

11-4-2005

AS Minutes 2005 11 04

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

Recommended Citation

"AS Minutes 2005 11 04" (2005). *Faculty Assembly Documents*. Paper 39.
http://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly/39

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 November 4, 2005

Jay Lacouture, Speaker of the Assembly, presided.

1. **Call to Order and Minutes.** The meeting was called to order at 1:29 PM. The Minutes of the meeting of October 14 were approved.
2. **Treasurer.** There is a little over \$1445 in the Assembly's account.

Jay Lacouture stepped out of the chair. John Quinn, Vice Speaker, presided.

3. **Motion – Core Complement addition.** Marialyn Riley, RSM, on behalf of the Core Curriculum Advisory Committee, presented the following Motion: That the Faculty Assembly endorse the proposed Core Complement elective entitled **ART 131 Drawing I: Representation and Reflection** that was submitted by the Art Department and approved by the Core Curriculum Advisory Committee. The Motion was seconded and passed unanimously in a show of hands.

Jay Lacouture returned to the Chair.

4. **Motion – Core Capstone.** Daniel Cowdin, a member of the Capstone Development Team, presented the following Motion: That the Faculty Assembly endorse **GST 450 Capstone Course – Living Wisdom: Contemporary Challenges** as the Capstone Course for the Salve Regina University Core Curriculum. The Motion was seconded and passed in a voice vote with 6 NO votes and no abstentions. [The course description is in an Appendix, a separate document.]
5. **Antone Excellence Awards.** Peter Liota, James Garman, and James Hersh spoke to the Assembly about the benefits of the Antone Excellence Awards.
6. **Workload.** The Speaker opened the floor for a discussion of workload. He reminded the Assembly that Stephen Trainor, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the Committee on Faculty Responsibilities have set plans in motion to facilitate the development of ideas on new ways to determine faculty workload. He also noted that, in April 2004, a committee set up by the Vice President for Academic Affairs had submitted a report to the VPAA on faculty workload, inclusive of a plan for reducing faculty workload. Some of the results of a faculty survey from this report were read to the Assembly.

The following were some of the points raised during the discussion:

Some faculty have to travel as part of their teaching. This time for travel should be considered in any redefinition of workload. || The class size and the number of advisees have to be considered in any new definition of workload. || More secretarial help would lighten workload. More clerical assistance is an improvement that could be done soon. || Faculty cannot realistically work on any plan to change workload if they have no access to budget figures. || If the length of class time could be changed, faculty would not have to commute so frequently to the campus. || Faculty are overstretched with the current curricular offerings.

More full-time faculty are probably needed. || A reduction in workload will have positive effects on the quality of education and the “culture” of the institution. || Adjuncts are not easy to find. It would be unrealistic to think that adjuncts will take care of any staffing shortages caused by a new workload system.

Stephen Trainor responded to some of the points that were raised. He said faculty should feel free to submit a wide variety of suggestions. Some faculty are already working on proposals. || It was important to think of a redefinition of workload as a project with two stages: The first stage would be a general readjustment for all full-time faculty. The second would address the distinctive needs and concerns of departments, in addition to issues such as class size and the number of advisees. The broad decisions should come first; the details come later. || The Committee on Faculty Responsibilities is trying to gather as much data as it can; it would be happy to share whatever information it finds. || Reducing the number of courses in departments and scheduling some courses less frequently would help to pay for some of the cost of workload reduction. || More secretarial support is essential; he is looking into that. || Because space is limited, classes have to be spread out over time. It would be difficult to find classroom space if the length of every class were expanded to seventy-five minutes.

Dean Trainor said that a reduction in workload at this time is not being coupled with an increase in what is expected from faculty (i.e., more scholarship and research); the purpose of the reduction is to help faculty do what they are doing now, and “they are already doing an awful lot.” || It would be faster to have the administration decide on a workload reduction plan but it is important to do this project right and carefully. Faculty, the people closest to the problems involved with this project, have to be the ones who propose the solutions. By February he hopes the process that has been set in motion will surface creative, innovative ideas and that he can present several models to the President.

On another matter, the Dean reminded the Assembly that five years ago (October 2, 2000) he had addressed the Assembly and proposed a process for developing a new and creative Core that would go along with the Mission statement. Today, with the Assembly’s endorsement of the structure of the Core Capstone, this five-year process has been completed.

At 2:19 PM the Speaker called for a brief recess. The meeting resumed at 2:19 PM in Executive Session.