

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
FACULTY ASSEMBLY
MINUTES
August 30, 2013**

2:00 p.m.

Kinard Auditorium

I. Approval of minutes of August 15, 2012

Arts and Sciences Faculty Assembly Frank Pullano, Chair
Meeting was called to order at 2:02 pm, and it proceeded with a quorum. The minutes of the August 15, 2013 meeting were approved with a few small corrections.

II. Report from CAS Committees

1. Nominating and Rules Committee Jeannie Haubert

Ballots were distributed at the meeting for the following positions (voting allowed through noon the following business day):

Nominations for Curriculum Committee: select one from Gwen Daley (GEOL), Kelly Richardson (ENGL), and Liz Evans (WLAC).

Nominations for Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: select one from Wendy Campbell (SCWK) and William Schulte (MCOM).

2. Curriculum Committee Jeff Sinn

Dr. Jeff Sinn presented a report from the Curriculum Committee. The following changes were approved:

- i. *New officers:* Chair Jeff Sinn (PSYC), and Secretary Greg Oakes (PHIL)
- ii. *Blanket petition from Biology department approved.* (Allow BIOL 551, 552A, and 552B to be options to partially fulfill Area A requirement in biology curriculum. These courses were already approved for the 2013-14 catalog, so this petition makes them an option for all previous catalogs.)
- iii. *Three student petitions were approved.*

III. Unfinished Business

1. Revisions to CAS Scholarship Statement.

Dr. Frank Pullano explained that the assembly would vote on the revisions separately, with only a few minutes of discussion on each motion. All five motions passed (please see Appendix I for details).

- i. Clarification on role of Research with Students
- ii. Clarification on Placement of Presentations (move to Priority II)

- iii. Remove bullet on co-authored Presentations from Priority II
- iv. Modify Presentations in Priority III in reference to co-authorship
- v. Modify statement describing expectations for promotion or appoint to rank of Professor in the Scholarly Activity section

IV. New Business

1. Revisions to CAS Professional Stewardship Statement [Appendix II below]

Initial discussion began with Dr. Beth Costner’s explanation of the rationale behind the changes. Some faculty members expressed concern about the definition of the phrase “minority of cases,” but several examples were provided to illustrate the purpose of that statement, including Dr. Frank Pullano’s work with the LEAP program. Then, conversation shifted to the part of the statement that suggests individuals who fall into this minority “should have previously discussed” this with their chair and/or dean. The assembly concluded the wording should remain flexible in order to avoid the implication that individuals need approval from the chair/dean. Finally, much discussion focused on the description of Professor in this category with a majority of faculty arguing for the removal of the word “and” from the phrase “University, discipline, and community”; instead, that phrase should read “University, discipline, or community.” Faculty assembly will vote on these changes at the next meeting.

2. Schedule and procedures for Dean’s Comments on Annual Reports [Appendix III below]

Dr. Karen Kedrowski outlined the background for a new plan that will provide feedback from the Dean on personnel reviews. After she and Dr. Beth Costner left the room, faculty discussed the proposed schedule; faculty were almost unanimously in favor of receiving feedback (especially in cases where feedback has not been provided for several years), but they requested clarification about the form that will be filled out by the Associate and Assistant Deans.

V. Announcements

Dr. Dave Pretty announced that the graduate faculty would meet immediately following this meeting.

Dr. Brad Tripp reminded faculty about the upcoming meetings for the General Education committee. Re-certifications for 200-level courses are the committee focus this year, and all forms must be received at least one week prior to the meeting to be included on the agenda. Next meeting is scheduled for November 1.

Dr. Adolphus Belk reiterated the distinction between his email address and Adria Belk’s email address.

VI. Dean’s Remarks Karen Kedrowski

Dr. Karen Kedrowski thanked everyone for the good feedback, and expressed a hope that future meetings will be less arduous. Then, she called attention to the following items:

- The dean's office is short staffed due to the lack of additional hires, so the office is hiring for two positions, College Assessment Coordinator and College Admissions Coordinator.
- Deadlines for travel requests are in effect this year, and faculty are encouraged to remember those dates.
- Because the bookstore now sells ebooks and kindle books, the college needs to rethink the policy regarding handheld technology. An ad-hoc committee will be created to lead this discussion, and one suggestion was to introduce "a gadget day" that will allow students to complete electronic evaluations.
- Dr. Marsha Bollinger will spearhead a committee about ways to better evaluate part-time faculty or those with split positions.
- The college has decided to bring back the scholarship celebration by merging it with homecoming events on November 9, 2013.
- Employees will soon be asked to complete mandatory training regarding our responsibility to victims of sexual abuse. All employees must complete the HR training, and chairs have agreed that this training is part of everyone's academic responsibility for the year.

