

Winthrop University Faculty Conference
22 August 2014
2:00 pm Plowden Auditorium, Withers Building

Agenda

- I. Approval of minutes for April 25, 2014 Faculty Conference *(minutes attached)*

- II. Report from the Chair John Bird
 - a. Remarks and Introduction of Secretary and Parliamentarian
 - b. Recognition of Faculty Members Promoted and/or Tenured
 - c. Report from May 9, June 13, and June 26, 2014 Board of Trustees Meetings

- III. Report from the Acting President/Provost Debra Boyd

- IV. Academic Council Janice Chism

- V. Committee Reports
 - a. Introduction of Standing Committee Chairs (2014-2015) John Bird

 - b. Committee Reports
 - 1. Faculty Committee on University Priorities Michael Matthews
 - 2. Faculty Committee on University Life Kathy Davis
 - 3. Rules Sue Spencer
 - 3. Other committee reports

- VI. Unfinished Business

- VII. New Business

- VIII. Announcements
 - a. Registrar Reminders Gina Jones

 - b. Other Announcements

- IX. Adjournment

Faculty Conference Membership (329) 35% = 115 20% = 66

Winthrop University Faculty Conference

22 April 2014

2:00 pm Byrnes Recital Hall

Quorum Not Reached

The meeting was commenced by Dr. Bird at 2:00.

I. There was a motion to proceed without a quorum (121 members in attendance).

II. Approval of minutes for March, 2014 Faculty Conference

The minutes were approved.

III. Report from the Chair, John Bird

- a. Dr. Bird referenced Winthrop faculty's recently passed resolution on academic freedom and noted that all SC public bodies have passed similar resolutions (on academic freedom). He noted: "This situation is ongoing as the SC Legislature continues to debate the budget."
- b. Dr. Bird thanked Casey Cothran and Tara Collins for agreeing to serve as Faculty Conference secretary and parliamentarian again next year.
- c. Dr. Bird extended his thanks to the 2013-2014 chairs of university committees, and specifically to Jo Koster of the curriculum committee. Thanks to Christopher J. Aubrie, student body president, who has done a good deal of work; thanks to Debra Boyd for all her behind-the-scenes work, coordination, and cooperation throughout the year; thanks also to President Williamson for championing the faculty and working with the board to return our communication rights. Dr. Bird noted his appreciation for the board, especially Sue Smith-Rex and Kathy Bigham (in attendance): he thanked them for listening to faculty and working for students.
- d. Dr. Bird noted that the Board of Trustees will meet on May 9; at that time, there will be opportunity for public comment. Please speak to Dr. Bird if you have any information you would like to convey to the board.

IV. Report from the President, Jamie Comstock Williamson

- a. President Comstock Williamson thanked the faculty for their time and for their contributions during the week of investiture. She attended as many events as she could, and she was moved by the care faculty and students put into planning celebratory events. The event was an important one for Winthrop, but also an important event in her life.
- b. Report from Columbia: The House moved their budget forward to the Senate with \$0 recurring dollars for higher education. There are some monies for one-time funds. Clemson got 1 million dollars, USC got 1 million, and Winthrop got \$750,000 dollars.

This is an exciting potential opportunity. There seems to be evidence that Winthrop has a strong reputation, a perception that Winthrop deserves support. The senate budget is still in process, but the university has reasons to be optimistic.

- c. The decisions of the state legislature affect how we proceed with our budgeting for next year. President Comstock Williamson: “We are trying to build a budget that will function if we get 0 dollars or a million dollars (what we asked for); we are trying not to increase tuition. All current versions of the budget include a salary increase for faculty and staff. Now, the budget is based on projected enrollment; if projected enrollment is not made, we will not be able to do all the things we want to. I know you understand this. We will know much more before the end of June than we know right now. I’m sorry I cannot be more definitive; I am just sharing what we are trying to do.”
- d. President Comstock Williamson apologized for not communicating more with faculty and students about how and why summer school tuition was being increased. She noted that there should have been a communication to everyone who was advising students about why tuition was increased. (The president reviewed the history of the price of summer school, noted how it was lowered during the economic downturn and was never raised back to a normal level . . .until now.) President Comstock Williamson: “I hope you will accept our sincere apology for not getting that communicated to you.” News about summer school: as of April 18, students have registered for 7,028.5 credit hours. Last year, students completed 7,905 summer school hours. It is expected that some students who are enrolled will drop out and some will sign up, but if numbers stay the same, we will have made 588,375 dollars increase in revenue. (Note: The university must see \$600,000 to give a 1% raise to faculty and staff.)
- e. Notes on enrollment: There are new, exciting trends in retention. Winthrop will have 203 additional students in the fall because of improved retention. There are lots of ways to grow enrollment, and retention is one way of doing this. President Comstock Williamson offered congratulations to the faculty, noting, “Students stay because of you. You challenge and inspire them, engage them with their classmates, and because of you they believe Winthrop University is the place for them. It will be my job to make sure they can afford to stay. We want the students who have the ability to learn and who want to stay to stay. You’ve done your part; now, I’ll do mine.”
- f. The president noted her name change: “I am most comfortable if you call me Jamie. I never want to stop being one of you.”

Jennifer Solomon: Where does the additional summer school money raised go? I’ve heard it’s not going to faculty teaching summer school.

Jamie Comstock Williamson: They will still get their paycheck; there is not usually a corresponding salary increase every time tuition goes up. There are various budgets, of course, but our “best case scenario” does allow for overall salary increases rather than particular money for just summer school teachers. Dr. Boyd and I also want more money to “say yes” when people

want money for activities to help students, to provide travel funds, to complete all sorts of brilliant plans... we have no money right now to help, and we look forward to having it.

- g. The president noted: "Thanks for all you will do today to help students graduate on time by taking a full load of 15 hours a semester."

V. Report from the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost, Debra Boyd

Provost Boyd advised the faculty: "It is time to reflect and take a breath and think about what the year has been about. It has been a very positive time for me, working with Jamie and with all of you. It is always a privilege for me to work with you in whatever opportunity or capacity we have to do so. I look out here and I see a group of people who are dedicated, who give so much to Winthrop and to its students. I appreciate the work that you do so that strangers who come to our campus quickly see that we really are a community." Provost Boyd noted that she looks forward to the things that faculty will do in the next two weeks to reinforce and strengthen the Winthrop community. 1) Exams build community. Students need exams; it reinforces learning, makes it deep and permanent. Also 2) Celebrations build community. It is important to honor all the work done by students, faculty, and staff.

VI. Committee Reports

- a. Academic Council Report: Dr. Jo Koster

Dr. Koster thanked the members of Academic Council for a year of very good and very hard work.

There was nothing to be voted on concerning Curriculum.

The faculty voted on the certification of new GNED courses: the new courses were approved.

Dr. Koster reminded faculty that next year courses will need GNED recertification for global credit; remember that 200-level courses in Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, etc. will need to be re-approved. Get started early on the necessary paperwork!

The faculty voted on a proposal to change language about using courses in both the major and the minor: it passed.

