

**Roger Williams University  
Faculty Senate  
Draft Minutes  
October 4, 2017  
2:15-4:30, Upper Commons**

Meeting Came to Order at 2:15 p.m.

- A. Roll Call: introduction of Faculty Senators in lieu of a traditional roll call.  
Present: Bosco, Cutting, Duffy, Engvall, Hall, Kenney, Knights, MacPhee, McKinley, Moskowitz, O'Connell, Pearce, Roberts, Sawoski, Schroth, Shelton, Sorger, Soto, Speakman, Stevens, Thangaraj, Topf, Updike, Winfield

Absent: Emmer, Boggs, Hollingsworth, Melton

Open Seats: SHAE:HUM, SSNS:MNS, SAHP (2)

Student senators: Cheyenne Quintal, Sarah Wood and Jon Bailey Francois.

Guests: R Cole, J Dunseath, D Farish, D O'Driscoll, B Palm, J Platania, L Turner, B Williams, A Workman, M Zhou

- B. Announcements – no formal announcements

- C. President Farish's remarks

Thanks to those who came to the State of the University Address, here is the 30-second version: This is the year of planning, how do we plan for the future, more than a day or a year at a time. We are having a difficult time making the budget with just the students on the Bristol Campus. Should we grow the campus with the undergraduate population, what about graduate students, what about the Providence campus? We need this done in a thoughtful way, with purpose and direction. It should be an inclusive process so that we can develop a consensus. We expect this conversation to occur over the next year and a half.

- a. Request for update on Wells Fargo relationship

From a year ago, there was real passion about this, how shoddily, even by banking standards, Wells Fargo's business practices were. As more about Wells Fargo's business practices came to light, we have begun the process of severing our business relationship. With Board approval, we are moving forward on an RFP for banking services. This will occur by the end of the fiscal year. We will do this with a little bit of noise, indicating to the world why we are no longer working with a disreputable company.

- b. Follow-up on new Engineering building

We went through a Forum, where we agreed to disagree. The issue comes down to the siting of the building, to the east of the engineering building, between engineering and

Gabelli. The reason for the choice is that excavation in that location will be inexpensive since there is no ledge versus the west side of the engineering building, which has substantial ledge and an \$800,000 in increased costs to do so. Absent a Master Plan for the campus, there are no other alternatives to the placement of the building. I have represented to the Board the discussion at the Forum, nothing is going forward until we raise an additional \$3M. No groundbreaking until spring at the earliest. We are still weighing ideas, such as turning the building 180 degrees, while other options will not work due to their increased costs.

Discussion included observations that the need for the building is not the issue, but social science and science students also need labs, the aesthetics do matter, costs of bringing current building to code, Bristol building codes, possibility of moving site to the other side of Old Ferry Rd. The points were also made that this issue is not reducible to being an emotional or NIMBY issue, and that it would be worthwhile to thoroughly plan this, even if it means a year's delay, for example, to assure that initiative, and others like it down the road, are accomplished as "correctly" as can be, rather than in a hurried "kick the can down the road" fashion.

President Farish –Bringing the existing building up to current code would be costly. Bristol does have codes about the placement and height codes. We can plan all we want, but we have to go through Bristol with anything that we do on campus.

#### D. Provost Workman's remarks

President Farish mentioned this is the year we begin planning about utilization on the Bristol Campus. We are at capacity now. How big should we get, how big can we get? How big can we get given that the pool of students we draw from has been shrinking? We will be growing some programs, maybe business and engineering, and shrinking other programs if we decide to maintain a 4100 student limit. We will be doing an Academic Strategic Enrollment Management Plan . We will be asking what the max capacity is by program (distributed summary of the process), we will be looking at demand for programs, at what students will be choosing to do as core concentrations, and at the skills employers will be needing. We will also look at our competitors, and to whom we are losing students, and what they are offering. We will meet with schools and programs to discuss these questions using this data. A "Phase 1 Academic Reporting Portfolio" outline was distributed to the Senate. Please see attached.

