Minutes  
RWU Faculty Senate  
March 6, 2013  
Library Seminar Room  
Last Revised: March 30, 2013

1. Approval of the minutes of February 6, 2013

2. Motion (Woodruff, Tehrani): Approval of the minutes of February 6, 2013. Motion passed with two abstentions.

3. President Farish

President Farish described the most recent Board of Trustees meeting. The Fiscal Year 2015 budget will go in draft form to the board one year from now. Balanced budget is close but depends on a few things, for example what will F’14 tuition be vis-à-vis affordable excellence? What new revenue streams will be in place a year from now? In the president’s blog that appears on the main RWU web page. President described the university as: “Half liberal arts, half professional” and stated that all students should have strengths in both areas. He also cites an NPR report on desirability of internships. He described a favorable feeling at accepted student’s day with the caution: “The vibe is great, but does this translate into enrollment?”

Some non-budgetary items of the president’s new initiatives will come back to the senate. President invites email from senators and faculty.

Q: What is the status of the capital campaign?  A: Our consultant report determined low viability of a capital campaign right now.

Q: Revenue enhancement. Is there a plan on what is going on in Providence?  A: Eight or nine proposals for increasing activity in Providence. New facility in Providence will be online before September of 14.

Q: Endowment?  A: Good news and bad news. Some bills came due just as the market drop happened. Recent market climb has recovered some ground, as of last week endowment about $77M.
Q: Where are we going with online education? Is the future competing with other institutions for the online market? The president does not see the future of RWU as competing in a race to the bottom of low cost, mass produced online courses.

Q: Does White Paper #3 suggest a process of Program Review in which academic programs will be expected to provide some cost justification? A: We need to start balancing our checkbook. Currently, we cannot tell what we are expending and what we bring in. We do not currently reference our activity to revenue. Are there things we can do to improve balance? This can only be answered when we know where are we subsidizing, where are we netting. There is no intention of closing programs or reducing faculty numbers. The issue is more about how we expand under-resourced programs. There was some experience of this at Rowan (17M over three years, in process described as “no pain”). One objective is to make sure the senate is informed.

Q: Grant writing - what will be the priority? A: Our objective is to be highly supporting. We will never be an R1, but there is much research going on and this could be better supported. A big push in grants may send us in wrong direction.

The president cited hearing many anecdotes from faculty about administrative obstacles to grant activity. President took this opportunity to advise the senate of a new role of Rick Hale as “Mr. Fix It”. He has asked Rick Hale to be a resource when faculty hit an administrative stone wall. Now there will be a place to go to get problems resolved.

4. Provost Workman

Provost Workman shared some research showing RWU with unfavorable cost vs. results relative to its local peers. Some of these data are a few years old and there have been improvements over this period, but there is still much work to be done.

Provost Workman reported that Faculty Development Committee Chair Kamille Gentles-Pearl presented a proposal about a new faculty development program. The Provost was enthusiastic about the proposal and will provide support. Provost will also support an effort to expand the program to three running simultaneously.

Retention task force is looking at FYE, advising, and impediments to success. The FYE is reported as being favorably received by students. The task force is looking at combining and integrating the advising function and improving the Datatel system. Most of the recommendations the provost receives are for customer service improvements in the Bursar’s office.

The 360 degree evaluation of deans will be rolled out in April.

Provost Workman described an interesting project for cloud computing begun in SAAHP and SECCM. This has the potential to convert computer labs to interactive spaces, and also to provide better access to continuing studies students.

Provost reports the registrar is implementing new procedures for making sure students who should be graduating in May do graduate in May. Students ‘walk’ but do not formally graduate until August, affecting our graduation rate needlessly.

RWU putting together activities to celebrate the 350th anniversary of RI charter, including an essay contest co-sponsored with the student senate.

5. Report of Executive Committee
   a. Meeting with President and Provost on February 12, 2013.
Announcements: Library is sponsoring the ITHAKA Survey. No students came to the Life after RWU speaker series last year. Student senate has passed a resolution recommending that the registrar’s office be moved under Academic Affairs. Faculty Senate would like the SAAHP to address the issue of senators who are elected in fall being subsequently scheduled to teach on Wednesday afternoons in the spring.

2:45:43 PM

b. Elections (Tehrani)

i. Continuing Education committee

The names of candidates have been forwarded to the provost, who will announce the formation of this committee soon.

ii. General Education Committee

What is timing for two-year limits? Half year elections? The election of 1/3 of the committee will conducted this summer.

iii. Senate

Schools are welcome to employ their own process. Incumbent senators must request the election committee to conduct election of their school.

iv. Dean’s Council representative

v. Provost’s committee on online education. Speakman asks for volunteers.

Q: Wasn’t there a previous committee?

6. Committee reports

a. General Education Committee (Van Schepen)

3:01:43 PM

Chair Van Schepen presented the activity of the committee. The summer activity of the committee will be presenting the committee’s work to the faculty.

b. Core Curriculum Committee (Nester)

3:12:46 PM

Chair Nester will collaborate with dean of FCAS regarding scheduling of CORE courses. CCC will not modify the Fall ’13 schedule but will review the schedule and make recommendations for next scheduling cycle.