The faculty voted on a proposal to change the grade equivalent for S to C-. Dr. Bird called for questions or discussion. Seeing none, the faculty voted: the change passed.

Dr. Koster opened the discussion on the modification of the General Education Program. She thanked the faculty for their thoughtful, principled, and open-minded contributions, for keeping the welfare of the students at the forefront. She encouraged the faculty to notice that the proposal had grown longer because the committee responded to the faculty's previous suggestions and

comments. She noted, “The plan presented today has been unanimously recommended by Academic Council.”

Redefining the General Education Program

1. Proposal 1: Change the name of Winthrop’s general education program from “The Touchstone Program” to “The General Education Program.” The faculty voted to change the name: the change was approved.
2. Proposal 2: Strongly encourage departments and programs to move to reduce the minimum number of hours required for graduation from 124 to 120, except where licensure, accreditation, or complexity make such reductions impossible. The faculty voted to change minimum degree hour requirements: The change was approved.
3. Proposal 3: Require that departments and programs re-examine their overall programs of study in relation to general education in accordance with the seven principles set out by this task force. (See Appendix I for Principles.) The faculty discussed requiring departments and programs to re-examine overall programs of study:

Greg Oakes: I admire that we should self-examine for “major creep,” but how will things be played out after the examination has been conducted? Will departments be asked to report on this? What happens after the examination?

Debra Boyd: We will handle it the way we would handle any curriculum information; bring the results forth to the college, and changes will be made at the college level. This puts a lot of trust and responsibility on faculty to honestly examine programs and requirements.

Andrew Vorder Bruegge: Is the committee asking us to use major requirements in the competency areas to meet general education requirements?

Jo Koster: Yes, we encourage departments to let students do this.

Paul Martyka: The Department of Fine Arts demands a work intensive degree (the “Bachelor of Fine Arts”). I would like to speak out against Principle V; it discriminates against my College. I would like to offer a formal amendment to Principle V. There should be a *three* course limit rather than a *two* course limit. Also, I would like to critique the use of the word “should” rather than the word “must.”

No second: The amendment did not pass.

Chad Dresbach: Does Principle V conflict with Principle I? By limiting it to two courses, it could defacto add hours to a degree.

Jo Koster: The hope is that departments will reduce the number of major hours required to earn a degree to a reasonable number, one that will allow students to graduate in four years.

David Wohl: I think there is an implied asterisk in Principle V that accreditation overrides that rule. I think we would be more comfortable if that was more explicitly stated.

Matthew Hayes: Is this about process or product? Looking at department major requirements?

John Bird: We are giving the departments and programs a chance to look at things and work *with* the Curriculum Committee. We are sure this will be a process that may take place over a couple of years.

The faculty voted on the need for departments to re-examine major requirements in concert with the seven principles: the requirement was approved.

4. Proposal 4: Recommend that Winthrop adopt a modified version of our current General Education program that reduces the overall number of hours from 46-58 to 35-50 hours, as outlined in the following table (see Appendix II). This modified program will allow two courses from a student's major program of study to apply to General Education (usually 6 hours), exclusive of the Writing Intensive, Oral Intensive, and Technology proficiencies (which should be met in the major if possible). The faculty discussed the modified version of the General Education Program:

Jo Koster: Please note the new physical activity requirement. Notably, here we are making official what students are already doing; many take these courses.

Jeff Sinn: I would like to thank the committee for its good work. I would also like to make the point that we only received this document in March. We have not had much time to consider it.

Apologies given.

Jeff Sinn: I feel like I've only recently engaged. I wish I knew this was going on when it was being planned. I'm doing my best... once you pass something this substantial, you change the fundamental constituencies. I feel that the issue of major creep has not been fully addressed. Our current remedy is that we don't let students use more than 2 credits from the major for GenEd. This is a good idea, and I support it, but my main fear is that we are making the Social Sciences pay a heavy price rather than policing departments. And can departments police themselves? Is this the same issue that was a problem with the previous GenEd form? The petitions process gives us a treasure trove of possible remedies. Many ad hoc agreements could be specified ahead of time... that's an empirical data set we could look at right now. Majors and specialists are by their very nature focused on what they do and have a hard time seeing beyond that. This will not solve the problem.

Paul Martyka: Allowing three major requirements to count toward general education requirements might help to solve the things concerning Jeff.

Jeff Sinn: To continue... I am worried about the Department of Religious Studies, which requires people to take an introductory course in order to discover or develop an interest. The people on this committee do not have experience with this sort of student flow. If we consider the lab requirement, make it only required for those in the College of Arts and Sciences, that could save huge amounts of money. The study Academically Adrift shows that the liberal arts are necessary to get students critically thinking deeply... these courses are crucial. Also, CRTW can be replaced by PHIL. You speak against "Helicopter Faculty," but it is true that students pick easy courses; I think they need our guidance.

John Bird: To address your comment on CRTW and PHIL, do note that the common core will be investigated next year.

Jo Koster: There has not been a big public hearing, but the committee has requested and received continuous input from faculty across the campus all year.

Mike Lipscomb: I would like to speak in support of Jeff. Cutting Social Sciences and the Humanities from 15 to 9 hours... this is indeed troubling. I feel these courses need a special kind of protection. In order to ensure the protection of those courses, we have to protect their enrollments, in a way that we don't have to protect the enrollments of courses in the natural sciences or in the College of Education. In a world where these kinds of courses are under attack, I think a good case can be made that the Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts are having to make a huge sacrifice in order to get these hours down to size. I would like us to reconsider this.

Janet Wojcik: To speak specifically about the Social Sciences... There are requirements for graduate school. Students will take social science classes, despite the fact that they are not required for the completion of GenEd.

Paula Mitchell: Speaking as someone who advises science majors, I can't say enough how important it is to encourage scientists to take Psychology or Sociology. It forces them to get a broader education, inspires them to branch out in minors...

Will Kiblinger: I would like to propose a formal amendment. I would like to change the cut to the Social Sciences/Humanities/Arts section to 3 hours. The proposed cut of 9 hours is disproportionate and premature. I propose a more balanced and shared sacrifice. Indeed, we do not yet know the results of formal examination of the core. Programs have not yet addressed their major creep. We can revisit the need for further cuts to Social Sciences/Humanities/Arts at a later date.

SECONDED

Paul Martyka: Dean Gloria Jones... please remind us of the charge.

Gloria Jones: SACS requires 30 hours; we require 36-58. Frankly, we give our students no exploratory room. If we reduce the number of required courses in GenEd, our students have the

opportunity to take courses in Arts, Humanities, and the Social Sciences... courses that are not proscribed.

Mike Lipscomb: I don't think this addresses Will's point about it being premature to make these kinds of drastic cuts. We don't know how this will affect enrollment. This is a democratic body; we can revisit this issue again next year.

Kristin Kiblinger: There are things that need further consideration before we proceed. The timing of this time of year... I am not convinced this issue has received the attention it would have otherwise received. We are better off proceeding slowly rather than having to redo it; once cuts are made, it is unlikely they can be reversed. Until the majors have made their adjustments, let's not ask so much from GenEd. Even though there are global and historical perspectives, philosophy will still suffer.

