

**Winthrop University Faculty Conference
28 September, 2018
2:00 p.m., Kinard 018**

Agenda

- I. Approval of Minutes for August 18, 2018 Faculty Conference
(Minutes to Follow)
- II. Report from the Chair
Michael Lipscomb
- III. Report from the President
Dan Mahony
- IV. Report from the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
Debra Boyd
- V. Academic Council
Jo Koster *(Supporting Material, to Follow, in Appendix I)*
- VI. Committee Reports
 - a. Rules Committee: Bylaws and Policy Proposals
Zach Abernathy *(Supporting Materials in Appendix II)*
 - b. Personnel Committee: Electronic Election Announcement
and Floor Nominations
Scott Werts *(Supporting Materials in Appendix III)*
- VII. Task Force on Tenure and Promotion Protocols
Michael Lipscomb

VIII. Registrar, Office of Records and Registration
Gina Jones

IX. Unfinished Business

X. New Business

XI. Announcements

XII. Adjournment

Faculty Conference Membership (333) 35%= 117 20%= 67

Minutes
Winthrop University Faculty Conference
17 August 2018
2:00 p.m., Plowden Auditorium

- I. Dr. Boyd introduced new Vice President for Student Affairs Sheila Burkhalter, who spoke briefly about move-in today.
- II. Approval of Minutes for April 13, 2018 Faculty Conference (Minutes to Follow). Faculty voted to approve the minutes from our last meeting.
- III. Report from the Chair, Dr. Michael Lipscomb
 - a. Remarks and Introduction of Secretary and Parliamentarian: Dr. Lipscomb thanked Dr. Bickford and Dr. Kiblinger for continuing in these roles this year.
 - b. Dr. Lipscomb introduced committee chairs of the committees of Faculty Conference: Academic Council: Jo Koster; GENED: Kristen Abernathy; Undergraduate Curriculum: Laura Glasscock; Faculty Committee University Priorities: Malayka Klimchak; Rules: Zach Abernathy; Academic Freedom and Tenure: Jennifer Jordan; Faculty Committee on University Life: Jackie McFadden; Faculty Personnel: Scott Werts; Library: Seth Rouser; Undergraduate Petitions: Jason Chung. Academic Integrity has not picked a chair yet.

c. Recognition of Faculty Members Promoted and/or Tenured:

Tenure: In 2017-2018, nine faculty were awarded tenure. Following is a roster of individuals receiving tenure.

College of Arts and Sciences

Dr. Maria Aysa-Lastra	Sociology
Dr. Eric Birgbauer	Biology
Dr. Tara Collins	Psychology
Dr. Amanda Hiner	English
Dr. Sarah Reiland	Psychology
Dr. William Schulte	Mass Communication

College of Visual and Performing Arts

Ms. Stacy Davidson	Fine Art
Dr. Jeffrey McEvoy	Music
Ms. Meg Schriffen	Dance

Promotion: In 2017-2018, twenty-three faculty were awarded promotions to Professor or Associate Professor. Following is a roster of individuals receiving promotion.

To Rank of Professor

College of Arts and Sciences

Dr. M. Gregory Oakes	Philosophy
Dr. Kathy Lyon	Psychology
Dr. Kelly Richardson	English

College of Business Administration

Dr. Barbara Burgess-Wilkerson	Management
Dr. Melissa Carsten	Management

Richard W. Riley College of Education

Dr. Kathryn Davis	PE Ed
Dr. Shawna Helf	Literacy
Dr. Kavin Ming	Literacy

College of Visual and Performing Arts

Dr. Tomoko Deguchi	Music
Dr. L. Mark Lewis	Music

To Rank of Associate Professor

College of Arts and Sciences

Dr. Zachary Abernathy	Mathematics
Dr. Meir Barak	Biology
Dr. Leslie Bickford	English
Dr. Tara Collins	Psychology
Dr. Dustin Hoffman	English
Dr. Sarah Reiland	Psychology

Dr. William Schulte Mass Communication

College of Business Administration

Dr. Adriana Cordis Accounting

Dr. Philip Gibson Finance

College of Visual and Performing Arts

Ms. Stacey Davidson Fine Art

Ms. Emily Morgan Dance

Dr. Tracy Patterson Music

Ms. Meg Schriffen Dance

- d. Dr. Lipscomb spoke to the ways in which he works with FCUP and FCUL to ensure the President and Provost hear faculty concerns put forth to these committees. He elaborated on the division of work between the two: FCUL hears concerns about the day-to-day operations of the university, like a parking or building problem; FCUP hears concerns related to the fundamental mission of the university. Faculty confused about which committee to approach should rest assured that the committees will direct their concerns accordingly. FCUP is working in a proactive way with the administration.
- e. The Task Force on Tenure and Promotion Protocols is reviewing the processes for tenure and promotion this year, continuing their work from last year. Dr. Lipscomb entreated faculty to communicate with this group about their concerns and ideas about these processes.
- f. Amanda Stewart let us know at our last meeting last year that the Foundation has money available for students struggling with food insecurity, buying books and supplies, etc. Faculty identifying such students should contact Miranda Knight and let her pursue each case herself.
- g. Report from June 21 and 22, 2018 Board of Trustees Meeting: Dr. Lipscomb gave a distilled version of Board activities. They welcomed three new members: Isaiah Venning (Elected by the Alumni Association), Ed Driggers (Elected by the General Assembly Congressional District 4), and Robby Sisco (Elected by the General Assembly Congressional District 7). The Board elected Mr. Glen McCall as Chair and Ms. Cathy Bigham as Vice Chair. Dr. Lipscomb thanked Mr. Karl Folkens for his good work and expressed confidence in the new leadership. The Board discussed how to keep tuition increases low and approved the lowest increases feasible. The Board also began a new contract with food service Sodexo. Dr. Lipscomb thanked Dr. Boyd for her leadership through some recent challenging times. She will be working hard during this next year, after which she plans to return to the English department.

IV. Report from the President, Dr. Dan Mahony

- a. Administration has done some summer ½ day meetings with the Board, which Dr. Mahony spoke about in terms of tuition. The state legislature gave us \$800,000 but increased some fees that equaled this extra money. We did get money for some facilities. This summer there were focus groups created to work with staff concerns expressed in the surveys last year.
- b. Food Services change: We didn't choose Sodexo; the state really scores the different food services and mainly makes the choice. The 2.4% increase in the food service fee is the lowest increase we've had in a long time. Based on how we do revenue sharing this is 10 to 20 million dollars better over the next ten years than Aramark. Sodexo has taken on more responsibility than Aramark did in the past. All front line employees with Aramark were offered jobs; some managerial folks stayed, but many Sodexo managers were already in place.
- c. Provost Search: If you're interested in serving on the committee, talk to Dr. Lipscomb or your Dean. We want to begin that search ASAP. Question: Will we be using a search company? Dr. Mahony said not for this search. It's probably \$100,000 to hire a search firm, and many deans want to be Provost, so we should be able to find plenty of good candidates without using a search company.
- d. Enrollment: Enrollment is down across the country; Dr. Mahony spoke to the reasons why (the PowerPoint for this report is available in the Supporting Materials for the August 17 Faculty Conference Assembly, which is available via the Faculty Conference Webpage) and the following brief highlights:
 - i. There is a consistent trend across the country for larger institutions to gobble up more students since 2011 to the detriment of smaller institutions, both four-year and two-year. By income, the USC/Clemson population nearly exactly matches that of a private university like Furman or Wofford. Our out of state students pay about twice as much as our in-state students. Nationally, about 40% of students lose the LIFE scholarship after their first year of college.
 - ii. Dr. Mahony spoke about strategies to recruit students. International recruitment is not as realistic under the current conditions as it used to be. Community college transfer students are a great pool to pull from, but WU needs to be more transfer friendly. Adult degree completers comprise a fast growing group to increase enrollment, as do Professional Master's and Certificate Programs. Increased retention continues to be critical.
 - iii. Dr. Mahony also said we are working with a financial aid leveraging firm to more strategically spend our financial aid dollars/institutional aid. We're limited by the state on how much

