Minutes  
RWU Faculty Senate  
February 6, 2013  
Library Seminar Room  
Last Revised: February 21, 2013

1. Roll call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Alfieri</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Bruce Marlowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Beitler</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Dave Moskowitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Carr</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Cliff Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Emmer</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Hubert Kamdem Noussi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Eson</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Roxanne O’Connell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fobert</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Joseph Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamille Gentles-Peart</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Lauren Rossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Harvey</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Tony Ruocco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France Hunter</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Mark Sawoski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan-Uddin Khan</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Ferd Schroth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nermin Kura</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valerie Sloan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Leuchak</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Approval of minutes of December 5, 2012
   Motion to accept minutes (Tehrani, Varano) Approved with 3 abstentions.

3. Provost Workman
   Provost invites faculty to visit president’s blog. Blog refers to the Newmann report. Disturbing sentence identifies us as a problematic area. President’s Affordable Excellence initiative is a response to this concern. Provost describes possible steps to reduce costs; few items in the budget are discretionary. Better approach is to increase revenue. Retention is first on the list. There is currently a robust effort in this area. Retention improvements could yield enormous benefits. Living learning and FYE can have great effect. Second area is summer programs. We can do more things that are central to our mission in the summer. Administration is hoping for $300,000 of additional revenue from summer activities, including students staying on campus for summer courses. Third area is continuing studies. Provost is looking at programs that are online and hybrid. We are severing relationship with College Unbound. Fourth area is graduate studies.

   Curriculum processes delivered some proposals to provost prematurely. He has rescinded approval as a glitch in process, not a repudiation of programs.
Q: Do we have a dean of graduate studies? A: No. Graduate committee is looking at this. Are enrollments in graduate programs a moving target? All programs should be reviewed. Hanover research group provides market studies.

4. Report of Executive Committee
   a. Meeting with President and Provost on December 7.
      V.P. Stein presented the executive committee minutes.
   b. Service on administrative committees—update on membership and activity—

      President Speakman reported that she acted on behalf of the senate and supplied the president with candidate names for the Budget and Planning Committee and for a new retention effort.

      **Motion (Roberts, O'Connell) Faculty senate will co-sponsor with the Student Senate the Roger Williams The Man and The Legacy contest.**

      Motion passed unanimously.

   c. Election of four faculty members to the Foundation for the Promotion of Scholarship and Teaching--Elections Committee--time sensitive
      This is a contractual requirement of the faculty. Senate election committee will conduct election.
   d. Update on hiring process of administrative positions (Speakman)

      Q: Will there be a review of deans? A: Provost Workman stated that there would be a 360 degree evaluation in spring 2013.

2:32:47 PM

5. Committee reports
   a. Ad hoc Committee on Continuing Education (Moskowitz reporting for Emmer)
      *See attached letter regarding announcements of developments in SCS
      Provost Workman: The Hanover report has been sent to M. Emmer, but the Simmons Report cannot be located despite a vigorous search. The Committee also expressed interest in seeing the business plan, and the provost has promised to provide this to the committee.

      The attached memo contains the statement by Interim Dean Jamie Scurry “[Instructional Design]… has added me to each of your courses so that I can review your course materials”. Without prior faculty consent, this is an objectionable practice.

      President Speakman also expressed concern that there is currently great activity in continuing studies, but it seems to be happening without faculty involvement. It is the senate’s intent that the Ad-hoc Committee on Continuing Education provide
recommendations for continuing studies, and it appears these efforts are proceeding in isolation.

b. Curriculum (Ruocco)
2:37:17 PM
Chair Ruocco explains the technical glitch in the online system. New location is called “Senate Vote” on the curriculum site.

Motion (Ruocco, Alfieri): The Senate accepts the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee as described in paragraphs 3a through 3b of the FSCC minutes of 12 Dec 2012*
Motion approved with 1 abstention.

Motion (Ruocco, Alfieri): The Senate accepts the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee and adds a new Master of Science in Cybersecurity program described in paragraph 3d of the FSCC minutes of 12 Dec 2012*

Arguments against: What is the point of a background check for an online course?
Arguments for: The Background Requirement is not unusual for similar programs, and this is motivated by the nature of the industry, where all employment opportunities will require a successful background check.

Arguments against: It was noted that the approval in SJS was two approving and two abstaining
Arguments for: One abstention was the proposer and one abstention was by a new faculty who had trouble accessing the electronic system. The result was explained as a problematic voting process and not a lack of support among SJS faculty

Arguments against: Is this cart-before-the-horse proposal? If we are working on our infrastructure, is this the best time to be adding this new program?
Arguments for: (Provost commentary) This is an Emerging area in great demand with high standards. Market position is advantageous, want to get this moving before missing market opportunity.

Arguments against: Is Doug White the only faculty member qualified to teach all these courses? Arguments for: Are we second guessing hiring decisions?

Arguments against: Does senate endorse a totally online master’s program taught mostly by adjuncts?
Arguments for: No questions were raised in Curriculum Committee meetings. Current 8-week programs are mostly adjunct.

Arguments against: If this is a program for non-degreed students, why is it a master’s? Is it not more appropriate as a certificate or training program?
Arguments for: Justice Studies has long precedent in attracting students with diverse degrees, not unusual to combine these as a master’s degree. This field is brand new and transitioning, thus, it is not unusual for students with disparate undergraduate degrees.
Motion Passed (15-6-8)
3:09:06 PM
Motion (Ruocco, O'Connell): The Senate accepts the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee as described in paragraph 2a of the FSCC minutes of Jan 28 2013 (electronic flow of proposals*)

Discussion: Committee reports updating policies and the electronic flow to represent the existing (paper) flow with no changes in policies. Q: Does electronic trail fully duplicate the paper trail? A: The electronic flow follows the exact process of the hardcopy proposals.

