

**Academic Council Minutes
10/3/2014**

Abbigail Armstrong	Education
Adolphus Belk	Arts and Sciences
Judy Brit	Education
Janice Chism, Chair	Arts and Sciences
Ian Deas*	CSL Student Representative
Tomoko Deguchi	Visual & Performing Arts
Marguerite Doman	Business Administration
Laura Glasscock	Arts and Sciences
Lisa Harris*	Education
Trent Kull	Arts and Sciences
Stephanie Lawson	Business Administration
David Meeler	Arts and Sciences
Marge Moody	Visual & Performing Arts
Ron Parks	Visual & Performing Arts
Dave Pretty	Arts and Sciences
Spiro Shetuni	Dacus Library
Will Thacker	Business Administration
Ginger Williams	Arts and Sciences
Gina Jones, Secretary	Registrar

*absent

Guests: Jarvis Jackson, Tim Drueke, Jo Koster, Adria Belk, Andrew Vorder Bruegge, and Daniel Gordon

Dr. Chism called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m. and welcomed everyone.

I. Approval of the Minutes for the Meeting of 29 August, 2014 – approved via email

II. Remarks from the Chair

Janice Chism

Dr. Chism met with Dr. Boyd last week to talk about initiatives of Academic Council, including the appraisal of Gen Ed core courses. She stated that we'll talk more when Dr. Boyd can be here.

III. Comments from Acting President and Provost

Debra Boyd

Dr. Boyd could not be here due to the Board of Trustees meeting. Mr. Drueke spoke in her place. He stated that the BOT was using a new consultant for the presidential search. He asked everyone to take some time out to help with presidential search meeting next week. The salary study will be undertaken and was on the agenda for the BOT. There are new committees within the BOT and there is faculty representation.

Janice commented that John Bird wanted to be here but he was at the BOT meeting also.

IV. Committee Reports

A. CUC

Will Thacker

Dr. Thacker presented one degree program modification BS-NUTR. It was unanimously approved.

Program Change Items (Degree) recommended and forwarded to Academic Council for action:

Degree	Major	Conc.	Department	Action
BS	NUTR	DIET	Human Nutrition	<p>MODIFY PROGRAM: Reduce number of hour range required for degree from 124-130 to 120-123; Change General Education requirements to New General Education requirements (See Attached Template); Add NUTR 221, 494 and MATH 141 to list of required courses in major; Remove NUTR 490C, CHEM 301 and ACCT 280 from list of required courses; Remove PSYC 206 as an individual course requirement; Add PSYC 206, SOCL 300 as acceptable courses in "Select 6 hours from" area of the major</p> <p>*Approval was granted with the following modifications to the requested program:</p> <p><i>Oral Communication: Range changed from 0-3 to 3</i> <i>Technology Requirement: Change range from 0-3 to 3</i> <i>Quantitative Methods: Remove list of courses and replace with "See Approved List</i> <i>Major Requirements: Reduce total number of credits from 73 to 70</i> <i>Total Hours: Change credit range from 120-123 to 120</i></p>

Academic Council unanimously approved this modification.

Program Change Items (Minor) recommended and forwarded to Academic Council for action:

Minor	Title	Department	Action
PHOT	Photography	Fine Arts	NEW PROGRAM

Academic Council unanimously approved this new minor.

Program Change Items (Minor) recommended and forwarded to Academic Council for action:

Minor	Title	Department	Action
MUSC	Music	Music	MODIFY PROGRAM: Reduce number of required credits from 23 to 20; Remove 3 semester hours of music courses numbered above 299 requirement
SWEL	Social Welfare	Social Work	MODIFY PROGRAM: Require minimum grade of C- in all required courses

Academic Council unanimously approved these modifications.