scholarship money we can provide, so we need to be very strategic about how we spend that money on students. Question: Are there stats on the actual number of college age students available? Is the number of kids just down? Dr. Mahony answered we do see fewer coming out of high school. Question: Dr. Greg Oakes asked where WU is in terms of price compared to our peers in the state? Dr. Mahony answered that the best source is College Score Card, which breaks down what students actually pay: we're in the middle of the state in terms of price. Our average freshman only pays \$4,500. Sticker price is meaningless. Question: what portion of that reduction are we providing institutionally as opposed to Pell grants, etc? We provide about 1/3rd of that reduction. Given changes we've made in the Foundation management, we have about \$1000 more already for scholarships than we did. This will help us in a long term way. Question: Dr. Adolphus Belk added that students pay about 66% of our sticker price. Question: What percentage of our students are first generation? Dr. Mahony said that 45% of our Pell students are first generation students. Follow up: given that percentage, how do we get out the "ignore the sticker price" message and show prospective students what they'll actually spend? During recruiting, we do this, and talking up state scholarships to stay in state would help. Question: Dr. Van Aller, CAS, wondering whether common strategies among comprehensive universities could help? We give a private school education for a public school price. Dr. Mahony agreed, but said it's sometimes hard to convince students of this. Question: Mr. Jason Tselentis, CVPA, heard NYU is giving away tuition because they're worried about pricing themselves out of good students. Clemson used to offer tuition to STEM majors. When will we have to get that aggressive? Dr. Mahony said we can't because our endowment is so low, but we absolutely have to raise money for scholarships. Q: Dr. Alex Perri, CBA. Are there any smaller colleges in our group doing something right? What can we learn from them? Dr. Mahony said they've relied less on traditional first year freshman. Other schools have also lowered their standards. We do rely on the SAT and ACT too much; they don't predict success. We can change our admission strategies without lowering our standards. Western Carolina lowered tuition for in-state students to \$500 and \$2500 for out of state; the state gave

them the money to supplement that amount. They've been able to buck the trend. Dr. Kristi Schoepfer, COE: our website is not user friendly but is a big part of recruitment. Dr. Mahony said it will help but may not significantly. We are working on the user friendly aspect. Dr. Charles Randle, COB, moved here from MS. Have we thought about the fact that UNCC's tuition is ½ of ours? Do we target in the same area? If so, is that time well spent? Answer: that's the challenge we have being close to NC: they have more funding from the state. We have targeted the Charlotte area with some success, but it's mainly the upper income levels who come. Going away from home can be more appealing to 18 year olds, even with Charlotteans. Dr. Cheryl Fortner-Wood, CAS, said the CHE town hall celebrated the tech college system last year. Do you know of anything else they might be doing to help out? Dr. Mahony said he's struggled to understand what the CHE's strategy is and is going to meet with some folks from CHE soon. They keep saying things like SC will have three institutional failures, and we shouldn't be bringing in out of state students. He disagrees with the last and asked them to add "one won't be Winthrop University" to the former. Dr. Frank Pullano, CAS, asked what's going on on the corner where Citgo used to be? Dr. Mahony answered that it's been bought and he's not sure what the final development will look like. He expects there will be food. It's nice for us since it's at a main entry to our campus.

- IV. Report from the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Debra Boyd:
- a. Dr. Boyd said there were 44 new faculty to introduce. All introductions were therefore very short, so there will be information on the Academic Affairs website to tell more about them and about what's going on in the Provost's office. A Business Analyst has been added to the Provost's office.
 - b. Dr. Boyd reflected on work that happened last year. From the working groups on the strategic plan, one on academic programs generated many new program ideas. Over ½ of the programs suggested by this group have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented, including creating an online MBA, a certificate on the business of craft beer, the Bachelor of Professional Studies, additional cyber security initiatives, and other adult degree completion programs. Dr. Boyd thanked faculty who have worked on the planning and implementation of these and other courses. Dr. Boyd also said she looks forward to another good year. This year we need to stay efficient, effective, and energized to push through some of these initiatives; she thanked those involved in doing so.

- V. Academic Council (Supporting Material to Follow, Appendix I), Dr. Jo Koster:
- a. Academic Council met April 18 and approved three programs in CVPA. Dr. Koster asked whether there were any questions; there were none. See attached report.
 - b. Dr. Koster thanked Dr. Laura Glasscock for taking on CUC this year and thanked Dr. Will Thacker for his service on CUC for previous years. She also thanked Dr. Kristen Abernathy for being chair of GNED again.
 - c. Dr. Koster reminded faculty that Academic Council responds to individuals or groups with concerns about academic policies; she encouraged people to reach out to her.
 - d. 200-level courses in GNED in Historical, Social Sciences, Natural Science, and Quantitative will be due for recertification this year.

VII. Committee Reports

- a. Rules Committee, Dr. Zach Abernathy:

Dr. Abernathy introduced himself as the new chair of Rules. This year work will include the set of bylaws changes COB sent for them to look at. The committee will also be formalizing rules for keeping the Faculty Conference bylaws up to date. We will begin electronic voting. Rules can help faculty who need to need help cleaning up bylaws on a committee: contact Dr. Abernathy. Dr. Lipscomb reminded faculty that, in his role on the Task Force for Tenure and Promotion Protocols, he will be working with Rules, then showing us the information so we can vote on it.

- b. Faculty Committee on University Priorities, Dr. Malayka Klimchak:

FCUP has a new reporting document. The link is available on the Faculty Conference webpage: click on the FCUP Reports link, log in, and see where the concerns are in the process of being addressed. It's also on the Academic Affairs webpage under Faculty Resources. FCUP is working to improve communication. FCUP meets with the President and Provost once a month, along with Dr. Lipscomb and a small group from FCUP. There will be scheduled regular updates on critical issues during Faculty Conference. There will also be a shift in focus so that FCUP can become more proactive and strategic. They will meet with university administrators about different topics. Dr. Klimchak asked for the patience of faculty during this transition. Dr. Lipscomb added that Faculty Conference, FCUP, and FCUL will work with Rules to make sure no work or institutional knowledge gets lost as people rotate out of relevant roles on those bodies. The members of the FCUP Committee were announced: Malayka Klimchak, CBA (GFA), CHAIR; Shawna Helf, COE; Kathy Lyon, UC; Ron Parks, CVPA; Cara Peters, CBA; Scott Werts, CAS; Michael Lipscomb, FC Chair, Ex Officio.

VIII. Other Reports: NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative, Dr. Trent Kull:

Please see the attached report. Dr. Kull described his job and said the Student Success Office does not currently have a Director. He hopes to introduce us to that person soon. He asked faculty to come to him with concerns about student athletes. Coaches are not supposed to contact faculty members; it's best practice if we want to talk with a coach to go through Dr. Kull.

IV. Chair of Staff Conference, Ms. Nicole Chisari: Ms. Chisari explained there are 6 committees under Staff Conference; it's for all staff. They have worked with Faculty Conference on the Ombuds Policy initiative and were excited that Staff Assembly had a voice in this. She encouraged working together towards our often shared goals. She also asked us to let her know in University Relations if we had a great student success story. They are always looking for great stories for social media. This can also help us reach out on a national level to promote Winthrop.

X. Presentation of Ombuds Policy Proposal, Dr. Ginger Williams (see Appendix IV):

In 2017, the Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Promotion committee report suggested establishing an Ombuds. Rules has drafted a policy that's been vetted by University attorneys, for which they are asking our approval. Dr. Lipscomb explained that anyone who would use the Ombuds office would do so voluntarily. University Counsel has approved this draft of the policy; if we approve it and Staff Conference does so, it will move to the Office of the Provost, who will then implement the policy. Question: who will pay for this? It will be a faculty or staff member who gets reassigned time to do it, probably a ½ time position. This is the way many of our peers do it. This person will recognize both faculty and staff, so it could also be a staff member, from counselling, for example. This person will have to go to 40 hours of training by the OIA organization. Faculty voted to adopt the policy.