VII. Adjournment: 4 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah Spring (for Clara Paulino)

Appendix I (08/30/13)

B. Scholarly Activity

Scholarly Activity is an essential part of University life and development and encompasses the many pursuits that broaden and expand the learning communities in which faculty function and the University is situated. Typically these activities are related to the faculty member's discipline but may include significant work that prompts the intellectual advancement of others in areas related to the faculty member's University appointment.

The evaluation of scholarly endeavors is greatly influenced by the disciplinary focus of the faculty member and regulations for evaluation established by accrediting agencies; however, the evaluation of scholarship must be flexible enough to recognize unique contributions that arise as faculty engage in discovery, integration, and application. Using Boyer's (1990) categories of scholarship presented in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, academic unit priority systems must recognize a variety of avenues for scholarly engagement. The scholarship of *discovery* encompasses those activities that have been traditionally considered scholarship and focuses on creation of knowledge or products. The scholarship of *integration* focuses more on activities that help non-specialists make connections to a discipline or on explorations that examine information in a new way. The scholarship of *application* differs from the focus on research and synthesis crucial to the first two forms of scholarship. Here the scholar uses knowledge to solve specific problems. The scholarship of *teaching* focuses on the work of scholars as they affect and change the students with whom they engage. This form of scholarship is seen when the faculty and students are pushed to explore and think in new ways, thus expanding what is known about the discipline, its connections, and related problems.

By using a broader lens through which to examine and evaluate scholarly engagement, we are encouraging an environment in which Winthrop faculty can actively affect the communities in which they directly engage. Therefore, unit level systems should recognize the importance of both theoretical study and the application of theory to solve problems in a variety of settings.

When submitting work to be considered in the category of *Scholarly Activity*, the faculty member should provide validation (internal or external) of the work's merit. Although the University Faculty Roles document does not include priority guidelines for scholarly work, provided examples are intended to show a range of scholarly activities. The academic unit priority guidelines will situate such engagement within the disciplines and will be used to evaluate merit. In this category of evaluation, faculty members should only include scholarly activities associated with their roles as Winthrop faculty members.

Examples of *Scholarly Activity* may include but are not limited to:

- Academic presentations (e.g., academic conferences, professional conferences, on-campus colloquia)
- Academic publications (e.g., academic journals, conference proceedings, scholarly books, textbooks)
- Application of scholarship that results in documented change (e.g., collaboration with local schools, work with community organizations in problem solving, new professional certifications resulting from significant exploration, design of assessment systems/reports that require synthesis of expertise and exploration of data)
- Creation of scholarly materials or models (e.g., significant study that leads to change in University processes, policies, or widely-used materials)
- Creative endeavors, performances, and literary or artistic works
- Grant development and awards

- *Significant study to expand areas of scholarly expertise promoting cross-disciplinary experiences and/or student research*
- *Invitational or juried exhibitions*
- *Patent applications*

College of Arts and Sciences' Statement on Scholarly Activity

The College of Arts and Sciences endorses the university definition of Scholarly Activity. In addition, the College recognizes the diverse ways faculty members engage in scholarly activity and that these activities often overlap or bridge the divisions between student intellectual development, scholarship, and professional stewardship.

Regardless of its diversity, however, scholarship:

- 1) Is intellectually rigorous,
- 2) Extends the frontiers of knowledge/creative expression,
- 3) Can be documented, and
- 4) Is validated by and shared with other professionals.

Scholarly activities that count toward tenure and promotion involve these four primary qualities.

In terms of the first two qualities, scholarly activity is defined as serious inquiry, examination, or experimentation aimed at the discovery and interpretation of knowledge, revision of accepted theories or laws in the light of new knowledge, or practical application of theories or laws. Scholarship involving creative activities may be defined as the act of bringing into existence *ex nihilo*, as in composing a poem or play. The final two qualities involve the distribution of knowledge through a variety of modes: scholarly publications, electronic media, patents, developing new clinical techniques, public performance, grant production, and the reporting of findings.

These discovery and interpretive activities extend one's disciplinary expertise, generate new knowledge, have tangible results, and contribute substantively to one's discipline or the larger academic community.

