ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

Minutes
December 5, 2012, 2:00 P.M.
Library Seminar Room
Revised 2/5/13

1. Roll call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>y</th>
<th></th>
<th>y</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Alfieri</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce Marlowe</td>
<td></td>
<td>June Speakman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Beitler</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Moskowitz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Becky Spritz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cliff Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Staats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Emmer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hubert Kamdem Noussi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Stein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Esons</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxanne O’Connell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne Tait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fobert</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minoo Tehran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamille Gentles-Peat</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Lauren Rossi</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Mel Topf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Harvey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tony Ruocco</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France Hunter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Sawoski</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Sean Varano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan-Uddin Khan</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Ferd Schroth</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Yajni Warnapala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nermin Kura</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valerie Sloan</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Kerri Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Leuchak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Rom Woodruff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Attendance: Student representative Tom Sojka, President Farish, Provost Workman

2. Approval of minutes of November 7, 2012 (Moskowitz, Emmer) Approved with 1 abstention.

3. President Farish: Indicated he is pleased with ratification of contract and that the board has also ratified. His administration will now begin the work of recruiting the next class of students. He thanked faculty for their efforts in contacting students, and enrollment management will begin forwarding names of applied students to departments. Some positive news is that there is currently an uptick in transfer applicants. The university budget is the second major piece of business. The president is planning on developing an inclusive committee to develop budget using “broad based thinking”. It is his goal to make the budgeting process at RWU more transparent. The president will ask executive committee for faculty participation. Next year’s budget is passed by the Board of Trustees at the May board meeting.

4. Provost Workman:
Indicates that he met with the Faculty Development Committee and has an interest in developing a teaching and learning center. He endorses the work of the steering committee on proposing a governance structure for interdisciplinary programs. His retention task force has had its first meeting and is divided into three sub-committees: first year sub-committee, academic support sub-committee and “administrative impediments” sub-committee. The provost reports activity on orienting international faculty and will forward a proposal to the senate for comment. The FCAS dean search is making progress.

5. Tom Sojka, Student Senate

Student Body VP Tom Sojka presented the attached memorandum describing activities this semester.

Senators raised two issues about items contained in the report:

One phrase in the report “the committee assembled a dossier of student complaints against a faculty member” raised questions about who was assembling this dossier and for what purpose.

The student senate has approved a resolution supporting gender neutral housing. A concern was raised that female Moslem students should be considered.

6. Report of Executive Committee

a. Meeting with President and Provost on November 9.
   All items of the executive committee meeting were addressed in the prior reports.

b. Update to P/NP procedure
   This item will be discussed later in the meeting.

c. Update on eight week programs
   There will be no more eight-week programs although students in current eight week programs will be allowed to complete the programs.

d. Board of Trustees meets Friday, send items to Sue Bosco (sbosco@rwu.edu)

7. Committee reports

a. Ad hoc committee on continuing education (Emmer)

The committee reports it has emailed the provost a request for three studies on the School of Continuing Studies produced by consultants. Provost Workman: There are 3 reports – the first is the Hanover Report. This asks: How are Continuing Studies programs organized at other institutions? This report will be forwarded to the ad hoc committee when it is available. The second is the Simons report. The provost is not
sure of the content of this report and will look into it, but expects it will be shared with the committee. The third is the Hale Report. This report specifically addresses personnel issues and there is no offer to share it with the ad hoc committee.

Senators expressed concern that the current model for continuing studies is not sustainable and that there is little faculty input. The ad hoc committee intends on putting together a white paper outlining these issues. President Farish: His desire is to maintain what is already in place and then ask what we are trying to accomplish with the continuing studies program. President will send the ad hoc committee a report of the findings of the administration for the committee to vet. The President is glad there is a formal group of the faculty senate to interact with. Administration is seeking to determine the areas that are of high or low faculty concern regarding continuing studies.

