

WINTHROP UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC COUNCIL MINUTES
August 27, 2010

Academic Council met on Friday, August 27 2010 at 2:00 p.m. in 212 Thurmond Hall.

Members:

David Beatty	Visual & Performing Arts
Keith Benson	Business Administration
John Bird	Arts & Sciences
Chad Dresbach	Visual & Performing Arts
Rebecca Evers	Education
Sydney Evans	CSL Student
Matthew Fike	Arts & Sciences
Mark Hamilton	Visual & Performing Arts
Lisa Harris	Education
Kelly James	Arts & Sciences
Will Kiblinger	Arts & Sciences
Hemant Patwardhan*	Business Administration
Dave Pretty, Chair	Arts & Sciences
Frank Pullano	Arts & Sciences
Carol Shields *	Education
Marilyn Smith	Business Administration
Gale Teaster-Woods*	Library
Gina Jones, Secretary	Registrar

* Absent

Guests present: Tom Moore, Tim Drueke, Jack DeRochi, Matt Hayes, and Marsha Bollinger

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m. by Chair Pretty.

I. Minutes

The minutes from the April 2, 2010 were approved.

II. Remarks from the Chair

Dr. Pretty stated he is looking forward to the new year and hopes that the council would rise to any challenge. He requested that the next meeting be changed from September 24 (Tuesday) to October 1 (Friday).

III. Remarks from the VPAA

Dr. Moore thanked the chair and members for serving. He reminded the council that the SACS report goes to the printer on September 1. He indicated that AC may be involved with a focused review in November but was unsure at this time. Dr. Moore mentioned the University Level Competencies (ULC) and asked for discussion.

Dr. Pullano asked if there was any status report on the QEP. Dr. Moore responded that the committee was meeting on Tuesday. SACS Vice President Jackson met with the committee and ALC and thought the QEP was too ambitious. Dr. Moore expects Winthrop to pare it down. Globalizing the Winthrop experience is important, but QEP is only a subset of that. University Level Competencies are intended to simplify some things.

IV. Discussion of University Level Competencies

Dr. DeRochi gave some background information on the University-Level Competencies. He stated it was important to know that these came *from* Winthrop. The goal was to be as inclusive as possible in developing these competencies. He stated that the committee discussed these thoroughly. They did have concerns that sentences would be separated and wanted to ensure that the paragraphs showed what Winthrop can do.

Dr. Benson asked how this fit with Gen Ed. Dr. DeRochi stated that Gen Ed is “aspirational” (7 goals). ULCs were meant to be the pillars which hold up Gen Ed.

Dr. Benson asked if a student was on the committee and Dr. DeRochi said no. Dr. Benson stated that he had brought these before one of his classes for feedback.

Dr. Moore drew a diagram of a multi-tiered cake where the top layers filtered down to the bottom to demonstrate Gen Ed, ULC and the major: Gen Ed/literacy was on the bottom, ULC was the middle layer, and the major was on top.

Mr. Hamilton asked if there had been any conversation about whether we have new strategic goals. He mentioned the associate degree issue at Coastal Carolina.

Dr. Bird commented that the ULC committee had done a good job and urged that we resist altering it; otherwise, it might become a burden.

Dr. Pullano clarified that these ULC’s are for degree programs and not programs like LEAP.

Dr. DeRochi stated that the idea is that we have outcomes that departments already have.

Dr. James asked how these would be implemented in a concrete way.

Dr. Hayes replied that it depends on the program. The goal is not to create additional work. Departments should define these ULCs in a way that makes sense in their courses. This can be streamlined within already-used assessments.

Dr. Bollinger asked that if these are approved, what does it mean for this year? Dr. Moore responded that as programs are assessed, it will be next fall before they are implemented (around Oct. 1).

Dr. Moore encouraged continued discussion among faculty and thanked Dr. Benson for taking it to his students for feedback.

The Executive Summary is provided below:

***University-Wide Academic Assessment Committee (UWAAC) Report
for Vice President of Academic Affairs Moore
July 30, 2010***

Executive Summary

The University-Wide Academic Assessment Committee (UWAAC) is recommending four university-level competencies for approval during the 2010-2011 academic year.