Applied activities, which often overlap with professional service and teaching, are distinguished from civic and institutional citizenship by their scholarly rigor. They represent the best in professional practice and draw on the faculty member's professional knowledge. They may take form in a variety of internal and external activities in which one brings his/her expertise to bear on problems and tasks and, thereby, benefits the campus or professional community and/or the common good. In many disciplines, applied scholarship is an essential if not primary contributor to the field's knowledge base. Examples include conducting clinical intervention studies, program management, developing grant proposals, providing technical assistance, shaping public policy, editing journals, consulting, and writing or performing for the media.

Teaching is especially valued as a scholarly enterprise at Winthrop. Teacher-scholars acquire and generate knowledge by ongoing study of new material in their fields and in reflective practice. They apply or disseminate knowledge by integrating it into their pedagogy; developing new programs and courses; formulating, publishing, or presenting reports of new teaching techniques; and participating in programs with the schools, in assessment programs, and in programs that educate the public.

As a guide for faculty pursuing tenure, promotion and post-tenure review, the following list prioritizes some scholarly activities based on the degree to which they embody the above mentioned four primary qualities: rigor, knowledge contribution, and the degree of review or validation by disciplinary peers or other professionals. Candidates for promotion and tenure bear the burden of proof for demonstrating the scholarly nature of their work and substantiating its priority ranking. When forwarding a candidate's

dossier, departments will include an evaluation of the scholar's work and assign those activities to the appropriate priority area.

Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences are encouraged to collaborate with students in research and other scholarly activity. Faculty mentoring of student research and other scholarly activity is Student Intellectual Development. When the mentoring relationship leads to a product, this product can be categorized as Scholarly Activity as defined below.

The general guidelines on the priority level of a scholarly product should be followed in any case of co-authorship, whether with students or other professional colleagues. In all cases of co-authorship, the faculty member should clearly delineate the role s/he played in generating scholarly products.

The following list is to aid faculty in communicating their scholarly identity by codifying, according to priority, scholarly and creative activity within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Priority One Scholarship *illustrates novel ideas, demonstrates mastery of skill, or refinement of current knowledge, highest public/private validation or judgment of work. Examples of such scholarship would be:*

- Publications in any mode of original or innovative work, that is refereed or judged by other professionals - including those related to teaching, interdisciplinary work and service: for example, books, book chapters, textbooks or teaching materials from original research and discovery, monographs, articles, poems, or plays.
- Applied forms of scholarship: for example, consultations, translations, and development of patents or new testing methodologies which lead to innovative processes or products or advance scholarly fields.
- Editorship of a major publication.
- Grants funded by extramural agencies or foundations.

Priority Two Scholarship *integrates existing ideas, utilizes discipline-specific skills, often products of the refinement process, less stringent public/private validation or judgment of work. Examples of such scholarship would be:*

- Publications in any mode of scholarly information: for example, book reviews or other materials, bibliographies, abstracts of materials published by others, encyclopedia contributions, technical manuals, and websites and textbooks that integrate existing knowledge in new ways.
- Applied forms of scholarship including in rare cases professional stewardship which contribute to one's discipline or community: for example, serving on an editorial board or as a public policy analyst; producing research reports for agencies, disciplinary groups, businesses and industry.
- **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.**
- Grants developed and submitted to seek extramural funding.

Priority Three Scholarship *uses discipline skills in myriad productive ways without the kinds of professional assessment that characterize higher priority scholarship. Examples of such scholarship would be:*

- Publications in popular and non-academic sources, including newsletters and magazines directed to general and specialized audiences.

- **Publications or presentations in contexts outside of the classroom where students are the primary audience and that include an opportunity for scholarly exchange.**
- Applied forms of scholarship in which one serves other scholars and professionals or contributes to the good of the community: for example, reviewing research proposals, papers and accreditation or certification applications for an external group; constructing and developing web sites that provide a forum for the exchange of scholarly ideas, research problems or pedagogical materials; developing and organizing scholarly conferences; and serving on the boards of professional organizations.
- Presentations, talks, and activities for the general public, which draw upon one's scholarly expertise.
- Direction or supervision of student master's theses, undergraduate honors theses, or substantial research and creative projects.
- Projects or experiences that require an extended time commitment and significantly broaden one's pedagogical or professional expertise such as faculty exchange programs, Fulbright studies, workshops and colloquia.
- Funded intramural grants.