2:35:42 PM

b. Ad hoc committee on faculty led study abroad (Tehrani)

2:42:31 PM

The committee worked on the process to review courses and forwarded a proposal to academic standards. Also, the Global Center has created a non-content survey for such courses. This survey was sent to the faculty with study abroad courses and the received responses were all positive. At this time the survey is under review by Institutional Research Center and it will be brought to the senate for review. As for the funds left over from some trips, Provost Workman stated: trips occasionally run in surplus, possibly open the trips to non-RWU students. Provost would like to increase participation. Some senators expressed concern that fees are too high due to the financial structure of these trips. The ad hoc Committee will review the idea of opening the trips to non-RWU students and also the cost structure.

c. Curriculum (Ruocco)

2:50:47 PM The committee presented its understanding of the history of the change to the P/NP policy. Some expressed a preference for academic standards and policies to consider this issue rather than curriculum.

Motion (Moskowitz, Roberts) Faculty Senate recommends to the provost that internships and coops should be letter graded. (Withdrawn)

Motion (Exec Committee, Khan) Refer to the Academic Standards and Policies committee the university-wide pass/no pass policy and return a recommendation. Motion approved with 4 abstentions.
3:07:18 PM

**Motion (Curriculum, Esons) The Senate accepts the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee and approves a new Core Concentration in Sustainable Studies.**

Motion passes with 1 opposed and three abstentions

d. Faculty Development (Gentles-Peart)

3:17:48 PM Senator Murphy reports for committee, briefly outlines the items contained in the distributed minutes.

e. Steering (Topf)

3:19:31 PM

**Motion (Steering, Stein) The senate adopts the policy on interdisciplinary programs contained in the attached document and requests implementation by the provost.**

3:28:06 PM Discussion: Some senators expressed concern that the proposal is creating more administration. Primary concerns were the status of existing IP programs relative to the new structure. Faculty have been developing such programs on their own without another layer of bureaucracy, raising the question as to why do we need such a structure? Some senators expressed that administrative support is needed especially if the program is new or if no faculty is expending extraordinary efforts as its champion.

**Motion to Table (Roberts, Sawoski) Approved 17-7-1**

f. University Life (Roberts)

3:35:05 PM The committee reports on items contained in its distributed minutes. The chair described the Faculty lunch with students program and some senators suggested that these programs were successful at other institutions.

g. Diversity (Emmer)

**Motion: (Emmer, Moskowitz) The faculty senate endorses the statement “In light of and as a means of actively supporting the newly created University Diversity statement, the Diversity Committee moves that the Faculty Senate endorse the Safe Zone program and other ongoing professional development opportunities for faculty who wish to enhance their pedagogical strategies and the campus climate” Motion approved with 5 abstentions.**

h. Admissions and Enrollment (Turner)
3:41:56 PM The committee wishes to establish a more formal relationship with the enrollment management office and is awaiting feedback from the executive committee regarding its proposal.

i. Academic Standards and Policies (Moskowitz)

Committee reports that many peer institutions have moved to SAT optional.

Senator Moskowitz also reports on his role as liaison to the Provost’s Degree Audit committee. The registrar is willing to work towards having more declarations in effect to limit the size of the report and make it more readable.

Provost Workman: This will be a two stage process, the first is a short term fix. Next year there should be a more complete change to a better format.

Substitutions of courses continue to be a thorny issue for the system, for example when a course number changes from one catalog to the next. Live deployment for the first stage improvement expected March 2013.

j. General Education (Van Schepen) 3:46:41 PM

Initial reading will be taken from core faculty by a survey to be sent shortly. In spring 2013, all faculty of all sections of the core will be asked to provide assessment and to plan for an artifact to be used in assessment. Are small changes to the courses curriculum changes or are these for assessment?

In an email exchange earlier in the month, President Speakman acting as senate president had instructed the proposers of a Freshman Seminar added to two sections of a CORE course to submit their proposal to the faculty senate curriculum committee. President Speakman asked the senate for a confirmation of this executive decision.

The subsequent discussion focused on two issues: Why the Gen Ed Committee was proposing such seminar; and the degree that regular evolution of courses reaches the level of curriculum change. Is this course a new course or is it just an incremental change to an existing course (a process that would never come under curriculum committee review)?

Proposers explained that the change was just for certain sections for CORE102&104 with two additional outcomes and seminar format. No changing of course descriptions or catalog copy.

4:13:53 PM Motion (Tehrani, Moskowitz): The course should follow the process for approval of a new course and be reviewed by the FSCC. Motion defeated (18-5-2)

Motion to adjourn 4:20:21 PM