

12-3-2001

AS Minutes 2001 12 03

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly

Recommended Citation

"AS Minutes 2001 12 03" (2001). *Faculty Assembly Documents*. Paper 72.
http://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly/72

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty and Staff at Digital Commons @ Salve Regina. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Assembly Documents by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Salve Regina. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@salve.edu.

SALVE REGINA UNIVERSITY FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Meeting of December 3 / 17, 2001, TB Room, O'Hare

Johnelle Luciani, RSM, Speaker of the Assembly, presided.

1. **Call to Order and Executive Session.** The meeting was called to order at 2:05 PM. About 75 members of the full-time Teaching Faculty were in attendance. The first part of the meeting was in Executive Session, meaning that this part of the meeting was open only to members of the Assembly (full-time Teaching Faculty).
2. **Minutes.** The Minutes of the meeting of November 5 were accepted.
3. **Request.** The Speaker informed the Assembly that the Vice President for Academic Affairs / Dean of Faculty had requested to be invited to the part of the meeting in Executive Session. The Speaker noted that Assembly's constitution in the Faculty Manual permits the Speaker to invite individuals who are not members of the Assembly to attend a meeting in Executive Session. She asked the Assembly to advise her on this request. By paper ballot, the Assembly voted to proceed without invited guests.
4. **FACSB.** Members of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Salary and Benefits presented ideas and listened to comments and suggestions. The committee will return to the Assembly next semester with a formal proposal and ask for a vote. At the conclusion of this discussion, Executive Session ended and the meeting was open to delegates.
5. **Proposal from Business Studies.** Ron Atkins, Chair of the Department of Business Studies, reported to the Assembly about the progress of plans to change the majors offered by the department. This report, he noted, was one of the steps described in the "Protocol for Requesting the Faculty Assembly's Involvement in Changes Concerning Curriculum and Educational Policy," adopted by the Assembly on May 1, 2000.

The primary goals of the proposed changes are as follows:

- (1) Allow business students the opportunity to access other programs of interest offered by the University.
- (2) Clarify business course programs/objectives/course requirements.
- (3) Consolidate existing courses where applicable to avoid duplication.
- (4) Reduce total course requirements to earn degrees in Business Administration (BS) and Management (BA).
- (5) Create new degree: BA in Management.
- (6) Strengthen BS associated majors in Marketing-Finance.
- (7) Eliminate weak concentrations in Marketing, Finance and Human Resource Management.

Discussions leading to the proposed program changes went on within the department for over a year and a half. Business Studies also consulted the following and asked for their opinions: Chairs of other departments impacted by the proposal, the IACBE (external accreditation board for business programs), the Business Advisory Council (business leaders), Sigma Beta Delta membership (Business Honor Society), and selected graduates of the business program. The content of the revised program was benchmarked against Stonehill, PC, Bryant, and Roger Williams and incorporates the best of their programs.

Copies of the proposal were provided attendees at the December 2001 meeting of the Faculty Assembly and Undergraduate Council for review and comment.

The proposal has the support of the Business Studies faculty and is ready for implementation when the faculty review process established by the Protocol has been completed. A request for a vote of support for the proposal will be requested at the February 2002 meeting of the Faculty Assembly.

- 6.1 **Motion - Core Curriculum.** The following Motion was presented and seconded: “That the attached ‘Structure of the Salve Regina University Core Curriculum: A Program Designed for Lifelong Learning and Responsible World Citizenship’ (Prolog-Rationale, Goals and Objectives, list of courses, and Matrix) be the foundation on which this core is developed further.” The Motion originated in the joint faculty-administration **“Deliberative Committee on the Core Curriculum.”**

Discussion. The Assembly unanimously agreed on rules for the debate: (a) Comments from individuals would be limited to three minutes at a time. (b) No one could make another comment until all those who had not spoken had an opportunity to speak. (c) Comments would be made at a microphone in the center aisle.