Because faculty are asked to articulate a scholarly identity when applying for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review, faculty should demonstrate how their work among the priority categories contributes to an overall professional identity. Building upon the four previously identified qualities of scholarly activity (see above on p. 5: intellectual rigor; extension of the frontiers of knowledge or creative expression; documentation; and validation by and shared with other professionals): faculty need to display intellectual/creativity curiosity, illustrate mastery of necessary skill sets related to their discipline (qualitative, quantitative, artistic), present outcomes to peers and/or external audiences, and demonstrate efforts to make one's work better oriented towards maximizing academic/public utility. Expectations vary by level of appointment.

Tenure:

The candidate must have established an active research identity, while demonstrating the four primary qualities of scholarly activity.

Associate Professor:

The candidate must have established a successful research identity and earned professional recognition in the discipline/profession, while demonstrating the four primary qualities of scholarly activity. The candidate's scholarly activity should be recent and sustained.

Professor:

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.

Appendix II (08/30/13)

C. Professional Stewardship

Professional Stewardship—as it counts toward tenure, promotion, annual evaluations, and merit raises—is “service” that requires faculty members to use their knowledge and experience to enhance the University and/or community. Carol Geary Schneider (1998) asserts that “professional stewardship” captures the significance of activities that are vital to the health and well-being of universities and that require significant faculty time and the application of faculty knowledge or expertise. Activities that illustrate Professional Stewardship require faculty members to be involved in work that goes beyond regular teaching expectations and academic responsibility. Through such opportunities faculty impact circumstances, create opportunities for new knowledge or services, and/or support and enrich the function of existing structures on and off campus.

Professional Stewardship develops with experience at the University and is a vital component of the faculty’s role in the University mission. All faculty, regardless of rank, participate in Professional Stewardship activities that are reflective of their roles, ranks, and expertise. When providing evidence, faculty are encouraged to discuss the level of engagement, how expertise was applied, and/or the impact of activities.

Examples of Professional Stewardship may include but are not limited to:

- Active engagement with a campus student group (e.g., duties of a faculty advisor, participation in the design and delivery of programming, consultation related to discipline)
- Active membership on community committees, task forces, or similar groups
- Application of faculty knowledge or expertise to support university initiatives (e.g., student research activities, service learning opportunities, international experiences, support opportunities)
- Facilitation of professional development programs or continuing education programs
- Leadership roles in assessment initiatives that require significant time and expertise
- Leadership roles in international, national, or regional professional organizations
- Management of external grant programs
- Presentations, workshops, or demonstrations to professional, civic, or community organizations not seen as scholarship Program coordination (e.g., degree programs, academic support services)
- Service or leadership on a committee (typically at the college or university level) that has been shown to be complex in nature, require significant engagement, or demand considerable time
- Special assignments within the department, college, or university (e.g., fund raising, development of new programs, grant program evaluation, creation of a policy manual)

In a minority of cases, a faculty member whose job has been redefined by circumstances and who is applying for promotion may show exemplary work in the area of Professional Stewardship as the priority area for promotion. This exemplary work must be sustained, complex, and time consuming; have significant impact on the University or learning community; and receive recognition by peers. Individuals presenting accomplishments in this category as the priority area for promotion should have previously discussed the decision to do so with the department chair and the college dean. In addition,

these faculty must provide evidence of impact for Professional Stewardship activities and engage in Scholarly Activity.

College of Arts and Sciences' Statement on Professional Stewardship

The College of Arts and Sciences endorses the university definition of Professional Stewardship. In addition, the College recognizes the diverse ways faculty members engage in professional stewardship and that these activities often overlap or bridge the divisions between student intellectual development, scholarship, and professional stewardship.

Regardless of the diversity of their efforts, faculty members' work in professional stewardship is based on their professional knowledge and/or disciplinary expertise. The College also sees the following as examples of professional stewardship:

- Administrative leadership at the program, department, college, or university level.
- Mentorship, service, or leadership at the program, department, college, university, or professional level that has been shown to be complex in nature, requires significant engagement, or demands considerable time.
- Special assignments at the program, department, college, or university level (e.g., assessment, accreditation, recruitment, curricular modification, development of new programs, program evaluation, policy formulation, fund raising).

Similar to its perspective on Scholarly Activity, the College recognizes a spectrum of contributions in Professional Stewardship. Committee work traditionally associated with a faculty member's basic responsibilities—categorized as Academic Responsibility in the Faculty Roles at Winthrop document—do contribute to Professional Stewardship but not to the same degree as other more intensive and time-consuming activities. For example, a scholarship committee that meets only once or twice a year is not regarded as the same level of service as the College Personnel Advisory Committee.