XI. Office of Computing and Information Technology, Mr. Patrice Bruneau:

Over the summer, the ACC labs had a hardware refresh. We had to move to Windows 10. Dalton has new technology; anyone teaching there should go check it out. Most classrooms now have a touch monitor or touch computer: be careful. This comes with Windows 10, and Microsoft is abandoning Windows 7, so we have to move to 10. In Kinard we still have the old screens; they are working towards putting up new screens. We have no more student Z drive; they have Google drive. There are many advantages, including that their files are accessible on and off campus on all types of machines. There is no more green book or blue book: the technology handbook is now an interactive FAQ list of general information. Mr. Bruneau said to let IT know any suggestions for changing or adding things here. He reminded faculty not to click on links in emails, to call IT if we do, and to change our passwords. There's a minimum of 8 characters, upper lowercase, a number or symbol. Microsoft One Drive is the equivalent faculty version of the student Google drive. Faculty were encouraged to move from their Z drives to Microsoft One. WiFi will be refreshed in many buildings, and classrooms will be updated.

Technology Advisory groups: members of different colleges get together with IT to help when they do remodels, etc. Talk to your dean if you're interested.

XII. Registrar, Office of Records and Registration, Ms. Gina Jones: The office was busy this summer. There's been a soft release of an online graduation application: students can now apply on Wingspan for graduation. New registration features are coming up this fall. One is students will be able to see their schedule as they register. Ms. Jones told faculty to be on the lookout for FERPA training sessions and please make sure to sign up if they've never attended one.

XIII. Unfinished Business

XIV. New Business

XIV. Announcements

a. Dr. Mark Herring, Library, and Dr. Kelly Costner, Chair of the Executive Board of the Friends of Dacus. The fall event brings Alexis Abramson; this is a dinner event with a reception. November 1 at 6:00. Please see attached flier. Membership is looking to add more faculty members. Friends will recognize newly tenured faculty to select a book for the library, add a name plate and a statement about that book's selection. Details about that coming soon.

c. Dr. Gloria Jones, Rock the Hill: This is this Saturday at 2:00-3:30 at the Coliseum. Please see the attached flier. Seating for faculty in section 129 has been reserved. You're welcome to bring your family if you choose. Dr. Jones also reminded faculty to make sure that we have grades on the books for students for interim grading. This is another tremendous retention effort.

d. Dr. Rosie Hopkins-Campbell, Fresh Check Day: Wellness coordinator on campus. Mental health affects students greatly. Fresh Check Day is in its third year; it's a mental health awareness and suicide prevention event. This is also connected to retention rates. Please encourage students to attend: Thursday, October 25 in the West Center from 9:00 AM-12:00 noon. Students can become aware of resources on campus and know how to recognize signs and symptoms in their friends. There is a new online resource on the Health and Counselling website that can help students see if they need to go talk to someone. An Alcoholics Anonymous group in Room 210 Crawford will begin August 29th and be every Wednesday afterwards.

Dr. Drueke reminded us of Convocation Monday

Dr. Bollinger reminded us of the Food Conference in February and said we'd be getting emails soon to remind us of the CFP.

Dr. Bickford encouraged faculty to send exemplary students to her for ONCA.

XV. Adjournment

Appendix I: Report from Academic Council

Academic Council Report to Faculty Conference September 28, 2018

Curriculum Reviewed (no action needed by Faculty Conference)

Course	Title	Action
CBLN351	Special Topics in Community-Based Learning	Modify course
EXSC384	Exercise Physiology	Modify course
HDFS450	Family Stress and Resilience	Modify course
IDVS395	Directed Research in Individualized Studies	Modify course
INDS111	111. Interior Design Studio: Fundamentals (3:1:6)	Drop Course
INDS300	Interior Design Portfolio Review	Drop Course
INDS313	313. Spatial Analysis and Theory II (3:1:6)	Drop Course
INDS323	323. Presentation Techniques II (3:1:6)	Drop Course
INDS443	443. Textile Design: Structural (3:7).	Drop Course
MCOM311	Digital Culture and Society	New course
MCOM390	Culture of Media Startups	New course
MUSA180	Piano Class for Musical Theatre	Modify course
MUST591	591. Principles of Teaching Music: Secondary (3).	Modify course
PFST301	Introduction to Professional Studies	New course
PFST302	Diversity and Collaboration in the Workplace	New course
PFST303	Applied Critical Thinking	New course

General Education Curriculum

I. Recertifications

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

SOCIAL SCIENCE

EDCO 200

ORAL

THRA 120

II. First Certification (requires vote by Faculty Conference)

The following course was approved for inclusion:

GLOBAL

MCOM 304

Transfer Credit

Academic Council voted unanimously to strike the following language from p. 11 of the *Undergraduate Catalog*:

~~● Transferring students who have completed course work in general studies programs are permitted to transfer only 15 semester hours of selected courses from such programs into any curriculum at Winthrop. The selection of the courses and the applicability to the curriculum is determined by the academic division receiving the student.~~

~~The individual college at Winthrop makes the final determination of the applicability of the accepted credit to the student's degree program. Only 65 hours from a two-year college may be applied toward a baccalaureate degree.~~

Academic Council also voted to add a sentence reminding transfer students about the 30 hours above 299 to the next paragraph in the catalog.

Other business

Academic Council plans the following discussions:

- Amendments to the attendance policy covering online and hybrid classes at the next meeting (November 16)
- Revisions to the Constitution requirement, possibly at the next meeting
- Possible revisions to the Cultural Events policy, including a possible addition of behavior clauses, at the next meeting
- Plans to discuss the plus/minus grading policy and the assignment of values to the quality points system, at the next meeting
- Ongoing discussion of changing the grading deadline for non-graduating students and the nature of culminating course experiences, at the first meeting of the Spring semester

Appendix II: Report from Rules Committee Bylaws and Policy Proposals

A. Post Tenure Review Policy Change Recommendation:

Post Tenure Review--Effective ~~2014-2015~~2018-2019 Academic Year

Policy Description

A post-tenure review process was first established at Winthrop in response to the mandate in Act 359 (1996), South Carolina's performance funding legislation that public institutions of higher education include in their faculty performance review systems periodic peer evaluation of tenured faculty members. In line with the AAUP's definition¹, the Post-Tenure Review Process at Winthrop is a system focused on sustaining faculty development beyond the point at which tenure is granted.

~~Therefore~~Therefore, the process is focused on sustaining faculty involvement in all aspects of the University and providing support for all faculty members as identified through the review process.

To receive a "Satisfactory" post-tenure evaluation, the tenured faculty member should provide evidence ~~that that of continuing commitment to discharging academic duties conscientiously and with professional competence e-level of activity associated with the rank held has been maintained throughout the years~~ since the initial tenure decision ~~or, promotion, or~~ previous post-tenure review¹. This involvement should include a record of promoting *Student Intellectual Development*, continued *Scholarly Activity*, and ongoing *Professional Stewardship*. Further, the faculty member should provide evidence of a record of sustained academic responsibility.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt

Policy Procedures

All tenured faculty will participate in post-tenure review every six years. Faculty members will be reviewed six years after the year in which their tenure was effective, a post-tenure review was conducted, or a promotion was awarded. ~~Outcomes and recommendations from the post-tenure process will be used in merit raise decisions.~~

In the case of faculty seeking promotion during the year in which a post-tenure review is scheduled, the faculty should submit application materials based on the timeline for promotion established in Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop. If promotion is granted then the post-tenure review is deemed to be satisfactory and the faculty member will stand for post-tenure review again in 6 years. If promotion is denied, the faculty member will stand for post-tenure review in the following academic year.

Exceptions to the six-year cycle of post-tenure review are as follows:

- Faculty who sign statements of an intention to retire (including TERI separation dates) within two years after they are scheduled for post-tenure review will not participate. Faculty exercising this option must complete a post-tenure review during the academic year following rescission of an intention to retire.

¹<https://www.aaup.org/report/post-tenure-review-aaup-response>

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

· Faculty who take personal leave (e.g., sick leave, maternity leave, etc.) for longer than one semester may request, through the Vice President for Academic Affairs, that their review be deferred for a period appropriate to the duration of leave taken. The Vice President Chief Academic Officer of the institution (hereinafter, Chief Academic Officer will be used to refer to that for the institution) will rule on the deferral in consultation with the faculty member's dean and department chair and inform the faculty member in writing of the year in which post-tenure review will take place. This deferral does not apply to faculty who have received sabbatical leaves or other leaves for development purposes.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

· Faculty members who wish to request that their review be rescheduled (for example, because of a sabbatical or other leave for development purposes which will take them away from campus during the year post-tenure review is scheduled) should make their request in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs Chief Academic Officer, who will consult with the dean and department chair and inform the faculty member in writing whether the review will be rescheduled.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

· Department chairs, associate deans, and assistant deans who are not full-time administrators will be reviewed according to the schedule and procedures for faculty members. Post-tenure review for full-time administrators holding faculty rank will be deferred. Regular review of full-time administrators is conducted through alternative processes involving faculty and staff from multiple units. Such faculty will stand for post-tenure after three annual review cycles in a position that is not full-time administration.

