said the phrase “graduate student research” should be included in the statement. Questions arose about the phrase “outside of the traditional classroom,” which some felt made undergraduate research type activities outside the classroom a requirement for promotion to this rank, while leaving in-class undergraduate research out of the equation when it came to promotion. Dr. Costner highlighted the phrase “but are not limited to” and mentioned several activities that could be categorized as mentoring (job mentoring, academic mentoring, etc.), as well as supplemental academic support (work with a student who is struggling, retention efforts, etc.). She further clarified that leaving out graduate research was an oversight and would be fixed. Someone pointed out “mentoring” as a problematic term. The Dean suggested the Assembly come up with a list of suggestions to be sent back to the committee and the re-drafted documents be circulated before the next meeting. Dr. Sinn and Dr. Lipscomb brought back the question of the focus on teaching activities, which should be better articulated in the statement given the time-consuming nature of such activities. Dr. Mitchell remarked that the first part of the statement referred to what one needs to do to get promoted while the latter part seemed to be about what one would have to do once one got promoted, and asked for the statement to be revised for clarity. The Dean asked whether the comments by Dr. Sinn and others reflected the group’s thinking, namely when it came to the language about teaching and about inside/outside classroom activities, and the Assembly answered affirmatively. Dr. Lipscomb suggested adding the phrase “may include” in some of the requirements to allow for more flexibility, and Dr. Koster said she would like to see a notion of “best practices” added to the statements.

3. Professor:

“For promotion to the rank of Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate that the basic expectations for Student Intellectual Development described for Associate Professor have been maintained. Further, evidence of creative approaches, instructional renewal, and continuous personal exploration should be provided. A Professor is an individual who is respected among peers, maintains positive environments that promote student learning and development in and out of the classroom, and serves as a mentor for new faculty as they develop strategies to engage students. Finally, a Professor is recognized as a leader in Student Intellectual Development through work on and/or off campus.”

There were questions about how to document “respect” as well as on the imprecision of terms such as “peers.” Dr. Disney pointed out that the current language included terms as “maturity” and “leadership,” and one could ask the same questions about these. She and Dr. Haubert gave examples of how these and other qualities can be documented. Again, Dr. Sinn said that the markers in the statement did not assess the quality of the teaching and testing. Someone suggested we link Student Intellectual development to University Learning Competence, using the latter to document the former. A comment was made on

“personal exploration,” rather than “professional exploration.” Dr. Adolphus Belk warned against too strict definitions, which might be too limiting, as circumstances change over time.

Clarification for Scholarly Activity

1. The phrase “faculty members must identify the most appropriate single category for reporting” was taken out; mentoring is now allowed to be counted as Student Intellectual Development and the product of that mentoring (presentation, poster, conference paper, etc.) can be categorized as scholarly activity; also, any language that differentiates student co-authorship from any other type of co-authorship was taken out.

Questions arose about “product” and more questions were raised about co-authorship. Dr. Costner said that the point had been to remove students from the statement completely. Whether there was a co-author at all, student or otherwise, would not be important to the way the activity would be viewed. Dr. Disney added that if there was co-authoring, whether with a colleague or a student, it would be the faculty member’s responsibility to make clear what type of collaboration it had been. To the remark by Dr. Lipscomb that the different types of products resulting from research need to be classified more rigorously when it comes to scholarship, it was replied that the proposed language was an attempt to clarify precisely those points: while prior language made it difficult to classify research done with a student as scholarship, classification now depends on the quality of the product rather than whether it was co-authored with a student.

2. Priorities

The previous Priority I statement (“presentations that reach a significant audience, which have undergone a stringent, refereed selection process by experts and produced a scholarly product that marks a significant contribution to the field”) was removed and is now addressed in the latter part of the statement for Priority II (“Presentations, performances, exhibitions, clinics, workshops or symposia in significant professional contexts that include an opportunity for scholarly exchange. When presentations undergo a stringent, refereed selection process by experts and produce a scholarly product that makes a significant contribution to the field they may qualify as Priority One scholarship. The burden of proof for the latter qualification lies with the faculty member.”).

The previous Priority II statement (“Co-authored publications or presentations with a student or students in significant professional contexts outside of the classroom where students are the primary audience and that include an opportunity for scholarly exchange.”) was integrated in the first part of the current Priority II statement, which covers this situation without giving the unintended impression that the co-presenter determines priority level.

