Salve Regina University

Digital Commons @ Salve Regina

Faculty Assembly Documents   Faculty and Staff

9-27-2005

EC Minutes 2005 09 27

Recommended Citation

Minutes of the meeting of September 27, 2005   Miley

Present: Jay Lacouture (Chair)
               Thomas Day, James Garman, Carol Gibbons, Johnelle Luciani RSM,
               Paula Martasian, Barbara Sylvia, Lisa Zuccarelli OP

1. **Dean of Undergraduate Studies.** Before the meeting, Stephen Trainor, Dean of
   Undergraduate Studies, spoke with the committee about various matters. He offered the
   suggestion that the governance process regarding curriculum could be streamlined and made
   more meaningful. He noted the absence of a committee for reviewing and approving
   curriculum at the University. A simpler and faster process for approving curriculum changes,
   one that avoided redundancy, would be a helpful way of improving the University's
   governance process.

   Dean Trainor noted that the Committee on Faculty Responsibilities has been looking at the
   matter of workload and "what it means to be a university," two issues that are connected. He
   is now Chair of this committee. There is a need for a general adjustment of faculty workload
   across the board; the reduction of teaching time will allow more time for research and
   scholarship. He also noted that any adjustment in workload should recognize the unique
   nature of the different disciplines and their unique teaching demands.

   The President of the University, he said, recognizes the need for a reduction of teaching loads
   and she has told Dean Trainor, "Show me a plan" for this change. Dean Trainor suggested
   that the plan can be developed by using a procedure similar to what was done for the Core
   Curriculum. For this project on teaching loads, faculty would be invited to work individually
   or in groups and develop specific models; the Faculty Assembly would rank models that
   faculty have developed and then send this ranking to the President, who would make the final
   choice.

   A steering committee for the Core Curriculum models guided the proposals through the
   process. The steering committee that will guide the workload proposals through this same
   process will be the Committee on Faculty Responsibilities. He gave the Executive Committee
   a handout, a draft document entitled "New Faculty Workload Model," and stressed that is
   was a draft and will be changed. The draft described the process and set out the four stages
   for the project ("Being Aware," "Being Creative," "Being Critical," "Communicating"); he
   noted that these four stages worked well for the development of the new Core. The handout
   also included a timetable for a process that would begin on September 30, 2005 and end on
   April 7, 2006 with the Faculty Assembly voting to rank the order of preference for the
   proposed models.

   The Dean said he would like the Committee on Faculty Responsibilities to return to a larger
   scope: namely, the question, "What does it mean to be a Catholic university of distinction."
   Workload is part of that same question. He invited the Assembly to elect three members of
   this steering committee and asked for the cooperation of the Executive Committee in
   facilitating this election.

   During the discussion with the Executive Committee, the Dean was asked how much detail
   would be in a proposed model. He replied that all details did not have to be specified.

Concerning a question about ways to reduce costs, he mentioned that there were many possibilities: for example, cutting back the number of times a course is offered with low enrollment and going to a four-credit model.

Members of the Executive Committee also brought up other points: *The Executive Committee is not authorized to endorse any process for redefining workload; the committee first has to go to the Assembly for authorization. *The Vice President for Academic Affairs set up a Committee on Workload (now called the Committee on Faculty Responsibilities). In April 2004 this committee submitted a report to the VPAA on faculty workload, inclusive of a plan for reducing faculty workload. There was no response. This report was posted on the Academic Affairs Web-page. *At its May 5, 2003 meeting, the Assembly passed a Motion that requested a just and equitable workload policy for faculty who teach atypical courses with required contact hours that exceed the hours/credits for the course. There was no response to this request. *In the draft that Dean Trainor presented to the committee, the discussions and debates concerning proposals are all scheduled for Assembly meetings. This would make it difficult for the Assembly to attend to its other business.

Concerning Dean Trainor's remarks about developing a simpler and faster way of approving curriculum changes, committee members mentioned the Assembly's "Protocol for Requesting the Faculty Assembly's Involvement in Changes Concerning Curriculum and Educational Policy" (May 1, 2000). The Protocol does not specify a process but it does spell out what it considers professional conduct for faculty when making curriculum changes. *The Faculty Assembly has been conscientious in trying to move curriculum changes through the Assembly as quickly as possible. Significant delays can occur after the faculty have approved a proposed curriculum change and the proposal has been sent to the administration for final approval.

2. **Call to Order and Minutes.** The meeting was called to order at 6:40 PM. The committee approved the minutes of August 24.

3. **Message for Dean.** The committee asked the Chair to e-mail Dean Trainor and convey the following concerning the plans for the development of proposed models on faculty workload: The committee is in agreement with Dean Trainor's suggestions that workload should be reduced and it wants to discuss this matter with the Assembly first.

4. **Committees.** The Chair reported on the result of his request for volunteers to committees. Twelve faculty have volunteered for the Faculty Advisory Committee on Salary and Benefits; 14 have agreed to be in the pool of faculty who are willing to be asked to serve on an ad hoc Grievance Committee.

5. **Treasurer.** There is $515 in the Assembly's account. A notice for dues ($35) will be mailed to faculty

6. **Assembly meeting.** The committee approved the agenda for the October 14 Assembly meeting. Instead of refreshments available at the meeting in Ochre Court, there will be a reception in honor of new faculty in the new faculty dining area of O'Hare.

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 PM.