The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs Division of Academic Affairs will maintain the post-tenure review schedule, notify the deans who will inform the faculty members when their post-tenure reviews will take place, and update annually the time-line for review. See calendar on Academic Affairs webpage

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Required Materials

The Post-Tenure Review Portfolio will include the following items:

1. A statement from the faculty member outlining work and development in the areas of *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, *Professional Stewardship*, and academic responsibility since the last tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review. Each category should include tables or lists clearly outlining activities. The faculty member is encouraged to describe any noteworthy accomplishments and to describe activity where the impact or time needed may not be apparent to reviewers.
2. A statement of the faculty member's goals and plans for involvement and development over the next six years.
3. Annual reports from all years since last review (including student evaluation data, chair/immediate supervisor evaluations, and dean evaluations).

4. Peer evaluations, if available.
5. Current vita.
6. Information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the six-year, post-tenure review period.
7. Supporting documents pertinent to the review.

If desired by a faculty member, the committee may send evidence of *Student Intellectual Development, Scholarly Activity, Professional Stewardship*, and academic responsibility to one or more reviewers outside the University. External reviewers will be selected by the committee in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed.

Post-Tenure Review Committee.

All members of post-tenure review committees will be tenured Winthrop faculty. No faculty member will serve on a post-tenure review committee in the year in which he or she is scheduled for post-tenure review. For review of faculty members, the committee will consist of one member from the candidate's department if available, one member external to the department, and preferably a second member from the candidate's department. For review of chairs and other administrators without full-time administrative duties, the committee will consist of one member from the candidate's academic department if available; one additional member from the academic unit in which the candidate serves, and one chair, assistant dean, or associate dean from another academic unit.

The faculty member should submit a list of possible committee members to the department chair consistent with the composition described above. Review committees will be selected by the department chair in such a way that the majority of members come from the faculty member's list of possible candidates. The department chair will submit the list of committee members to the dean, who will approve the committee as complying with post-tenure review policies and procedures. The dean will notify the chair and faculty member of the composition of the committee. The faculty member can appeal to the dean the appointment of any committee members who are not selected from the list provided.

The review committee will write a post-tenure review report evaluating the faculty member's performance and including a rating of "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory." The report will provide evidence for the committee's rating and suggestions for future performance and development. The committee will send copies of the report to the faculty member under review. A copy of the report and the post-tenure portfolio will be forwarded to the department chair or to the direct supervisor in cases of faculty in administrative roles. If the faculty member wishes to provide a written response, the faculty member must submit this response to the department chair/direct supervisor within two weeks of the notification of the decision.

The department chair or direct supervisor will review the committee report and portfolio, write a response, and forward all materials to the dean. The dean will also review all materials and reports, write a response, and forward information/materials as described below to the [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) [Chief Academic Officer](#). All statements will be sent to the faculty member as the portfolio moves to the next level of review.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Satisfactory Reviews

In the case of a “Satisfactory” review, the committee’s report will document areas in which the faculty member has excelled and make recommendations for future performance and development. In the case of a “Satisfactory” evaluation, the committee report cannot be overturned nor the rating changed to “Unsatisfactory” by the chair/supervisor or the dean. A copy of the report and all supporting statements will be kept in the dean’s office. A list of faculty members who have received “Satisfactory” post-tenure reviews in a unit will be forwarded annually to the [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) [Chief Academic Officer](#).

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Unsatisfactory Review

In the case of an “Unsatisfactory” review, the committee’s report will document ways in which the faculty member’s performance of specific duties and roles is unsatisfactory and will include a development plan.

The development plan must include:

- realistic goals and expectations for performance;
- activities to improve performance;
- a timeline for completing the development plan that allows for two annual review cycles by chairs/supervisors and deans —that address the development plan;
- suggested resources to support the plan; and
- methods for assessing achievement of the goals and expectations, including peer and student evaluations of performance.

In the case of unsatisfactory reviews each response from the chair/direct supervisor and dean will include an indication of agreement or disagreement with the committee report. Further, copies of the responses will be forwarded to both the faculty member and the chair of the post-tenure review committee. The dean will forward all materials to the [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) [Chief Academic Officer](#). The [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) [Chief Academic Officer](#) will respond in writing to the dean and the faculty member indicating agreement or disagreement with the committee report.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

If the department chair, dean, or [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) [Chief Academic Officer](#) disagrees with the “Unsatisfactory” rating or with aspects of the development plan, they will discuss such disagreements. If two of them agree to either change the rating to “Satisfactory” or to modify the development plan, such changes will be made and communicated to the review committee and the faculty member.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

If the department chair, dean, and [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) Chief Academic Officer agree with the “Unsatisfactory” rating, another review of the faculty member’s performance will be conducted after the completion of the development plan. The department chair will retain a complete copy of the materials submitted for the review, the committee report, and any statements from the faculty member, department chair, dean, and [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) Chief Academic Officer.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Not Highlight

Appeals Process

The Committee on [Academic Freedom and Tenure](#) Academic Freedom, Tenure, & Promotion will serve as the appeals committee in all cases involving post-tenure review.

Basis for Appeals. A faculty member may appeal the results of a post-tenure review rating for any of the following reasons:

- An appeal on the basis that the procedures and timetable posted were not followed or that the post-tenure review –committee was improperly constituted or improperly directed, which resulted in an incorrect finding or recommendation.
- An appeal of the substance of the committee’s evaluation of the faculty member’s performance as “Unsatisfactory.” Such appeals should reflect a set of unusual or extraordinary circumstances and will require considerable supporting evidence, –particularly in cases in which the review committee, department chair, dean, or [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) Chief Academic Officer –concurred in the evaluation.
- An appeal of the development plan, requesting an adjustment of the plan recommended by the review committee and –approved by the [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) Chief Academic Officer

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Possible Courses of Action. Depending on the nature of the appeal, the Committee on [Academic Freedom and Tenure](#) Academic Freedom, Tenure, & Promotion may recommend:

- that the evaluation of the post-tenure review committee be allowed to stand;
- that the development plan recommended by the review committee be revised; or
- that a new committee be constituted and the review process repeated in the following year, using the procedures established for all post-tenure reviews.

Procedures for Appeals. Any faculty member who desires to appeal should notify the [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) Chief Academic Officer within five days of notification. Then within two weeks of receiving the [Vice President](#) Chief Academic Officer’s evaluation and development plan, the faculty member must forward to the President and the Committee on [Academic Freedom and Tenure](#) Academic Freedom, Tenure, & Promotion:

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Not Highlight

- A letter outlining the basis for the appeal and stating the desired outcome (revision of development plan or review by a –new post-tenure review committee).
- The entire post-tenure review package, including the committee’s report, any response from the faculty member, and the –reports from the department chair, the dean, and the [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) Chief Academic Officers.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Not Highlight

Within two weeks of receiving the appeal materials, the Committee on [Academic Freedom and Tenure](#) [Academic Freedom, Tenure, & Promotion](#) will forward its findings to the President, the [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) [Chief Academic Officers](#), the dean, the department chair, and the faculty member. The committee's report should reflect the basis and evidence for the appeal and recommend one of the courses of action listed above.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Within two weeks of receiving the report from the Committee on [Academic Freedom and Tenure](#) [Academic Freedom, Tenure, & Promotion](#), the President will report to the Committee, the [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) [Chief Academic Officers](#), the dean, the department chair, and the faculty member whether the development plan should be revised, whether a new review should be completed in the next academic year, or whether the post-tenure review committee's evaluation should be allowed to stand. Should the President not respond to the Committee's recommendation within two weeks, the Committee's recommendation will be allowed to stand.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

If this process results in a "Satisfactory" rating, the dean's office will maintain a copy of all reports and supporting statements.

