

Salve Regina University

Digital Commons @ Salve Regina

Faculty Assembly Documents

Faculty and Staff

10-2-2013

AS Minutes 2013 10 02

Salve Regina University

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

Recommended Citation

Salve Regina University, "AS Minutes 2013 10 02" (2013). *Faculty Assembly Documents*. 204.
https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly/204

Rights Statement



In Copyright - Educational Use Permitted. URI: <http://rightsstatements.org/vocab/InC-EDU/1.0/>

This Item is protected by copyright and/or related rights. You are free to use this Item in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. In addition, no permission is required from the rights-holder(s) for educational uses. For other uses, you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s).

Faculty Assembly
October 2, 2013

Quorum Count: 101 (and clickers have run out)

Minutes approved: By consent (3:10 pm)

Lisa Z. Treasurer's Report: Please give us \$20.00; helps us with events, food, sympathy flowers/cards, life events, etc.

Arlene N. Judy Keenan scholarship. Brochures handed out.

Mariann M. Conferences and events. Scheduling. Security—everything needs to be on the calendar. Small fee to host event for outside groups now. Miley executive dining room available. Small conference room downstairs in Miley sometimes available. Mercy Center has a conference room. We've lost Rogers. Space is tight. Write it down—2197.

Voting procedures: (acquired from Craig C.)

Steve S.: Curriculum Committee Announcements

Members—Khalil H, Sally G, Jackie J, Steve S, Arlene N, Bernard M, Eileen W, Madeleine E, Luigi B.

Agenda items for 2013-2014 academic year

- * Review and facilitate the faculty review of all curriculum proposals
- * Implement an electronic online review system for curriculum proposals
- * Seek resources and provide assistance for faculty that are planning to develop new programs
- * Vote on the Marketing minor proposal.

Marketing Minor proposal: I move that the Faculty Assembly endorse the creation of a Marketing Minor as outlined in the proposal submitted by the Department of Business Studies and Economics at Salve Regina University.

Discussion:

Q: Why wasn't Psychology included?

A: (Nadia A.) Wasn't considered, but there's no reason that can't happen in the future.

Yes: 85%

No: 11%

Abstain: 4%

CCTF has asked us to move into Executive Session. 3:32 pm.

Q: Does this quorum include Assistant Deans?

A: Yes.

Alison S. Asking you to endorse or not endorse this one-page Core Curriculum model. This was posted at the beginning of September.

Motion: The Core Curriculum Task Force moves that the Faculty Assembly endorse the Core Curriculum Model Proposal “Enduring Questions and Contemporary Challenges” as a complete model inclusive of all four parts as posted on the Faculty Assembly Web page.

Amendment: Since the core model has been discussed extensively already, forego discussion and call the question. Seconded.

Yes: 57%

No: 38%

Abstain: 5%

Motion does not pass.

Discussion: Correction about what counts as testing out of Modern Languages in terms of AP scores.

Discussion: Thanks to the Task Force. I see some things I like and other things I don't. Is this the best we can produce at this point in our history? I think we could do better. When I vote no it is my way of telling that to the administration.

Discussion: I'm voting based on its merits. Does this work for our students? I don't believe that it does. Catholic intellectual tradition is too limited by this model, especially in Part II which focuses too heavily on philosophy. Sister Leona has asked for feedback on how several departments might engage with the Catholic Intellectual Tradition. The assumptions embedded in the Core, including its focus on the western tradition is very limited and archaic.

Discussion: This model does not improve the writing skills of students.

Discussion: I will be voting yes, it's balanced, takes into account the many interests of the faculty at large, and incorporates multiple disciplines. The distribution model allows us to reach students we haven't otherwise been able to reach. I think it's a fair model. Compromises have been made.

Discussion: I agree with those comments. People have had the opportunities to express their concerns. This is a reasonably good and balanced model.

Discussion: With regard to Philosophy and Religious Studies and part II, there are no bars to including other disciplines. Those courses can be offered.

Discussion: This pushes a particular discipline. I don't want to favor a model that forces some students to take a particular course—this is a self-serving model for certain departments. I don't understand the argument that we should vote for an imperfect model. I cannot endorse that logic.

Discussion: I encourage the adoption of the model—increases choice and exposes them to new ideas and will improve the intellectual subculture of the university.

Point of clarification: What happens after the vote? Alison's response: This will go to the senior administration regardless of how the vote goes. If it's approved there's no guarantee it will be accepted wholly. Administration is free to accept, modify, or reject the model.

Discussion: The overall message of this model is come here and experience the shared past. The people we need to reach are not interested in a shared past. They want the promise of a shared future—this Core does not send that message.

Discussion: I'm generally disposed to this model. The first is the University Seminar. Choice and passion—great. It worries me that there's a discrepancy between the goals and objectives and how much writing is required. It puts the onus on the second semester. The issue of Sign Language—there are certain disciplines where ASL is helpful. I will be looking for evidence of where the careers are that need this. If it's this important, then it's going to be required for that major.

Discussion: This model is not very different from what we have now. There's no incentive for Professional Programs to get involved.

Discussion: We have improved what we have now, including the University Seminar, which has no fixed texts and is open to science and professional studies faculty. The writing seminar has the potential to be an improvement over ENG 150. Now they'll have choices too. With History now we'll be able to offer different courses for students who need a different course. Moving the capstone into the major is a plus.

Discussion: The proposal offers a better alternative to the Core Complement system.

Discussion: This core has been formulated based on input from faculty and students. There wasn't huge displeasure with the current core, but this model addresses those problems.

Discussion: It provides more flexibility for nursing students and allows nursing faculty to offer courses in the University Seminars.

Discussion: I'm in favor of it—every department has been involved in the task force. It was inclusive and everyone had the opportunity to comment. We need to continue to trust our colleagues. This was an inclusive process based on compromise.

Discussion: I'm voting no—this isn't a positive compromise. It's not global enough in its concerns. This will not serve our students. The third part is very discipline based (and doesn't allow for much interdisciplinarity).

Discussion: Support for proposal. We're not turning this over to a bunch of faceless bureaucrats—we're the ones who will implement it. It has challenges, but it has more opportunities. It's a more responsive core that will enable Salve to move forward and meet the needs of a changing world.

Discussion: Why would we vote for something that's flawed? This was more about departmental turf battles than what's best for the students.

Discussion: I take anger at that last statement—students were the primary focus. I have nothing to gain from it.

Discussion: Can we call the question?

Motion to end discussion and call the question. Seconded.

Yes: 86%

No: 12%

Abstain: 2%

Motion to Endorse:

Yes: 60%

No: 35%

Abstain: 5%

Motion passes.

FACSB report: Jameson C.

Committee: Chace, Munge, Combies, Gibbons, Mangieri, Marcoux, Quinn, Rothman

Professional Development: \$800

Academic Papers Fund: \$1000

Conference Attendance: \$500 (can't do both)

Provost Funds: \$1500

Collaborative Project Grants:

Faculty-Student Research Grants

Sabbaticals

Sabbaticals—can we speed up the process? FACSB will look at this
International conference fund no longer exists

New online home page (Craig Condella). It's a work in progress. Position paper protocol is up there.

Introduction of members of Executive Committee

Search for Provost? Sister Jane will be willing to talk to Assembly.