

Salve Regina University

Digital Commons @ Salve Regina

Faculty Assembly Documents

Faculty and Staff

4-30-2014

AS Minutes 2014 04 30

Salve Regina University

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

Recommended Citation

Salve Regina University, "AS Minutes 2014 04 30" (2014). *Faculty Assembly Documents*. 210.
https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly/210

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
4/30/2014

Quorum (54)
Minutes approved

Reports: Treasury report
Technology statement—Sister Jane will take it under advisement
Meeting with adjunct faculty April 15 (15 or 20 showed up)—issues that came up has been posted on Canvas
Emily Colbert—French and Spanish thing (?)

Each person can speak twice on a motion (Robert's Rules)—2 minutes in length please

Motion: Core Curriculum Advisory Committee. (Seconded.)

Discussion: Having two parallel committees to handle curriculum matters seems like overkill. This seems like it's adding bureaucracy and layers of approval. This proposal gives committee a lot of power to say "no" and block, with the only appeal to the Executive Committee. Problems with procedure. One of charges is assessment. We don't have anything about assessment yet.

In favor of this proposal—adding additional element to the other curriculum committee would be unwieldy. Like to add to the proposal that the chair is moving to a faculty position—needs full support (clerical and faculty).

If committee continues to exist the departments who contribute to Part III have to have representation on the committee. We don't always understand what our departments do.

Steve deserves thanks—it's a lot of work.

Motion—Amendment to the proposal regarding constitution of the committee (Chad Raymond)—committee of nine is too many. Proposal as worded would allow a single department to have a majority of seats on the committee. Reduce number on committee to seven, at least two from A&S and from Professional Studies, three at large, and each member from a different department. (Seconded.)

Discussion. 9 members offers breadth, gives faculty a chance to serve on an elected committee. I like Chad's proposal.

Vote on Chad's motion: 68, 24, 8 (passes)

Original motion: Discussion. Didn't want to make it seem like other committee is underworked. One committee of nine and one committee of seven still seems too much (redundant). Point of clarification: yes/no vote? But if it's voted down, do we still have a committee? If voted down it's unclear what that new committee would be doing. Understanding that assessment would be part of that new committee. If voted down, you can't just disband or dismiss the committee. Question: would it simplify matters if this was made an assessment committee instead of a

curriculum committee? Discussion—this affords better oversight. Getting it right should trump efficiency.

Vote on motion: 67, 21, 12 (passes)

Curriculum Committee: Biology, Music, Education and Psychology have been approved.

ADJ proposal. Motion (seconded). Vote on motion: 87, 11, 3 (passes)

SOA proposal. Motion. (Seconded)

Discussion: Chair of department short explanation. Desire to become current in discipline and in line with current practices. Discussion of courses to be dropped and added. Quoted directly from outside report. I was insensitive to reproduce that language. Desire to change arrangement of cross-listing not a commentary on Social Work—they have impeccable credentials and are adored by their students. Departments should decide which courses should be taught by their majors.

The comments made by external reviewer were that Social Work faculty are inappropriate and doing a disservice. Few Social Work students take the course—our opportunity to serve the university. Those statements were made public, and personally hurt and professionally embarrassed. The process could run a different way.

Language was not unintentional or unfortunate. We were provided a rationale that listed lack of sociology faculty. Not cross-listing it has no impact on me as a teacher, but my concern is that students who do not look at courses in professional studies might have an opportunity to take a course. About social problems and their possible responses to it. In many schools Social Problems is taught by Social Work.

As a Sister of Mercy I am embarrassed by what has appeared online. The external evaluator should have contacted the department. Wants it tabled for procedural reasons.

Steve S. responds. Clearly announced at last meeting. There is no alternative to current structure. The document was posted on the 2nd. It has been posted for 29 days. This question is not about process, it's about content.

Motion to table discussion. That the vote on the SOA Proposal as submitted by the Curriculum Committee be postponed until the next Faculty Assembly meeting. 21, 76, 3 (does not pass)

Discussion continues. Hurt has been done. Is there a way to maintain the course? Answer: I made a mistake—I shouldn't have used her language. I did research at other Sociology departments—schools like Boston College, BU, St. Anselm's, URI, Roger Williams, U of Chicago, etc. Social Problems only taught in three Sociology departments. Did away with in the 1980s and 1990s—these issues come up in other courses. Not disciplinary norm to have Social Work faculty teaching. The course will still be offered. Social Problems is whether or not it's cross-listed. I've

read proposal and what I read is well thought out idea for a modernized Sociology Department. I read an objection from an outside reviewer that a course is in jeopardy because when it is detached from Sociology. Good argument for professional studies courses to be included in the Core, but we cannot decide if a course should be cross-listed by a department who doesn't wish it. We should seriously consider courses that aren't just Arts & Sciences. As I read the proposal, it's mostly about reworking the major—this is an issue of cross-listing. This never comes in front of the Assembly. Why are we having this discussion/vote? Why not offer this course as a University Seminar? I would love to be able to tell other departments that they needed to cross-list my courses, but the world doesn't work that way. It sets a very dangerous precedent for Assembly to tell departments which courses to cross-list. Answer: we're a department that has an external evaluator—we're objecting to the very strong language, the process. Administrators did not object. My program will probably be most impacted by this proposal, but we'll make adjustments, because they should be allowed to do what they need to with their majors. I support the motion. If Social Problems is no longer an appropriate course, I'm wondering what the one Sociologist in the room thinks? Response—my book has been out of print for a number of years. This department is doing its level best to provide the best program it can. Having read the report, the larger context has been taken into account. The outside evaluator was thinking about what Sociology and Anthropology students needed. The larger context and situation was complicated. In terms of a Social Problems course, it's a great course. No one would advise people not to take it, but the Sociology and Anthropology department should make its decisions.

Vote on Motion: 63, 33, 3

Announcements. Three proposals are now on Canvas.

Motion: Faculty Manual.

A few concerns remain, but we can vote on it now and then fix them. Two posts on Canvas site. We can fix some of this on the fly at future Assembly meetings. Can we look at the concerns later? A discussion on Rank & Tenure is probably necessary, but not necessarily for this vote. Faculty manuals are like airports and they're never finished, so we should vote on it. If we put this through now it might get murky as to which manual faculty are under.

Vote on Motion: 85, 13 1 (passes)

Deadline is June 1 for University II. Please submit at any time now.

Expediting Review committee is not responsible for who are teaching the courses.

Election Committee business. EPC professional program run-off.

Nominations for Speaker: Craig Condella. Elected by voice vote.

FACSB:--met with Sister Jane. Everything is tied to enrollments. Moving to 9-month contract.

