Winthrop University Faculty Conference
December 3, 2010
2 pm Whitton Auditorium, Carroll Hall

Agenda

I.	Approval of minutes of October 8, 2010 Faculty Conference	(*minutes attached*)
II.	Report from the Chair	Marsha Bollinger
III.	Report from the President	Anthony DiGiorgio
IV.	Report from the Vice President for Academic Affairs	Thomas Moore
V.	Committee Reports	
	Academic Council *(materials on pgs. 5-7)*	Dave Pretty
	Personnel Committee *(sample ballot attached, pg. 8)*	Siobhan Brownson
	Rules Committee *(materials on pg. 9)*	Mark Mitchell
	University Life *(materials attached, pgs. 10-12)*	Matthew Manwarren
	University Priorities *(materials attached, pgs13-19)*	Scott Huffmon
	Roles and Rewards Committee	Beth Costner
	SACS Reports	Karen Jones, Pat Graham
	TALONS Report	Cheryl Fortner-Wood, Tim Drueke
VI.	Unfinished business	
	Academic Freedom definition *(material attached, pg. 20)*	Rebecca Evers
VII.	New business	
VIII.	Announcements	
	From the Registrar	Gina Jones
IX.	Adjournment	

Faculty Conference Membership (317) 35%= 111; 20% = 63

Winthrop University Faculty Conference
Minutes from October 8, 2010
Whitton Auditorium

I. The meeting was called to order at 3:00; the faculty voted to do business in the absence of a quorum.

II. The minutes from the August 20, 2010 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Report from the Faculty Conference Chair, Dr. Marsha Bollinger.

Dr. Bollinger began by announcing that the Board of Trustees had not met since the last Faculty Conference meeting. The next Board meeting is on Friday, November 5.

She continued by stating that she has had two notable occasions to represent the faculty: (1) at the dedication luncheon for the DiGiorgio Campus Center and (2) at a briefing for the Winthrop Board and Rock Hill City Council on the College Town Action Plan. She commented that she wished more were able to be present at the dedication to hear the moving comments from two Board members and the DiGiorgios' daughter.

Dr. Bollinger also reported that the definition of academic freedom that had been passed by Faculty Conference at the August meeting needs to be modified before it can appear in the Faculty Manual. Specific recommendations from the president have been forwarded to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee.

IV. Report from the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Thomas Moore.

Dr. Moore began by taking responsibility for not checking the definition of Academic Freedom the faculty had submitted before it went to Dr. DiGiorgio. It will be resubmitted with the edits.

Dr. Moore then relayed information from President DiGiorgio. The enrollment numbers are not official yet, but they are expected to be lower than originally thought. However, Dr. Moore is "feeling good" about this year.

Dr. Moore briefly discussed Readiness Winthrop, saying that it is not a project, but a process that will take time. It relies on a range of items and it does not merely look at next year; it looks into the future.

Dr. Moore expressed his strong support for the University Level Competencies. The President would like to see technology and working in teams to solve problems added to the competencies at a later time.

A faculty member asked if Dr. DiGiorgio would pass the definition of Academic Freedom after the changes. Dr. Moore is certain he will.

V. Committee Reports

Academic Council, Dr. Dave Pretty

For information only:

College of Arts and Sciences, Department of English
Modify Bachelor of Arts in English, Language and Literature Track to allow ENGL 200 to count towards the major by removing required hours of English electives above 299.

For action by Faculty Conference:

Faculty Conference unanimously approved the four university-level competencies recommended by the University- Wide Academic Assessment Committee as proposed. See the agenda for details.

University Life

A written report was provided with the agenda.

VI. Unfinished Business

Curricular process update, Dr. Jo Koster and Mr. Tim Drueke

> Important curricular dates were announced.
Changes for the 2011-2012 academic year MUST be approved by the March 11, 2011, Faculty Conference meeting:
- Or by the March 1 Academic Council meeting
- Or by the February 18 CUC meeting
- Or by the January 28 faculty assemblies
Also remember, some items will need review by:
- February 11 General Ed Curriculum Committee
- February 8, Teacher Education Committee
Please contact Tim Drueke to see when your item needs approval.

> Faculty Conference was reminded in fair detail about how curricular actions now pass through the "new" review system. To review the Academic Program Approval Procedures, go to http://www.winthrop.edu/recandreg/default.aspx?id=7122.

> Be sure to consult with Tim Drueke before submitting changes or proposals.

QEP Report, Dr. Marilyn Sarow

Dr. Sarow announced the new director of the QEP.