Laura Dougherty: Can students double dip if a course applies in different areas?

No... only for the Constitutional Requirement

Debra Boyd: I would like to speak to two things 1. The issue of programmatic change. We have talked about being deliberate. Whenever we make any change, there are both intended and unintended consequences. In order for us to be more flexible and more attentive to our students, we may need to try things out rather than making them perfect; however, it doesn't mean that we don't need to be careful and pay attention. We need to trust the people you have selected, for this committee, to make good decisions. 2. This is not about enrollments! This is about what are we doing to serve our students well. Let's stop talking about what students will take our particular courses and talk about this issue in terms of what will serve our students well.

Greg Oakes: I do have significant concerns about the impact on our program. And while I don't want to engage in a struggle over turf, I think we have a special case here of significant risk. If we were to change this to a reduction of three hours instead of six, this can be revisited later. Once they are gone they are very hard to put back. I vote to accept the amendment.

Mike Lipscomb: I don't think enrollments and what's best for our students are disconnected. The health of Philosophy and Anthropology departments are crucial to the health of our students. Getting rid of these departments does not serve our students. It's not enrollment in the sense that we can have the best or most popular department in the university... we are talking about causing an existential crisis in these departments.

Debra Boyd: We would not be a university of any caliber if we did not have Philosophy, Anthropology, the Arts, religion courses. I believe having options for students are important. I am not speaking against this amendment. I am simply pointing out that any program worth its salt allows students to explore topics in which they are interested. The literature requirement was cut, but English survived.

Adolphus Belk: I supported this as a member of Academic Council because I felt like it helped us reach goals for students. But I appreciate this open discussion. Even if we cut hours, our goal is to grow enrollment. That means the demand will be there because we will have more students. But, we can't know about enrollments now. I find myself swayed by this argument, and I don't think adding this class back would ruin the overall goals.

Jeff Sinn: English is taught in high school. There are certain courses where we need to think about enrollment because it's not on their radar. Students don't know what it is.

Guy Reel: I am in agreement with Adolphus. Anytime you have warring factions, a modest proposal may be in order. We can always change it later.

Janet Wojcik: We're not cutting hours like we said we wanted to.

Jeannie Haubert: I agree it's in the student's best interest to cut requirements to 120 hours. Yet, I do think students are harmed by such a drastic cut to Social Sciences and Humanities. I think we can get down to 120 with other cuts. We have not yet addressed cuts to the core and cuts in major hours.

Barbara Pierce: Motion to call the question.

SECONDED

VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT without further discussion on the Kiblinger amendment. 71 for/45 against, the amendment passes. Proposal 5 as amended passed.

Jennifer Belk: I would like to make a motion to postpone discussion of amendment four until a subsequent meeting.

SECONDED

Motion failed

5. Proposal 5: Although it was outside our charge of looking at ways in which the General Education program might have lost focus or have fallen victim to 'major creep,' we are aware that many faculty have questions about the General Education Core (ACAD 101, WRIT 101, HMXP 102, and CRTW 201) in terms of content, sequencing, consistency of delivery, transferability, and other issues. We therefore recommend that the Provost appoint a task force of faculty and staff with appropriate expertise to evaluate the Core and make recommendations for any changes that might be necessary to ensure that it continues to meet the principles of the General Education program.

Jeff Sinn: What is meant by expertise? How public will this be?

Debra Boyd: People who have taught the courses and people across campus.

Paul Martyka: What does “examine the core” mean?

Debra Boyd: Asking questions about the order of the courses, the content of the courses... many things.

Daniel Gordon: Does that mean deciding what transfer credits count? Transferability?

Yes

Dwight Dimaculangan: We are in favor of this. Can these skills be taught in the major itself? When should students take HMXP? This is a ton of hours (9). Are these courses actually needed?

The faculty voted on the need to examine the Core: the motion was approved.

6. Proposal 6: Charge the General Education Curriculum Committee to examine the category descriptions and requirements to ensure that they are congruent with the revised General Education definition and program, and ensure that the processes by which courses are included or recertified for the General Education program document that these courses meet all the requirements for inclusion, such as course content, writing components, etc.

Paul Martyka: Is this the existing committee or the ones that have been voted in (that would be assumed to start in the fall)?

The newly elected committee

The faculty voted: the charge was passed.

7. Proposal 7: Charge the Office of Records and Registration or appropriate support offices to update the instructions for the Curriculum Application Process to remind departments and programs of the need to explain clearly the reasons (such as licensure or accreditation requirements) for specifying or restricting the selection of courses in a student’s general education choices so that there is a clearly-documented rationale for why such decisions were made.

Greg Oakes: Point of clarification ... the intent is as we go forward? I note the phrase “decisions were made.”

Yes

The faculty voted: the charge was passed.

Debra Boyd: I would like to offer thanks to the task force, to Academic Council, and to all of you for putting our students first. This sort of spirited debate is what makes Winthrop University so great.

b. Rules committee: Paula Mitchell

No questions on report; Sue Spenser announced as the new chair.

c. Faculty Committee on University Priorities: Mike Lipscomb

Dr. Lipscomb noted the changed nature of the committee's work this year. Faculty will be able to view the committee's report online, with summaries of written responses from the administration, addressing inquiries. The committee was able to have candid conversations with Jamie, Debra, and the rest of the executive officers. The committee is pleased that these administrators have created a new kind of atmosphere where concerns are addressed. Thank you! Faculty will be able to see the report via a secure website. The Committee on University Priorities worked with the Committee on University Life to make sure all concerns were addressed. Dr. Lipscomb emphasized the important process of communication: "Please communicate if your query isn't being adequately answered, or if you have questions or ideas about the issues brought up in the report. These conversations are continuous and will roll forward." Michael Matthews will be the next chair. The committee is hoping for continuity of purpose and vision.

Jeannie Haubert: Why are responses being relegated to a website instead of brought up here?

Jamie Comstock Williamson: Questions always welcome here.

Debra Boyd: Maybe at the next meeting, when the report is final, we can have a discussion here.

Kristi Schoepfer: Students are suffering due to the increased cost of summer school; the price increase was never communicated to us or to them.

Jamie Comstock Williamson: I am so sorry; it can't be undone, and I understand your frustration. As an aside, it's unusual that summer tuition has not changed in so long. I wish we would have thought of and realized this communication oversight sooner. I hope nothing like this will ever happen again; we will be very mindful.

Mike Lipscomb: The report encompasses 17 enquiries that take up 9 pages of response. It might make more sense to send the faculty a written document that would allow them to pursue specific feedback, especially when this meeting is so long.

Jennifer Solomon: It seems to me that, for this particular committee, having actual reports presented to Faculty Conference would be very helpful. People would hear things at the same time and be able to ask questions about it. Frequent and public reports would produce a more engaged faculty.

John Bird: I will place this committee on the agenda at the August meeting for us to discuss issues.

Brad Tripp: Is the concern about summer school included in the forthcoming report?

