

12-3-2008

AS Minutes 2008 12 08

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

Recommended Citation

"AS Minutes 2008 12 08" (2008). *Faculty Assembly Documents*. Paper 16.
http://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly/16

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.

Minutes of the Faculty Assembly December 3, 2008

The meeting began informally about 2:45. While we were waiting to see if a quorum would be reached, the speaker of the Faculty Assembly, Will Stout, asked faculty for topics they would like to see discussed at the forums on academic rigor/integrity next semester. The following were suggested:

1. Defining rigor
2. Extra credit work vs. regular coursework
3. Grade inflation/grading
4. Busy work vs. thoughtful work
5. Choice of textbook/amount of textbook covered
6. How evaluations affect rigor
7. Our expectations of students/students' expectations (i.e., student culture)
8. Leadership roles for setting these definitions
9. Number of courses taken by students (are they taking too many?)
10. Types of exams being given
11. Academic policies and procedures on academic dishonesty/integrity
12. Peer review and help
13. Comparisons with other institutions (whom we would emulate)

A quorum was reached at 2:54 p.m., and the meeting was called to order.

Approval of Minutes.

The following amendments were made to the minutes (changes in bold):

- a. Ernie Rothman **proposed** a discussion of academic rigor and integrity.
 - i. Academic Rigor should be discussed as well as grade inflation.
 - ii. Evaluations, **currently** the primary **tool used to measure** teaching effectiveness **at Salve Regina, should be reconsidered. It measures only popularity, not teaching effectiveness. Furthermore, its current use in the rank and tenure process inhibits academic rigor.**
 - iii. Suggestion that evaluations be replaced by peer review, even if that means bringing in experts/colleagues **within the discipline** from other institutions.
 - iv. The Faculty Assembly agreed that the Executive Committee should arrange forums to discuss these issues in the spring of 2009 prior to the spring workshop.

The minutes were approved following the amendments.

Old Business

1. Diane Tomkinson presented the attached proposal from the EPC. She reminded us of the changes, which were presented at last month's meeting. This input is simply feedback that we will give to the administrator's supervisor, not directly to the administrator him/herself. A motion was made to accept the process, and the motion was seconded. The motion passed with 49 in favor, 2 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
2. Donna Harrington-Lueker from Communication Studies offered to answer further questions about the proposed minor in Film Studies, which was presented at last month's meeting. With no discussion, a motion was made to vote on the minor; the motion was seconded. The minor was accepted by a vote of 47 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention.

3. Peggy Matteson accepted questions on the proposed changes to the B.S. in Nursing, also presented at last month's meeting. There was no discussion.
A motion was made to vote, which was seconded. The Assembly voted to accept the changes to the B.S. in Nursing, and it passed with 43 in favor, 3 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

4. Tom Day and James Mitchell reported for the Protocol Review Committee, and answered questions from the faculty on the procedures. Members of the PRC, in addition to Tom Day and James Mitchell, are: Tony LoPresti, Chris Kiernan, Will Stout, Catherine Zipf, and Peggy Matteson.