Minutes
RWU Faculty Senate
April 3, 2013
Library Seminar Room
Last Revised: April 12, 2013

1. Roll call

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

In attendance: Tom Sojka, Karim Beswick of student senate; Provost Workman, President Farish, Associate Provost Cole.

2. Approval of the minutes of March 6, 2013 Motion to approve (Varano, Khan) Motion Approved with 4 abstentions

3. President Farish

Three brief announcements: President has had many meetings with students, although he understands these are hand-picked students, these students are asked “What is the one thing at RWU you hope never changes?” and the regularly respond “We hope commitment the faculty make to us never goes away”. The president thanked the faculty for their commitment to service. Second item: During Accepted Student’s Day, the president is seeing a real level of enthusiasm, “many prospective students “really, really want to come”. There is currently some concern about the end of this year’s recruiting cycle, as we are running a little short so far. The president reinforced the importance of the upcoming Accepted Student Day, and described this year as “a challenging year”. The yield of the last ASD is historically near 40%, and then there is some “melt” over the summer. Retention is a far greater problem, we lose 20% of freshman class, plenty of room for improvement. Third item: the NEASC visit will be 3 years from now. A summer activity of the administration will be to outline our preparation. Currently we do not have viable “strategic plan”.

Q: Who is the group working on this? A: administration group.

4. Provost Workman
Three points: The office of Registrar is moving to Academic Affairs. Joan Romano will be interim registrar. Projects such as Datatel improvements are a bit behind the curve. Hope to have new registrar ASAP.

The provost’s Response Retention Task Force has produced its report: There are four areas to respond to: 1) FYE and Honors program, 2) advising system to be worked on over summer, 3) system for identifying students who are struggling, 4) administrative impediments.

The provost announced the Student Senate passed bill (attached) suggesting a Provost Advisory Council for students be formed.

2:21:31 PM

5. Report of Executive Committee

a. Meeting with President and Provost on March 19th, 2013. President Speakman presents minutes of the executive committee meeting. No questions or comments.

b. SCS Senators

President Speakman raised the issue that no faculty are assigned to the SCS, so how does this school get representation in the Senate? Apparently, our academic governance has not kept pace with administrative changes. Currently SCS is not an academic unit, and therefore has no standing in academic governance, only administrative governance. Q: Is there going to be a larger academic reorganization? Provost: Not within the time horizon for acting on this issue.

There is currently an ad hoc committee on SCS, but this committee was looking at the bigger picture and not academic governance.

Motion (Esons, O’Connell): The issue of representation within the faculty senate for SCS and program development and location of majors is referred to the steering committee for investigation.

Substitute Motion (Esons, O’Connell): Refer to the steering committee senate representation of “University College” as it stands in the current constitution. Motion approved with one abstention.

2:42:41 PM

Motion (Tehrani, Marlowe) All faculty caucus proposed for May 1st 4:30-5:30. Motion passes with 1 opposed and 6 abstentions.

2:48:23 PM

GEC (Van Schepen) reports. Core Curriculum artifacts are being collected this spring, he is currently working on a storage location. Committee is working on an “assessment insurance policy for faculty” aimed at reassuring faculty that this process is not a review of faculty performance. Outcome Rubrics are being vetted, these will be approved by GEC this spring. Committee expect a 3-4 day evaluation of artifacts.

2:50:59 PM
Motion to reorder (Ruocco, O’Connell) Reorder the agenda to move CC above new business. Motion approved with one abstention.

6. Committee reports
   a. Curriculum (Ruocco)
      i. Motion (Ruocco, Topf): The Senate accepts the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee as described in paragraphs 3a through 3c of FSCC Minutes dated 20 March 2013. Motion approved with one abstention.

      Arguments against: Q: Proposal refers to “banking”, what are the implications of “banking”? Does “unbanking” require CC approval?

      Arguments for: CC Petition required for unbanking. Banking is one response to the lack of memory in Datatel. If a course is deleted then any academic record employing those courses will generate an error.

      ii. Motion (Ruocco, Varano): The Senate accepts the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee and reinstates standard grading for COMM 460 (paragraph 3.d of FSCC Minutes dated 20 March 2013). Motion approved with two abstentions.

      Arguments against:

      Arguments for: Graded internship is now at the discretion of the program.

      3:02:10 PM

      iii. Motion (Ruocco, Topf): The Senate accepts the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee and expands the university WTNG requirement (paragraph 3.e of FSCC Minutes dated 20 March 2013). Motion approved with one opposed and one abstention.

      Arguments against: Is the reading Expo and a 200 or 300? Will there be additional prerequisites? Are these new courses? Will courses be potentially starved of students? Are we going to flood FSCC with proposals to change writing requirement?

      Arguments for: Sen. Beitler presents a memo describing changes in writing program. The Writing Department is hoping to meet faculty needs as well as student needs.

      iv. Motion (Ruocco, Varano): The Senate accepts the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee and adds a new B.S. in Forensic Science program (paragraph 3.f of FSCC Minutes dated 20 March 2013). Motion approved with two abstentions.

      3:13:26 PM

7. New Business
   a. Motion (Speakman, Tehrani): Refer to the university life committee that the hours at the Center for Academic Development be expanded to accommodate the needs of students in evening and summer classes. Motion passes with 1 opposed and two abstentions.