Mike Lipscomb: Yes. It's also been addressed in this meeting through the president's candid remarks.

Jamie Comstock Williamson: "I can tell you that it is easy for me to be forthcoming because you are so civil. I appreciate our reasonable responses. Thank you for asking questions; it's good for me to hear these questions. That makes it easier for me, that you are so reasonable and civil and your questions come from a place that shows you care about our students."

d. Faculty Committee on University Life Report: Jennifer Disney

Dr. Disney could not yet report on the committee's new chair. She encouraged faculty to please read the written report. A lot of questions forwarded to the committee were policy questions; the administration directed the committee to where policy was written. She noted to Dr. Bird, "Please put this committee on the agenda for fall, too."

e. Academic Freedom and Tenure: Dave Pretty

Dr. Pretty referenced the situation concerning the College of Charleston and USC Upstate, and the potential cuts in their state funding. He then presented a brief report on Undergraduate Petitions.

VII. Unfinished Business

There was none.

VIII. New Business

The Article 8, Section 8 Bylaws change was voted on and passed.

The Article 8, section 7 Bylaws change was voted on and passed.

IX. Announcements

Gina Jones, Registrar reminders

X. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Casey A. Cothran

Next meeting August 22, 2014

Faculty Conference Membership (329) 35% = 115 20% = 66

Appendix I

General Education Task Force's Seven Principles to Preserve the Integrity of Winthrop's General Education Program:

- I. Majors should specify specific courses in general education categories only if they are bound by accreditation or an outside agency.
- II. Majors may recommend a specific course for discipline or pedagogical reasons, but they must accept other courses that have been approved for our general education program if students take them (or have previously taken them).
- III. If a student changes majors, he or she may use previously-taken courses to satisfy general education requirements, except in the case of accreditation or licensure issues.
- IV. Majors are encouraged to fulfill the writing intensive, technology, and oral proficiency requirements within the major. We realize that this will not be possible in all majors. (These are exempted from item V because they represent proficiencies rather than points of view.)
- V. There should be a two course limit on how much of a student's major program of study may be used to meet GNED requirements; departments should be asked to make changes in their programs to avoid exceeding that limit.
- VI. Overall, to fulfill general education requirements, we should try to focus on competencies rather than specific courses as much as possible.
- VII. Majors should not be so rigid in the way they interface with general education that students can't complete the major within four years if they do not start in the major from the first semester, accreditation requirements notwithstanding.

Appendix II

Recommendation 4: Proposed General Education Program (for 2015-16 Catalogue)

ACAD 101 (required of first-time freshmen only) 1 credit

Shared Skills and Proficiencies

Writing and Critical Thinking

WRIT 101 (A grade of C- or better is required) 3 credits

HMXP 102 (Grade of C- or better in WRIT 101 is pre-req) 3 credits

CRTW 201 (A grade of C- or better in HMXP is pre-req) 3 credits

Oral Communication (may be met in course counted in the major) 0-3 credits

Technology (may be met in course counted in the major) 0-3 credits

Intensive Writing (may be met in course counted in the major) 0-3 credits

Physical Activity (may be waived for some students) 1 credit

Thinking Critically Across Disciplines

Global Perspectives 3 credits

Historical Perspectives 3 credits

Constitution Requirement (may be met in another Gen Ed category) 0-3 credits

Introducing Students to Broad Disciplinary Perspectives

Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts

Social Science (at least two designators if 6 hrs) 3-6 credits

Humanities & Arts (at least two designators if 6 hrs) 3-6 credits

Quantitative Skills and Natural Science (including one lab science)

Quantitative 3-8 credits

Natural Science (if two courses taken, one each from 2 of 3 categories and one must be a lab)
3-8 credits

Total 35-50 credits

Important Dates for Curriculum Action for 2014-15

Academic Council

Janice Chism

This is going to be a very busy year for curriculum action so...



Photo Credit: National Geographic Society

Friendly Reminder from the CUC and Gen Ed Committee

- Curricular materials need to reach the CUC and Gen Ed **NO LATER THAN ONE WEEK** prior to the scheduled meeting to be considered at that meeting



Photo Credit: David Slater New Scientist

Deadlines for Submitting Curriculum Materials 2014-15

Last Date to Submit Materials to CUC	Friday, Sept. 19th	Friday, Nov. 7th	Friday, Jan. 9th	Friday, Feb. 13th	Friday, April 3rd
CUC Meeting Dates	Friday, Sept. 26th	Friday, Nov. 14th	Friday, Jan 16th	Friday, Feb 20th	Friday, April 10th
Academic Council Meeting Dates	Friday, Oct. 3rd	Friday, Nov. 21st	Friday, Jan. 23rd	Friday, Feb. 27th	Friday, April 17th

Deadlines for Submitting Materials for General Education

Last Dates to Submit Materials to Gen Ed	Wed., Aug. 27th	Monday, Oct. 29th	Tues., Feb. 3rd	Wed., Mar. 25th
Gen Ed Meeting Dates	Friday, Sept. 12th	Friday, Nov. 7th	Friday, Feb. 13th	Friday, April 3rd

Faculty Input for University Priorities 2013-2014

NOTE: This committee met twice with the President, once in the Fall Semester and once in the Spring Semester. The first meeting was attended by President Comstock Williamson, Debra Boyd, J.P. McKee, Kim Keel, Kimberly Faust, and Lisa Cowart. The second meeting was attended by President Comstock Williamson, Debra Boyd, J.P. McKee, Kimberly Faust, Lisa Cowart, Jeff Perez, and Danny Nicholson.

RESOURCE ALLOCATION

- 1) **University Priorities:** Faculty have raised questions regarding salaries at Winthrop University and their relationship to our peer institutions. Faculty have requested that raising faculty salaries become a targeted goal of the university to ensure retention of faculty and address faculty morale after many years of no raises. A goodwill gesture toward cost-of-living raises, even if implemented slowly over time, would go a long way.

The President has taken this up as a focused priority. She emphasizes that she understands herself to be a member of the faculty. She also related her actions in previous positions that secured raises for faculty. She did point out, however, that the ability to give raises is dependent on increasing revenue, and given the reluctance of the state legislature to provide more funding and the upper limits on raising additional revenue by raising tuition, this will largely be a matter of increasing enrollment.

As noted in the response to the question below, the Provost's office continues to gather data regarding how Winthrop faculty salaries compare to other, similar universities. That information is crucial to maintaining the competitiveness of Winthrop with our peer institutions. Even though our most recent data finds our salaries to be fairly competitive with our peer institutions, the Provost has noted that we are not constrained to simply match those institutions, and that raising salaries remains a primary goal of the institution.

The Provost also made a point of saying that "staff salaries need to be addressed, too," and, "looking ahead, administrators, deans, chairs, and the Faculty Committee on University Priorities need to contribute their insights on an overall plan for both faculty and staff."