Background

With the approval of the Touchstone Program in 2002, the General Education Assessment Advisory Committee was formed by Vice President Moore in order to review the effectiveness of the program's fulfillment of the General Education goals. Over the last five years, while gathering assessment data, it became apparent that a gap existed between what was expected of students as illustrated by the original seven General Education Goals and the new curriculum as prescribed by the Touchstone Program. Specifically, during the "Recertification" process of 2009-2010, when courses were required to apply for recertification as courses that met General Education Guidelines, it became clear that the courses fulfilled the requirements of the new Touchstone Program but not the original seven General Education Goals. While Winthrop University was recognizing the gap as revealed by its assessment protocol, a shift emerged in the rhetoric used at SACS meetings and workshops: SACS colleagues questioned the assumption that applying the goals only to students in their first two years was an accurate means for measuring learning outcomes for graduates. Instead, they suggested that adding end-of-program assessments for capacities developed throughout the curriculum would yield the most concrete data for analyzing the effectiveness of our programs.

Dr. Moore therefore charged the General Education Assessment Advisory Committee—now renamed the University-Wide Academic Assessment Committee (UWAAC)—to "recommend to the Vice President for Academic Affairs appropriate university-level undergraduate competencies that are clear, assessable, and attainable by Winthrop graduates across degree programs." The committee commenced with developing university-level competencies that are consistent with Winthrop University's Mission Statement.

Summary of Research

UWAAC determined that Winthrop's University-Level Competencies (ULCs) should stem as much as possible from current Winthrop assessment plan templates. The committee therefore reviewed program-level student learning outcomes (SLOs) for *all* programs across Winthrop University. Although there were discipline-specific goals and outcomes for each program, it was apparent during this review that four consistent themes emerged across the university. Most programs developed certain goals that revolved around four essential categories: a) critical thinking and problem solving, b) appreciation of multiple perspectives, c) the discipline's interconnectedness with the broader community, and d) communication and expression. All programs had a SLO coded in at least one of the categories.

In addition to this internal research, UWAAC conducted extensive secondary research and examined ULCs of accrediting agencies and peer institutions, documents reporting the history and methods of assessment (including the Association of American Colleges and Universities' *Liberal Education and America's Promise* vision), data regarding incoming student expectations, and surveys of employer interests and expectations. The information uncovered in this secondary research confirmed the scope and direction of UWAAC's original four categories for university-level competencies.

Recommendation for Winthrop ULCs

Taking into consideration the above research, UWAAC recommends Winthrop University faculty approve the following ULCs (full report includes strategy/assessment examples):

Competency 1: Winthrop graduates think critically and solve problems.

Winthrop University graduates reason logically, evaluate and use evidence, and solve problems. They seek out and assess relevant information from multiple viewpoints to form well-reasoned conclusions. Winthrop graduates consider the full context and consequences of their decisions and continually reexamine their own critical thinking process, including the strengths and weaknesses of their arguments.

Competency 2: Winthrop graduates are personally and socially responsible.

Winthrop University graduates value integrity, perceive moral dimensions, and achieve excellence in their work. They take seriously the perspectives of others, practice ethical reasoning, and reflect

on experiences. Winthrop graduates hold a sense of responsibility to the broader community and contribute to the greater good.

Competency 3: Winthrop graduates understand the interconnected nature of the world and the time in which they live.

Winthrop University graduates comprehend the historical, social, and global contexts of their disciplines and their lives. They also recognize how their chosen area of study is inextricably linked to other fields. Winthrop graduates collaborate with members of diverse academic, professional, and cultural communities as informed and engaged citizens.

Competency 4: Winthrop graduates communicate effectively.

Winthrop University graduates communicate in a manner appropriate to the subject, occasion, and audience. They create texts – including but not limited to written, oral, and visual presentations – that convey content effectively. Mindful of their voice and the impact of their communication, Winthrop graduates successfully express and exchange ideas.

Future Considerations

The development of Winthrop University's ULCs is the first step in a larger process to meet two main goals. First, the development and university-wide assessment of ULCs allows Winthrop University to evaluate student progress toward developing "the ability to communicate effectively, appreciate diversity, work collaboratively, synthesize knowledge, solve complex problems and adapt to change" (*Winthrop University Undergraduate Catalog*, p. 1) and to document that progress to stakeholders (such as faculty, students, legislature, and SACS). Second, establishing a system for ongoing assessment of ULCs provides a structure to improve student learning across all programs of study.