If the appeals process upholds an "Unsatisfactory" rating, the faculty member begins the development plan and will be reviewed again according to the timeline established in the development plan.

Second Review after an Unsatisfactory Evaluation

The second review will take place within three months of the completion deadline communicated in the development plan. If feasible, the committee that conducted the original review will be reconvened to conduct the second review. If a committee member is unavailable for the second review, a replacement will be chosen by the department chair in consultation with the faculty member.

The following materials will be provided to the committee by the faculty member and department chair:

- a complete copy of the materials from the first review;
- a statement from the faculty member delineating the activities undertaken during the development period with a self-evaluation of the outcomes;
- annual reports from all years since last review (including student evaluation data, chair/immediate supervisor evaluations, and dean evaluations);
- information on *Student Intellectual Development, Scholarly Activity, Professional Stewardship*, and/or academic responsibility needed to indicate progress identified in the development plan;
- copies of the results of any assessments required by the development plan;
- a statement from the chair documenting resources provided to support the development plan;
- an updated vita; and
- any other materials addressing progress within the context of the development plan.

The committee reviews the materials above and decides whether the faculty member has made significant progress toward addressing the problems identified in the initial “Unsatisfactory” review. The committee writes a report clearly indicating the recommendation and reasons for the decision. This report is forwarded to the chair and dean as established in post-tenure reviews to allow for statements to be provided. As in “Satisfactory” evaluations, this information is reported to the [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) [Chief Academic Officer](#) by the dean.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

If the committee returns an “Unsatisfactory” evaluation on the second review, the faculty member may add a response to the committee report within two weeks of notification. As in the case for regular post-tenure review, the response from the chair/direct supervisor and dean will include an indication of agreement or disagreement with the committee report.

Further, copies of the responses will be forwarded to both the faculty member and the chair of the review committee. The dean will forward all materials to the [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) [Chief Academic Officer](#).

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

The [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) [Chief Academic Officer](#) will respond in writing to the dean, the chair, the faculty member, and the review committee indicating agreement or disagreement with the report.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Not Highlight

If the department chair, dean, and/or [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) [Chief Academic Officer](#) disagrees with the “Unsatisfactory” rating, they will discuss the rating. If two of them agree, the rating will be changed to “Satisfactory.”

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Not Highlight

As mandated by the Commission on Higher Education, if a faculty member fails to make substantial progress toward the performance goals outlined in the development plan within the specified time frame of the development plan and does not receive a “Satisfactory” on the subsequent review, the [Vice President for Academic Affairs](#) [Chief Academic Officer](#) can require that the development plan be continued for a specific time frame to include two complete annual review cycles or can recommend that the institution initiate procedures for dismissal of the faculty member, as outlined in the Winthrop University *Faculty Manual*.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Not Highlight

B. Bylaws Changes Related to the Faculty Committee on University Priorities

Proposed FCUP Changes to FC Bylaws

Article VII, Section 1

Membership. Membership in the Faculty Conference for at least one year by the beginning of their appointment is required for election to any standing committee of Faculty Conference unless otherwise

stated. Membership on standing committees shall be for staggered three-year terms as determined by regulations established by the Faculty Conference, and vacancies shall be filled by election for the remainder of the unexpired term (see Article VII, Section 6). **Membership on the Faculty Committee on University Priorities, which meets with university administrators and considers topics of strategic importance to the university, shall be for staggered four-year terms.** Members of standing committees of Faculty Conference who have served complete terms may not succeed themselves. The date for the formal commencement of new terms for committee members shall be the beginning date of the nine-month appointment. From time to time the Faculty Conference, in consultation with the Council of Student Leaders, shall determine rules concerning student representation on committees of the Faculty Conference.

Article VIII, Section 8

University Priorities. This committee shall be responsible for ~~meeting at least once per semester with the President and the other Executive Officers of the University to provide~~ providing a faculty perspective on admissions policy, planning, objective setting, and resource allocation, as well as other areas that are important to the University's future.

The committee shall consist of eight voting members and one non-voting ex officio member: one member elected from each of the degree-granting colleges, one member elected from the Library faculty, one member elected from the faculty of University College, and one member elected by the Graduate Faculty Assembly. All members of this committee must be tenured. The Chair of the Faculty Conference shall serve as an ex officio member with vote. The Chair of the Faculty Committee on University Life shall serve as an ex officio member without a vote. The Chair of the University Priorities Committee shall attend open meetings of the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Membership on the Faculty Committee on University Priorities (FCUP) shall be for staggered four-year terms. To achieve this staggering, current members may serve two-year, three-year or four-year terms. Once a regular rotation of staggered four-year terms has been established, then the transitional language in the sentence immediately preceding will cease to be operative; along with this sentence, it will be removed from the Bylaws. The chair shall be elected, by the members of FCUP, to a two-year term that is staggered with the Chair of Faculty Conference. The Chair of the Faculty Committee on University Priorities, the Chair of Faculty Conference, and at least one elected member of the Faculty Committee on University Priorities shall be responsible for meeting with the President and, as appropriate, other Executive Officers of the University at least three times each semester and once over the summer to provide updates about topics that are under the committee's charge. All members of the Faculty Committee on University Priorities shall attend at least one of the meetings each semester with the President and, as appropriate, other Executive Officers of the University.

c. CBA Bylaws

Governance and Bylaws

A. BY-LAWS OF THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY OF THE COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Article I NAME

The name of this organization shall be the Faculty Assembly of the College of Business Administration.

Article II RESPONSIBILITIES

Section 1. The Faculty Assembly shall be responsible for: (1) its own organization and procedures as provided in these bylaws; (2) the academic programs, policies, and regulations of the College of Business Administration within the limitations prescribed by the Faculty Conference of Winthrop University; (3) such additional matters as shall be referred to it by the Faculty Conference of Winthrop University or by appropriate administrative officers of Winthrop University.

Section 2. The Faculty Assembly shall instruct subordinate committees, standing and select, and shall periodically review their major decisions.

Section 3. The Faculty Assembly shall be the principal legislative body of the College of Business Administration faculty. The minutes of its meetings shall be filed with the Secretary of the Faculty Conference, and its actions may be reviewed by the Faculty Conference or its subordinate bodies in accordance with the bylaws of the Faculty Conference of Winthrop University.

Article III MEMBERSHIP

Every member of the Faculty Conference who is appointed to the College of Business Administration shall be a member of the Faculty Assembly. If the eligibility of a person for membership is questioned, the Faculty Assembly shall be the judge of the qualifications of that person for membership in the Faculty Assembly.

Article IV OFFICERS

Section 1. The Chair of the Faculty Assembly shall be elected biennially by the Faculty Assembly, and shall be a full-time tenured faculty member. The election will be held in the

spring semester preceding the beginning of the term in the following academic year. A vacancy in the office shall be filled by election of the Faculty Assembly for the unexpired term. No one shall serve more than two consecutive terms. The Chair will preside over Faculty Assembly meetings.

Section 2. The Vice Chair of the Faculty Assembly shall be elected biennially by the Faculty Assembly. The Vice Chair shall be the presiding officer when the Chair is absent or chooses not to preside. The election will be held in the spring semester preceding the beginning of the term in the following academic year. A vacancy in the office shall be filled by election of the Faculty Assembly.

Section 3. The Secretary of the Faculty Assembly shall be appointed by the Chair of the Faculty Assembly.

Section 4. The Parliamentarian of the Faculty Assembly shall be appointed by the Chair of the Faculty Assembly.

Article V MEETINGS

Section 1. The Chair of the Faculty Assembly shall determine a schedule of regular meetings, which shall be approved by the Faculty Assembly at its first meeting of the academic year. At least one meeting shall be held each semester, and special meetings shall be held at the call of the Chair of the Faculty Assembly, the CBA Dean, or twenty percent of the members of the Faculty Assembly.

Section 2. An agenda shall be prepared by the Chair of the Faculty Assembly in consultation with the Dean and distributed to Faculty Assembly no less than five working days before a meeting.

Section 3. The Chair of the Faculty Assembly and the Secretary will work with the Dean's office to maintain a web page of bylaws, officers, agendas, minutes, etc.