- 2) **University Priorities:** Faculty have asked that a systematic process be set in motion to look at salary compression issues, particularly given the impact of the recession. Many faculty are "stuck" in salaries that are not equitable within their own departments with regard to rank, and also not on par with peer institutions in the region nor with the private sector in some professions. Dean Kedrowski mentioned post-tenure review as a way to resolve salary compression, but we need a broader strategy in addition to that. To offer just one example, under a post-tenure review-only system, it is possible that someone could have been hired just prior to the recession, do exemplary work, and go 12 or more years with only one chance at a raise (with promotion and before a first post-tenure

review). A post-tenure review-only system will not make up for the losses in earnings accrued over the recession period that set some faculty at more of a disadvantage than others with regard to issues of salary compression.

The Provost has taken up this issue as a focused priority. Her office is engaged in a thorough review of how salaries compare within and across departments and colleges, as well as in comparison to peer universities. Priority will be given to achieving equity within departments. The information gathered in this review is crucial in seeking to rectify differences that are a result of compression. Again, any solution to this problem remains a function of increased revenue (see response to #1 above). The Provost, however, also suggested that it might be possible to use savings from retirements to feed back into specific departments to deal with compression. The Provost's office is committed to exploring any further measures to address compression as ideas emerge in conversation with the President, other executive officers, staff, and the faculty.

- 3) **University Priorities:** Faculty would appreciate if the administration would re-examine the summer pay system. Currently, the pay for full-time faculty is based on the number of students in class, but that number is not assessed until the third day. Faculty are not sure that it is ethical or appropriate to ask a faculty member to commit to teach a class without knowing how much he/she will be paid. It is possible that a person would choose not to teach if the minimum amount was guaranteed to be the pay for the class. Faculty may not think it is the wisest use of the scarce resource of time to teach a summer class for the minimum pay; however, faculty teach in the summer to earn additional salary. So, faculty members teach a class, gambling on the fact that they will have enough students on the third day. Faculty have expressed concern about the extent to which it is in the best interest of Winthrop University to have faculty “gambling” on their salaries, as well as the extent to which this is a comfortable or ethical position in which to put faculty. Faculty have expressed that there might be several ways to resolve this situation that would still allow the summer classes to be a source of income for Winthrop while better protecting faculty resources.

The Provost's office is reviewing the issues surrounding summer school pay. The Provost expresses a desire to simplify the decision rules for determining pay that might avoid some of the unintended ethical outcomes attendant to the current system (such as an incentive to make courses easier in order to attract a requisite number of students). The Provost has suggested the need to offer more attractive summer school options, such as on-line offerings. The Provost is also willing to entertain creative solutions to enhance the effectiveness of summer school offerings and encourages suggestions from the faculty. The provost reminds us that decisions about summer school protocols are made within a financial reality in which summer school classes are a necessary source of income for the university.

The Provost notes that a pay rate of 7.5% of a faculty member's annual salary at the 12 student threshold is fairly generous. At many institutions the threshold for the top pay grade is 20 students.

Link to Summer Salary Policy (effective summer 2004; revised May 2011):
<http://www2.winthrop.edu/public/policy/fullpolicy.aspx?pid=201>

- 4) **University Priorities:** Faculty have raised questions about the replacement of vacant faculty lines and the associated decision-making rules. For example, across Winthrop University, how many tenure track faculty positions are currently vacant? What are the plans for filling those positions? Where is the money for those positions now? How is it spent? Too often, it seems, tenure-track appointments are being replaced by non-tenure track positions in ways that conflict with the nature and character of Winthrop University.

The provost points out that 21 positions were filled last year (30 searches were conducted), and 14 searches are underway this year. Decisions are necessarily made on a contextual basis, depending on available finances and the urgency of filling particular vacant positions (if a position must be filled for accreditation purposes, for example).

Seen from a perspective that considers the system as a whole, the administration never fully or finally replaces a full time position with a part time position. In some cases, however, the administration will shift full time positions from one department or college to another, and sometimes the administration will temporarily use part time employees to fill full time positions.

- 5) **University Priorities:** Faculty would be appreciative if the administration would re-examine the university sabbatical policy. Faculty have raised questions over the criteria for the granting of half-year and full-year sabbaticals. What are the criteria? Who makes the decisions and how are they made? Are full-year sabbaticals, which presumably provide cost-savings for the university, less competitive than half-year sabbaticals? Is sufficient attention paid to the different criteria across different colleges and disciplines about what constitutes sabbatical-worthy research, or is this just left to the discretion of deans?

The Provost discussed the sabbatical leave policy in terms of its consistency and its real-world fairness. All sabbatical decisions are decided with reference to an internal rubric, with particular attention given to the scholarly potential of applicants' proposed sabbatical projects and the productivity of past sabbaticals. The merit of applications, however, must be balanced with the immediate needs of departments, and those needs mean that in rare instances a sabbatical cannot be awarded at a particular time. The Provost presented the number of sabbatical applications and the number awarded over the past several years, and those numbers reveal a continued commitment to providing sabbaticals for faculty research.

Sabbatical Year	Number of Sabbatical Applications	Sabbaticals Awarded
2009-10	6 one-semester	Sabbaticals were not awarded for this year

	requests	because of the economic situation.	
2010-11	13 (2 academic-year requests, 11 one-semester requests)	Michael Evans	Academic Year
		Ron Parks	Fall Semester
		Keith Benson	Spring Semester
		Janice Chism	Spring Semester
		Carol Marchel	Spring Semester
		Kelly Richardson	Spring Semester
2011-12	2 academic-year requests	Seymour Simmons	Academic Year
		Peter Judge	Academic Year (not taken; served as CAS Dean)
2012-13	3 (2 academic-year requests, 1 one-semester request)	Gerry Derksen	Academic Year
		Stephen Smith	Academic Year
		Brad Witzel	Fall Semester
2013-14	10 (2 academic-year requests [1 later withdrawn], 7 one-semester requests, 1 calendar-year request)	Tim Boylan	Academic Year
		Connie Hale	Calendar Year
		Peter Judge	Fall Semester
		A.J. Angulo	Fall Semester
		Laura Ullrich	Spring Semester
		Phil Moody	Spring Semester
2014-15	10 one-semester requests	Donald Friedman	Fall Semester
		Amy Gerald	Spring Semester
		Jeannie Haubert	Fall Semester
		Pedro Munoz	Fall Semester
		Alice Burmeister	Fall Semester
		Matthew Manwarren	Fall Semester

The Academic Leadership Council reviews all sabbatical applications and ranks them according to the criteria in the policy. The Provost submits a report—on which sabbatical proposals were endorsed by ALC and which were not—to the President for approval.

Link to Sabbatical Leave Policy:

<http://www2.winthrop.edu/public/policy/fullpolicy.aspx?pid=248>

- 6) **University Priorities:** Faculty have raised questions about the way(s) in which the Foundation manages accounts. There are complaints about money that is supposed to be available for department and scholarship accounts being withheld. Concerned faculty have asked for, at the very least, greater transparency regarding the management of these accounts.

The Foundation has been reorganized and more staff have been added and trained in order to meet growing workloads. For many years, the Foundation's finances

were managed by one person, and that was simply not enough person power to deal with the volume and complexity of the work. Throughout that period, the Foundation was running about a year behind in the servicing of accounts. There is no indication of any type of malfeasance regarding the handling of Foundation accounts during this period. Furthermore, some payouts from accounts were not possible in the immediate aftermath of the 2008 recession, and those accounts are now in a position to begin making payments.