Once this is complete, the next step will be what types of facilities we need to look at, other curricular concerns, student support, etc. We should have a good look at what we need, and where we can go. We will see what coalitions of programs we can have, partnerships on and off campus. Academic programs will be given opportunities to design curricula that more closely align with other programs on campus, perhaps resulting in the generation of new programs. Robert Cole is in charge of this project, which is expected to be completed by the end of the academic year.

Vice President Moskowitz – can you discuss the model you are using, where has it been used before, what is the predictive accuracy of the model, and can you point to any successes using it?

Brian Williams, VP of Enrollment Management and Marketing – There is no model for this yet. The current model is about getting a freshman class, but not retention. Open to talking about models we have now, Monte Carlo models, and smaller models.

Vice President Soto: what is the relationship of this enrollment management plan to the Cost Center Analysis?

Provost Workman – They are related, and the CCA will be folded into the presentations when we meet with programs about the enrollment management plan; we are not using the CCA to make cuts in programs.

E. Adoption of Minutes of September 6, 2017 (Speakman/Roberts) passed 23-0-1

F. Introduction of Dan O’Drissoll, Registrar

(Asked to speak about priorities and goals.)

Dan O’Drissoll, Registrar – Would like to have more interaction with campus, better workflow and increased efficiencies. Next up will be the curricular process, and how poorly CurricuNet is serving us there. I am looking at other vendors/products, where I will solicit your feedback. We are a team, and I want to involve the faculty.

Senator Cutting – I think we have a benchmark that Senator O’Connell designed as a baseline that worked for 5 or 6 years. Look at that and then see what we need going forward.

Dan O’Drissoll, Registrar – Curriculum software is the way of the future. We are also looking at a catalog solution, so that as curriculum changes, the catalog changes with it, simultaneously. We will be working with Associate Dean Jacobs, since he sits outside of the majors, and soliciting his feedback as well.

Vice President Soto asked about the status of the current catalog given that advising is coming up. The Registrar said it should be back very soon.

Senator Cutting – I have been producing searchable catalogs, so if you wish to send it to me, I can do the same with the next catalog. The Registrar will do this.

G. Introduction of Brian Williams, VP of Enrollment Management and Marketing

This is my first full class recruitment process at RWU. Fall of 2018 is my focus as we build a greater enrollment plan. It is a partnership with faculty, student, and alumni as part of the success. We would like to lead with an academic message. We are bringing school guidance counselors to campus. Reports from students indicate that the time they spent with faculty is the most rewarding.

Senator MacPhee – We should coordinate admissions with orientation, for example, when students are told to drop their majors at orientation, it makes it difficult to recruit a class, and support programs.

Brian Williams, VP of Enrollment Management and Marketing – we will be handling that transition more smoothly, from admissions to orientation. Thank you for those comments.

Other questions were raised about our geographic focus for recruitment – will it still be in the same areas? Have we exhausted the area from which we currently draw? Brian Williams responded that he will use the planning exercise as a basis and data to determine where we can go deeper in our market, local, regional, and national strategies.

President Bosco – Please reach out to the Chair of the Admissions and Enrollment Committee.

- H. Acceptance of Committee reports (Moskowitz/Speakman) – approved unanimously.
  - a. University Life
  - b. Executive Committee
  - c. Diversity Committee

- I. Elections Committee Update

Senator Updike – no candidates for recording secretary, Stephen O’Shea will serve as liaison to the Advancement Committee of the Board of Trustees, Senator Speakman will serve as liaison to the Recruitment and Retention Committee of the Board of Trustees. There will be an election for the liaison to Academic Affairs. There are no candidates for GECPC, some candidates interested in the Sustainability committees. There are also faculty needed for SHAE Curriculum Committee, and Provost’s Foundation.

President Bosco – We need a chair for Faculty Development, or there will be no Excellence in Teaching Award. In addition, Arnold Robison needs assistance from this committee for CPC fellowships. Senator Cutting volunteers to chair the FDC.

President Bosco – We need a Dean’s Council representative. The Council meets Tuesdays from 10 – noon - Senator Speakman will represent the Faculty Senate from 10-11, and Senator Roberts will represent the Faculty Senate from 11-12.