      Arguments for: Tutoring has long hours but exam center has problematic limitations.
b. **Motion (Tehrani, Varano):** Visit the appropriate location of CCC by 2016.

Motion (10-9-7) Motion approved.

c. **Motion (Tehrani, Esons):** Refer to Academic Standards and Policies the issue of transparency and faculty input regarding assignment of classes and determination of delivery format. **Motion approved (17-9-2)**

**Arguments against:** Does the contract refer to this? Isn’t format a curriculum issue? Is this a standard that should be applied to all schools, even schools that consider the current system fine, or is this a GSB issue? In FCAS the chairs schedule, in SECCM dean consults with faculty.

**Arguments for:** There was a unilateral GSB dean’s decision to have a full-time cohort of business students on campus in the summer. The GSB dean made all staffing decisions without consultation with faculty who had long term association with the courses. This was a deviation from standard practices in the GSB that some faculty found objectionable.

3:29:05 PM

d. **Motion (Topf, Hunter):** 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. **Motion approved (17-4-7)**

**Arguments against:** Is this a rule for the committees that the senate itself does not follow? Is there a rational potential for untenured faculty to wish to remain anonymous?

**Arguments for:** Some curriculum committees are having closed votes. We are adults; we should not feel uncomfortable for what we say.

3:34:28 PM

e. **Motion (Topf, Speakman):** 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.

**Arguments against:** Senate is limiting dialog on committees that senate does not control. Can this be applied retroactively, meaning that an idea that comes before the senate can be halted because somewhere in its history a closed meeting was held? How can ideas be limited? How will this be enforced? How can it be universally applicable, the motion covers a lot of ground?

**Arguments for:** This is a statement for transparency that is important for the senate to make.

3:46:27 PM Motion defeated.

f. **Motion: (Tehrani):** Charge the University Life Committee to review the Students' Senate election, transparency, procedures, etc. This motion received no second.
g. Motion (Tehrani): Executive Committee will request the administration to direct the consulting team that is hired for room utilization to meet and consult with the faculty. This motion received no second.

8. Committee reports (continued)

3:53:41 PM

b. Faculty Development (Gentles-Peart)

c. Steering (Topf)

Report: Steering Committee statement on electronic meetings. The members discussed a proposed constitutional amendment to authorize the Senate Executive Committee to call electronic meetings of the Senate and to hold electronic voting on matters arising at electronic meetings.

The Steering Committee recommends to the Senate that the Senate may hold electronic meetings, using the software available for such meetings, where a quorum of Senators are “present” (at their computers) at the designated meeting time. Voting on motions and resolutions may take place at such meeting.

Otherwise, such virtual meetings and voting (for example by emailing) are not appropriate for a body the size and nature of the Senate. First, real deliberation and debate would be weakened on issues that may be of importance to the Senate, the faculty, and the University. Second, deciding a quorum and dealing with such parliamentary actions as motions to amend and motions to substitute would create problems in keeping order. Third, the Senate constitution already provides for emergency or other special meetings as needed. We believe that this may be a better means of resolving time-sensitive issues.

Steering Committee Statement on Senate minutes. The members discussed a proposed amendment to provide that Senate minutes include only actions taken and discussion related to the actions, and not record discussion unrelated to motions or other actions. The Steering Committee believes that such a proposal does not require a constitutional amendment, and may be adopted by the Senate as a bylaw.

Motion (Topf, Stein): Under exceptional circumstances the president of the senate in consultation with the executive committee may call electronic meetings, using the software available for such meetings, where a quorum of Senators are “present” (at their computers) at the designated meeting time. Voting on motions and resolutions may take place at such meeting. Motion approved with 2 opposed and 2 abstentions.

Arguments against: Is this normal or for emergencies?

Arguments for: Parliamentary issues are problematic with 33 senators. The Bridges site can do this. At this date this type of meetings are commonplace technology.

4:04:08 PM

Motion (Topf, Murphy): The faculty senate constitution shall be amended as follows:

(B) Insert in Art. IV, (1): “The president shall not serve more than three consecutive terms in any six consecutive year period.” (7-14-I) Motion defeated
(C) Insert in Art. I (3): “Further, the faculty as a whole shall elect five senators-at-large. Their terms shall be staggered so that there are no more than five such senators serving at the same time.” Motion withdrawn.

4:18:10 PM

Motion (Stein, O’Connell) Insert in Art. I (3): “Further, the faculty as a whole shall elect five senators-at-large. Their terms shall be staggered so that there are no more than five such senators serving at the same time.” Motion approved with two abstentions.

Arguments against: Small department a problem with term limits? Do we lose expertise? Term limits are anti-democratic. Does the math of part (A) work out?

Arguments for: There have been 10 at large senators in the past.

(2) Technical changes

(A) Insert in Art. III, “Faculty Senate” before each mention of “President,” to avoid ambiguity.

(B) Insert in Art. I (1): “Mario J. Gabelli School of Business”.

Motion (Topf, Murphy): Motion approved.

4:24:01 PM Report from O’Connell for the Elections Committee: Elections for school representatives have been conducted.

Motion to adjourn (Varano, O’Connell) 4:25:29 PM

d. University Life (Roberts)

e. Diversity (Emmer)

f. Admissions and Enrollment (Turner)

g. Academic Standards and Policies (Moskowitz)