In order for ULCs to become an effective tool for measuring institutional academic success and for improving undergraduate education, Winthrop University must build upon existing successful assessment strategies and implement new ones where needed. *Successful assessment improves student learning and demonstrates institutional effectiveness (or highlights areas for improvement)*. Such assessment of Winthrop's ULCs will require broad-based support and involvement from faculty in and out of the classroom. Finally, significant resources will be required to incorporate and assess ULCs successfully across all academic programs, including but not limited to support for faculty assessment leaders and support for the development and maintenance of new assessment processes.

V. Unfinished Business—none

VI. New Business

Mr. Drueke provided reference material for the new curriculum process. He referred to himself as the "curriculum sheriff." He will be creating a Web page that will help with tracking curriculum. He asked that if members hear of program changes to refer chairs to him so that he can notify the proper body (CHE, SACS).

Dr. Kiblinger asked what was considered a program change. Mr. Drueke replied that it was *anything* that affects a program. He will monitor the Curriculum Action System as much as possible to try to catch any issues with program changes.

Regarding the designator add/change/drop being ended at the College Assembly level, Dr. Pullano expressed that a department could get around the 36-hour rule. Mr. Drueke reminded the members that the faculty approved this as is and that the registrar had to approve the designator.

Dr. Pretty encouraged everyone to read emails regarding curriculum in order to stay on top of these issues. Faculty Conference can always be asked to pass something different.

The curriculum reference material is provided below:

The New Curriculum Process: Levels of Review

Undergraduate Curriculum Actions that **end** at the College Assembly level unless review is requested:

- Rename course
- Change course description**
- Add, change, or drop a designator

Graduate Curriculum Actions that **end** at the College Graduate Assembly level unless review is requested:

- Rename or change course description
- Add, drop, or change a prerequisite
- Change the credit hours of an existing course
- Add, drop, or renumber a course
- Add, change, or drop a designator

Undergraduate Curriculum Actions that go to the General Education Curriculum Committee for approval:

- Add or drop a course in the Touchstone General Education program
- **If change of course description suggests that revised course needs review to assure it still meets GNED criteria (e.g.: a science course changes from a physical science to an earth science or a writing component is substantially altered)

Actions approved by the GECC are reported to CUC; CUC reports them out for information so that members of Faculty Conference have the opportunity to call for review.

Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Actions that go to the Teacher Education Committee for approval:

- Add, drop or change a pre-requisite for courses **required** in a teacher education degree track/concentration or program (reported to CUC so that CUC can report them out and members of Faculty Conference have the opportunity to call for review).
- Change graduation requirements in a teacher education degree track or program (no change in overall # of hours)
- Change # of hours needed to complete a teacher education degree program (or track/concentration in such a program)
- Add or drop a teacher education degree program (or track/concentration in such a program)

Undergraduate Curriculum Actions that **end** at the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum unless review is requested:

- Add, drop or change a pre-requisite
- Change credit hours for an existing course
- Add, drop or renumber a course
- Add or change requirements for a minor

Undergraduate Curriculum Actions that **end** at Academic Council unless review is requested:

- Add or drop a minor
- Change graduation requirements in a major or track/concentration in a major (no change in overall # of hours)

Graduate Curriculum Actions that **end** at Graduate Council unless review is requested:

- Changing graduation requirements in a degree program (or track/concentration in a degree program) with no change in overall number of hours

Undergraduate Curriculum Actions that require the approval of Faculty Conference:

- Changes in the number of hours needed to complete an existing degree program (or track or concentration in an existing degree program)
- Adding or dropping a degree program or track/concentration within a degree program

Graduate Curriculum Actions that require the approval of Graduate Council:

- Changing the number of hours required to complete a degree program or track/concentration within a degree program
- Adding or dropping a degree program or track/concentration within a degree program

VII. Announcements

Dr. Moore spoke about SACS and faculty credentialing.

VIII. Adjournment

Dr. Pretty adjourned the meeting at 3:05 p.m.

The next meeting will be on October 1 in McFeat Conference Room B.