She stated that Horizons (study abroad program) was no longer a part of QEP. The SACS specialist had said that "too much was being done" regarding the QEP. Another hurdle was the fact that $300,000 would have had to be raised for the program. As a result, Horizons has been moved out of QEP but is still "alive."

Dr. Sarow finished by saying that the final form of the QEP will be distributed to the faculty in November.

TALONS Report

Tim Drueke and Gina Jones did a cursory presentation of DegreeWorks. Mr. Drueke asked the faculty to please attend the training sessions for more detailed information. There will also be a webpage tutorial for students and faculty.

VII. New Business

There was no new business.

VIII. Announcements

Registration for math placement exams is on the Math Department website.

Dr. Moore expressed his appreciation to the QEP team, to AAAS, and to Records and Registration for all their hard work.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:22 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. L. Mark Lewis

FROM ACADEMIC COUNCIL:

Items approved by Academic Council (AC) as recommended by Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum (CUC):

Department of Human Nutrition
Modify Bachelor of Science in Human Nutrition-Dietetics by 1.) Replacing ECON 215 with a social science elective in Touchstone program; 2.) Removing NUTR 340A or C and adding NUTR 490 A or C; 3.) Deleting CHEM 521 Nutritional Biochemistry as a required course (**modify program**)

Modify Bachelor of Science in Human Nutrition-Food Systems Management by removing NUTR 340C and adding NUTR 490C **(modify program)**

Modify Bachelor of Science in Human Nutrition-Nutrition Science by replacing ECON 215 with a social science elective in Touchstone program **(modify program)**

Department of History
Modify Minor in Peace, Justice and Conflict Resolution Studies by adding PEAC 350 and PEAC 550 to the list of minor electives **(modify program).**

Items approved at CUC Level. No action required by AC.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Department of Environmental Studies
Add: SUST 102 Introduction to Sustainability (New Course)
Add: SUST 300 Topics in Applied Sustainability (New Course)

Department of Chemistry, Physics and Geology
Add: GEOL 225 Soils and Land Use (**New Course**)

Department of Modern Languages
Modify FREN 206 French for Business by changing course number to FREN 306 (**Renumber Course**); by changing course prerequisite from FREN 202 or permission of the instructor to FREN 250 or permission of the instructor (**Modify Prerequisite**)

Modify GERM 206 French for German for Business by changing course number to GERM 306 (**Renumber Course**); by changing course prerequisite from GERM 202 or permission of the instructor to GERM 250 or permission of the instructor (**Modify Prerequisite**)

Modify SPAN 206 French for Spanish for Business by changing course number to SPAN 306 (**Renumber Course**); by changing course prerequisite from SPAN 202 or permission of the instructor to SPAN 250 or permission of the instructor (**Modify Prerequisite**)

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Department of Physical Education, Sport and Human Performance
Modify EXSC 485 Exercise Physiology II and Lab by removing EXSC 511 as corequisite **(Modify Course)**

Modify PHED 290 Assessment of Physical Education by changing course number to PHED 390 (**Renumber Course**)

Modify PHED 384 Exercise Physiology by adding PHED 385 Exercise Physiology Laboratory as a Corequisite (**Modify Course**)

Modify PHED 480 Exercise Testing and Prescription by changing prerequisites to PHED 384, PHED 385, BIOL 307 and BIOL 308; by changing corequisites to PHED 481 for EXSC majors only, PHED 384, PHED 385

Items approved at College Assembly Level. No action required by CUC or AC.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Department of English
Course: WRIT 566 Technical and Scientific Writing
Action: Changed Course Title, course description, teaching method and added goals.

Department of Sociology
Course: ANTH 220 Introduction to Archaeology
Action: Changed Course Description

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Department of Accounting, Finance, and Economics
Course: ECON 495 Research in Economics
Action: Increased the number of times credit can be received from 2 to 2-6 times.

Department of Management and Marketing
Course: MGMT 326 Operations Management
Action: Changed Course Title, course description, and added course goals

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Department of Physical Education, Sport and Human Performance
Course: PHED 385 Exercise Physiology Laboratory
Action: Added Spring Term to course offering

The following items were tabled at the CUC Level and forwarded to the Graduate Council for action:

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
Department of Mathematics
Add: MAED 594 Basic Mathematical Concepts for Primary Teachers (**New Course**)

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Department of Physical Education, Sport and Human Performance
Modify EXSC 511 Physical Activity for Special and Aging Populations by changing Corequisite from EXSC 485 to PHED 480/481

Modify PHED 548 Psychology of Sport and Physical Activity by changing course number to PHED 401 (**Renumber Course)**

AC approved the following recommendations from the General Education Curriculum Committee:

1. Course Modifications - approved
    a. ANTH 220—course description change
    b. WRIT 566—course title change from "Technical and Scientific Writing" to "Writing for Sciences and Technology"

2. General Education Certifications
    a. First Certify
        i. Global: GERM 301—not accepted yet
        ii. Social Science: MCOM 101—accepted
        iii. Historical Perspective: ARTH 480, 481, 482—accepted with guidance
        iv. Humanities and Arts: DANT 385, 386—not accepted yet
    b. Recertification
        i. Historical Perspective
            1. HIST 313, 344, 345, 350, 351, 352, 509, 525, 527, 547, 548, 550, 560—accepted
            2. HIST 315—accepted with guidance
        ii. Humanities and Arts
            1. ENGL 308—accepted
            2. MGMT 575—not accepted yet
        iii. Oral Communications
            1. HIST 300—not accepted yet
            2. MAED 391—not accepted yet
        iv. Social Science
            1. HONR 234x—accepted
        v. Global Perspectives
            1. GEOG 303—not accepted yet
        vi. Technology
            1. MCOM 205, 241—accepted
            2. WRIT 501—accepted with guidance

FACULTY ELECTIONS

December 2010

Membership in the Winthrop University Faculty Conference for at least one year is required for election to any Standing Committee. A member of a Standing Committee of Faculty Conference who has served a complete term may not succeed him/herself. Standing Committees are noted on the Ballot.

The Kerley method of voting is used to prevent ties and runoff elections. Number you choices 1 (your first choice), 2, 3, etc. for every candidate on the ballot.

Example In a race to elect 2 committee members:

    _____4_____ Candidate A

    _____1_____ Candidate B   Using check marks will <u>void your</u>

    _____3_____ Candidate C   <u>ballot</u> for races with more than two

    _____2_____ Candidate D   candidates

<u>**Judicial Council.**</u> **2 year staggered terms for two faculty members elected by Faculty Conference; chair is appointed faculty member for a 2 year term; 1 year term for students.**

Serving through Spring 2011 to replace Carol Marchel (Curriculum and Pedagogy) for one semester, the nominees of the Faculty Personnel Committee are: (elect 1)

_____ Carlos Caballero, Arts and Sciences (Department of Mathematics)

_____ Cynthia Forrest, Arts and Sciences (Department of Social Work)

FROM RULES COMMITTEE:

The Rules Committee recommends that the following bylaws change be put on the agenda for the March 11, 2011 Faculty Conference meeting.   Recommended changes are shown in red.

Article IX – Section 4
The President of the University, upon the recommendation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, shall appoint three voting members of the Academic Council, each from a different major academic division of the University. The Faculty Conference shall elect three voting members at large. Each major academic division of the University shall elect members according to the following formula: one member for the first 25 full-time-equivalent faculty members or fraction thereof in that division and on additional member for each additional 50 full-time-equivalent faculty member or fraction thereof. **College Level** administrative officers **whose administrative assignment is greater than 50% of their workload** shall be ineligible to serve on the Academic Council, either by election or appointment, except as secretary. Department chairs are eligible to serve on Academic Council. The term of the chair shall be one year. The Council of Student Leaders shall select one voting member, who shall serve a one-year term. The terms of the voting members of the Academic Council shall be three years and shall be staggered as determined by regulations adopted by the Faculty Conference. If a member ceases to serve, his or her successor shall be appointed or elected for the unexpired term only. A voting member may not serve in succession more than two complete consecutive terms. No person shall be eligible to serve as a voting member unless he or she has served two years as a student at Winthrop University or as a faculty member at Winthrop University immediately preceding his or her service.

FACULTY COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY LIFE
Report to the Faculty Conference, December 3, 2010

The Faculty Committee on University Life met on October 28. Another meeting is scheduled for November 18.

The following is a list of items our committee has discussed.

1) Our committee has been in touch with President DiGiorgio regarding his recent statement in which he stated that Winthrop had no immediate plans to initiate new construction on campus in the immediate future. Our committee asked for clarification about proposed plans to build a new library. Our questions to the President were the following.
   a) Do plans still exist to build a new library?
   b) And if not, are there plans to address the following concerns with respect to the current library facility?
       i) The need for group study rooms on the main floor and possibly the ground floor;
       ii) The possibility of providing 24 hour access to the main floor with gates to seal off the other floors; and if so, how will the fire code be met?
       iii) The need for more individual private study space.
The following is President DiGiorgio's response.