Under the leadership of Kim Keel and Robin Embry the Foundation has brought 700 accounts up to date. The Foundation has also converted to 21st century technology in order to handle its workload. Under the new leadership, the Foundation is committed to transparency and is working on creating real time access to accounts (which includes 391 endowed accounts and 700 individual accounts).

2013 Annual Report: <http://www.wufoundation.com/financialoutlook.htm>

- 7) **University Priorities:** Faculty have raised questions about Dr. DiGiorgio’s total compensation package: what the total compensation package is (including foundation funds) and for how long it will persist. In addition, faculty have expressed concern that Dr. DiGiorgio has hired a full-time executive administrative assistant as well as Rebecca Masters (part-time) to “help tell his story.” Are these hires from his personal funds or from public funds? Faculty are concerned by the (presumably substantial) expenditure of funds for a former president who is on paid leave to work on tasks that do not seem to advance the main mission of the university, especially when academic departments still suffer from budget cuts/freezes and students are charged such high tuition rates.

The arrangements made for Dr. DiGiorgio’s compensation is “extraordinarily common,” and reflects one year of sabbatical compensation.

The President Emeritus’s compensation, as determined by the Board of Trustees, is as follows:

For the period from July 2013 through June 2014:

\$169,970 state salary

\$80,000 salary supplement

\$20,000 housing supplement—typical for presidents who do not reside in University-owned property. This payment was begun a few years ago when Dr. DiGiorgio moved out of the President’s House.

\$12,000 life insurance annuity—paid directly to insurance company

\$30,000 advancement funds—reimbursements per spending SC procurement code policy

\$4,755 one year car lease

From August 16, 2014 forward:

Nine-month faculty appointment annual salary of \$139,066.

As a tenured faculty member, the President Emeritus's performance will be reviewed annually by the sitting President. The following areas will be evaluated annually: public service, consulting, writing, selective fund-raising, assorted lectures, and in other areas decided upon in consultation with the current President. The former President is not required to teach.

Assistants' salaries:

The President Emeritus has two Administrative Assistants, whose combined salaries are \$80,000 annually. Part of these resources are for assistance in compiling 24 years of Winthrop History, which will be ultimately written by a trained historian. Dr. Comstock Williamson stated, "We owe it to the present and future to record this history."

OBJECTIVE SETTING

- 8) **University Priorities:** Faculty have raised questions about a lack of attentiveness to external factors beyond the university's control when establishing goals, such as the president's publicly announced goal of achieving 82% freshmen to sophomore retention. Faculty have also raised questions about how the president understands our ability to negotiate conflicting goals (such as attainment/retention goals v. a continued commitment to academic rigor).

The President argues that external factors beyond the university's control may be less prohibitive than they first appear. In seeking to hit the 82% benchmark for freshmen to sophomore retention, the President seeks to focus on the questions of who does not return, and their reasons for not returning. Though our retention rate for students moving from their freshman to sophomore years is, at 72%, above the national average, the President believes that focusing on these non-returners can profitably inform our efforts to reach the 82% goal. The number one reason given for students not returning after their freshman year is that they cannot afford to do so. Some of that number can be tied to students who lose their Life Scholarships, pointing to the need for both increased academic intervention and more need-based financial aid. To the first point, Provost Boyd remarks that reaching this goal underlines the need for faculty buy-in to the idea and practice of academic intervention through continued participation in mid-semester grade reporting and working cooperatively with the tutoring resources offered by the Academic Success Center. The committee noted that the new version of ACAD, which holds students directly accountable for responding appropriately to their mid-term grade reports and which actively seeks to connect students to tutoring programs, such as those offered by the Academic Success Center, will be instrumental in moving the university towards its retention goals in ways that allow us to maintain our

academic rigor. To the second point about increasing financial-based aid, the President envisions the creation of “Life-line Loans” designed to make it financially viable for students who have lost their Life Scholarships to stay in school and recover their scholarships.

- 9) **University Priorities:** Faculty would be appreciative if the administration would re-examine the campus-wide summer/weekend air conditioning/heat policy. Faculty come in to work in their offices over the summer, especially in August to prepare for the start of the fall semester, and faculty office buildings (like Bancroft) are unbearable, while classroom buildings (like Owens) are kept cool and empty. Efficiency and cost-savings goals may not be being met in the best way for the campus community, while faculty are being hampered in their efforts to achieve student learning and development.

J.P. McKee (Vice President, Office of the Vice President for Finance and Business) stresses the willingness of the university to work with faculty on these issues in the context of needing to be parsimonious about energy usage in order to keep expenses low. He urges faculty to contact Walter Hardin (Associate Vice President of Facilities Management) when issues arise in this context. It was noted that an effort is made to consolidate classroom usage (in Owens, for example) in order to provide the best working environment during summer months.

- 10) **University Priorities:** Faculty have raised questions about the lack of child care/education options for children of faculty, staff, and students, especially during the summer months. Currently, such programs are not offered, which creates hardship for faculty and staff who work during that time of year. Such summer programs, it is argued, could create revenue streams for the university and provide internship opportunities for graduate and undergraduate students.

The administration has established a due diligence process internally, as well as an external conversation with the Boys & Girls Clubs of York County, to look at what type of collaborative relationship might be feasible. The President has approved Kim Keel researching the need and formally beginning the evaluation process for available solutions.

OTHER AREAS OF COMMON CONCERN

- 11) **University Priorities:** Faculty have raised questions about the lack of a consistent tenure and promotion policy for deans and about the way deans are evaluated. There is an expressed concern that deans are not reviewed in a consistent method consonant with the best practices of peer institutions, but rather that deans are able to unduly influence the likelihood of a positive review through the way in which reviewers are selected. If faculty are able to evaluate chairs in an online, anonymous way, why can't deans be evaluated in the same way?

There was a policy for review of deans, but that policy was removed by a former Vice President for Academic Affairs. The requirement of such a policy is not part of the bylaws. There is, however, a process in place, which includes an annual review in a fashion similar to the way faculty members are reviewed each year.

There is a shared desire across the administration to change the internal form that is currently used for the annual review of deans, as well as the protocol for determining who takes part in such a review. The President's Advisory Council will take up the question of how to more properly and effectively review the performance of all administrators, including deans.

- 12) **University Priorities:** Why does Winthrop University not have an Ombudsperson to: (1) listen while remaining neutral with respect to the facts to understand issues from the perspective of the individual raising the issue; (2) assist in reframing issues and helping individuals evaluate options, including the use of informal and formal resolution resources?

Though Winthrop does not have an officially designated Ombudsperson, Lisa Cowart (Associate Vice-President for Human Resources) serves in this role for faculty and staff. She works with the Provost depending on the particular nature of the case. In these roles, the VP for Human Resources and the Provost help negotiate and resolve issues concerning legal rights and personality clashes. The VP for Human Resources and the Provost urge faculty and staff to resolve issues, when at all possible, at the local level, but they are committed to giving the best guidance possible in cases where such local resolution is not possible.