The prior Priority III statement (“Co-authored publications or presentations with a student or students in contexts outside of the classroom where students are the primary audience and that include an opportunity for scholarly exchange.”) was replaced by “Publications or presentations in contexts outside of the classroom where students are the primary audience and that include an opportunity for scholarly exchange.”

The Dean asked if these changes made the statements clearer and clarified that most presentations are Priority II; only in a very small number of cases, when there is a peer-review process to get on the program, can the argument be made that it is a Priority I presentation. Someone added that, in order to reach that level, there should also be evidence that the presentation contributed to new knowledge in the field.

3. Descriptions by Rank

Professor: Prior language read: “The candidate must have achieved a mature record of scholarly excellence and earned a measure of national or equally significant recognition in the discipline of specialization, while demonstrating the four primary qualities of scholarly activity.”

The proposed changes now read: “The candidate must have achieved a mature record of scholarly excellence and earned significant professional recognition in the discipline/profession, while demonstrating the four primary qualities of scholarly activity.”

Dr. John Bird said he understood the fear faculty had of the word "national", but that liked the aspiration implicit in it.

The Dean asked the assembly whether discussion on the next item, "Professional Stewardship," should be suspended at this point so we could continue with the agenda. The assembly agreed. She thanked the assembly for the excellent comments.

IX. New Business

There was no new business.

X. Announcements

Dr. Pullano announced that this year all freshmen must have mid-semester grades; he reminded us that there are freshmen in all classes. Mid-semester grading opens Monday, Sept 30 and closes Sunday, Oct. 6. Under any other announcements, Dr. Disney announced that Dr. Lipscomb had been elected Chair of the Committee of University Priorities and she had been elected Chair of the Committee on University Life. Previous members of these committees had asked her to ask the faculty members to participate in the democratic process by informing these committees of their concerns. Dr. Lipscomb would like to be sent emails with concerns and questions (which will remain anonymous), to serve as the voice of the faculty. Dr. Leslie Bickford announced she is the new director of the Office of National Competitive Awards, and made suggestions as to ways in which we can guide students to this Office. The Dean mentioned the Academic Success Center: three quarters of the courses the Center offers tutoring in are Arts and Sciences courses. Kathryn Wilson passed around Academic Success Center cards.

XI. Dean's remarks

The Dean thanked the Assembly for the work done in this meeting and expressed her thanks to Dr. Peter Judge, as well as to departmental and faculty members, who had made her feel very welcome. She then introduced Associate Dean Dr. Beth Costner; Student Services Director Dr. Adria Belk; Administrative Specialist Joan Vandersloot; the new Graduate Assistants; Assistant to the Dean for

Technology Mr. Brian Hipp; Assistant to the Dean Ms. Amanda Hackney; Administrative Coordinator Ms. Kathryn (Kat) Wilson; and the new Work Study Students.

She informed us that there are about 1,080 freshmen this year and that, according to their parents, the reasons for choosing Winthrop were the relationship between faculty and students, class size, and faculty commitment to student success. She asked us to be mindful of freshmen's difficulties.

As to the faculty travel budget, she stressed the need for different types of professional development activities and said that travel authorization deadlines had been devised to ensure fairness, so that there is money available through the year. The deadlines are: September 1 for Fall and early spring; December 15 for Spring and early summer; and March 31 for July-September. If presenting and/or participating in some other significant way, there is a budget of about \$700 available, on the basis of previous years' experience, to be spent on one trip. This amount will vary depending on need. When applicable, faculty members were encouraged to apply for additional travel money from the GLI.

Additional travel will be handled on a case by case basis. For the next meeting she would like to have feedback on the Scholarship Statement clarification as well as on the schedule of annual report feedback from the Dean's office. She would also like to start a conversation on electronic administration of student course evaluations electronic elections.

As to post-tenure review, CAS will have to participate more actively on post-tenure review duties. The Dean's office will be taking care not to overburden people and share post-tenure review duties equally.

The Dean further announced that President Comstock would like to meet with the college members; there would be a tour of the facilities and an assembly.

The Dean's final comments were about her leadership style, her future use of email for routine announcements, and her wish that these assembly meetings be fruitful work sessions.

XII. Adjournment

Dr. Pullano declared the meeting adjourned at 10:53 AM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Clara Paulino