While we still have intentions of building a new library facility, the prospect of doing so in the near term is limited by the current state of the economy. Given that the projected cost of a new library is now estimated to be more than $50 million, it will be necessary to finance the bulk of the construction through the state's capital improvement bond bill process rather than through dedicated fees paid by students.   There has not been a substantive bond bill to support capital construction since the mid 1990s. Although there is sufficient bonding capacity under the state's debt ceiling for a major capital bond bill, it will depend upon the intentions of Governor-elect Haley whether or not a bond bill emerges. If she signals a veto of a bond bill, the General Assembly will likely not initiate one since there is not a veto proof majority to override a gubernatorial veto. We have no indication when the next bond bill is to be, and stand ready to begin that process if and when the opportunity presents itself.

In the meantime, Dacus Library is on this year's list of facilities to be studied by a consulting architect to help us develop a plan for some significant adaptive reuse of the facility since we will likely have to depend upon it longer than anticipated. The areas you reference including additional group study rooms, 24 hour access, and individual private study spaces among other improvements are included in the study.

Also, we have already begun to look at alternative sites for the Louise Pettus Archives & Special Collections. The space vacated by the Archives would be used to support other library activities. As these processes move forward, the campus community will be kept informed. The Dacus staff have been solicited for input and will be kept in the loop as we move forward.

2) Our committee has also discussed the issue that students are now able to drop a course without having to obtain the signature of the course instructor and advisor. This change in policy has the following ramifications.

   a) An instructor is not given a chance to work with the student to help him/her succeed in the course. If a student has performed poorly on an exam and then drops the course out of fear of failing, the instructor does not have the opportunity to work with the student to improve his/her class standing.

b) If a student drops a course, the only way to know this fact is to check Wingspan on a regular basis, which is inconvenient and takes time.

c) If the advisor is left out of the process, it can create a challenge in the advising process (for example, a course that a student dropped and needed for a degree program might not be offered for several semesters, thus affecting the student's ability to graduate on time).

d) An advisor is not given the opportunity to help the student resolve concerns and issues with the course instructor.

Our committee has been in touch with Gina Jones, Registrar, and the following is her response to our concerns.

This change in procedure was thoroughly discussed with the Deans last spring and was supported by them. We did not take this change lightly. As with most change, however, there are challenges in meeting the needs of everyone.

Regarding the student and advising: The decision to withdraw from a course is the student's alone, and this is stated in the catalog. In discussions with the Deans and the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Registrar and Associate VP of Academic Affairs talked of difficulties students had in obtaining signatures from both advisor and instructor to withdraw from a class. In researching the reasoning behind signatures, we discovered that signatures were never intended to get "permission" from the advisor and instructor but rather to serve them with notification of the decision. Also, we had students (especially upperclassmen and graduates) who were angered by having to get what they saw as "permission" to withdraw from a course. We had to think of our many off-campus and evening students as well, who had great difficulty in meeting a 5 PM deadline that most offices at the university have. We also discussed with student services personnel about their conversations with students who wanted to withdraw, and none of them could say they talked a student out of withdrawing from a course. It is important, however, that students are informed about possible repercussions of withdrawing from a class, and I will be glad to add that to our website as well as include it in my email and Wingspan announcement on that subject.

We did research other colleges who had implemented online course withdrawals with great success including the College of Charleston, Appalachian State, UNC-Charlotte, and Lander.

Regarding faculty: In our discussions with the Deans, we did point out that faculty had access to their class lists 24 hours a day through Wingspan. Also, when instructors or advisors were not available to sign a form, department chairs, deans and student services personnel were the ones burdened with signing the forms. Faculty were not notified until they received a copy of the course withdrawal form several weeks and sometimes a couple of months later. An email notification process is certainly something we want to implement via Workflow, but given our time constraints, we were unable to set this in motion. We have to wait until IT is able to take on this task.

3) The committee discussed the prioritization of issues mentioned in the first meeting, September 24. A list of these issues is found in our report to the Faculty Conference, October 8 (under 4). The chair in the near future will send out an email blast to the entire faculty listing the topics mentioned so far in meetings with the hope

that faculty will send us their thoughts and opinions on these issues, and from there, our committee will have a better idea as to how we wish to prioritize these concerns.

The Faculty Committee on University Life will continue to address these issues, and we welcome input from faculty. We would also encourage faculty to be in touch with their college representatives on this committee if they wish to express other concerns. These representatives include Bob Gorman (Library), Christian Grattan (Arts and Sciences), Cecile Leung (Arts and Sciences), Matthew Manwarren (CVPA), Carol Marchel (COE), Lou Pantuosco (CBA), Kristi Schoepfer (COE), Courtney Starrett (CVPA), and Laura Ullrich (CBA).

