I. Approval of the minutes of the September meeting (Approved via e-mail)

II. Chair’s Remarks (Jo Koster)
Dr. Koster said she would try to be expeditious as there were some folks who have to leave at 3:30. The grading business will take place in a separate meeting in January. She understood this meeting will conflict with Graduate Council. This will be a data-driven discussion.

III. Remarks from the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (Debra Boyd)
Dr. Boyd indicated committees would be looking at policies that may or may not affect student retention. A Gen Ed review core committee has been formed. It will be asking questions such as “Is our Gen Ed creating barriers?” and “What are the issues?” It doesn’t mean we’re getting rid of it (Gen Ed core).

Dr. Boyd announced that the Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS) has been approved at all levels except the full CHE commission, but she expects that it will be approved.

She said there is a group working on another adult degree-completion program: the RN-BSN. Other institutions who have done this have not seen the growth expected. We are re-evaluating our marketing plans to make sure this is the best direction for us. This could be an online program.

Dr. Boyd encouraged the council members to encourage colleagues to discuss ways we can innovate our programs. Are there changes we can make? The audience for programs is changing.

The Board of Trustees is interested in looking at programs at the conceptual as well as the financial level. There will be discussion about profit and loss, understanding that some programs just lose money
(such as athletics). It’s not as simple as how many majors you have, but looking at a complex set of criteria as we examine a variety of programs. She talked about conversion majors (such as PHIL). This is something we do on a semi-annual basis so we should not worry about it.

She mentioned that some of the council members will be serving on some focus groups like employee satisfaction and classification and compensation. Those invitations have not gone out yet.

IV. Remarks from the President of the Council of Student Leaders (CSL): Ximena Perez-Velazco

Ms. Perez-Velazco introduced herself. She indicated that some students this semester have approached her about several issues: study day, wanting it to be extended by one day; courses being offered only in one semester and a student not being able to get a course she needed for graduation; and students wanting a different line of communication to deans. They would like a way to communicate anonymously through the college website.

Dr. Koster mentioned the ombudsman program which is beginning soon. Dr. Lipscomb indicated, however, that this was primarily between faculty and staff. He recommended that students work with a faculty member.

Dr. Doman mentioned that Dean Marlowe’s office would be a good resource for student issues.

Mr. Tselentis indicated that VPA at one time had a grievance committee. Dr. Bellantoni said that it no longer exists. Dr. Burmeister said that it was actually a student advisory committee which met with the dean. She mentioned that CSL should have a faculty member advisor. Ms. Perez-Velazco indicated they do but their role hasn’t been seen that way.

On the flip side, she’s had a student who wanted to express thanks to a professor but didn’t think it was appropriate early in the semester.

Dr. Koster spoke of course rotations—that there are not enough faculty to teach every course every semester.

Ms. Jones spoke to the study day issue. The day was actually added not too long ago (10-15 years). It would be difficult to add another day to the semester. Faculty are already challenged with getting grades in and this would give them even less time.

Ms. Perez-Velazco announced that on November 29, there would be a CSL Town Hall meeting at 7 PM where students will have a chance to express concerns. Residence Life, Campus Police, Financial Aid, and Sodexho will be represented.

V. Report from Standing Committees

A. Committee on University Curriculum (Laura Glasscock)

The following 4 Proposals for Program Change were approved unanimously by Academic Council:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA-ARTS</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Modify program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-ENGL-CSST</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Modify program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA-ARTS</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Modify program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS-NUTR-DIET</td>
<td>Human Nutrition</td>
<td>Modify program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. General Education Committee (Kristin Abernathy)**

1. **Recertifications**

The following courses were approved for recertification in the appropriate categories:

**NATURAL SCIENCE**
- GEOL 210 – Historical Geology
- GEOL 211 - Historical Geology Lab
- GEOL 270 - Dinosaurs
- NUTR 221 – Human Nutrition
- PHYS 211 – Physics with Calculus I
- PHYS 250 – Matter and Energy
- PHYS 253 – Astronomy
- PHYS 256 - Musical Acoustics