Q: Is staffing determined by deans? Nester: Yes, the CCC will only review; it will not take an active part in the current scheduling cycle. Provost: This is step toward consultation with faculty. The CORE currently does not have sufficient administrative support or structure. He will accept all recommendations on how to improve structure.

c. Curriculum (Ruocco)
Without Registrar curriculum is afloat. A persistent problem exists with cross-listed courses. Scheduling of these courses must happen twice, and these courses don’t really work in Bridges or Datatel.

i. Motion (Ruocco, Alfieri): The Senate accepts the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee as described in paragraphs 3a through 3c of the Feb 20, 2013 minutes. Motion approved with two abstentions.

ii. Motion (Ruocco, Alfieri): The Senate accepts the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee and adds a new Minor in Digital Forensics program (paragraph 3.d.i of the Feb 20, 2013 minutes). Motion approved with one abstention.

iii. Motion (Ruocco, Khan): The Senate accepts the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee and adds a new Dual Degree in Biology and PharmD program (paragraph 3.d.ii of the Feb 20, 2013 minutes). Motion approved with no abstentions.

iv. Motion (Ruocco, Tehrani): The Senate accepts the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee and adds a new Arts Management Minor program (paragraph 3.d.iii of the Feb 20, 2013 minutes). Motion approved with no abstentions.

v. Motion (Ruocco, Khan): The Senate accepts the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee as described in paragraphs 2a of the Supplemental Minutes of the Feb 20, 2013 meeting. Motion approved with one abstention.

vi. Motion (Ruocco, Sloan) The Faculty Senate vote electronically on proposals which are approved by the FSCC after the March Senate meeting but before the April 1st catalogue deadline.

Arguments for: Many proposals come in that are easy to read and make decision. Within one week the senate can approve via email. If a senator says no, the proposal may be pulled off. This can work if there is a baseline of respondents. Elections committee has experience and can set this up in Qualtrix. Faculty senate has little interest in holding up very minor changes. Can deadline be moved from 1st to 3rd? Last minute changes are relatively small additional change with respect to total changes.

Arguments against: This is a fudging of the dates because senate meets monthly. We are setting a dangerous precedent if we do not demand faculty adhere to deadlines. There is a deadline for a reason. Senate deliberation is lost if the senate is only a vote-casting body. Is this an efficiency argument? It is not appropriate for us to change a deadline that is not ours. Replies to email requests are few and far between.

Motion (Turner, Moskowitz) Faculty Senate requests the deadline be moved to April 4th. Motion Approved.

3:40:01 PM Provost Workman will check if the deadline can be moved to April 4th.
Motion (Topf, None*) The Senate adopt the proposed policy on interdisciplinary programs, as revised. (Attached) (11-10-3) Motion Approved

Arguments for: Chairman Topf distributes result of Google search from Cornell University. An equivalent search returns no results for RWU. Trouble is that there is no IP administrative structure at RWU. Some of the proposed changes refer to chairs, but not all departments have chairs. Current committee considered this issue, steering committee is fulfilling its charge.

Arguments against: An alternative version is circulated by Senator Roberts. Some inside-department programs are running well now, no need for external structure. Existing programs bristle at the notion of the senate dictating the program must be moved.

4:12:38 PM Motion to amend the proposal. (Roberts, Sawoski) Motion defeated. 7-14-3

* Senator Roberts raised his hand to oppose the motion and this was recognized by the chair as a second to the motion. In subsequent correspondence, senator Roberts indicated his preference not to be listed as the seconder of the motion.

e. Diversity (Emmer) 4:18:57 PM President agrees to hire chief diversity officer. Diversity committee will assist the president in writing the job description.

f. Ad Hoc Committee on Continuing Studies (Emmer)

Committee has been active looking at business plan for CS.

7. Old Business

8. New Business

a. Motion (Speakman, Sloan): Executive committee will bring to provost’s attention the attached issues related to advisor hold. Motion Approved.

Motion to adjourn (O’Connell, Esons) 4:22:12 PM

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 (Tehrani): Visit the appropriate location of CCC by 2016.

d. Motion (Tehrani): Refer to Academic Standards and Policies the issue of transparency and faculty input regarding assignment of classes and determination of delivery format.

e. Motion (Topf): The meetings of all committees of the Faculty Senate, whether permanent (standing) or ad hoc, shall be open to the RWU community, except when, by a vote of two-thirds of its members, the committee carries a motion to go into executive session, the motion (1) to state in general terms the reason, and (2) to be recorded in the committee’s published minutes. Voting on any motion may be by closed ballot.
f. Motion (Topf): Meetings of all non-Senate faculty committees, when the committee is considering a matter that it intends to bring to the Faculty Senate, shall consider the matter at an open meeting or, by a vote of two-thirds of its members, the committee carries a motion to go into executive session. The motion to go into executive session must (1) state in general terms the reason, and (2) to be recorded in the committee’s published minutes.