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Manwarren, Chair
Faculty Committee on University Life

Report by the Faculty Committee on University Priorities on Interviews with the Deans and Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs and University Advancement regarding Readiness Winthrop.

As Winthrop moves through this fiscal year toward one with even less money due to further cuts and the loss of federal stimulus money, the Faculty Committee on University Priorities thought it prudent to attempt to inform the faculty on Readiness Winthrop. Readiness Winthrop is the quickly moving and ever evolving attempt to prepare the university to weather these economic troubles.

Readiness Winthrop is meant to be more of a "process" than a "thing" and is also meant to be adaptive. There are both short term concerns and goals and long term concerns and goals. Few of these items are "set in stone" as doing so might prevent the university from nimbly responding to an unforeseen situation. That said, the Faculty Committee on University Priorities decided to interview the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Vice President of Finance and Business, the Vice President for University Advancement, and the Deans of the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business Administration, the Richard W. Riley College of Education, Library Services, University College, and Visual and Performing Arts. This list DOES NOT represent all of the officers and academic leaders we wished to interview; however, this pared down list seems more prudent given the limitations of interviewers (i.e. committee size) and in the interest of time.

Somewhat miraculously, stars and schedules aligned to allow for nearly all of these individuals to be interviewed by a member of the Faculty Committee on University Priorities. The committee settled on five core questions to which we felt the faculty needed answers. We asked the same five questions to each individual. As Readiness Winthrop became clearer, the overlap of some of the questions became obvious. The following **WILL NOT** answer all of your questions about this on-going process, but hopefully it will only be the opening of a constant conversation about something that affects us all.

We were able to schedule and complete interviews with: the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Vice President for University Advancement, and the Deans of the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business Administration, the Richard W. Riley College of Education, University College, and Visual and Performing Arts. Below are the five core questions.

1) What is your understanding of Readiness Winthrop (what it entails, what it means for your unit or division, etc.)

2) What should faculty know about Readiness Winthrop to help them be prepared?

3) What do you perceive to be the role for faculty in the Readiness Winthrop Initiative?

4) As you conduct activities for your part of Readiness Winthrop, what will you be reviewing, focusing on, evaluating, auditing, etc.?

5) What is your timeline for what you will be doing (and decisions you will be making) regarding Readiness Winthrop?

Each question will be presented followed by each individual answer to that question. Note: some interviews were done ***prior*** to the Deans being fully briefed on the process and some are direct responses while others are interviewer summaries. The committee is grateful to those who were able to make time for these interviews.

1) What is your understanding of Readiness Winthrop (what it entails, what it means for your unit or division, etc.)?

Vice President Moore:
Readiness Winthrop is an umbrella for (a) student recruitment, (b) student retention, (c) enhancing revenue, (d) increasing efficiencies, (e) reviewing facilities and capital improvements with an eye toward the above. Revenue enhancement (beyond increased tuition dollars from higher enrollments and student retention) *may* include, but not be limited to, grants, summer camps, corporate partnerships, etc.

Vice President Holten:
- It's an intentional process to get through the present tough times.
- Despite its name it's not a campaign with a start and an end – on-going.
- From her perspective we need to
  a) Look at recruiting "right" students = individuals who match up with Winthrop's offerings and faculty.
  b) Retain our recruits.
  c) Raise money from more sources to keep costs under control.
  d) Look for "efficiencies" = cuts some places.
- It's process to insure Winthrop's future and to help it grow, keep, support enrollment and do so cost-effectively without hurting programs
- But, choices will have to be made.
- Resources may be shifted

Dean Boyd:
- It's a process and it is on-going.
- It's not different in many ways from what we've always done.
- The context of the diminished role of state funding has necessitated our immediate attention be directed to make more informed decisions about what we do and how it's done.
- "Why rename it if we already do it?" To act as a focus, especially in more global context. Being "effective and efficient" is something that's been considered over the last 3 years.

Dean's role:
- To be more rigorous about programs and their A&S interactions.
- Will require we look at departments, programs and tracks.
- What cuts? What additions? It's based on what the unit needs to deliver [How that will be decided never made clear.] based on "evaluation of all aspects" including
  a) Student credit hour production
  b) Student needs (e.g., graduation requirements)
  c) Accreditation
  d) This is probably not that different from the approach so far but it needs to be more "intentional".
- There probably will be some shifting of resources
- She is "willing to meet with all representatives to the faculty Priorities Committee anytime."

Dean Weikle:
1. Readiness Winthrop is a broad plan examining how Winthrop can survive and excel given the current and likely future economic and political situation. It starts with the 3.4 million loss of federal dollars next year. A focus of the plan is to examine growth and sustainability of Winthrop University. It basically gives a one year license to the President with very broad powers to meet the tough economic times.