**SOCIAL SCIENCE**
- PLSC 201 – American Government
- PLSC 202 – State and Local Government
- PLSC 205 – International Politics
- PLSC 207 – Comparative Politics
- PLSC 260 – Model United Nations

The committee has requested modifications to syllabi for the following courses; these courses have not yet been approved for recertification:

**NATURAL SCIENCE**
- ANTH 315 - Forensic Anthropology

2. **First Certify**

The following courses were approved by Academic Council for inclusion:

**NATURAL SCIENCE**
- Physical:
  - PHYS 201 – General Physics I

**GLOBAL**
- ANTH 301 - Cross-Cultural Perspectives
- ANTH 321 - Cultures of Latin America
- ANTH 322 - Ancient Civilizations of the Americas
- ANTH 324 - Amerindian Warfare and Ritual Violence
- ANTH 326 - Native Peoples and the Environment
SOCIAL SCIENCE
ANTH 301 - Cross-Cultural Perspectives
ANTH 321 - Cultures of Latin America
ANTH 322 - Ancient Civilizations of the Americas
ANTH 324 - Amerindian Warfare and Ritual Violence
ANTH 326 - Native Peoples and the Environment

3. Additional Gen Ed Business (Jo Koster)
Review of HARTH and TECH requirements—appointment of ad hoc subcommittees

a. Humanities and Arts component ad hoc review committee:
   - Alice Burmeister
   - Adam Glover
   - Kristen Wonderlich

b. Technology component ad hoc review committee:
   - Matt Hayes
   - Marguerite Doman
   - Jason Tselentis

Committee charges: Review existing description, talk to GNED and stakeholders, report by April 5 AC meeting.

VI. Old Business
Proposed Modification to Course Attendance Policy—Jo Koster
2018-19 Undergraduate Catalog, p. 8: Class Attendance Policies
The following paragraphs are updated per the discussion that occurred during the AC meeting:

Students are expected to engage academically with classes and should understand that they are responsible for the academic consequences of absence. The student is responsible for all requirements of the course regardless of absences. Instructors are obligated to provide makeup opportunities only for students who are absent with adequate cause such as incapacitating illness, death of an immediate family member, or service as an authorized representative of the university. The instructor will be responsible for judging the adequacy of cause for absence. The student is responsible for providing documentation certifying the legitimacy of the absence to his or her instructor in advance of such absences. In health-related or family emergency cases where advance notice is not possible, documentation should be provided to the instructor no later than the date the student returns to class. If the instructor denies the adequacy of cause, then the student can appeal the denial to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chief Academic Officer, who will judge the adequacy of cause, and if found to be adequate, will require the instructor to provide a make-up opportunity.

The instructor may establish the attendance requirements for the course. The following policy will be in effect unless the instructor specifies otherwise: if a student’s absences in a course total 25 percent or more of the class meetings for the course, the student will receive a grade of N if the student withdraws from the course before the withdrawal deadline; after that date, unless warranted by
documented extenuating circumstances as described in the previous section, a grade of F or U shall be assigned.

For courses that are delivered in face-to-face, hybrid, or online forms, the instructor may establish the attendance and participation requirements for the course. The following policy will be in effect unless the instructor specifies otherwise: students must engage academically with the class at least one time in the first two calendar weeks of the course (academic engagement being defined as physically attending a class where there is an opportunity for direct interaction between the instructor and students; submitting an academic assignment; taking an exam, completing an interactive tutorial, or participating in computer-assisted instruction; participating actively in an assigned study group; participating actively in an online discussion about academic matters; or initiating contact with a faculty member to ask a question about the academic subject studied in the class). Failure to engage academically with a class may affect a student’s financial aid.

Students enrolled in hybrid or online courses are expected to follow the instructor’s stated policies for regularly engaging with class instruction*. The following policy will be in effect unless the instructor specifies otherwise: Students who fail to submit 25% of the assigned graded work in such a class will receive a grade of N if the student withdraws from the course before the withdrawal deadline; after that date, unless warranted by documented extenuating circumstances such as those described above, a grade of F or U shall be assigned.