Many comments were about procedures and the way this Motion came to the Assembly:

The Motion is ill-conceived. Members of the Deliberative Committee did not complete their task. The Matrices at the end are only the committee’s best guess and, in effect, they put words into the mouths of departments. The committee received written memos from faculty who took the trouble to write to the committee but these memos were never put on the agenda . . . The idea that this Deliberative Committee has finished its work and is disbanded is false. The Assembly commissioned the Deliberative Committee to finish the task, to carry the ball across the goal line. It has more work to do . . . Don’t rush this through. Procedures have been violated. The process was not followed. This material is not ready for the Assembly’s vote . . . The Deliberative Committee is not fractured. The goals and objectives presented today are a sign that it can work together. Unfortunately, this Motion was brought to the Assembly outside of the normal committee process.

The time has come to get this work out to the faculty in general. The Deliberative Committee is not broadly representative of the faculty and departments. It has gone as far as it can. Now is the time for broader representation . . . It is obvious that the members of this Deliberative Committee cannot work together. The committee’s charge does not say that it must produce all the details for every aspect of the Core Curriculum. The reasonable thing to do is bring in departments at this point . . .

Other comments were about the list of courses on page 6 of the Motion.

Three individuals expressed their disapproval of the proposal because certain courses were not required: Economics is not mentioned. All students must take Economics in a program concerned with “responsible World Citizenship.” Our students must understand the importance of Economics, especially in the non-Western world . . . The category for the Social Sciences is a grab bag of requirements. A student could graduate without taking a single course in History . . . Technology is extremely important today. A Core Curriculum must require every student to take a course in computer programs.

Perhaps this Core program tries to be so unique that even faculty cannot figure it out. There is a danger of requiring so many unique courses (including the Portal courses) that we will make things very difficult for transfer students . . . It will be very hard to integrate interdisciplinary courses because the demands of the individual disciplines are so different.

Another comment:

This is discouraging. We are spending all of this time talking about procedure and a tentative list of course areas. Nobody is talking about the Goals and Objectives in the Motion. They are many good things in them. It would be a shame to reject them at this point, after all of the hard work of so many individuals in formulating them.

6.2 **Amendment.** The Assembly passed the following amendment to the Motion:

That the Matrices in the Motion (pp. 7-19) be labeled as “Non-binding suggested examples.”

6.3 **Reconvene.** A procedural Motion was introduced to reconvene the meeting on December 17 at a time to be determined. By a vote of 31 to 16 the Assembly approved the Motion. The Speaker closed this part of the meeting at 3:54 PM.

December 17, 2001 - Continuation of the December 3 Meeting

The Speaker resumed the meeting at 10:07 AM and read out the original Motion (6.1) with its Amendment (6.2).

6.4 **Substitute Motion / Amendment by Substitution.** A member of the Assembly proposed an Amendment by Substitution that was germane to the original Motion. It was seconded.

**[The Faculty Assembly recommends]
That the Goals and Objectives of the Core Curriculum:
A Program Designed for Lifelong Learning and
Responsible World Citizenship be accepted so that the
Deliberative Committee on the Core Curriculum can
continue with the development of the Core Curriculum
and procedures for implementation in September 2003.**

The Speaker explained that this Substitute Motion / Amendment by Substitution, if the Assembly so decides, would replace the original Motion and its Amendment. During the debate on the Substitute Motion the original Motion may still be debated and amended. She also informed the Assembly that the President had agreed to a one-year extension of the preparation time for a new Core Curriculum, so that the new program could begin in the fall of 2003.

6.5 **Amendment to the Substitute Motion.** The following Amendment was proposed and seconded:

That the following be added to the end of the Substitute Motion [6.4]: “and bring back to the Assembly, by February 4, 2002, a plan for more faculty involvement in this process.”

This Amendment was passed (53 YES, 7 NO, 2 ABSTAIN).

- 6.6 **Replacement of the original Motion.** The Assembly voted 47 YES, 17 NO to replace the original Motion and its amendment (6.1 and 6.2) with the amended Substitute Motion (6.4 and 6.5).

The debate on the Substitute Motion and its Amendment followed the procedural rules adopted on December 3.

A large portion of the comments concerned the **joint faculty-administration Deliberative Committee on the Core Curriculum:**

There has been considerable confusion about the original Motion and how it came to the Assembly. The confusion was caused by differences of opinion among members of the Deliberative Committee on how to proceed. Because of time constraints, the committee had to edit the final Motion by e-mail. The “History” section in a draft of the original Motion, stated that the Deliberative Committee would be submitting a structure for the Core and, because of that, its task was finished. This statement was removed from the final version of the Motion that was given to the faculty. Unfortunately, that statement about the Deliberative Committee completing its task was circulated and has led to misunderstandings. This much is clear: the time has come to set up a more representative Core Curriculum Committee that would coordinate the work of other committees in specific areas.

