

From: Faculty Senate Academic Standards and Policies Committee Chair June Speakman
Senate VP Renee Soto, Executive Committee

To: Provost Andy Workman

Regarding: School of Continuing Studies

Date: January 11, 2018

Background

At its October 4th meeting, the Faculty Senate charged the Academic Standards and Policies Committee with studying several aspects of the School of Continuing Studies. The Senate further requested that the committee provide a report to the Faculty Senate at its February meeting.

Pursuant to that charge, we request (1) the documents listed below, and (2) responses to the questions listed below. The purpose for these requests is threefold: first, to ensure that RWU faculty are able to speak with knowledge of, and pride in, all RWU programs; second, to provide our full support to those programs; and third, to contribute our disciplinary expertise, our pedagogical knowledge and experience, and our research and analytical skills to what should be a common enterprise.

We request that this information be provided by January 26th so that we can report to the Senate in February.

At the December Senate meeting, Committee Chair Speakman asked that Senators provide more specific guidance regarding these issues. Following that, Speakman and Senate VP Soto compiled a list of questions and requests for information and sought a meeting with Provost Workman and SCS Dean Scurry. That request has been denied; instead Provost Workman has asked for the questions, and suggested that a meeting might be arranged later should it be needed.

With regard to curriculum development and approval in particular, the Senate considers its role to be essential in maintaining the integrity, coherence and continuity of the University's offerings and the value of an RWU degree. The content of courses, the structure of academic programs, the mode of delivery, and the qualifications of the faculty delivering the courses are all matters of concern to the Senate in its role as the faculty voice in shared governance.

In order for the Senate to fulfill this crucial role, it must have complete and timely information about all course and program proposals from all academic units. Reading about new programs and university initiatives in the *Providence Journal* is not the way faculty engaged in shared governance should receive this information.

Further, as noted above, the RWU faculty is the university's primary asset and source of strength. Our contribution to, and governance of, SCS is, at present, minimal and often impossible. This set of circumstances contributes significantly to a sense of a lack common purpose and unity. We hope to change that, or, failing a change, to acknowledge formally that the Senate can no longer exercise governance over SCS and to so notify NEASC.

Request for information

To support our report to the Senate, we request the following documents:

- An organization chart of SCS
- The SCS Strategic Plan
- A list of programs offered through SCS including number of participants, number of staff, budgets and funding sources
- List of partnerships
- A list of peer and aspirant schools
- Program reviews for SCS programs

Questions

Regarding Faculty

- What is the hiring process? Do faculty in the relevant discipline participate in the hiring process?
- Do Deans in SHAE, SECCM, SJS, SSNS and SAAHP “review, recommend and approve faculty assignments” for courses in their fields, as the job posting states?
- What is the training/orientation process?
- How are faculty evaluated by students? By peers and dean?
- To what extent are the resources of the full-time RWU faculty used for teaching and curriculum development?
- What is the basis of, and evidence for, the claim that FT faculty are not qualified to teach the kinds of students who enroll in SCS courses?

Regarding Curriculum Development

- Who participates in program and course development?
- Curriculum proposals list “faculty credentialed to teach.” How is that determined for SCS courses?
- How and when are programs reviewed? Is the schedule and process the same as in Bristol?

Regarding the SCS Course Schedule

- Why do some courses have multiple numbers? For example, CD41C, 42C, 43C, 45C.
- When a course is listed as “No Room Needed,” where does it meet? For example CD521.31C
- What is the policy for low-enrolled courses (for example, the TLM courses)? For FT faculty, for PT faculty?

Regarding the Board mandate to increase enrollment to 3000

Was the mandate Board-generated, or was it presented to the Board?

Was this mandate guided by strategic enrollment management?

Which programs will grow? What new programs will be developed?

How will recruitment be handled?

What administrative costs and capital costs are required to support this increase?

How many new full-time faculty will be needed to support this growth?

Regarding mission, vision, connections

Is there a mission statement for the School?

How is the relationship between SCS and the Bristol academic programs and faculty conceived?

How are partnerships developed and assessed? Who participates in the decisions about these partnerships?

What is the university subsidy for these partnerships?