Course Action Items approved at CUC Level but require no further action:

Subject	Course	Title	Department	Action
ENGL	431	Academic Internship in English	English	MODIFY COURSE: Change Prerequisite from "12 hours of ENGL (including English 300) and/or WRIT courses beyond WRIT 102 and a 2.5 GPA and permission of the Department Chair." to "12 hours of ENGL (including English 300) and/or WRIT courses above 299 and a 2.5 GPA and permission of the Department Chair."; Add Methods of Evaluation, Change Grade Basis from "Regular" to "SU"; Add Goals for the Course
GEOG	500	Global Sustainable Development	Interdisciplinary Studies	MODIFY COURSE: Change Prerequisite from "GEOG 101. " to "GEOG 101, Sophomore status, or permission of instructor."; Change Catalog Title and Description; Add Goals for the Course; Change Teaching Method from "Lecture, Independent Study" to "Lecture, Recitation/Discussion"; Add Methods of Evaluation
MDST	350	Studies in the Middle Ages	Interdisciplinary Studies	NEW COURSE
SCIE	594	Special Topics in Content and Pedagogy for Science Teachers	Biology	NEW COURSE
SCIE	594L	Special Topics Labs for Science Teachers	Biology	NEW COURSE

Dr. Doman asked about the 1 lecture hour in ENGL 431. Dr. Koster said it should not be there. Ms. Jones will correct in the Curriculum Action System.

B. General Education

Laura Glasscock

Dr. Glasscock stated that the committee had met Oct. 3. There were seven new certifications:

1. CSCI 101 D (Technology)
2. REG 316 (Historical, Humanities and Arts)
3. HIST 502 (Historical)
4. PEAC 550/502 (Historical)
5. ENVS 101 (Social Science)
6. HONR 234H (Social Science)
7. WRITE 368X (Technology)

Academic Council unanimously approved these new certifications.

Mr. Drueke said he's seen a dozen or so over the years. He noted the Honors recognition which is 48 hours with 3.75 gpa.

Dr. Doman asked if the transfer credit was just used for the degree program. Ms. Jones indicated that everything is calculated.

Mr. Drueke talked about the criteria for inclusion. The Winthrop gpa must be at least 3.5. If so, then does the transfer work when averaged in meet the minimum? If yes, then honors are awarded.

Dr. Williams asked how these petitions were handled. Mr. Drueke stated they were all denied.

He mentioned that 3.75 may be a little high, but it's based on fewer hours.

There was a discussion about maturity levels of students—18 year-olds versus older, returning students.

Dr. Glasscock stated that she worries about where we would draw the line at how many years.

Dr. Doman mentioned significant improvement vs. sustained achievement.

Ms. Moody felt that the student who messed up could never make it up. Dr. Lawson said they would still be getting a degree. It's not fair for those who struggled and made the honors.

Dr. Thacker talked about recognition for transfer students, but only Winthrop students couldn't get the recognition. Ms. Jones talked about academic forgiveness [students who return to Winthrop after having been gone for five or more years].

Dr. Belk asked how the student is being harmed by not getting honors. If the student has matured, their prospects for jobs and graduate school are going to still be there--can be woven into their personal statement.

Dr. Chism said it sounded like the policy was fine the way it was. There was no motion for change.

2. Course repeat policy (see attachment 2)

Dr. Pretty expressed interest in wanting to make a motion that we change the number to 12 hours (instead of four courses).

Mr. Drueke explained the policy. The problem comes with .5 and 1 credit-hour courses.

Ms. Jones pointed out that if you go to an hour policy that some students may not ever have the right combinations of courses to get the 12 hours. Dr. Parks said he would have a problem with someone retaking 12 one-hour classes. It might be a perception of inequity.

Dr. Meeler asked why a student wouldn't get to choose which courses to exempt.

Dr. Thacker said ineligibility would come into play. Mr. Jackson said he would like to see four courses or

twelve hours. He said students used to have to ask for the course to be labeled as a repeat and there was a deadline.

Dr. Belk asked to be refreshed about the problem. Mr. Druke said a petitioning student wanted an extra repeat because he had a 1-credit F which did not weigh as heavily as a 3-credit F.