   Everything is on the table to evaluate. Specifically for the business school we are looking to grow enrollment (as all schools are). We are looking for natural pairings for business majors (double major…psychology and business or math and computer science for example or a 5 year undergrad/MBA).
   Faculty need to know the 5 recruiting questions students and parents ask when considering a school and program (major)
   a. Does the institution offer a program they want?
   b. Is the program good? What evidence is there to support it?
   c. What evidence is there regarding student and alumni success after they student graduates?
   d. Can I get in the school?
   e. Can we afford it?

The first three questions are relevant because Winthrop will need to grow and faculty can have a direct impact. Winthrop also needs to offer relevant majors to meet the needs of the population and support the value and quality of the program. This drives family and student decisions to attend college.

Also, marketing programs directly to prospective students will become even more important. Everything is on the table to examine. Do we want to offer a mini-winter session? 4 hour courses?

Dean Rakestraw:
My understanding of Readiness Winthrop is that it involves a plan to make Winthrop prepared for its future—to keep it viable, transforming in accordance to society changes and how that impacts institutions of higher education (re Mohler's Culture Shift), and attracting students. This means looking at current and new program areas, delivery models, providing academic and student services to meet current and future student demands, etc.). For the COE, I think our new fifth year MAT model (MAT5) that is awaiting CHE approval is an example of an academic program that works with the Readiness Winthrop concerns. Offering programs in different format (more online/hybrid courses and programs), innovative scheduling, etc. are other things that we may consider. For us, I think it will primarily affect how we think about what programs we need to be providing—and how we provide them.

Dean Jones:
Readiness Winthrop is an initiative designed to discover ways to make ourselves more efficient, effective, and market ready in this time of economic downturn.

For University College this means:
- Improving transferability ease of courses particularly with respect to General Education. Example: A History course completed at a previous school for which Winthrop does not have an exact equivalent but clearly meets Historical Perspectives

- All Deans are looking at ways to make all programs more transfer friendly. Example: Assist non-traditional students by offering more online courses particularly in General Education.

Readiness Winthrop incorporates whatever we have to do that isn't illegal or immoral to ensure that our university continues to attract high-quality students from SC and beyond. Our job—everyone's job is to keep ourselves current—in our fields, in pedagogy, in recruitment, in retention, in whatever—to attract, keep, and prepare our students for careers and life.

Dean Wohl:
The dean said that, since he was new to Winthrop, his knowledge of 'Readiness Winthrop' was based on the public comments made by Dr. DiGiorgio. A recent meeting with the VP for Academic Affairs was helpful and that further meetings were planned. Dean Wohl's understanding was that it focused on finding creative ways to increase revenue and reduce expenditures – and that the 2011-12 academic year would be especially challenging. 'Readiness Winthrop' would be part of an overall strategy to insure that Winthrop was prepared to offer students new and interdisciplinary academic programs that would meet the demands of an increasingly complex digital world – and to explore ways to lessen the negative impact that the anticipated fiscal shortfall would have on the university, faculty, staff and students.

2) What should faculty know about Readiness Winthrop to help them be prepared?

Vice President Moore:
That they're involved already by actively participating in:
- participating in program reviews
- program development (e.g. sustainability minor, international studies)
- making the transfer process easier for students wishing to transfer to Winthrop
- focusing on honors offerings
- finding and promoting "student stories" for recruitment purposes
- creative scheduling

Vice President Holten:
- Kathryn's "all about faculty involvement".
- She wants to meet with all chairs/departments, deans, unit heads to talk about recruitment and retention.
- Wants faculty to "partner" with her office and its efforts. Needs help in getting "customized contacts" in her "Recruitment Plus" system.
  a) What's so special about this major?
  b) Web pages for departments with what's high quality about it, what do graduates end up doing, testimonials, etc.
  c) Especially interested in outcomes – professors who remain in contact w/students and can send Kathryn "the story", successes that offset the "Is it worth it?" argument. – A degree has a payoff.

Dean Boyd:
see answers to #1 above and #3 below

Dean Weikle:
Faculty need to know the 5 recruiting questions students and parents ask when considering a school and program (major)
1. Does the institution offer a program they want?
2. Is the program good? What evidence is there to support it?
3. What evidence is there regarding student and alumni success after they student graduates?
4. Can I get in the school?
5. Can we afford it?
Faculty should take this charge seriously and when asked to participate in Readiness Winthrop activities to make it a priority. "Cut to the chase" when taking Readiness Winthrop initiatives.