Dr. Disney thought to make it equitable for face-to-face classes, to change second sentence to end of second calendar week.

Dr. Whitney expressed concern about determining the adequacy of the cause for absence. He wondered about the legality, especially in cases of disability accommodations and HIPAA rules. Dr. Koster said she will discuss it with Tim Drueke, the Office of Accessibility, and Dr. Boyd, and report back. We may need to consult with the university Counsel.

Michelle Hare questioned having a policy for online/hybrid that wasn’t comparable to seat classes. Dr. Disney asked how to create a policy that addresses both.

Ms. Hare asked, “What problem are we trying to solve? What behavior are we trying to change? Will this policy solve the problem?”

The language was intended to give us a consistent definition. For seat classes, it’s easy to know. With online, we have no idea where they are.

Ms. Perez-Velazco mentioned that some online classes don’t have deadlines, that instructors just gave assignments and tell student to do them by the end of the semester. So if the student procrastinates, are they going to meet the definition? Ms. Hare said that this instructor would not be able to state the student had begun the class.

Dr. Koster asked if we should take out the first sentence. Dr. McLaine suggested that we say “all courses, whether online, hybrid, or seat-based.”

Dr. Disney spoke to regarding problem we’re trying to solve: are we helping faculty or students? We definitely want to be able for faculty to answer the Financial Aid attendance question. Some courses are self-paced, but we still need students to do something academic within the first two weeks of class.
Dr. Koster advocated for removing the first sentence as it would cover the academic policy part of it. We should focus on being able to give FA the information they need.

Dr. Whetstone questioned what would be the penalty for a student who did not do as the policy required. Dr. Koster asked if we should put “for financial aid purposes.” Ms. Hare said it can’t be just for FA, but we could note that FA may be affected.

Ms. Jones suggested that we tweak the first sentence of the attendance policy in the catalog to add “engage academically” rather than just “attend” (to accommodate online/hybrid). Dr. Koster wondered if moving that list up may be better if we move it down.

Dr. Abernathy asked about the 25% rule.

Dr. Koster Jo said since we are reworking these, we should take this to another meeting.

Dr. Disney agreed and said she was concerned about the 25% rule, too.

VII. New Business

A. Modifications to the Cultural Events Policy—Mike Lipscomb

Clarifications and Tweaks to the Cultural Events Policy

1. Students are encouraged to earn some cultural event credit through events in which they are not participating. Students may not earn more than one-half of the total required cultural event credit through a single event (e.g. trip abroad, conference). It should be noted, and strongly emphasized, that failure to attain the approval of the Cultural Events Committee does not reflect upon the quality or the validity of any event, nor the committee’s support for the program being presented, only its relevance to the specific goals of the cultural events requirement. Should be under (Guidelines for Attendance and Credit). Cultural Events Committee will go back to the Theatre and Dance department since their students seem to be the most affected and bring forward specific revised language to a future meeting.

2. We have an appeals process that currently allows students to appeal decisions about CE credit. The appeal goes to Tim Drueke. The committee approves of this process, but it needs to be made explicit in the process (“the Chief Academic Officer or her/his designee”). Academic Council agreed that this should be stated explicitly.

3. Submitting a Cultural Event Petition for Military Service. What should the petition consist of? Should there be a limit on the number of credits that can be awarded for this type of petition? Dr. Lipscomb indicated that Michael Szeman had clarified this on the webpage.

4. Is it okay for the Cultural Events Coordinator to approve events listed on the suggested off-campus list in absence of the committee? (The current practice is that this is allowable, but we want to affirm that this is acceptable to AC) AC approved this.

5. Add a statement concerning students receiving credit for performing in on-campus events and the process for awarding this credit. The committee believes that performers should receive one credit
for such a performance, and that there should be limit on the number of credits for performance that can count towards a student’s overall CE requirement (Guideline for Attendance and Credit) count towards a student’s overall CE requirement (Guideline for Attendance and Credit) The Cultural Events Committee will go back to the Theatre and Dance department since their students seem to be the most affected and bring forward revised language to a future meeting.