There is a consensus that the work of the Deliberative Committee on the Core Curriculum is not done. This committee must now work with departments and with the team that proposed the Core model that the Assembly approved on May 23. This is the only to develop a sense of ownership about any new Core.

We have to hold people accountable. The idea of a deadline for the Deliberative Committee is good . . . The Deliberative Committee on the Core Curriculum is like a control tower at an airport. It only helps the traffic flow. The real action will be in the committees that will send their work to the Deliberative Committee.

We will be giving the Deliberative Committee a carte blanche. This is a cause for concern . . . The Deliberative Committee has finished its work. It was commissioned to present a structure and the structure is there. This Substitute Motion only expands the power of this committee . . . There can be honest disagreements over the role of this Deliberative Committee. In the Assembly’s own Protocol for curriculum matters, which is found on the Assembly’s Web site, a deliberative committee helps the Assembly in debates on “delicate and troublesome questions.” The Protocol describes another type of committee that implements the wishes of the Assembly.

The constitution of the Faculty Assembly in the Faculty Manual indicates that the faculty determine curriculum. The Deliberative Committee exists as long as this job of determining the Core Curriculum exists. When it finishes this job, the Deliberative

Committee hands over its work to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Then the committee is dissolved . . . There is a misconception that the Deliberative Committee on the Core Curriculum is a faculty committee; it is really a joint faculty-administration committee. Administrators sit on this committee; they are members of it.

In the euphoria of May 23, when we set up this Deliberative Committee, we neglected to be sufficiently specific about its charge.

The work of the Deliberative Committee is not finished. The Assembly asked for a detailed structure but that has not yet been submitted. The Deliberative Committee was not given unregulated power. It was constituted by the Assembly and submits its work to the Assembly.

Committees for certain curricular areas will come up with the appropriate courses in the Core, not the Deliberative Committee . . . Questions about the courses in the subject areas should be determined by those areas, not the Deliberative Committee.

Some remarks were about the term **“responsible World Citizenship”**:

This concept of “World Citizenship” is a very serious flaw in the proposed Core. A “world attitude” is an American idea. The cosmopolitan world citizen is not a concern in other countries . . . This idea of “World Citizenship” goes back to Cicero. It implied that the Romans could ride roughshod over subject peoples under the ideal of world citizenship . . . This Core program ignores non-Western ethics . . . The idea of a “World Citizen” has shifted over the years; connotations from the past do not apply today . . . A member of the Assembly asked for a clarification of the expression “responsible World Citizenship.” Someone from the team that formulated the model for the Core responded and read from the “Prolog / Rationale” in the original Motion, which, he said, clearly defined the concept as it would apply at Salve Regina.

Comments on **critical thinking**:

We are wrestling with these issues because we need to make the connections clear between critical thinking and our Catholic identity. We must do this first.

Faculty are scared. They are afraid because there is no consensus about what we mean by critical thinking and how it fits into our Catholic identity. We have not reached this consensus and we must do it before we do anything else.

The President

The President stated that she is excited about the development of a new and better Core Curriculum. She is a member of the joint faculty-administration Deliberative Committee on the Core Curriculum.

She further stated that, on way or another, the new Core must be implemented in the fall of 2003. That deadline will not be extended again. The curriculum for the Core must be finished in time for inclusion in the catalog and course listings published in the spring of 2003. She suggested that, when the Deliberative Committee comes up with its proposal in February, it should also clearly define the role of this committee in the process.

6.7 Divide the Question

There was a Motion to divide the question (6.4 and 6.5 above) into two parts: one part concerning approval of the Goals and Objectives, the other part concerning the continuance of the Deliberative Committee. There was no debate because a Motion to divide the question is not debatable. The Motion failed (29 YES, 33 NO).

6.8 Approval of the Amended Substitute Motion.

The Assembly approved the amended Substitute Motion (6.4 and 6.5). The vote was 46 YES, 15 NO, 2 ABSTAIN

7. Adjourn. 11:37 AM.