Dean Rakestraw:
I think faculty need to understand the changes that occurring in society that will impact what we do as a college and university. What can and should we be offering that will meet our students' needs and the needs of the region and nation? If students can get on-line degrees or have courses/programs provided to them that are available without having to drive to campus each week, will they still come to us? Who will our future students be and how can we meet their expectations for an education? We need to look at the context of our world and changes that are ahead of us and be willing to think in an open-minded and forward-thinking manner as we make programmatic decisions.

Dean Jones:
Faculty may have to rethink/reshape the way they complete certain aspects of their jobs to meet current needs without diluting programs. Examples: online, Saturday, and more evening course offerings. Greater flexibility in scheduling.

Dean Wohl:
"My sense of faculty involvement is consistent with my view that strong faculty governance is essential in achieving consensus and making progress towards meeting the goals that the institution has established. I've heard the President say publically that he welcomes all ideas from the academic community that would help us work "smarter" and more efficiently. I'm not sure there is a structured forum for this input as yet, but I'm hopeful that the entire initiative will be transparent and participatory. But, I'm basically a pretty hopeful an optimistic guy. So, stay tuned for further updates."

3) What do you perceive to be the role for faculty in the Readiness Winthrop Initiative?

Vice President Moore:
see answer to #2. Already doing it. Promote the Academic Success Center and offer feedback through regular communication channels (i.e. established 'chain-of-command')

Vice President Holten:
- Do much of above as well as improve own advising activities.
- Try to understand more from student perspectives.
- Admits that we already have good faculty/student relationships a' la above concerns.

Dean Boyd:
- "take process seriously"
- "Get out of your own bunker"
- Do reviews of own offerings
- Consider the broadest view.
- Do above by being informed. Go to the Sourcebook at the Institutional research site and look at all data and information there.
- Cooperate in the process by working for the good of all students
- Ask selves how my work and that of the department/program, fit with the larger Winthrop goals. That includes more HMPX and ACAD involvement across the faculty.
- Suggested that "faculty might not get quite as much sleep."
- Need more trust.
- Faculty need to be active in the recruitment process.
- Faculty need to support retention efforts.
- We should be rigorous but, when appropriate, be flexible in accommodating students.
- use established chain-of-command for feedback

Dean Weikle:
Participate, take it seriously. We as faculty have been given different charges on various levels to examine issues such as sustainability options, double majors, online options and others. Resources depend on this. Our livelihood depends on this. This is an extremely in important initiative and we as faculty need to participate.

Dean Rakestraw:
To be proactive in gaining an understanding of the challenges that Winthrop faces and to be an active participant in thinking of ways we can make Winthrop "ready" for the future—that is, taking a good knowledge of the big picture and drawing it down to the program and college levels. It will take faculty to help produce well-reasoned, concrete ways to identify and implement any needed changes at the program and college levels.

Dean Jones:
Discover/look for ways to be more flexible and efficient without diluting programs. Suggestions up through department chairs, deans, …

Dean Wohl:
see #2 above

4) As you conduct activities for your part of Readiness Winthrop, what will you be reviewing, focusing on, evaluating, auditing, etc.?

Vice President Moore:
see #1 above and professional contracts (an example of something that *might* be looked at and *may or may not* be changed is the professional contract for deliveries)

Vice President Holten:
- See material in #1 plus get engaged more in/ more comfortable with emerging media (Google/banner ads, etc.)

Dean Boyd:
- covered most of this above in # 1 & #2
- "Readiness Winthrop" is a label for something already done/doing but has produced anxiety. She spoke mostly about that and emphasized faculty roles above as well as trust.

Dean Weikle:
- Curricula (is it appropriate to meet today's needs), majors offered and partners for double majors (evidently a big target for prospective parents and students), resources required for new majors.
- Focus- Growing student population, offering appropriate options and classes, maintaining high quality learning environment. What has the highest impact?
- Auditing- cost/benefit of new or reorganized options.
- Evaluate- First of three recruiting questions (see answers above).

Dean Rakestraw:
 I am trying to stay abreast of information related to the types of programs offered today. I'm asking these questions and trying to find the answers:
   a) What innovative, quality programs are being offered that attract students and seem to be filling a gap (re (types of programs, program content, program delivery, etc.)?

   b) Are new types of jobs being created in our professional fields that we need to be preparing people for? How can we be more responsive to changing workforce needs?

   c) What programs (quality or not) are taking innovative approaches (types of programs, program content, program delivery, etc.) and finding success in attracting students? What can we learn from them, if anything?
Basically, I'm trying to more fully understand the culture shift that is occurring, trying to determine how it could impact what we are doing as a college, and then specifically looking at our programs and how we deliver our programs to make sure that, with what we are doing right now, we are moving in good directions. I'm sure that we will need to have discussions about this within the College as Readiness Winthrop becomes more public. (Like I said earlier, you and the Univ Priorities Committee know more than I do about the actual plan that is coming from the Executive Officers.)