6. Time limit on applications for CE credit for travel experience (2 year cut-off). The committee has been following this published guideline; we are simply seeking an affirmation that this remains the agreed upon rule – the committee believes that this should be the rule, but some in the Registrar’s Office have asserted that is merely meant as a suggestive guideline, since there is no comparable deadline placed on academic credit). AC voted to strike the 2 year rule.

7. Add a statement that if the 4 to 6 week deadline prior to the event is missed that consideration of the event by the CE committee cannot be guaranteed and that monitors cannot be promised (currently located on the Sponsor a Cultural Events web page). AC agreed to the editorial change including language about monitors.

8. Add a statement that proposed events must be, in some defendable fashion, aimed at Winthrop students. AC decided that this language wasn’t necessary and that we would trust to the discretion of the Cultural Events committee in approving events.

Discussion:
#1. Students getting credit for performing: There is a concern that students could get all their CEs from performances.

Dr. Wonderlich stated that music students do not get credit for their performances. Music students have to attend 70 recital events.

Ms. Vinson said it was mostly Theatre students for which CE was being given.

Dr. Burmeister said that THTR/DANT students are a little different. Some are doing tech things and then sitting in the audience.

Ms. Vinson mentioned that students don’t get multiple credit for the same performance (multiple performances).

Dr. Boyd clarified about not getting more than half of CE from your performances.

Dr. Bellantoni said there weren’t enough performances in a year for a student to get that many.

Ms. Perez-Velazco asked if the students who are participating in the CE were also getting academic credit. Dr. Bellantoni said it would be the same as another professor requiring attendance at an event for class. He suggested that Dan Gordon, chair of THDN, be consulted.

#6--Dr. Wonderlich asked about the 2-year timeline for travel. For military, we do not put that time limit on it. Dr. Lipscomb indicated this presents a barrier for post-traditional students. Dr. Koster mentioned that there is no time limit for UG transfer credit, so putting it on CE credit would not be equivalent.
Dr. Koster asked Dr. Lipscomb which items we need to vote on.

Dr. Doman asked about how the students get credit for off-campus events. Ms. Vinson explained that process.

Dr. Wonderlich suggested that we do a better job of conveying this to our students.

Regarding the 2-year cut-off rule: Dr. Lipscomb asked if this should continue to be a guideline.

Ms. Perez-Velazco asked about it being 4-years—while students are enrolled.

Dr. Koster recommended striking the limit. All were in agreement.

Dr. Lipscomb has been sending email reminders about the 4-6 week deadline. (#7) He said this guideline has been able to clean up the process. This has been helpful especially in terms of getting a monitor.

#8—Dr. Lipscomb mentioned that an event was geared at parents and the committee questioned it. The Council determined that the committee should be trusted with that decision but the statement should not be added.

**B. Statement on Appropriate Behavior at Cultural Events (see below)**

The Cultural Event Committee is requesting that statement is added to be read at the beginning of each cultural event about expected behavior and the consequences of misbehavior (see below)

**Proposed Statement about Appropriate Behavior at Cultural Events**

Gloria Jones and Michael Lipscomb, in collaboration with the Cultural Events Committee and student leadership, crafted the following statement to be read before all cultural events:

> At Winthrop, we seek to cultivate a sense of responsibility grounded in our respect for one another, as both students and members of our larger communities. To that end, we ask all audience members to show their respect to the performers, presenters, and fellow audience members at this event by avoiding disruptive behavior, including the use of cell phones, personal electronic devices during the performance, presentation, or discussion portions of this event. Any audience member unwilling to follow these expectations may be asked to leave the event. Students asked to leave an event and will not receive Cultural Event Credit for attending the event.

*Stronger alternative last sentence:* Any audience member who is observed not following these expectations will be asked to leave the event and will not receive Cultural Event Credit for attending the event.

> The Cultural Events Committee prefers the stronger alternative last sentence.

Student leadership expressed some concern about enforcing an audience member’s removal from an event given that such an effort might create a scene. They suggested that perhaps the punitive focus
should be on audience members not receiving CE credit. Perhaps the idea of the statement is to suggest a potential punishment and to be judicious about actually enforcing an audience member’s removal.