The President adds that senior administration seeks to model doing what is right, and gave examples of not hiring a trusted friend and acquaintance on the advice of a search committee *and* in not having the courage earlier in her career (when she was less experienced as an administrator) to override a committee's recommendation about whom to hire for a particular position. She used her examples remind us that administrators make judgments that may or may not agree with the work of advisory committees, but also to make the point that our administration is guided by a commitment to make decisions that are in the best interest of the university and community.

The Provost and the President add that administrative decisions regarding personnel are subject to an extensive formal process in which candidates are reviewed at a number of levels and that candidates are subjected to extensive review by Human Resources. The Provost also connected these concerns to Winthrop's joining of the ACE Challenge, funded by the Sloan Foundation, that is dedicated to the promotion of faculty career flexibility, particularly in the areas of recruiting, retaining, and advancing faculty in their careers.

- 13) **University Priorities:** Why does Winthrop University not have a Diversity Officer? During President Comstock Williamson's interview visit with the campus community,

she was asked about faculty diversity, and she herself seemed surprised when she learned that we have no Diversity Officer. Does this remain a priority staffing position for her administration?

The president believes in a point person to lead on diversity. In South Carolina, however, a university cannot simply add another position, even if the university has the internal resources to do so. The university is only allowed a certain number of FTEs, and we cannot create a new job without the FTE being created by the state. The university has requested 10+ new FTEs, but until they are granted, the President plans on being very careful with the 2+ FTEs that we have. Other solutions to the need for a specified position to lead on diversity will be considered, particularly as data is gathered through Winthrop's participation in the "Great Colleges to Work For" survey.

EQUIRIES FORWARDED AFTER THE FALL MEETING WITH THE PRESIDENT

- 14) **University Priorities:** The University has made a significant commitment to undergraduate research, with an annual awards celebration, research publication, office for administration, faculty director, etc. Graduate students are at a point in their careers where they are often participating in significant research projects, leading to publications, presentations, and sometimes further graduate study, yet we don't do anything to celebrate their achievements, and it is often difficult to support their work. Does the University have any plans to recognize graduate research in the way(s) it has begun to recognize undergraduate research? Because this is another way we can call attention to the wonderful things that Winthrop students are doing.

The president and the Dean of the Graduate School, Jack DeRochi, are working with the Graduate Advisory Board on the timing and logistics of celebrating the achievements of graduate students, and the university is committed to celebrating these achievements.

- 15) **University Priorities:** Can Winthrop change the name of its main administrative building to remove the name of the unreconstructed racist Ben Tillman? His name on the building that is included on the Winthrop logo seems inappropriate at a university that prides itself on its commitment to diversity, particularly given its commitment to its African-American students.

Though the President understands the discomfort that many faculty and students share regarding the name of the main administrative building, she points out that there is a state statute against changing the name of a building named after an historical figure (SC Legal Code, 10-1-1-65). The President affirms, however, the

right of any faculty member to speak about this matter, though she reminds us that any such action would not reflect the official stance of the University.

- 16) **University Priorities:** Faculty have raised questions about the costs of the President's inauguration. Can the administration clarify the expense of the inauguration and place it into a context related to fundraising?

The purpose of the inauguration was to showcase the new President's vision and to showcase the wide range of activities and accomplishments that are currently occurring on campus. This event offered an important opportunity to get the Winthrop brand into the Charlotte and Rock Hill news cycle and to build funding opportunities in order to promote the long-term goals of the institution.

The total cost of the inauguration was \$70,000, \$23,000 of which went to the staging of the investiture (which included costs for Emergency Medical Services, sign language interpreters, robes for the platform party, etc.). The remaining portion of the \$70,000 covered marketing materials (such as state-wide advertising), invitations, money for banners, and research presentation materials. Money for the gala was provided through corporate donations (such as from Comporium) and personal donations.

Separate from any donations made to fund the gala, The Dare to Rise fund, which was integrated into invitations to the inauguration and the gala, has raised \$1.2 million to date. This, the President points out, indicates that the inauguration was a sound investment in terms of both money spent and in raising Winthrop's public profile.

- 17) **University Priorities:** Winthrop summer tuition used to be \$299 per credit; it has been raised to \$420 per credit. The new rate is now on the Winthrop website, but many faculty complained about not being warned that this change would take place.

Certain students, for example, are likely disproportionately impacted by this; many register for a 12 credit internship in the summer, and make the decision to do so a year in advance. Such students have been planning and budgeting for this summer (2014) for over a year; these students will now have to pay an additional \$1,452. To implement such a significant change with little notice seems to severely disadvantage students, as well as put faculty advisors in a difficult situation, particularly in terms of advising students.

Furthermore, it seems unreasonable that there will be a 30%-ish increase in tuition without a concurrent increase in faculty pay, especially when considering that a 3-credit course needs 6 students to make, generating \$7560, of which an assistant professor receives only \$2400. This is especially disturbing given the lack of raises in recent years. An increase in summer pay would by no means obviate the need for cost-of-living raises, especially for folks suffering most from salary compression, but it is an important issue. In addition, the dramatic increase in tuition could very well result in a significant drop in

summer enrollment, especially this year, causing more classes to fall below the enrollment minimum or below the 12 necessary to receive full pay.

The President says communication about this change could have been handled much better, and she apologizes for this oversight. She explained that this oversight was a product of her new administration's learning curve, and in particular the division of responsibilities under a new administration. Steps are being taken to correct this oversight.

The reason for the increase in summer tuition reflects the effort of the President to minimize required fees (Fall and Spring Semester tuition) by looking at the possibility of raising non-required fees (which include Summer Semester tuition). Summer Semester tuition had been lowered substantially in the past to increase enrollment, but this move did not substantially increase enrollments. The President and Provost point out that Summer Semester tuition is still a good bargain, with rates that are still 25% lower than the per-class costs during the regular academic year. These new Summer Semester tuition rates are not as high as at USC, but they are not the cheapest in the state.

The goal of this increased revenue is to minimize Fall and Spring Semester tuition costs and to put the University in a position to give faculty a 1% raise.

Faculty Committee on University Life Report 2013-2014

Chair: Dr. Jennifer Leigh Disney

Committee Members: Kathryn Davis, Stacey Davidson, Matthew Hayes, Jackie McFadden, Anne Olsen, Elke Schneider, Karen Stock, Laura Ullrich

This year, the Faculty Committee on University Life had ten issues upon which to focus. Four items (#1-4) dealt with Human Resources and workplace policy issues, and two items (#5-6) dealt with Facilities Management and health and safety concerns. As a result, the committee scheduled two meetings with these two offices. Human Resources was represented by Lisa Cowart, Associate Vice President for Human Resources, and Facilities Management was represented by Walter Hardin, Associate Vice President for Facilities Management, Chris Johnson, Sustainability Coordinator, and Mitzi Stewart, Winthrop University's Certified Hazardous Materials Manager and Environmental Health and Safety Manager. These meetings were incredibly informative. We will do our best to provide a summary of the information contained in these meetings and offer links where faculty and staff members can go for further information.