Article VI GRADUATE FACULTY

Section 1. The members of the Faculty Assembly of the College of Business Administration who have graduate faculty status shall be members of the Graduate Faculty of the College of Business Administration. The Chair of the Faculty Assembly shall serve as Chair of the College of Business Administration Graduate Faculty. The Graduate Faculty shall meet at the call of the Chair or any five members and shall operate as provided by the laws of the Graduate Faculty Assembly.

Section 2. The Vice Chair of the Graduate Faculty shall be elected biennially by the Graduate Faculty and shall be the presiding officer when the Chair is absent or chooses not to preside. The

election will be held in the spring semester preceding the beginning of the term in the following academic year. A vacancy in the office shall be filled by election of the Graduate Faculty for the unexpired term.

Section 3. The Secretary of the Graduate Faculty Assembly shall be appointed by the Chair of the Graduate Faculty.

Section 4. The Parliamentarian of the Graduate Faculty shall be appointed by the Chair of the Graduate Faculty.

Article VII DEPARTMENTS - ADMINISTRATION

Section 1. The College of Business Administration shall consist of several departments. Each faculty member shall be assigned to a department. A chair shall be selected for each department. The department shall be the basic unit charged with developing and maintaining courses and programs to be offered by the College of Business Administration.

Section 2. The Department Chair shall be appointed by the Dean. When a Chair vacancy occurs, the Dean may appoint a Search Committee to recruit and recommend a candidate for the position. The Department Chair in the Business Administration shall be the academic leader, a productive scholar, and a middle manager that is able to work beside peers.

Article VIII COMMITTEES

There shall be eight standing committees within the Faculty Assembly. They will be:

- Section 1. Personnel
- Section 2. CSCI Petitions
- Section 3. Curriculum, Assessment, and Petitions Committee
- Section 4. Scholarship and Awards
- Section 5. Graduate Programs Committee
- Section 6. Strategic Planning Committee
- Section 7. Library Committee
- Section 8. Credentials Committee

Ad hoc committees may be formed when deemed appropriate by the Dean or the Faculty Assembly. The College will also establish and maintain process committees to manage the continuous improvement efforts in all aspects of operation.

Section 1. The purpose of the Personnel Committee shall be to advise the Dean on matters of tenure and promotion. The Personnel Committee shall include a tenured faculty member elected by each department in the college and two members elected at large who must be tenured and be from different departments. The CBA representative to the University Personnel Committee will serve as an ex officio member of the CBA Personnel Committee.

The normal term of office of each department/college representative shall be two years. During

the spring of each year, the Personnel Committee shall elect one of its continuing members to serve as Chair of the Committee for the next academic year.

Section 2. The CSCI Petitions Committee shall be composed of three members elected by the Computer Science faculty. This committee shall be responsible for reviewing student petitions for exceptions to the requirement for the B.S. in Computer Science. The Chair shall be appointed by the Chair of the Department of Computer Science and Quantitative Methods for a one-year term. The other two members from the department shall be elected for two-year terms in alternate years.

Section 3. The College of Business Administration Curriculum, Assessment, and Petitions Committee shall review and evaluate the merit of all changes and additions to undergraduate degree programs in the college school and the sufficiency of supporting assessment data. In addition, the Committee will oversee policies for undergraduate assessment in the College of Business Administration, review assessment results, and report on the status of assessment to faculty. Finally, the Committee shall be responsible for reviewing student petitions regarding requirements for the B.S. in Business Administration and B.A. in Economics. The committee shall present their recommendations to the school's Faculty Assembly for a vote by the Assembly. This Committee shall consist of one member elected from each department and a Chair appointed by the dean. The normal term of office shall be two years. The dean will appoint an ex officio member of this committee (normally, the Associate Dean for Administration). The Director of Student Services serves as an ex officio nonvoting member of this committee.

Section 4. The Scholarship and Awards Committee shall be responsible for selecting students for College of Business scholarships and awards and recommending students for recognition by the Dean and the College of Business Administration. This committee shall consist of one member elected from each department and a Chair appointed by the dean. The normal term of office shall be two years. The dean will appoint an ex officio member of this committee (normally the Director of Student Services).

Section 5. The College of Business Administration Graduate Programs Committee provides general oversight of the Graduate Program and shall review and evaluate the merit of all changes and additions to graduate degree programs in the school and the sufficiency of supporting assessment data. In addition, the Committee will oversee policies for graduate assessment in the College of Business Administration, review assessment results, and report on the status of assessment to faculty. Finally, the Committee shall be responsible for reviewing student petitions for all graduate programs. The committee shall present their recommendations to the school's Faculty Assembly for a vote by the Assembly. This Committee shall consist of one member elected from each department and a Chair appointed by the dean. The normal term of office shall be two years. The dean will appoint an ex officio member of this committee (normally, the Associate Dean for Administration). The Director of Graduate Programs serves as an ex officio nonvoting member of this committee.

Section 6. The Strategic Planning Advisory Committee provides for faculty input regarding the development and implementation of strategic plans and policies for the College of Business. Among its duties are developing and interpreting a strategic planning database, consulting with

appropriate administrative personnel regarding strategic planning, reviewing the fit between the college's mission and the strategic plan, reviewing the fit between faculty professional development and the strategic plan, creating strategy-related task forces, participating in the planning and management of strategic planning retreats, working with Advisory Boards, and participating in other matters that impact faculty life. This committee will meet once per semester and will distribute agendas and minutes to faculty. Two faculty members will be elected by each department and one at-large member who represents interdisciplinary programs will be elected by the CBA Faculty Assembly. Department chairs will be excluded from service. Nonvoting administrative representatives may participate as ex-officio. Members will serve three-year terms. A chair will be elected by the committee from among the members on an annual basis.

Section 7. The Library Committee coordinates acquisitions and expenditures of the annual library allocation budget. The committee chair is also the CBA representative to the university wide library committee. Members are elected annually for 2-year terms with one representative from each department.

Section 8. The Credentials Committee is charged with evaluating the scholarly activity of faculty members for the purpose of faculty credentialing and the identification of scholarly activity quality. Faculty have the right to submit any intellectual contribution to the Credentials Committee that they believe has not been classified accurately in terms of quality by the current Personnel Policies and Procedures. In order to submit an intellectual contribution to the Credentials Committee, the faculty member must submit full evidence of peer review and additional evidence of outlet and article quality. If the majority of the Credentials Committee votes in favor of reclassification, a letter will be written for the faculty to include in their annual report and their tenure/promotion portfolio.

Faculty must submit their material for consideration by the Credentials Committee at least one month before the completion of their annual report. Evidence may be submitted for consideration before the submission of the intellectual contribution. In this case, a decision can be made conditional upon evidence of peer review, acceptance and publication. If a member of the Credentials Committee submits an intellectual contribution for consideration, that member must recuse him/herself and another Assistant/Associate Dean of the College of Business, identified by the Dean, will step in as a voting member of the Credentials Committee.

The membership of the committee will consist of the three department chairs, the Associate Dean charged with credentialing, and a tenured faculty member elected by the CBA faculty who is credentialed as Scholarly Academic. The Chair of the CBA Personnel Committee and the CBA representative to the University Personnel committee will serve ex-officio and non-voting.

Article IX PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

The rules contained in the most recent edition of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the Faculty Assembly and all committees or other entities created under the authority of these Bylaws in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with the relevant bylaws or special rules of order.

These Bylaws can be amended at any regular meeting of the Faculty Assembly by a two-thirds vote of members present and voting, provided that the proposed amendment has been placed on the agenda by vote of the Faculty Assembly at the previous meeting. Such an amendment shall become effective upon ratification by the Faculty Conference of Winthrop University.

Section 1. These Bylaws shall be operative beginning January 1, 1995, providing that they are first adopted by the Faculty Assembly and ratified by the Faculty Conference of Winthrop University.

Section 2. All programs, policies, and regulations previously operative in the area of responsibility of these Bylaws shall be valid and operative until changed.

(modified 9/2018)

Appendix III: Personnel Committee: Electronic Election Announcement and Floor Nominations

Special Election September 2018

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.

Voters shall rank the candidates in order of preference, with the favorite candidate receiving rank 1, the second favorite receiving rank 2, and so on.