Dr. Chism asked if we should put a group together to work with Ms. Jones on this. Dr. David Meeler, Dr. Dave Pretty, Mr. Jackson, and Dr. Marguerite Doman agreed to serve. Dr. Pretty will chair.

Dr. Thacker pointed out Appalachian State's policy of no repeats.

Dr. Belk said we should look at this for equity, but he would not support a no-repeat policy.

Dr. Deguchi said we may also consider Coastal Carolina's policy (related to academic misconduct). Ms. Jones stated that would have to be a new policy.

VIII. Announcements

Ms. Jones reminded everyone of interim grades.

Dr. Chism adjourned the council at 3:07 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Gina Jones, Secretary

Attachment 1

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 14, 2014

TO: Academic Council c/o Chair Jo Koster
FROM: University Petitions Committee
Kristin Kiblinger (Chair)

RE: policy regarding calculating honors

The University Petitions Committee wishes to call Academic Council's attention to the existing policy regarding how honors eligibility is calculated when students graduate. Currently, *all* past college grades affect the calculation that determines eligibility for honors, no matter how old the grades, and this applies whether the grades were earned at Winthrop or at another institution.

We received multiple petitions related to this issue. The petitions asked that very old grades (e.g., ten or more years old) not affect calculations for honors. There were cases of students who had very poor college grades as teenagers. Later in their lives, when they were more mature, they returned to college and did very well. However, they could not qualify to graduate with honors because of very poor grades from a decade or longer ago. The argument was that such students should be granted forgiveness for grades made long ago in very different circumstances, because those grades no longer reflected the kind of students they are today.

There was disagreement among our committee members about whether it was appropriate to exclude such grades for the purposes of calculating honors eligibility. Some members wondered whether there might be a particular kind of honors (other than cum laude, magna cum laude, and summa cum laude) that might be awarded in such circumstances. There was also some concern about keeping our policy in line with those of peer institutions, discipline-based honor societies, and accrediting bodies. We do not necessarily mean to endorse the need for a policy change, but just wanted to call Academic Council's attention to this matter, so that the policy might be reexamined and either affirmed or revised, given that it has generated multiple petitions.

Attachment 2

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 16, 2014

TO: Academic Council c/o Chair Janice Chism

FROM: University Petitions Committee

Kristin Kiblinger (Former Chair)

(This is unfinished business carrying over; Marge Moody is Chair this year.)

RE: concern about rule regarding repeating courses for grade replacement

In an effort to flag issues that come up as a result of reviewing petitions, the University Petitions Committee wishes to call Academic Council's attention to an issue regarding the grade exemptions rule for repeated courses (which can be found on p. 12 of the 2014-2015 catalog in the Academic Regulations section). The rule says that a student may repeat a course and replace the grade with the more recent grade, that a student may do this up to four times (under certain conditions), and that the grade exemptions will be automatically applied to the first four repeated courses as they are taken. A petition at our July 22, 2014 meeting was a case in which a student had already repeated four one-credit-hour courses and so had exhausted his allowable number of exemptions but asked to have his fourth exemption applied to a three-credit-hour course rather than to one of the one-credit-hour courses.

As a result of discussing this petition, we realized that, as the rule is written, there could arise a scenario in which one student could be exempting as many as sixteen hours (four four-hour courses) while another student is only allowed to exempt four hours (four one-hour courses), a discrepancy which might be perceived as unfair. This made us think about the fact that the limit is defined in terms of courses as opposed to credit hours.

Furthermore, if a student takes his or her fourth and fifth repeated courses in the same semester, the Registrar is already forced to choose which course to use for the fourth and final grade exemption. If the two courses have different original grades and/or different credit hours, there seems to be an assumption that the exemptions should be used to the student's best advantage, which may not otherwise happen when the rule is merely applied automatically to whichever four courses are repeated first.

It is not the place of our committee to recommend a revision of the rule. We were not elected for that task. However, we feel that we should communicate concerns that become apparent in the course of reviewing petitions.