Student leadership suggested that how to handle disciplinary problems become part of the training for monitors and, at CVPA events, stage managers. It was noted that language reminding Faculty/Staff sponsors of their duties in maintaining proper audience decorum is already part of the approval notification sent to sponsors.

Student leadership suggested that the statement above be put on playbills of CVPA performances and on the CE calendar. They also suggested that it be sent to athletic coaches and the heads of various student councils.

Ms. Jones recommended that monitors not be a part of the disciplinary process. Dr. Wonderlich agreed.

Dr. Disney recommends the “softer” of the statements.

Ms. Perez-Velazco said her biggest fear is not getting credit after being at an event for two hours. Also, someone else on their cellphone could get credit and she wouldn’t. The punishment of not getting credit could be the biggest deterrent.

Dr. Costner spoke to the use of “May be asked to leave” rather than “Will be asked to leave.” He also wanted to ensure this was going to be read aloud. Also mentioned that “audience” member is not just a student. Who will ask a person to leave?

Dr. Lipscomb said that sponsors are told that this would be part of their duties.

Dr. Garrison recommended “observed behavior”.

Dr. Costner recommended removing the first sentence which is to be read.

Dr. Boyd said the first sentence is important in keeping the philosophic frame.

Dr. Whitney wondered if the student be told at the end of the event they don’t get credit.

Dr. Disney had concerns about this.

Dr. Lipscomb said the use of the word “May” allows a sponsor to make the decision.

Dr. Wonderlich urged that we should train students about behavior.

Dr. Hayes asked if this is a policy or information. He wondered if the person knows they’re being disruptive.

Dr. Wonderlich stated that at music events they are told that it’s disruptive but still sees a bunch of blue screens.

Dr. Boyd indicated that people answer cell phones in the middle of an event.

Dr. Wonderlich suggested a Cultural Event 101 for new students.
It was determined that the whole statement would be the printed version and underlined portions would be the parts that are to be read aloud.

Dr. Disney supported the statement as amended.

Other council members agreed.

B. **Automatic Drop Policy proposal—Gina Jones, Jennifer Disney**

Dr. Koster indicated that some institutions have an auto-drop policy for students who don’t show up.

Dr. Disney said this came to us a query, especially for online courses. She met with Michelle Hare in Financial Aid. Winthrop’s Pell grant population is too large to establish this policy. They explored idea of earned/unearned F (some schools have this). Earned=did the work, just failed. Unearned=for non-attendance or non-participating.

Dr. Koster asked the Registrar’s opinion on this. Ms. Jones replied that she thought this could be easily adopted.

Dr. Koster said we don’t know why students are not attending, so a drop may not be appropriate. A drop could also affect athletic eligibility for both students and teams.

Dr. Garrison asked what would be the difference between the two grades. Ms. Jones replied that there would be none. They would impact the GPA the same way.

Dr. Disney talked about the D, F, U rate and asked if this was because of the faculty performance or student engagement? The two grades could be used for assessment.

Dr. Garrison talked about a student who attended for a couple of weeks and determined the course was not for him, but wouldn’t drop because he needed to be full-time.

Dr. Hayes questioned the definition of earned/unearned and suggested record keeping would be counter-productive.

Ms. Hare read the Federal FA definition of the earned/unearned F. Ms. Hare said that Financial Aid is only concerned with the unearned F.

Dr. Koster asked how this would affect a transcript.

Ms. Jones responded that we would have a legend to define the grade but the impact would be the same.

Dr. Koster asked if Dr. Disney wanted to make a motion. She indicated she and the Registrar would talk more and do some further investigation.
VIII. Announcements/ Adjournment
Dr. Koster announced that next meeting would be January 18, at 2 PM, in the Polly Ford Conference Room, to discuss concerns from the Grade Group regarding plus/minus grading.

The next regularly-scheduled meeting will be Friday, February 8, in MacFeat Conference Room B at 2 PM.

Dr. Koster adjourned the meeting at 4:16 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gina Jones, Secretary