Example: In a race to elect 2 committee members

_____3_____	Candidate A
_____1_____	Candidate B
_____2_____	Candidate C
_____4_____	Candidate D

Faculty Personnel

Three-year staggered terms / eight tenured faculty members

Three faculty members elected by Faculty Conference to serve at-large; five faculty members elected by the Faculty Assembly of each major academic division; 1-year term for chair elected by committee membership from committee membership. Administrative officers and department chairs are ineligible to serve. While serving, a member shall not be eligible for consideration for promotion.

Standing Committee of Faculty Conference

1 seat - Serving through Spring 2019 to complete term of Casey Cothran (English)

_____ Matthew Hayes, Psychology, Arts and Sciences

_____ Sarah Reiland, Psychology, Arts and Sciences

From the Language of the Current Bylaws:

Section 5 Elections. Regular elections by the Faculty Conference of members of all standing committees created by the Faculty Conference shall take place electronically following a spring semester meeting of the Faculty Conference. Special elections to fill vacancies shall take place as soon as practicable after such vacancies occur. When a member of a committee created by the Faculty Conference begins a leave of absence (i.e., medical, unpaid, or sabbatical), a committee vacancy is thereby created (unless the member requests to serve while on sabbatical or unpaid leave). When a vacancy occurs prior to the end of a full term, it shall be filled by election for the remainder of the unexpired term.

Section 6 Electoral Procedures. The electoral procedures are as follows:

1. Nomination: The Faculty Personnel Committee shall nominate at least two persons for each vacancy and circulate these names to the faculty prior to the opening of electronic voting. Additional nominations may be made from the floor during the meeting immediately prior to the opening of electronic voting, provided that the consent of the nominee has already been obtained.

2. Voting: Voting members of Faculty Conference will be sent an invitation to complete an anonymous electronic ballot following the meeting where nominations for open positions are closed. Faculty Conference shall use the Borda method to tally all votes.

a. The faculty monitors will consist of The Faculty Conference Parliamentarian and the Chair of Faculty Conference as a witness. In the case in which the Chair of Faculty Conference or Parliamentarian is a

candidate in an election, the Secretary of Faculty Conference will replace him/her as a witness for that election.

b. In all elections, voters shall rank the candidates in order of preference, with the favorite candidate receiving rank 1, the second favorite receiving rank 2, and so on.

c. When more than one person is to be elected to a council or committee and the terms are staggered, the longer terms shall be given to the persons with the more favorable totals.

d. If there is a tie, the faculty monitors shall break the tie by a method of equal chance, e.g. coin flip.

3. Timeline: Voting faculty members will have seventy-two hours to complete the electronic ballot before it closes.

4. Custody of Electronic Voting and Calculating Votes: The faculty monitors shall develop and distribute the electronic ballot. Vote totals will be calculated by the faculty monitors as described in Section 6.2 above.

5. Notification: As soon as votes are tabulated, both winning and losing candidates shall be notified of the outcome by the Parliamentarian of the Faculty Conference. Complete election results shall then be distributed promptly to the faculty by the Parliamentarian of the Faculty Conference.

Appendix IV: Draft of Ombuds Policy Proposal Ombuds Office Terms of Reference and Charter

Introduction:

The Ombuds Office was established in 2018 with the support of Winthrop University faculty, staff, and the Offices of the President and Provost. The Ombuds Office serves as an independent, confidential, neutral, and informal resource for any faculty, staff, or administration member of Winthrop University to seek assistance in identifying available options, facilitating productive communication, and bringing forth concerns about university policy or procedures. The Ombuds Office is designed to be free from direct university oversight or control. Thus, while the Ombuds derives its authority from and reports to the Office of the President, the services of the Ombuds Office are neither directed nor controlled by the President.

As an independent, confidential, neutral, and informal resource, the Ombuds has no institutional authority to change any rules, overturn any decisions, or even force issues to be addressed by others. The Ombuds is neutral in his/her activities and does not act as an advocate for any participant in a dispute or visitor to the office. The Ombuds impartially considers the interests and concerns of all persons involved in a situation with the aim of facilitating communication and assisting others in reaching mutually acceptable agreements that are fair, equitable, and consistent with the mission and policies of Winthrop University.

Services of the Ombuds Office include but are not limited to:

- Listening impartially to concerns and providing a confidential place to collaboratively explore solutions
- Developing options for informal approaches to resolving problems or concerns
- Pointing employees toward available services and resources and obtaining applicable information, including university policies
- Exploring early problem-solving approaches as a way to avoid escalation of conflicts and empowering individuals to find their own solutions to problems
- Coaching and training individuals and departments on communication and interpersonal relationship skills in the workplace
- Facilitating communication between parties during conflict
- Serving as a facilitator for group problem-solving and consensus development
- Assisting groups in the design and implementation of collaborative decision-making processes
- Mediating and advising mediation as an informal conflict resolution process
- Alerting individuals or groups to available formal channels for conflict resolution
- Identifying observed trends or problems
- Providing feedback relating to changes in policies or procedures
- Educating and informing the campus community about conflict resolution through presentations and office literature
- Modeling fairness, equity, inclusion, and civility in carrying out duties

Services the Ombuds cannot offer include, but are not limited to:

- Make changes to policies
- Offer arbitration
- Provide exceptions to policies or procedures
- Serve as notice to Winthrop University
- Formally investigate any issue
- Compel anyone to take part in the services of the Ombuds
- Participate in any formal internal or external process (e.g. lawsuits, grievances) unless required by law
- Take sides in any matter
- Provide legal advice on any matter
- Provide mental health counseling

Because of the confidential and informal nature of the office, records that are confidential in nature are destroyed as soon as possible and permitted by law. Thus, the Ombuds Office is not a place to go “on the record”; however, the Ombuds can assist in directing visitors to the appropriate mechanisms for going “on the record.” The Ombuds holds all communications with those seeking assistance in strict confidence to the extent permitted by law. The Ombuds Office does not participate in any formal process, whether internal or external to the university, unless required by law.

The Ombuds Office is expected to adhere to the standards outlined by the 2009 International Ombuds Association (IOA) Standards of Practice and Code of Ethics. In addition, the Ombuds Office is expected to adhere to the best practices outlined in the 2009 Supplement to the IOA's Standards of Practice.

Limitations of Use:

The Ombuds Office does not receive or record complaints on behalf of Winthrop University, and the Ombuds is not designated by the University as an individual authorized to receive reports of any violations of university policy or the law. THEREFORE, COMMUNICATIONS TO THE OMBUDS OFFICE REGARDING POSSIBLE VIOLATIONS OF UNIVERSITY POLICIES OR UNLAWFUL PRACTICES DO NOT CONSTITUTE NOTICE TO WINTHROP UNIVERSITY. Any such information shared with the Ombuds Office is not shared with the University. This allows the Ombuds to preserve the confidential and impartial nature of the office. If an individual discloses information that might evidence a violation of University policy or unlawful activity, the Ombuds will provide information necessary to permit the individual to make an official report to the University and, if requested, will assist the individual in making such a report.

Purpose and Scope of Services:

The Ombuds provides informal dispute resolution services to Winthrop faculty, staff, and administration. The Ombuds Office is a place where these constituents can seek guidance regarding workplace problems or concerns at no cost and without fear of retaliation. Consultation with the Ombuds is entirely voluntary and may not be compelled by the University or an employee. The Ombuds Office receives questions and concerns about individual situations or broader systemic issues and keeps them confidential. The Ombuds will listen, make informal inquiries, offer resolution options, make referrals, and informally mediate disputes independently and impartially. The Ombuds will assist individuals in reaching resolutions that are consistent with stated ideals, objectives, and policies of Winthrop University.

The Ombuds Office supplements, but does not replace, other more formal processes available to university employees. The Ombuds serves as an information and communication resource. The Ombuds can also serve as a catalyst for institutional change for the University through reporting of trends and identifying opportunities to enhance policies and procedures. The Ombuds has no authority to impose remedies or sanctions, nor does the Ombuds have the authority to enforce, make exceptions to, or change any Winthrop University policy, rule, or procedure.