Dean Jones:
Curriculum, course content, and those teaching to ensure our students' achievement and success.

Dean Wohl:
Within the College, the dean is starting to examine certain budgetary issues and the collection of data – for example, spending for/on adjunct faculty. This includes consistency as to what adjuncts are paid, and for chairs to look at data to compare reduced credit hours with the need to hire fewer adjunct faculty.

Mr. Wohl said that he had found significant errors (over a period of 4/5 years, 2006 - 2009) in the 'Credit Hour Production' in which certain sections of the College (e.g., the Design Department) were omitted. Inaccuracies over a number of years may impact the budget. This could also affect the case being made for staffing.

On the subject of recruitment, another important issue he understood, the dean said that Dr Moore has taken on the subject of 'transfer issues' - to make it easier for students to transfer, as per the 'articulation agreement'. This is an important issue as other colleges/universities are lowering their expectation/requirement in order to accept students. Also, many students may be going to Tech or two-year colleges for a couple of years, then transferring to WU, and others, in order to save money. Dr Wohl said that this was a difficult issue regarding parity for us in the arts but that we had to address it.

He also said that our web presence was important – to be able to reach the interested potential student, and he was working with his staff to see what could be done to improve this.

He said he was looking into the possibility of the '3 year degree' and also to develop new concentrations that offered interdisciplinary courses of study. But he added that such courses may be interesting theoretically but a little more difficult to find 'ownership' for, or by whom – a 'home'

5) What is your timeline for what you will be doing (and decisions you will be making) regarding Readiness Winthrop?

Vice President Moore:
Short term: these are the things you might hear the term "fast track" applied to within the Readiness Winthrop process. They are things that are happening now such as savings and efficiencies including not printing paper versions of the catalog, the Vision of Distinction, or F.Y.I. and increasing energy savings through efficiency. Also included are reviews of the possibility of ceasing to mail student grades (i.e. via 'snail mail')

Long term: an example of an item on a longer term horizon might be the development of new programs

Vice President Holten:
- This year:
  a) Develop stronger international recruitment efforts.
  b) Parent recruitment effort. – 70% of potential recruits involve parents in the decision of where they'll go. Get parents of students already here to talk to those of prospective students. Let THEM sell Winthrop.
- VOD – Make Winthrop a more transfer-friendly campus
  a) Two advisors, one "academic", one "practical".
  b) Need on-going evaluation of transcripts for folks intending to transfer to make effort more seamless.
  c) Get other students "instant evaluations" of transcripts.

Dean Boyd:
She said it's already being done but said that faculty and departmental reviews/ new curricula/department-level changes are on track for this semester and early next semester.

Dean Weikle:
The Deans submit their proposals. The President has till July 2011 to act upon these proposals according to the 1 year charge from the Board of Trustees.

Dean Rakestraw:
I am waiting for Dr. DiGiorgio to share more about Readiness Winthrop with the deans. I am so focused on SACS accreditation and other pressing matters this year that I am not really doing much—except getting the MAT5 program approved. I believe that I'll hear more about Readiness Winthrop in January and then will be asked to get our college involved in discussions and planning during 2011. So I'm in a "hold pattern" right now until I get more information and direction from Dr. DiGiorgio and Dr. Moore.

Dean Jones:
At this time no specific hard deadlines have been established. Readiness Winthrop is an ongoing process.

Dean Wohl:
"It's my sense from meetings that those issues (transfer flexibility, recruitment, flexible programs) are certainly being studied and/or in the process of being studied".

FROM ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE:

The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee requests the endorsement of the following statements. These will appear in the Faculty Manual.

Statement of Academic Freedom:

Institutions of higher education exist for the common good. In quest for this common good the right of faculty members to academic freedom is of fundamental importance. Academic Freedom empowers faculty to discuss responsibly all relevant matters in the classroom; to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression; and to speak or write as public citizens* without institutional discipline or restraint.

*When speaking or writing as private citizens:

Members of the academy faculty will adhere to all applicable laws and University policy that mandate any actions taken by employees as private citizens be done on the employees' personal time and without the use of state or University equipment, supplies, or facilities. Furthermore employees, when acting as public citizens, should clearly state that they are not speaking for the University.