The remaining four issues we were asked to address we did not feel required a full meeting of the committee, but rather a committee representative charged with seeking information from the appropriate member of the staff or administration. Brief reports on those issues (#7-10) are included below as well.

Each area of Human Resources concern is covered by a university policy. The relevant policy is linked after the appropriate issue raised below, including the [Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy](#); the [Ethics Act](#); the [Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Policy](#); the [Workplace Violence Policy](#); and the [Risk Management](#) link. In some cases, Lisa spoke with us about the difference between a reported action being unethical/immoral and illegal.

- 1) **University Life:** Faculty have raised questions regarding where to go to report inappropriate or discriminatory behavior being engaged in by one of their superiors. Faculty have expressed a desire to see the university be proactive about building awareness about workplace discrimination based not only on race and gender, but also familial status (not getting a position because of being a mother or father of young children -- assumptions being made that you wouldn't have time, be distracted, etc.). There also needs to be a clear, simple, straightforward, and law-compliant way to make a complaint or raise a concern without being afraid for your job or tenure/promotion chances. (**Human Resources, Committee Meeting**)

[Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy](#)

- 2) **University Life:** Faculty have raised questions about Winthrop University's compliance with the anti-nepotism policy and making sure that there is no hiring, supervisory, or managerial advantage gained among and between family members among the

administration, faculty, and staff. For example, can a search committee be told that they must hire the family member of an administrator? (**Human Resources, Committee Meeting**)

[Ethics Act](#)

- 3) **University Life:** Faculty have raised questions regarding whether or not Winthrop University has a Sexual Misconduct Policy and/or Sexual Harassment Policy to cover relationships between faculty members and students. In addition, is there any policy in place to give faculty members guidance and support if a faculty member feels s/he is being threatened or in danger of losing his/her life? (**Human Resources, Committee Meeting**)

[Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Policy](#)

[Workplace Violence Policy](#)

- 4) **University Life:** Faculty have raised questions about workers compensation/liability issues for students engaged in internships. What policies are in place to cover our student interns? (**Human Resources, Center for Career and Civic Engagement, Committee Meeting**)

[Risk Management](#)

- 5) **University Life:** Faculty have asked about the need to fix leaking roofs around the campus in buildings such as Withers, McLaurin, and Thurmond. Faculty have also inquired about the possibility of installing solar panels on more building roofs on campus, perhaps in the process of fixing them. (**Facilities Management and Sustainability Coordinator – Committee Meeting**)

The last major roofing project took place in 1983. On July 1, \$70,000 worth of patching roofs did take place. A new roof on Withers is estimated to cost \$3.5-\$4.5 million. Cost savings would take a long time to see in adding solar panels to existing roofs. Degree of large flat space and whether or not the roofs could take the extra weight are also factors to consider. Use of skylights, windows, and solar panels on newly constructed buildings like the West Center are important aspects of energy budget savings.

- 6) **University Life:** Faculty have raised some health and safety questions about certain buildings on campus. Is the carpet that was installed some years back in Bancroft Hall covering up asbestos? There has been lots of talk about toxic mold, and faculty expressed concern that there may be an even more serious problem lurking below the retouched surface. The HVAC system in Kinard Hall and other buildings may also need to be examined. (**Facilities Management and Sustainability Coordinator – Committee Meeting**)

Our experts in Facilities Management explained to us that there are more than 500 policies that they follow to keep people out of trouble and keep people protected. It is illegal to remove asbestos-containing material without certain precautions (yet it is not illegal to produce asbestos-containing materials - FYI.) There are no regulations that stipulate that one must remove asbestos-containing materials except in K-12 schools. The regulations stipulate that you must maintain asbestos-containing materials in good condition undisturbed. We also must maintain third party abatement contracts with licensed abatement companies and environmental consulting companies. Asbestos was not a common building material until after WWII. When asbestos-containing materials have been found in the floor tiles (ex, Rutledge, 1989), the key is not to disturb the tile, to call in a consultant, and to conduct active air samples to verify the safety. Self-reporting to the state also takes place.

“Toxic mold” is not really a true term. While there is a species of mold that exhibits some characteristics of toxicity, indoor air quality is never done. Because indoor air quality is not an exact science, there really are not clear standards. Filters are changed twice a year when the unit needs cleaning. Our staff experts in Facilities Management explained so much more to us, and they offered to do a TLC Session on these kinds of workplace health and safety issues if there was interest among the campus community.

- 7) **University Life:** Faculty have raised questions about the hours of operation of The West Center. Faculty have observed a lot of activity at 11:00pm at night when students are forced to leave. The West Center provides a safe, healthy environment in which our students are engaged. Should we re-examine the hours of operation in terms of extending them or adjusting them based upon use? (**Grant Scurry –Kathy Davis**)

Grant Scurry is going to conduct some research on how many students have been in the West Center on all the nights this semester from 10-11pm and see if it is feasible/cost effective to keep it open until midnight. We have to remember that keeping a facility this big open for an extra hour impacts a lot of things, but he seemed quite willing to look into it. He is going to get back to us about the participation trends and added costs.

- 8) **University Life:** Faculty have asked about establishing a greater police presence around Winthrop lake, particularly regarding speeding that endangers runners, walkers, bicyclists, and their children. Faculty point out that such a presence could also be a way of increasing revenue through the ticketing of speeders. Faculty have also suggested the installation of speed bumps that take bicyclists into account on the roads surrounding the lake area. (**Campus Police – Karen Stock**)

The police are very supportive of speed bumps. There was a consultant that came several years ago and recommended the installation of speed bumps. The issue is the cost. Figures mentioned seemed to be as high as several thousand dollars. This reportedly does not come out of the police budget and it is unknown from where it would come. Other cost estimates seemed to be in the range of hundreds of dollars, and thus did not seem cost prohibitive, but rather an issue of priority. Even one speed bump at the curve when leaving the shack parking lot would arguably make a big difference. This should be pursued.

- 9) **University Life:** Faculty have suggested that midterm grading be incorporated into the Five Year Calendar, either for currently affected student populations or for broader populations as requirements for providing midterm grades to those populations are mandated (**Debra Boyd, Gloria Jones**).

It is our understanding that midterm grading is being incorporated into the Five Year Calendar.

- 10) **University Life:** Faculty have asked questions about their ability to buy U.S. Savings Bonds automatically through payroll, at each pay period. Faculty have expressed that this program existed until a few years ago when payroll went to online only, ending the program. According to faculty reports, it is still possible to have the automatic purchase of the bonds through payroll. Faculty would like us to look into the re-establishment of this program. (**Payroll - Laura Ullrich**)

The US Department of Treasury stopped issuing paper savings bonds in January 2012. Individuals may purchase savings bonds via the Dept of Treasury's online process at www.treasurydirect.gov. Due to extremely low employee participation, Winthrop discontinued the payroll deduction as an efficiency measure at the time the paper bonds were discontinued and the option to purchase online became available.