Appointment of the Ombuds:

The President of Winthrop University, or the President's designee, is responsible for the appointment of an Ombuds to a three-year term. The Ombuds Advisory Committee should assist the President in this task. The committee will be responsible for assisting in the

development of the Ombuds job description, reviewing applications to the position, and recommending to the President at most three candidates who meet the minimum established qualifications. In reviewing applications, the committee should look for the characteristics an Ombuds should exhibit: listening, oral/written communication skills, sensitivity to issues, an understanding of appropriate use of power, clear understanding of university policy and procedures, willingness to abide by IOA standards, and so on. The final selection will be made by the President or the President's designee.

The President will work with the Ombuds to ensure reasonable release or reassigned time to permit the Ombuds to be effective in carrying out duties. While the Ombuds position is expected to take up no less than 50% of a faculty/staff member's time, ongoing assessment of the utilization of the Ombuds Office by the President may identify the need to increase that position to full time or even add additional Ombuds or additional support staff. The annual report produced by the Ombuds Office can be used as one metric by which the President can assess the Ombuds Office needs.

Ombuds Advisory Committee:

The Ombuds Advisory Committee meets at least once per semester. The committee consists of six voting members: the Chair of Faculty Conference and Chair of Staff Conference who are ex-officio, two voting members of administration appointed by the President, one member elected from the Faculty Conference at large, and one member elected from the Staff Assembly at large. The terms for appointed or elected members to this committee are for two years and will be staggered so that, in odd years, terms of one of the administration members as well as the staff member elected at large will expire and, in even years, terms of the other administration member and faculty member elected at large will expire.

In addition to assisting the President in Ombuds searches, this committee will serve as one resource for the Ombuds to consult regarding university, faculty, and staff policies, practices, and concerns. Similarly, the committee can also advise the Ombuds on trends they are seeing on behalf of faculty, staff, and administration. The Ombuds, at their discretion, can use this information to inform their current work or organize workshops to address relevant issues proactively.

Should concerns about the performance of the Ombuds arise the Ombuds Advisory Committee can review the concerns and notify the President of them. Should it be necessary to remove the Ombuds prior to the end of the Ombuds' term, the President will seek the advice of the Ombuds Advisory Committee and consider the committee's opinion as a factor in any decision they make regarding removal.

Training:

The Ombuds will maintain a Certified Organizational Ombuds Practitioner Certification. As the IOA requires experience practicing IOA standards before this certification can be granted, the President, at his/her discretion, may allow the Ombuds to operate as they pursue this

certification in a timely manner. The Ombuds should attend the annual IOA conference to support the continuing education of the Ombuds. The Ombuds should not take on or hold any additional administrative duties not related to their role as an Ombuds.

Additionally, due to the confidential and sensitive nature of issues that visitors bring to the office, any support staff or students used in the office will receive adequate training from the Ombuds to ensure interactions are handled in conformity with the 2009 IOA's Standards of Practice.

Annual Report:

The Ombuds will produce a yearly written report with general information and statistics about usage of the Ombuds, without jeopardizing the confidentiality of any individual or the Ombuds Office. The report will only include data that come from a population of a sufficient size and that will, in the judgment of the Ombuds, prevent re-identification of individuals from the report. An example report would contain: number of faculty/staff using the office, number of complaints assisted with, complaint trends, concerns, results of work over the last year, and any recommendations the Ombuds has. This report will be delivered annually to the Office of the President, Staff Assembly, and Faculty Conference.

2009 IOA Standards of Practice:

The Ombuds Office is guided by the 2009 IOA Standards of Practice (http://www.ombudsassociation.org/IOA_Main/media/SiteFiles/IOA_Standards_of_Practice_Oct_09.pdf) that include: independence, neutrality, impartiality, and confidentiality.

INDEPENDENCE

The Ombuds Office and the Ombuds are independent from other organizational entities. The Ombuds holds no other position within the organization which might compromise independence. The Ombuds exercises sole discretion over whether or how to act regarding an individual's concern, a trend, or concerns of multiple individuals over time. The Ombuds may also initiate action on a concern identified through the Ombuds' direct observation. The Ombuds has access to all information and all individuals in the organization, as permitted by law. The Ombuds has authority to select Ombuds Office staff and manage Ombuds Office budget and operations.

NEUTRALITY AND IMPARTIALITY

The Ombuds is neutral, impartial, and unaligned. The Ombuds strives for impartiality, fairness, and objectivity in the treatment of people and the consideration of issues. The Ombuds advocates for fair and equitably administered processes and does not advocate on behalf of any individual within the organization. The Ombuds is a designated neutral reporting to the highest possible level of the organization and operating independent of ordinary line and staff structures. The Ombuds should not report to nor be structurally affiliated with any compliance

function of the organization. The Ombuds serves in no additional role within the organization that would compromise the Ombuds' neutrality. The Ombuds should not be aligned with any formal or informal associations within the organization in a way that might create actual or perceived conflicts of interest for the Ombuds. The Ombuds should have no personal interest or stake in, and incur no gain or loss from, the outcome of an issue. The Ombuds has a responsibility to consider the legitimate concerns and interests of all individuals affected by the matter under consideration. The Ombuds helps develop a range of responsible options to resolve problems and facilitate discussion to identify the best options.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The Ombuds holds all communications with those seeking assistance in strict confidence and takes all reasonable steps to safeguard confidentiality, including the following: The Ombuds does not reveal, and must not be required to reveal, the identity of any individual contacting the Ombuds Office; nor does the Ombuds reveal information provided in confidence that could lead to the identification of any individual contacting the Ombuds Office, without that individual's express permission, given in the course of informal discussions with the Ombuds; the Ombuds takes specific action related to an individual's issue only with the individual's express permission and only to the extent permitted, and even then at the sole discretion of the Ombuds, unless such action can be taken in a way that safeguards the identity of the individual contacting the Ombuds Office. The only exception to this privilege of confidentiality is where there appears to be imminent risk of serious harm and where there is no other reasonable option. Whether this risk exists is a determination to be made by the Ombuds. Communications between the Ombuds and others (made while the Ombuds is serving in that capacity) are considered privileged. The privilege belongs to the Ombuds and the Ombuds Office, rather than to any party to an issue. Others cannot waive this privilege. The Ombuds does not testify in any formal process inside the organization and resists testifying in any formal process outside of the organization regarding a visitor's contact with the Ombuds or confidential information communicated to the Ombuds, even if given permission or requested to do so. The Ombuds may, however, provide general, non-confidential information about the Ombuds Office or the Ombuds profession. If the Ombuds pursues an issue systemically (e.g., provides feedback on trends, issues, policies and practices) the Ombuds does so in a way that safeguards the identity of individuals. The Ombuds keeps no records containing identifying information on behalf of the organization. The Ombuds maintains information (e.g., notes, phone messages, appointment calendars) in a secure location and manner, protected from inspection by others (including management), and has a consistent and standard practice for the destruction of such information. The Ombuds prepares any data and/or reports in a manner that protects confidentiality. Communications made to the Ombuds are not notice to the organization. The Ombuds neither acts as agent for, nor accepts notice on behalf of, the organization and shall not serve in a position or role that is designated by the organization as a place to receive notice on behalf of the organization. However, the Ombuds may refer individuals to the appropriate place where formal notice can be made.

INFORMALITY AND OTHER STANDARDS

The Ombuds functions on an informal basis by such means as: listening, providing and receiving information, identifying and reframing issues, developing a range of responsible options, and – with permission and at Ombuds discretion – engaging in informal third-party intervention. When possible, the Ombuds helps people develop new ways to solve problems themselves. The Ombuds as an informal and off-the-record resource pursues resolution of concerns and looks into procedural irregularities and/or broader systemic problems when appropriate. The Ombuds does not make binding decisions, mandate policies, or formally adjudicate issues for the organization. The Ombuds supplements, but does not replace, any formal channels. Use of the Ombuds Office is voluntary and is not a required step in any grievance process or organizational policy. The Ombuds does not participate in any formal investigative or adjudicative procedures. Formal investigations should be conducted by others. When a formal investigation is requested, the Ombuds refers individuals to the appropriate offices or individual. The Ombuds identifies trends, issues, and concerns about policies and procedures, including potential future issues and concerns, without breaching confidentiality or anonymity, and provides recommendations for responsibly addressing them. The Ombuds acts in accordance with the IOA Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice, keeps professionally current by pursuing continuing education, and provides opportunities for staff to pursue professional training. The Ombuds endeavors to be worthy of the trust placed in the Ombuds Office.