- J. New Business
  - a. Vote on the following motion: Resolved that the Faculty Senate offers its thanks to President Farish for affirming, before students and parents at convocation, his strong support for academic freedom and freedom of speech. (Topf/Bosco)

Discussion: many presidents at other institutions do not support faculty, President Farish made an unequivocal statement at Freshman Convocation, which is worth our recognition.

Question called. Motion passed 16 – 1 – 4

b. Report from Student Course Survey Committee – Bill Palm

Bill Palm presents the results of the Committee's work. Provides background on the committee's work, discussed the number of favorable responses out of the total number of responses. As to the question of psychometric validity, the committee had neither the means nor the ability to do so. We relied on face validity.

Revision received 14 responses. The committee considered all feedback, with items listed below being concerns that the Committee could not resolve, or were not in a position to resolve:

Question 9 (3 of 14) had concerns with this item

Question 10 (2 ) had concerns about non-native speakers

Question 13 (what availability is expected?)

Double barrel questions eliminated where feasible.

Discussion included support for the new questions and appreciation for the committee's work. Concerns were raised about some of the specific questions, especially #3 asking what grade the student expected to receive in the class. Statistical methods were also discussed. The receipt today of the memo from the RWUFA created additional concerns. The RWUFA communication is attached.

Motion to Table (Topf/McKinley): Motion passed unanimously

c. Report from Indigenous People's Week Committee – Annie Winfield

Postponed until next meeting, Senator Winfield had to leave the meeting.

d. School of Continuing Studies – Pending questions/concerns – assign to standing committees

- i. Curriculum management – Moved to refer to Academic Standards (Roberts/O'Connell) – approved unanimously
- ii. Adjunct hiring – Moved to Faculty Development (Cutting/Roberts) – approved unanimously
- iii. Course delivery -Moved to Academic Standards (Speakman/Soto) – approved 20-0-1

e. MOTION to charge Admissions and Enrollment Committee with looking into the following questions regarding entering students who have been classified as Undecided Liberal Arts. The Committee shall report back to the Senate in November with such answers as it has obtained, and with any recommendations it may choose to make. (M. Topf, Roberts – with an edited Item 4. below)

1. Since 2012, how many entering students have been classified as Undecided Liberal Arts (UND/LA)?
2. Of these students, how many applied to RWU for admission to each of the professional schools, but were rejected and placed into UND/LA?
3. What were the freshman-to-sophomore attrition rates for this cohort of applicants?

4. What is the 4-year graduate rate for the 2012 and 2013 members of this cohort?
5. Were students in this cohort informed of the reason they were classified as UND/LA?
6. Do the professional schools do any subsequent professional outreach to these students during the fall or spring semesters of their first year to gauge their interest in the professional school to which they originally applied?

Motion approved 20-0-1

Motion: For the Academic Standards Committee to examine the status of the Arts Management minor (Shelton/Speakman). Motion passed unanimously.

Senator Speakman: I wish to make a motion objecting to the process by which the proposed engineering building site was chosen.

Senator Topf – who is this motion targeted to? To whom does this motion go? And should we not be careful with no confidence votes, given the past history at RWU of no confidence votes?

Discussion was wide-ranging with many participants. Issues raised centered around the closed nature of the process, continuation of “cart before horse” practice, and not wanting to pit faculty and students against one another. Some mentioned that there should be a master plan before this construction is done, and that the forum was actually an unveiling of the architectural plan.

Motion to extend (Topf/Schroth). Motion to extend the meeting for 15 minutes – passed unanimously.

Motion - The Faculty Senate votes no confidence in the process by which the decision was made to site the SECCM expansion between The Gabelli School of Business and the current SECCM building. The Senate urges the Administration to delay implementation of the project to allow for an enhanced and an inclusive planning process, further consideration of alternative sites, and enhanced fundraising efforts (Speakman/Schroth) – passed 16-2-1.

Motion to Adjourn – Adjourned at 4:35 p.m.