In a minority of cases, a faculty member whose job has been redefined by circumstances and who is applying for promotion may show exemplary work in the area of Professional Stewardship as the priority area for promotion. Candidates cannot use Professional Stewardship as a replacement for Scholarly Activity; instead, activities in both areas are judged together to determine candidate's professional impact. In that minority of cases where Exemplary Professional Stewardship and Scholarship are used together to make a case for promotion in rank, the candidate must have evidence of multiple and/or sustained activities that allow for use of professional knowledge and skills to make a significant impact in the community, profession, and/or university. Although work as an administrator can be used to demonstrate Professional Stewardship, when building a case for Exemplary Professional Stewardship, the candidate must demonstrate how the work went well beyond what is normally expected of the administrative role. Individuals presenting accomplishments in this category as the priority area for promotion should have previously discussed the decision to do so with the department chair and/or the college dean.

The following descriptions by rank provide an illustration of how faculty expectations can change across time and rank at Winthrop.

Tenure

A candidate for a tenured appointment should demonstrate a developing record of professional engagement in the campus community and discipline. This can be established through activities

associated with Academic Responsibility which can include but are not limited to regular attendance at faculty governance meetings, service in the department, involvement in University events that allow for interaction with students and families, and participation in professional events related to the discipline.

Associate Professor

A candidate for the rank of Associate Professor should demonstrate the characteristics of a tenured professor. Further, for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must provide evidence for continued, productive involvement on campus beyond the department. This can be demonstrated through activities which can include but are not limited to participation on committees and/or taskforces outside the department, leadership in professional organizations, or community involvement related to the individual's discipline. As an Associate Professor, such involvement should be maintained and opportunities for leadership should be sought.

Professor

A candidate for the rank of Professor should demonstrate the characteristics of an Associate Professor. Further, the candidate must provide evidence of how involvement in the University, discipline, and community has developed over time to include a significant level of leadership and maturity recognized by one's peers. A candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor must demonstrate leadership and mentorship (through example and/or specific activity) on and/or off campus.

Appendix III (08/30/13)

A proposed schedule for feedback from the Dean on personnel reviews

Underlying Assumptions:

- Given the size and complexity of the College, the Dean, realistically, cannot read and provide meaningful feedback on annual reports for all faculty members in the College.
- The Department chair is, and should continue to be, the most important source of both summative and formative feedback to, and mentorship of, faculty in each department.
- The Dean's first responsibility is to faculty/staff who are direct reports to the Dean.
- This is a holistic approach to faculty reviews and incorporates pre-tenure/third year reviews, promotion and tenure reviews, and post-tenure reviews processes in addition to annual report comments.
- The Dean or a designated Assistant/Associate Dean will look over every annual report submitted by faculty (including adjunct faculty) each year. In most cases the response to faculty from a review of the annual report by the Dean or a designated Assistant/Associate Dean will be brief. (See Dean's Evaluation of Faculty: <http://www2.winthrop.edu/artscience/onlineforms/arfinstructions.htm>). When the reviewer agrees with the assessment of the chair this will be indicated by a check. If a designated Assistant/Associate Dean sees an issue, this will be shared with the Dean as described below.

Proposal: Each year, the Dean will read and comment on the annual reports/administrative reviews submitted by the following individuals:

- Direct reports on the CAS Dean's office staff (Student Services Director, Assistant to Dean, Administrative Coordinator, Assistant/Associate Deans).
- All Department Chairs.
- Probationary faculty upon the completion of the third year.
- Associate Professors and tenured Assistant Professors every six years, starting *three years* after last review (tenure or promotion).
- Non-tenure track faculty every three years upon completion of year three, year six, and then every six years.
- Faculty on multi-year contracts, upon completion of year three, year six, and then every six years every three years.
- Any faculty members, including adjunct faculty members, who appeal their chair's comments.
- Any faculty flagged by a chair for Dean review.
- Any faculty members, including adjunct faculty members, whose annual reports or chair's comments are flagged by the designated Assistant/Associate Dean for any reason.

Approximate total number of faculty receiving Dean's Comments each year: 45-50

In addition, the Dean will participate as dictated by the University Personnel Process in the following reviews annually:

- Pretenure/Third year Reviews
- Tenure reviews
- Promotion reviews

Post Tenure reviews