Motion passed with one abstention.

c. Faculty Development (Gentles-Pearl)

3:14:46 PM Committee has adopted faculty learning community approach and made a proposal to the provost.

d. Diversity (Hunter reporting for Emmer)

3:17:38 PM

Motion (Hunter, Woodruff): The diversity committee moves that the faculty requests of the university president, Dr. Farish, appoint a Chief Diversity Officer. The reasoning behind this request is there are many diversity initiatives and issues that should be coordinated and investigated by one office (or person) in order to support the newly adopted university diversity statement and lead the campus community to a more diverse environment.

Arguments against: President has requested to meet with the committee before the senate passes this motion. Q: Was Rick Hale already hired for this? Q: Are we asking for yet more administrators?

Arguments for: There is no harm in passing this motion now.

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion (Hunter, Woodruff): The diversity committee asks the faculty senate to modify the specific part of the faculty senate constitution that deals with committee membership to allow the diversity committee to have a larger voting group. Limiting committee membership to a small number of voting members tends to prevent participation by the various constituencies in the diversity conversations, i.e. people do not want to attend/participate if they do not feel they have a voice.

3:25:26 PM

Arguments against: The change requires a change to constitution. There is already a long list of voting members; if people do not attend they can be removed. A more secure idea of the committee’s mission would help in determining best makeup. Are administrators eligible to be members of senate committee? Is it possible that the committee has outgrown the senate?

Arguments for: Committee’s efforts rely on diverse departments, many not in the specific purview of faculty.

Motion Withdrawn 3:34:39 PM

e. Ad hoc committee on Faculty led study abroad programs (Tehrani)
Motion (Tehrani, Hunter): The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the Faculty-led Study Abroad Student Survey Instrument. *(See attached)*
Motion passed unanimously.

Report from Deans Council—summer school plans President Speakman reported that Provost Workman has already presented the administration’s plans for expanding summer school. Q: What is the demand for summer courses? Faculty would be willing to work at developing summer courses and programs if we were given some idea as to what courses and/or programs are in demand. A: (Provost) Provost is currently investigating this by looking at what courses do students transfer in.

6. Old Business
   a. Motion (Tehrani, Roberts) Students be permitted to register for up to 18 credits without dean’s signature but with approval of advisor.
      Motion passed unanimously.
   b. Motion (Turner, Fobert) The Faculty Senate requests that the Administration clarify the University’s policy on requiring non-essential staff to come to campus when classes are cancelled due to weather (or other unforeseen circumstances).
      Arguments for: We believe this poses a substantial risk to their health and safety, especially at a time when their presence on campus is largely unnecessary due to the absence of faculty and students. An example cited is the pod administrative assistant in FCAS. Without faculty and student activity in the pod, there is little reason to require this administrative assistant to either remain at the post or use a vacation day.
      Motion passed unanimously.

3:51:09 PM
   c. Motion to Take from the Table the Steering Committee motion (below) Laid on the Table in December. (Stein, Spritz)
      Motion passed unanimously.
      Original Motion (Topf, Stein): The senate adopts the policy on interdisciplinary programs contained in the attached document and requests implementation by the provost.
      Arguments for: Faculty senate offers no opinion on this issue if we leave the proposal on the table.
      Arguments against: Is the provost currently appointing interdisciplinary program coordinators? What is faculty input in selecting?
Arguments for: Currently the dean appoints interdisciplinary program coordinators.

Arguments against: Are the courses within the colleges? Is distinction between inter- and intra-very clear? There is no reason to add an administrative layer to programs that are already working well.

Arguments for: Is there a list of faculty who are faculty in the sustainability program? How do we know who is in the faculty? There is a need for some administrative support for interdisciplinary programs.

Motion (Turner, Moskowitz) Table the motion pending revision of the proposal based on discussion at senate.

Motion passed with 2 opposed.

7. New Business
   a. Motion (Turner, Murphy): The Faculty Senate recommends to the provost that the scheduling of Core Courses be initiated by the Chair of the Core Sub-Committee, and submitted to the Dean of FCAS.

        4:13:22 PM
   Arguments for: When the call goes out for CORE senior seminars, the decision process is opaque. Modify language of the motion to “recommends to the provost”, shown above.
   Arguments against: CORE is an interdisciplinary committee, and the senate is uncertain about the governance of these programs, witness the previous debate. There are two committees discussing this already. There is a great need for clarification of the process, this motion does nothing to clarify.

        Provost commentary: He wants faculty to think about how these should be organized.

        Motion passed unanimously.

        The following items will be moved to the next meeting.

   b. Motion (Speakman): The Faculty Senate recommends that the hours at the Center for Academic Development be expanded to accommodate the needs of students in evening and summer classes.

   c. Motion (Speakman): Refer to University Life Committee issues regarding Bookstore orders and re-orders.

   d. Motion (Speakman): Refer to University Life Committee issues pertaining to parking, including the number of 15-minute spots, the number of Office of the President spots, the definition of “University Authorized vehicle,” the reason why the Intercultural Center has reserved spots, and an explanation for why fines for violating parking rules are so high.

Adjourn 4:23:40 PM